LABBAI (LUBEY) (Tamil, Ilappai, said to be a corruption of 'arabbi'), in class of Indian Muslims, also known as Djamakas (Skt. rvauna, "Greek, western"), supposed to be descended from Arab immigrants who intermarried with native women, but now having nothing to distinguish them from the aboriginal people, except their mode of dress and manner of shaving the head and trimming the beard. In 1111 they numbered 401,700 and chiefly on the E. coast of Southern India. Most of them are Sunni, of the Shâhîs waqfshah, and their head-quarters are at Naqâvâ, the burial place of their patron saint, Shih al-Hamîd Abû al-Kadr (ob. 1600), commonly known as Kâdir Wall or Mihrân Sâhî (see Gazetteer of the Tanjore District, p. 245). They read the Qur'ân in Tamil translation, written in Arabic characters. They are industrious and enterprising, especially as fishermen and traders.


LABBAIKA (See Taliya).

LABID b. RIMÂ, ASC' ASI, an Arab poet of the pagan period, who lived into the days of Islam (mawhur), belonged to the family of Banu Dja'lâr, a branch of the Khilâb, who belonged to the Banu 'Amir and therefore to the Khawazim. According to Ibn Sa’d, vi. 21, he died in 40 (666/667) in the night on which Mu'awiyah arrived in al-Nukhâba to conclude peace with Hasan b. 'Ali. Others, like Ibn Hajar, iii. 657, write Nâsir (Fûn Fûsul-l'Asâs), ii. 51 thinks ought to be followed, give 41 A.H., others again 42. He is said to have reached an unusually great age (al-Sidjastânî, K. al-Mu'mmârin, ed. Goldziher, ch. 61). In fact he makes several allusions to this in his poems. The date of his birth can only be approximately fixed. Even before 600 A.D. he seems to have obtained a prominent position in his tribe by his command of language. As quite a young man he is said to have accompanying a delegation from his tribe to the court of king Abd al-Malik Nu'mân of al-Ihâs (c. 580-602), and when the latter was invited against the Banu 'Amir by his friend Abd al-Rahîm b. Ziyad al-Abî (of the tribe to which Labid's mother belonged),Labid succeeded with a satirical râjâ (Divân, NO. 33) in so ridiculing him to the king that he restored his favour to the Banu 'Amir. A verse from Nu'mân's answer to his courtier who sought to defend himself from the lampoon on him became proverbial (cf. al-Mufâsâlât, al-Fâhûr, L. 47; al-'Askari, Amâlî, on the margin of Maidûn, ii. 117, 7-18).

al-Maidûn, ii. 33; K. al-Ashqâr, xv. 94 sqq.; 91 sqq., xvi. 22 sqq., 21 sqq.; Abd al-Kâdir, Kâmânat al-Adwâb, i. 79 sqq., iv. 171 sqq.). In his later poems Labid also often prides himself on having helped his tribe by his eloquence. He remained loyal to his tribe even when a famous poet and scorned the profession of a wandering singer, practised by his contemporary al-'Askâr. But the coming of the Prophet Muhammad threw him out of the usual groove. We do not know the exact date of his conversion to Islam. As early as Djamâkâts II of the year 8 the chiefs of the tribe of 'Amir b. 'Abdullâh, 'Amir b. Tufail and Arbab b. Kâzî, a stepbrother of Labid, seem to have negotiated in Medina about the admission of their tribe to the new constitution without reaching any result (see Caetani, Amâlî, ii. 90 sqq.). Both men are said to have soon after come to an untimely end. 'Amir from plague and Arbab from a lightning stroke; the latter story seems to find confirmation in Labid's lament for him (Divân, NO. 5). The accusation on the other hand that Arbab attempted to kill the Prophet is quite incredible; for in that case Labid could hardly have composed several elegies on him and they would certainly not have been included in his Divân. In the year 9 the tribe again sent a delegation to Medina which included the poet and an agreement was reached. Labid is said on this occasion to have become a Muslim. He later migrated to Kufa where he died. Of his family only a daughter is mentioned who is said to have inherited his talent (see al-Maidûn, ii. 49, 13 sqq.; al-Ghâzâlî, Maqâlî, al-Badr, v. 57, 7 sqq.).

Labid's poems were very highly esteemed by the Arabs. Al-Nâbi'sha is said to have declared him the greatest poet among the Arabs and at least of his tribe, the Khawazim, on account of his Mu'âlââ. He himself is said to have claimed third place after Ibrân b. 'Abdullâh and Ta'hâf. Al-Djamâkâts (Tâl'mâd b. Shâ'îrâd, ed. Hall, p. 29 sqq.) places him in the third class of pagan poets along with al-Nâbi'sha and Abu Dhu'ayb and al-Shâmâkâb. Labid showed himself equally master of the kafilaf, the masâfiya and the bâshâlân. One of his bâshâlân was adopted into the collection of mu'âlââs and is thought by Nâsirî (Fûn Fûsul-l'Asâs, ii. 51) to be one of the best specimens of Beduin poetry. Labid uses the traditional pictures of the animal world — wild asses and antelopes fleeing before the hunter and fighting with his dogs — as charmingly as the usual complacencies about drinking bouts. He seems on the one hand to have only cultivated the marâb, because it had been traditional. He deals far less with the subject of woman's love than with the description of the Aslāf which he likes with
artistic calligraphy. He is also fond of recalling memories of places of his native district, the palm-groves and irrigation works of which continually move him to charming descriptions; indeed, one such connection he gives the whole literary (Hist. E. As., 19, 4, 490) of a journey from central Arabia to the coast of the Persian Gulf (see von Kremer, et al., p. 12). As his almost contemporary Abū Ẓahīr is fond of doing, in the Maʾālūkūt, 9, 154, he turns however more often to his beloved and thus combines the maḥāl with the main part of the hājīda to an organic whole; but for him this is simply a mode of transition to a new descriptive passage. His poetry is however distinguished from that of other poets of the pagan period by a certain religious feeling which seems to have been not exactly rare among his contemporaries, even before Muhammad's mission. While Zuhair, for example, still expresses his practical wisdom derived from the experience of a long life, in plain though impressive language, Lahib with such excessive always strikes a religious note. He certainly did not profess Christianity nor can we see in him a representative of the so-called Ḥanīfa of the ʿIra, as von Kremer wished to do. In him rather we find the belief in Allah as the guardian of morality finding particular expression, a belief widely disseminated in Arabia by the preaching of the Christian church. Such passages naturally invited the Muslim traditionists to increase them. Indeed a later author went so far as to ascribe to him a verse by Abū T-ʿAṣḥāyā (fig. 15). But many passages of his Divān seem to owe their inspiration to the Koran. The statement that he writes in more poetry after his conversion to Islam is obviously an invention (see the Sād, vi, 31, a repeated later; e.g. by ʿAlī Ḥusaynī, Majāli, ii. 52 infra); it is contradicted by the simple fact that poems 21 and 53 of the ʿArbāʿ were only composed shortly before his death (F. al-ʿArbāʿ, xvi. 101). The description of Paradise (Hist. E. As., 2, 14) is certainly inspired by the Koran like the idea that precedes it, that a record is kept of the doings of men. Under the influence of Islam in N. 39 and 41, verses 11 of which, as Ibn ʿAbī-l-Faqīr (i. 151), states that giving a verse, certainly must be written after his conversion, if it is not to be considered an interpolation, he replaces the maḥāl by pure adulation. Thus he creates a new artistic form that of poetical passages on the sanctity of human life; besides the Korān he may of course have been influenced by Christian preaching. He only follows older models in the composition when he combines adulation with the allusions of Islam from a woman in N. 14, so in Tahārīs multibāb, verses 56 spp. 63-65 (cf. Caster, Das Schickel, p. 93); where this is however only an episode in the whole.

Lahib's Divān was edited, according to the Fihrist, p. 158, by several of the greatest Arabic philologists, Abū ʿAbī al-Ṣabbāh, AbūʿAbī al-Shahbāz, al-Aṣmaʿ, al-Ṭāhir and Ibn al-Sāhih. Of these editions only half of that of al-Ṭāhir with a commentary has survived in the manuscript edited by al-Khālidī (see below) of the year 529. All other MSS. are much later, e.g. those in Leiden, Strasbourg, and that in Cairo not yet edited which also contains the Divān of Abū Ẓahīr, ed. by J. Holl.


LACCIADIVES (Lakīya divī, "the hundred thousand islands"), a group of coral atolls lying off the Malabar Coast between 8° and 14° N. and 71° 40′ and 74° W. There are thirteen islands in all, but only eight are inhabited, and these are divided into two groups—the northern, including the inhabited islands of Annini, Kudamart, Kitiya and Cetat, and the southern, including the inhabited islands of Agatti, Kara-rat, Androth and Kulendi. The northern group, for administrative purposes, forms part of the south Kanara District and the southern, of the Malabar District. To the south of the Laccadives stands the isolated island of Minikini, belonging physically, neither to this group nor to the Maldives, but approaching rather to the latter. The Laccadives were originally colonized by Hindus from Malabar but the inhabitants were converted to Islam in the thirteenth century, according to tradition. They number about 10,000, and in habits and customs resemble the Māppilas of North Malabar, but their women hold a higher position, and are neither veiled nor secluded. Inheritance follows the female line. The people formerly owned all that they cultivated, and the Kollam and Rajīs were virtually independent until, in the sixteenth century the Rajīs bestowed on them his admiral, the Alī Rāwjī of Kamanur, whose descendants governed them until 1791, when Kamanur was conquered by the British, into whose hands they fell.

Bibliography: J. Stanley Gardiner, The Pummi and Geography of the Maldives and Laccadive Archipelagoes, Cambridge 1901—1905; Malabar District Gazetteer, Madras 1908; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908. (T. W. Ham)

LĀDHĪK (Lātīhī, Gk. Aistōs), the name of several towns in Asia Minor.

1. The ancient Aistōs, or Aistēvounē, or (Lātīhī Saray). It probably derived this name from the smelling furnaces which were here and around, as the centre of the quicksilver mining area. It was in Karaman south of Konya, on the great military road which ran through Asia Minor. Lātāhī Saray already knows it by its modern name of Yorgā Saray or Lātīhī Saray in Karaman.

Bibliography: Hadi bi, Dhikr bi-Aṣsām, p. 411 sqq.; Ibn ibn Abī, ed. Houtman in Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoukides, ill. 23, 25 = iv. 8, 9; Cramer, Asia Minor, ii.
LADIK — AL-LADHIKIYA.


Ladik (Hudjda Khalifa; Ladijkiya), the ancient Laodicea ad Lyceum was in the S. E. part of Djermiyan. Al-Battjia calls it, in following Greek sources, Ladijkiya Fratijia (= Φρατίγια while Ptolomy places it in Caria). According to Ibn Battjia it was a large town with 7 Friday mosques, beautiful gardens, flowing rivers and springs and fine markets. The Greek women there made remarkably beautiful and durable woollen goods, embroidered with gold. Ibn Battjia also praises the hospitality of the inhabitants but censures the freedom of their morals. Slave girls were sold and prostitution practised even in the public baths. On the history of the town (now Eski Hora) see above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Ladik, the ancient Laodicaea Riveirae, south of Amasya.


AL-LADHIKIYA, a sea-port in Northern Syria, this ancient Laodicea Riveirae. It was founded by Seleucus I, who called it after his mother Laodike, and towards the end of the Seleucid empire it was the residence of the alliance of the four most important Syrian cities, the stegan, Antiochus, Amaena, Seleucia and Laodicea. In the reign of Justinian I it was made the capital of the newly founded province of Theodoria.

When the Arabs under the governor of Hims, Ubada b. al-Samit al-Aqmar, advanced on the town, the inhabitants made a determined resistance. Ubada encamped near Ladik and had deep trenches dug in which even horsemen could advance, unobserved. After a pretended retreat he returned in the night and was then able to surprise the inhabitants who had unobservantly opened the great gate of the city, and to enter the town. The citadel was then stormed and Ubada proclaimed upon the walls Allah akbar. A section of the Christian inhabitants fled to al-Basai (Birj-ir', al-Baladir, ed. de Goeje, p. 133), should thus be corrected for sanad: Ed. Schwar in Wallhausen, Z. D. M. G., i, 145. Their request to be allowed to return to the town was granted them on payment of a fixed sum as tribute. They retained possession of their churches, while Ubada had a new mosque built which was later enlarged (al-Baladir, ed. c. 134 ss.). About 97 (according to al-Baladir: 100 A.H.), the Greeks attacked the coast of al-Ladik and with a fleet, burned the town and carried off its inhabitants as prisoners (al-Baladir, ed. cl. c. Brook, J. H. S. 1878, xviii, p. 195). Umar had al-Ladik rebuilt, fortified and renamed the inhabitants from their captors. Yazid completed the restoration of the city after 'Umar's death and he also put a garrison in it. According to another story however, Yazid's services to the town were only the renovation of the defences and the strengthening of the garrison (al-Baladir, ed. cit. Mar'ud, Muruj al-Dhahab, Paris, viii, p. 281).

Nichephore Phokas in 968 won the town and the whole of Northern Syria from the Byzantines (Vahyi b. Sa'id al-Anjaki, ed. Kratkovskiy, and Vassiliev in Patrologia Orientalis, 1924, xlvii, p. 219). In 980, according to Vahyi b. Sa'id, when the Romans think, took his statement from a local chronicler of al-Ladik, the emperor Basil II appointed a certain Karmath, who had distinguished himself in an expedition against Tartalus which belonged to the Fatimid, to be governor of the town. When it was besieged by the Arab Muzay and ibn Shakir, he was captured during a sortie, and beheaded in Cairo (Reuss, Zepiski, Nauk, Acad. Nauk, xlv, p. 16 sqq. 153 sqq.). Michael Burzos (al-Faraj, ed. 1992) put down a rising of the Muslims in the town and had them deported to Bilad al-Rum (Vahyi, ed. Rosetti, p. 257). In 1086 al-Ladikkiya belonged to the Barqun Khan of Shaisan (Dasenberg, Osman. Chron., p. 27 sqq.) who had, however, to cede it to the Seljuk Malik Shah. In August 1098, the Count of Normandy took the town; it then passed in rapid succession to the Byzantines, to Bohemond of Tarentum, to the Byznatines again and finally after 18 months' siege, to Tancred of Antakiya (Rübbel), Gesch. des Kreises Jerusalema, p. 45, note 8). In 1104 we again find the Greeks besieging it by land and sea, and Bohemund promised the Emperor Alexius Comnenus in the treaty of Didim (1108) the possession of this territory among other places (Anna Comnena, Alexias, Boma, ii, p. 94, 271). Tancred however soon afterwards with the help of a Frank fleet took the town which in the meantime had again passed to the Muslims. The governor of Halab took and sacked it in 1130 in 1137 and 1170 it was visited by two severe earthquakes, in which only the principal Greek church remained intact. On July 23, 1188, Salih al-Din took the town ("Imad al-Din, Fath, p. 141; Abu Shama, Aziz al-Ramuiyatun, ed. Cairo 1287/1288, ii, p. 128 = Hisid, Orient, des Crois., iv, p. 561). In autumn 1197 Bohemund III succeeded once more in conquering al-Ladikkiya or a part of the town at least. In 1225 the Halabs destroyed the town or its citizens out of fear of the Christians approaching on the Fifth Crusade. But even after this (since 1197), half the city remained in possession of the Franks. Balbar in 1275 demanded that they should hand over this part of it. In 1281 al-Ladikkiya belonged to the emir Sonkor of Dimashq, whom the Seljuk had been forced to surrender it in a treaty (June 24), but after the fall of Sonkor, another emir won it back from Aflumer (April 20, 1287); soon afterwards a new earthquake almost completely destroyed several of its strong towers, the pigeon-tower, the light-house and the towers in the sea; great siege engines completed the destruction of the fortifications.

The district of al-Ladikkiya, which had hitherto gone with Halab under the Ayyubids (Vahyi, Minhaj, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv, p. 338; al-Shu'ayb, ed. Furtt, p. 237), was ceded to the king of the eleventh century, who declared it the new province of Tartalus ("Umar, Twr, ed. R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., 1910, p. 282, in R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., 1910, p. 282, in C. Zaaydi, Msy, ed. R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., 1910, p. 282, in F. Zaaydi, "Imad al-Din, Fath, p. 141; Abu Shama, Aziz al-Ramuiyatun, ed. Cairo 1287/1288, ii, p. 128 = Hisid, Orient, des Crois., iv, p. 561). In autumn 1197 Bohemund III succeeded once more in conquering al-Ladikkiya or a part of the town at least. In 1225 the Halabs destroyed the town or its citizens out of fear of the Christians approaching on the Fifth Crusade. But even after this (since 1197), half the city remained in possession of the Franks. Balbar in 1275 demanded that they should hand over this part of it. In 1281 al-Ladikkiya belonged to the emir Sonkor of Dimashq, whom the Seljuk had been forced to surrender it in a treaty (June 24), but after the fall of Sonkor, another emir won it back from Aflumer (April 20, 1287); soon afterwards a new earthquake almost completely destroyed several of its strong towers, the pigeon-tower, the light-house and the towers in the sea; great siege engines completed the destruction of the fortifications. 

The district of al-Ladikkiya, which had hitherto gone with Halab under the Ayyubids (Vahyi, Minhaj, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv, p. 338; al-Shu'ayb, ed. Furtt, p. 237), was ceded to the king of the eleventh century, who declared it the new province of Tartalus ("Umar, Twr, ed. R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., 1910, p. 282, in R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., 1910, p. 282, in C. Zaaydi, Msy, ed. R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., 1910, p. 282, in F. Zaaydi, "Imad al-Din, Fath, p. 141; Abu Shama, Aziz al-Ramuiyatun, ed. Cairo 1287/1288, ii, p. 128 = Hisid, Orient, des Crois., iv, p. 561). In autumn 1197 Bohemund III succeeded once more in conquering al-Ladikkiya or a part of the town at least. In 1225 the Halabs destroyed the town or its citizens out of fear of the Christians approaching on the Fifth Crusade. But even after this (since 1197), half the city remained in possession of the Franks. Balbar in 1275 demanded that they should hand over this part of it. In 1281 al-Ladikkiya belonged to the emir Sonkor of Dimashq, whom the Seljuk had been forced to surrender it in a treaty (June 24), but after the fall of Sonkor, another emir won it back from Aflumer (April 20, 1287); soon afterwards a new earthquake almost completely destroyed several of its strong towers, the pigeon-tower, the light-house and the towers in the sea; great siege engines completed the destruction of the fortifications.
Paris MSS. Arab. 4435, fol. 94r, 122v, 123r, in van Berchem, Voyage en Syria, p. 290, note 3; al-Kalbajahandi, *Tabb al-Dun*, v. 145; transl. Gaudenfrey-Demoubyens, *La Syrie*, p. 113 (ed.). The Arab geographers and historians mention many ancient buildings that had survived in the town; they also tell of two castles connected with one another on a hill which commanded al-Lādhiqīya (Bahāʾ al-Dun, in Hist. Or. des Crois., ii. 110), a great city-gate, which it took a number of men to open (al-Ghālibī, ed. v. 132), and the splendid monastery of Dār al-Furūs (Masʿūdī, *Masāʾik al-Dhakhīlah*, viii. 251; Dānāwihi, ed. Mehren, v. 209, Abu ʿl-Fadl, Geogr., transl. Renand-Guyard, i. 183, in Ibn Batūta, i. 1831: al-Furūs) called after Zul Fursi and the name of the eminence to the north of the town (M. Hartmann, *Z.D.P.V.*, iv. 466 and map). A short description of al-Lādhiqīya is given by Ranulf of Caen (Grund Tavereh, ch. 144; Rohlricht: *Z.D.P.V.*, 2: 316 has put together a list of the buildings of the town known from Frankish sources). It is quite probable that the earthquakes and frequent pillaging suffered by the town in the course of centuries, it never seems to have been quite desolate but not uninhabited. The fine, high houses and the straight streets paved with marble blocks, noted by Ibn al-ʿAli, and Abu ʿl-Ḥasan (Hist. Or. des Crois., i. 720; iv. 361) and which they say had suffered much when the town was sacked (cf. also Yaḥyā, ed. de Goeje, *B.C.A.*, vi. 208), recall the description of Laodicea in Ptolemy's *Geography* as a *κατάκτα ιερόν πόλις* (Strabo, xvi. p. 753), and of the modern town van Berchem says (J.A., 1902, p. 425; cf. Voyage, i. p. 289 sq.): *la ville de Zedadhi a gardé ses ruines. Il est curieux que, en plein, d'aspect tout moderne, existât un moyen âge; il semble qu'il ait été à l'antiquité, comme certaines autres villes de Damas et d'Éphèse*. The origin of the straight streets and the square plan of the town (cf. Th. Schnieter in the Flortschrift für H. Kiepert, 1908, p. 224, 249) has been ascribed to architects of the Roman empire (A. v. Gerkan, Griech. Stadtbaukunst, 1904, passim), but more recently Culler has shown that they were already existing in the early Hellenistic period and had been borrowed as early as by Hippodamos of Miletus (fifth century) from the architecture of the ancient east (Architektur Hippodamos, in *Memoriai dell Accad. dei Lincei*, ser. v., vol. xvii, p. 409, 433 sqq.; Camont, *Guide de l'Égypte*, Paris, 1916, xiv. note 3, 4, 24 sqq., 483).

Laghuat — Lahidj

The town which was visited in 1503 by Ludovico di Bartholomeo and in 1810 by V. G. von Sestoc and which Niebuhr still calls Al-Mashat is but a name in the face of the desert, a word, if you will, in the air. In the old days, when the towns were full of inhabitants, this place was a town of several thousand houses and 500 straw orreed huts with almost 5,000 inhabitants, owes its prosperity to the Russian-Turkish war in the course of which in 1828 England temporarily proclaimed a state of siege in Aden and evicted the Arabs and Somaills from Aden. The latter went to Lahidj, where they built themselves thousands of huts close to the town, which now form extensive suburbs and considerably increased the number of inhabitants. The sea of houses is dominated by the palace of the Sultan, built by Indian architects and four to five storeys high with extensive subsidiary buildings; it is entirely built of clay and painted white. The palace is surrounded by a clay wall in the east of which lies a town with its numerous rectangular flat-roofed houses, all built of sun-dried bricks made of a mixture of dung, clay, straw and dried grass and one or two stories high. The reality of the picture is broken only by the very simple, insignificant mosques which are outlined in white round the roof. To the east of the palace in the shade of beautiful leafy trees and palms is a pleasant looking one-storied bungalow built by the Sultan for foreign guests. Round the town are scattered little groups of low straw-huts, made of Shibra stems and surrounded by a hedge which is inhabited by Somaills and their families. In addition to these there are also small Sahrawi settlements in Lahidj. The great majority of the inhabitants however are Yemeni Arabs, who live in the numerous houses and mud-huts, which form the town with its narrow, winding, dusty streets. A part of the town is reserved for the Jews, who look wretched and are merchants and artisans. There are also a few Muslim Jews who are traders. All types of the population are met with in the bazaar street which is barely six feet wide. Not far from this is the armaments' market where smiths, Arabs and Jews have erected their simple workshops in open booths. The principal weapons made here are the fine jirba's while the long cavalry lances, which are used by the Yemeni Kabils, are made in Dahla, Anqalib or Ha'w and brought for sale to the Lahidj market. In

Bibliography: E. Basset, Les dictionnari attirage attribués à Sidi Ahmed ben Youssef; in 'Y. A., 1890; E. Doumas, Le Sahara al-
Wellsted's time there were also 30 silk-weavers here, who got their yarn from India. The oasis is very well watered and the numerous little canals are fed by the perennial streams which pass not far from the town. Lahijd which plays an important part in the caravan traffic is connected by a road with 'Aden and in 1907 was to have been linked up by a railway with 'Aden and 'Adil', part of which was actually surveyed but the plan was abandoned. England took up the scheme again in 1915 during the war and laid a strategic railway of 1 metre gauge for 25 miles to Lahijd; in 1921 it was extended a few miles beyond the oasis of Lahijd and now reaches Ḥabab al-Ḥamra', 8 miles N.W. of al-Ḥaṣa. The continuation of the railway to 'Aden would open up Southern Yemen and increase the importance of Lahijd.

History. The name Lahijd (Lahijd) which means a damp low lying area intersected by water channels, a place-name that admirably suits Lahijd, is connected by the genealogists with the Himyar Lahijd b. Wāli b. al-Ghawth b. Ḥāsan b. al-Ẓahir. Lahijd is a name that is still current and is accepted by the geographers to a district in Yemen which forms part of the territory of Ḥabab al-Ḥamra, a town in the Yemeni province of Ḥabab al-Ḥamra. Lahijd is a fertile area with good water supplies and a mild climate. It is located on the Red Sea coast and is connected by a road with 'Aden. Lahijd was an important center for the slave trade, with many slave caravans passing through. The area is famous for its date palm groves and its fertile land.

The coast of Lahijd is known for its strategic location, as it is close to the Red Sea and the Arabian Sea. The area has been inhabited for thousands of years, with evidence of early human settlement. Lahijd has been a center of trade and commerce, with caravans passing through to 'Aden and other parts of Yemen. The area is still known for its agricultural resources and its role in the regional economy.
the Sultan, or his sons were to enter or leave 'Aden free of duty. In spite of this treaty the Sultan, who was still sore over the loss of 'Aden, continued to intrigue against the English and supported the attack of the Arabs on 'Aden in 1840 and even had the English representative in 'Aden, Hassan Khatib, murdered and regularly adopted a hostile attitude towards the English. His constant failures however forced him to change his policy and on February 11, 1843 he concluded a new agreement with England which was renewed in a more stringent form on February 20, 1844. Before his monthly allowance was again paid to him, Mubaisin Faqil, who had again allowed himself to be involved in a war with England in 1846 in which he was defeated, died on November 30, 1847. His son and successor Ahmad maintained friendly relations with England as it was in his best interest to do so. He died in 1849 and was succeeded by his brother 'Ali who resumed a policy of hostility to England and roused the hostility of the tribes against 'Aden. On March 7, 1849 a treaty was however concluded with the East India Company which was ratified on October 30, by Lord Udalhouse, but an attitude of constant friendship to England was not thereby secured. The Sultan even cut off supplies and it finally came to open fighting in which the Sultan was defeated on March 18, 1858 at Sheikh 'Othman so that he had again to reconcile himself to a peaceful policy. When in 1873 the Turks in their reconquest of the Yemen advanced on the hinterland of 'Aden, the English occupied Lahij and this had to retire as a result of English diplomatic negotiations with the Sublime Porte. Whether these negotiations were instigated or approved by the Sultan and the effects of its independence — only nominal it is true — by the Turkish occupation of his territory, is not known. In any case in 1887, as E. Glaser records, Sultan Faqil b. 'Ali was receiving a monthly allowance of 1,250 dollars from 'Aden.

**Genealogical Survey of the Sultans of Lahij.**

Faqil b. 'Ali b. Salih b. Salim (1728–1742)

- 'Abd al-Karim (1742–1753)

- Mubaisin (1827–Nov. 30, 1847)

- Ahmad (1847–1849)

- Faqil (1849–1866)

- Fatimah (after 1866?)

- July 1915

- 'Abd al-Karim (since July 1915)

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


LAHIDJAN. I. A town in Gilan in the east of the Safid-Rud and north of the mountain Dulaf (cf. the ancient name of a people *Abíšonas*) on the river Kói-khala (Pardesar) which 8 miles higher up flows through Langarud, the present capital of the district of Rám-i Khán.

Lahidjan although unknown to the early Arab geographers is certainly one of the oldest towns in Gilan. Its foundation is attributed to the legendary Lahid b. Sâm b. Náb, the river Safid-Rud divides Gilan into two parts. In ancient times the river formed the frontier between the Arramids on the coast and the Kullusors or Gilai on the west; cf. Andreas, Armeniae, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie. In the Muslim period the part of the Gilan to the east of the river was called Biya-pash and that to the west Biya-pas (the word *pash* [cf. Aḥmād Rāzī in Dorn, Auszüge, p. 100, corresponds to the Avestic *wistāh*, *water-course*]. According to Kāhīnī the people of Biya-pash were *Allīda (Zaidis) and those of Biya-pas *Habalis or sectarians of mátād Abū Džafar (= Tābari).

The old dynasty of Biya-pash was that of the Kowām or Hawūm in the modern Rám-i Khán. Its founder was Nāšir b. Kāhīnī Ḥasan *Utrīshā, a descendant of the Caliph *Alī, who preached Nāshirī doctrines in Gilan and died in 364 (974) (Ibn-i-Abirā, viii. 61; Tābari, iii. 2392). His descendants are known as Nāshirwānd. Later the family divided into two branches, in the reign of Ujjājīn the lord of Kowām was Sāltāb b. Sāltāb b. Kālīkwāz b. Sāltāb (the descent of this branch is not quite certain); the lord of Lahidjān, the most powerful of the princes of Gilan (or of Biya-pash), was Naw-Pāddishā (or Shāh-i nāw).

When in 1307 Ujjājīn arrived before Lahidijān (via Tāror-Lūwādšān-Dāšṭān-Rustā) Naw Pāddishā submitted to him and thus kept his position.

Lahidjian became more generally known as the capital of the dynasty of Biya-pash called Kār-Kīyā. These sāiyids came originally from the village of Malāt (in the district of Rám-i Khán). About 769 during the civil war between the two lines of Nāshirwānd, the descendants of Sharāf al-Dīn and those of Amur Muhammad of Rám-i Khán, Sāiyid *Alī b. Sāiyid Kīyā sowed Biya-pash, Dashtām and some districts of Māzandaran. The power of the Nāshirwānd was re-established in 791–794; in 908 (1502) the troops of Amir Ḥusain al-Dīn of Fārān (Biya-pash) sacked the town and similar invasions were repeated in 910 (1504) and in 914 (1508) but, except for such interruptions, the dynasty of the Kār-Kīyā lasted till 1000 (1592). The Safawids had close connections with Lahidjian in the village of Shāhīshābār, with the road from Lahidjian to Langarud is the tomb of Shāhī Shīkh Zāhīd (d. in 714 = 1314), who was the spiritual father (ftr) of Shīkh Šāh al-Dīn, the famous ancestor of the Safawī dynasty. Shāh Ismā'īl I, a fugitive from the Al-Koyanu, found refuge with the Kār-Kīyā Mirzā Alī and studied under Mūsawī Shams al-Dīn Lahidjian (E. Dacosta, Ross, The early years of Shāh Ismā'īl, Tekas, 1895, p. 286). These friendly relations were broken in the reign of the Kār Kīyā Khān Ahmad Khān (943–975 and 985–1000) who was at first imprisoned by Shāh Tahmāsp and later driven from the throne by Shāh Aḥbāb, who was desirous of adding his intrigues with the Ottomans. Ahmad Khān ended his days in Constantinople (Hammer, G.O.R., ii. 562, 576). In 1000 (1592) Shāh Aḥbāb came to Lahidjian and destroyed the gardens in front of the castle. During their occupation of Gilan (1724–1734) the Russians built two forts in Lahidjian. Lahidjian has now lost all political importance, but has retained its local importance as the centre of one of the largest and richest districts in Gilan. The town has 2,360 houses with 10,000 inhabitants. There are many tombs there of members of the old ruling family. The district is divided into seven cantons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khālīsh</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pašmačah</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanārī-Pārī</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāh Šah-i bālī</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourkha</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čārdē</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaght Nāshā</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Several districts in Persia have however derived from the stems Lāh and Lār [v.]: Lahijān, an important little town in Transcaucasia west of Shamshāna [cf. šam-aš]; Lahidjian, a village in the county of Kurkāt in the province of Pārs; Lahidjian, a canton of Mulk Kudristān [cf. sawūd-nāsā], which the Sharāf-šāhīn, 286 calls Lahidjian. There is a village of Lahidiān near Ilhāk, south of Tabriz and a village of Lāhijān south of the Araxes about 12 miles above the south of the river of Ardabil (Kara-Šīr). The forms Lāh and Lār may both come from *Lād[* (cf. the old Persian *Māz[a, which gave Māz in Persian and Māz-i in Armenian). According to the dictionaries (Vallier), the old name of the town of Lār [v.] was Lāh/Lād; the silk called *lad is also known as *lāh (Lāh however may equally well be explained by *lāz). The change of *d(ā) to r is
attested in the Caspian dialects (it is regular in Tātī; in Mānzadārī we have the parallel forms láhād/láhād; Melganov, p. 221). The fact that we have districts of Lāhīdān and Lārīdān in the adjoining provinces of Gilān and Mānzadārān is remarkable, but still more significant is the fact that Lāhīd of Shīrvān represents an islet of Iranīan Tātī surrounded by Turkīs (the Tātī are now found scattered throughout Daghīšān, the country round Teherān, Aghāshāhī, Kāzar, etc.). Their present name has a rather general and vague character, of which Teherān. The colony of Lāhīd may have retained the original dialect formerly spoken in the metropolis. The name of the silk láhīd/láhīd suggests the former existence of a place called Lād, which produced silk (cf. Vakš, v. v. Lāhīd). [Yaḵīr says that Lāhīd produces the silk called “Lāhīdī” which is not of high quality.] With the suffix ‘-i, the word láhī would mean the people of Lād. It remains to be seen if the region of Lāhīdān is not the ancestral home of numerous Lāhīdī colonies. At the present day there is spoken in Lāhīdān — although with certain local peculiarities — the Gilākī dialect but this parent dialect has here exercised a levelling influence, of which the foreign Turkīs was incapable in the case of the people of Lāhīd of Shīrvān. As to Lāhīdān of Khūzestān we may recall the hypothesis of Andraes that the name “Dišā” which the Zākī call themselves (north of Diyarbakr) is a metathesis of Dišālam (Danīlam). The emigrations from Gilān, still very obscure, certainly penetrated far to the west. — [To the names mentioned one might add perhaps that of Kal-i Lāhīdī in Khūstān (i.e. on the coast) and that of the Tārākī in Khūstān (v. s., xiv/1, p. 240).] (V. Minorsky)

LĀHĪR, capital of the province of the Pāndjāb, British India, situated on the river Kāś, at 31° 35' north latitude, 74° 20' east longitude. Population in 1911, 228,687 of whom 139,301 were Muhammadans. The foundation of Lāhīr is traditionally attributed to a mythical Lava or Lōh, son of Kāna, after whom the city was named. Lōhāwar. It is not mentioned in the chronicles of the invasion of Alexander the Great, nor is the town described either by Strabo or Pliny, but it may be the Lōhākā of Ptolemy, which Sir Alexander Cunningham (in his Ancient Geography of India) explains as Lāvāika, "the abode of Lava". In the Mahābhārata, the Pāndjāb is called Tākādaca, or the country of the Tākas. According to Huien Tsang, Tākī was the capital of the Pāndjāb in 663 A.D. He makes no mention of Lāhīr by any name capable of identification as such, though he traversed the entire province and stayed in it for quite two years. Possibly the Lokeot of the Purāṇas is Lāhīr. The Dehshā Bahāq (a compilation from the Purāṇas) gives an account of a battle between Bānumal, Rādja of Lāvāpūr, and one Bhīm Sen Kanēkson, the mythical ancestor of the solar Rādja princes of Carnātik, India, is said to have migrated south from Lōkot, and was assigned by Connel Ted to c. 145 A.D. One of the earliest gateways is known as the Bhāti Gate; the Solānkhā and Bhātā of Rādjarāpān point to Lāhīr as the seat of an earlier settlement. The first distinct mention of Lāhīr occurs in the history of the campaign of Subhātarīn, and of Mahmūd of Ghāznī, when the Brahman kings of the Kāshī valley, being driven from Pāshawr and Ohind, established their new capital first at Bhēra on the Dīhelm, and then at Lāhīr. Both Dīsī Pāl, and his son Anang Pāl, the successive antagonists of the Ghāznī invaders, are called Rādjas of Lāhīr by Farāhī, according to whom the Hindu dynasty was subverted in A.D. 1037, when Lāhīr became the residence of a Muslim governor under the king of Ghāznī. A final insurrection of the Hindūs was quelled by Māwduī in 1045, and the city was left in charge of Malik Ayān, whom Muhammadan tradition regards as the founder. During the reign of Mas‘ūd III (1009—1114), Lāhīr became the capital of the Ghāznī dynasty, but was captured in A.D. 1186 by Shāhāb al-Dīn, known as Muhammad Ghōrī, the Muhammadan conqueror of India. The town was sacked by the Mongols of Cīngī Khan, and of Tūmhār, and in the reign of Mubārāk Shāh it was "a desolate waste in which no living thing except the owl of ill-omen had its abode" (Elliot-Dowson, iv. 56, 37). Lāhīr remained insignificant throughout the period of the Pāshās and Durrāns. In 1456, Bahālī Lōdī seized Lāhīr as a first step to power. It was plundered by Akbar’s troops in 1524. Even at this time the Pāndjāb was an almost uninhabited waste, except for a few walled cities in which the Hindūs could exist in some security from the frontier raiders. The Mongols of Bahk and Kāshū every year used to make raids on the Pāndjāb, and for this reason the province remained depopulated for a long time, and very little agriculture was carried on. Rāj Rām De Baht, of Patālā, rented the whole Pāndjāb from the governor of Lāhīr for 900,000 takās (£ 2,000) (Lāhīr’s Memoirs).

Under the Great Mughals, Agra, Dīlī, and Lāhīr were the three chief cities and mints of the Mughal Empire. Akbar held his court here from 1584 to 1598, and repaired and enlarged the fort. In the time of Dājīghūr, who made it a secondary capital, Lāhīr reached its zenith of wealth and splendour; the tombs of this emperor and of his famous consort Nūr Jāhān, are on the opposite side of the Kāś. The place fully shared in the misfortunes which attended the decline of the Mughal Empire. Situated on the high-road from Afgānīstān, it was exposed to the visitation of every Western invader, and suffered from the successive conquests of Nadīr Shāh, Ahmad Shāh Durrānī, and other less famous oppressors. Lāhīr was a bone of contention between the Sikhs and the Moslems, and the great city of the Mughal princes and their viceroy was reduced to little more than a heap of ruins. But the rising of Sikh power under Rājītī Singh (1708 A.D.) made Lāhīr once more the centre of a flourishing realm. It relapsed into anarchy after Rājītī Singh’s death. Then followed the First and Second Sikh Wars, and annexation to British India in 1849. Since that time the capital of the Pāndjāb has grown steadily, and a new town covers a large tract which was recently a wilderness.

The native city is a walled town with thirteen gates. It has been a municipality since 1867. The old crafts are moribund, but have been replaced by trades of a modern character. There are power mills — cotton, flour, iron — and a large agricultural market. The European quarter, or Civil Station, lies to the south and east of the city, and is a large administrative, educational, and business centre. The older part is known as Anarkali, and here are the buildings of the Government Secretariat,
University of the Punjab, Government College, Medical and Law Colleges, and Museum. A number of smaller institutions are associated with it, including the Punjab University Library, the Punjab Museum, and the Punjab Agricultural University.

**Biography:**


(B. R. Whitehead)

**) LAILA (A.), night, Lailat al-barâ'a, Lailat al-Kadî, see RAMADân.**

**LAILA L-ARKHÂLÂ, an Arab poet, daughter of Abdallah b. al-Rahbâl(a) b. Ka'b b. Mu'awiya of the tribe of Uqail b. Ka'b. She got her name from the fact that her father — according to other traditions one of her ancestors Ka'b or Mu'awiya — was known as al-Akhyl (= the falcon). Perhaps it was a common name in her family and the phrase wa-nâma l-arkhâlî-N in her verses glorifying her family may refer to this (Aghâni, x. 80; Hanabî, p. 711). Laila is usually mentioned in connection with her fellow-tribesman Tawba b. Hushayr b. Khalefâ-dji, fragments of her lamentations for him are preserved in the Kitâb al-Aghâni. She also wrote an elegy on the death of the Caliph Uthman. It is also recorded of her that she exchanged lampoons with Nâhîga al-Djawâdi. Her conversations with Mu'awiya, Abd al-Malik and Ǧâhdî-jâjîd b. Vâsun are several times recorded. She lived in her old age to take her to her uncle Kutabâ b. Muslim in Khdiri, but she is said to have died on the way. She must therefore have flourished in the second half of the first century A.H.

**Biography:**


(H. H. Brau)

**LAILÂ KHAHÎM, with Fitnêth Khaftâm, the greatest Turkish poets of the older school, at the end of the romantic and beginning of the modern period. Born in Constantinople, the daughter of Kaft-Askor Moreli-zade Hâmid Efendi, she received an excellent education. Her Molla [14 v.] contributed most to her poetic development; she was related to him and always retained a grateful memory of him as is shown by her elegy, full of deep feeling on his death. In her case the lack of information about her is characteristic of the old Turkish conception of women about whom very little is spoken in public. She was early married but divorced very soon afterwards. She had the reputation of a Lesbian. She cared very little about the opinion of the world. She lived for her pleasures and her writing. A few anecdotes relate to her infringements of the social code of Turkish ladies. She joined the Mewlewî and was buried in the Mewlewî convent in Galata. She died in 1264 (1848).**

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

**Biography:**

**Fâîto, Tezkîrîs, Constantinople 1271, p. 323-324; Mehméd Dâhlîn, Meğbûhî al-Nâdî, Constantinople 1295, ii. 195; Ahmad Râfî, Lâqâhî-ta'qullîyâ we-diğh-rûs-yâ, Constantinople 1300, vi. 154; M. Nâdî, Tâzîmî, Constantinople 1308, p. 271; Ahmad Mîhkîr, Şîrîr Khansûrlu, Constantinople 1311, p. 54-52; Thurâîyî, Sîjdîlî, I'timâdî, iv. 93; Sînf, Kânûnî al-Âlamî, vi. 4060; Brussal M. Tâhir, I'timâdî Muâqâllîrî, Constantinople 1325-1343, ii, p. 406; Ibrâhîm Nadîm, Ta'rikh-i Eshq-i Derzîrî, Constantinople 1338, i. 626; Konstantînî, Mûnîkhabbîl-i Akhîr-i 'Imamîyâ, Constantinople, i. 328, p. 276-279; Sâylînî, Ahkâm-i ahrâm-e ma'qâm-i Şâhî, Iznik 1893; St. Petersburg 1903, p. 271; Histories of Ottoman poetry by Hammer-Furstgall, Gibb (v. 342-349), Nasmandjî etc. (T. Menzil)

**) LAILÂ U-MÂDJINÎN. (See MAHÎNÎN.)**

**LAÎTH. (See KINÂNÎ.)**

**LAK, i. The most southern group of Kurd tribes in Persia. According to Zain al-Âbidîn their name (Lak, often Lakk) is explained by the Persian word lak (100,000) which is said to have been the original number of families of Lak. The group of importance as the Zand dynasty arose from it. The Lak now living in Northern Luristan are sometimes connected with the Lur (Zain al-Âbidîn), whom they resemble from the sanguine and ethical point of view. The facts of history however show that the Lak have immigrated to their present settlements from lands further north. They are a well-to-do tribe. The language, according to O. Mann, has the characteristics of Kurdish and not of the Luri dialects [cf. Lûr]. (Cirirîk, Futûwî Journal, St. Petersburg 1875, p. 227, says: "the Lur and the Lak speak different dialects and hate one another".)**

The Lak appear in the Shâraf-nâmâ, i. 393 alongside of the Zand, among the secondary Kurds tribes, subjects of Persia. According to Kabino, the Lak were settled in Luristan by order of Shîh 'Abbâs who wished: in this way to create some support for the new walis of Luristan, Hûsain Khañîn, whom he had chosen from among the relatives of the old Shâhshâh al 'Attâb (Tâhir-i Alâm-i, p. 369). Of these tribes, the Lûsîlîs had formerly lived at Mâhidâsh (S.W. of Kavoûn- shâb); the Dîlâfûn take their name from Ablî Dâlah [cf. the article AL-ḴÂMî, s. v.] whose sels of the third (ninth) century lying in the north of Luristan [cf. Sultân-ḵânî] and the Bûlghân of Zohûr [q.v.] as well as of Luristan say they come from Mawijîl and are evidently one tribe. The Luristan branch seems to have exchanged its Kurnâmi dialect for
Lakki during its sojourn among the Lak in the time of Shāh 'Abdul. Even after Shāh 'Abdul there were several Lak tribes outside of Luristan. Zain al-'Abidin (bog. of the sixteenth century) mentions among the Lak: the Zand, the Māfi, the Bādijān, and the Zand-yi kīla (†). To the last tribe (according to Hostum-Schindler: Begege) belonged Karm Khān Zand (born in Pārtiy, the modern Pāré about 20 miles from Dowlahābād on the Sulţānābād road). When at Shār-e Karm Khān sent for the Lak tribe of Bārāinwand. In 1212 (1797) the Bārāinwand and the Bādijān actively supported Muhammad Khān Zand in his attempt to take the power from the Kāshfī (H. J. Brydges, A History of Persia, London 1833, p. 46, 58; R. G. Watson, A History of Persia, London 1866, p. 115). Under the Kāshfī several Lak tribes were broken up; in 1830 remnants of them were to be found among the Bādijān of Khāntik (Khvārābād, Khvārābād, Khvārābād, Khvārābād, Khvārābād, Khvārābād, Khvārābād, Khvārābād), Russ. trans., p. 110-121); there are still a few Zand families in the Dork-Farāsān district to the S.E. of Kermān-shāh (H. M. M., xxviiii., p. 39); a section of the 'Amala of Puth-i Kuh claims to be descended from the Karm Khān tribe. At the present day there are Māfi at Waramin, Tīhrān, and Karān. According to a good list compiled by RousSea at Kermānshāh in 1807 (cf. Pardvand, Shāh, Vinyla 1813, ill. 85, 98) there were considered as Lak the following tribes: Kalīn, Māfī, Nānakī, Dālīwān, Pāyrawān, Kūli, Šīrīwān, Bahrāmīn, Karīkī, Tawalli, Zīrywān, Kālīwān, Nāmīwān, Aqmānāwān, Bōbī, Zīlī, Hārsī, and Shahīwān. According to O. Mann and Rabino, the Lak tribes of Luristan are as follows: Sisyla (9,000 families), Dīfān (7,470), Tīhrān-Amrāyī (1,582 families), the Bārāin wand (6,000 families) and Dālīwān (1,000 families) forming part of the Bāla-gīrāwī group, a total of about 15,000 tents. The Bārāinwand and Dālīwand live to the east of Khvārābād around the sources of the river which flows through this town; the Sisyla and the Dīfān occupy the beautiful plains of Al-kitāb and Khāwā respectively while the Tīhrān (perhaps = Tarkhān, i.e., exempt from taxes) live between the left bank of the Saimara and the lower course of its left bank tributary from Khvārābād. The territory occupied by the Lak and including N. and N.W. Luristan is sometimes called Lakhtistān. The cohesion of the Lak tribes is evident from the fact that even before 1914 the Sisyla, Dīfān and Tīhrān were united under the authority of Nāzār Khān of the Amrāyī clan. In addition to the bōnī tribes and language, there is that of religion for all the Dīfān and many of the 'Amala of Tīhrān belong to the extremist Shī's sect of the Ahl-i Haq (cf. Sulaymān Sulaymān).
practically reduced to little more than a title of honour. Its archaic flavour, the glorious memories which it recalled of the phylarchs of India, was very impressive in the "Burke" or "Almanac de Gothâ" of the Arabs. But as to the Lakhmids, they no longer have a separate existence from the Djarâmân. When in the lands to the west of the Euphrates, we find them mentioned alone, the name must be taken to mean the Djarâmân. It is the latter that the chroniclers usually have in mind.


(H. Lammens)

**LAKHNAU,** former capital of the province of Oudh (Awadh), now secondary capital of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in British India; situated on the river Gomti, at 26° 55' N. lat., 80° 56' E. long. Population at the 1911 census, 197,852, of whom 4,401 were Muslims. The town has a long history, dating from the time of the Sih Marcus, who reigned in the 16th century. It became a Muslim dominion in the 17th century, and was for a time the capital of the Mughal Empire. The town was captured by the British in 1857, and has since been administered by the British Government.

**Lakhmât.** See LAKHTU.

**Lâzâzâni.** See Mîmâd Lâzâzâni.

**Lâm (Bani Lâm),** an Arab tribe leading a nomadic life on the lower course of the Tigris (Ali Gharbi, Ali Sharei, Amâra). According to the statistics of Khurshid Efendi (middle of the 18th century) there were over 4,400 families of Bani Lâm west of the Tigris, and the Tigris, 17,450 families of the Bani Lâm went over to the Persian territory between 1788 and 1846 (the southern parts of the Fashûl-Khâ, the domains of the wâls of Huwâza); some columns were even established east of the Karkhâr and at Falâshîyya.

The Bani Lâm claim to come originally from...
under the same emperor and the caliph al-Mutawakkil; the sixth in 283 (896) under the caliph al-Mutawakkil and the emperor Leo VI; the seventh called "redemption from treachery" under the same emperor and the caliph al-Muktafi in 292 (905); the eighth three years later in 295 (907); the ninth took place in 305 (917) under the caliph al-Muktafi and the emperor Constantine Philophyrogenetos; the tenth took place in 313 (925) under the same rulers; the eleventh in 326 (938) under the same emperor and the caliph al-Kālid; the twelfth took place in 335 (946) in the caliphate of al-Mu'tūs through the intermediary of Salf al-Dawla the Hamdanī, lord of Aleppo. This river had at this place either a ford or a bridge which the ransomed prisoners crossed. There was also a town of the same name (Adana, Lamuri) on this river not far from the sea.


(L. Hoare)

LAMGHANAT, a district in eastern Afghanistan. It is often referred to by Bâbur, see W. E. Burne's translation of his *Memoirs*, p. 141 and P. de Courteille, i. 287. The name is fancifully connected with Lamoch, the father of Noah.

(H. Beveridge)

LAMIT, nom de plume (takhallûs) of SHAIKH MAJMUDD, b. 'OTÌMAN b. 'ALI AL-Nâşrî, a celebrated Sûfî writer and poet of the early part of the reign of Sulaimân I, the era, not only of the greatest political development of the Turkish empire, but also that in which literature was most cultivated. He was born in Brussa, the son of the defterdar of Sulâtan Bâyâr's treasury. His grandfather had been taken by Timurlenk after his invasion to Transoxania (Samarkand) where he learned the art of nakkâshih (embroidery and painting) there highly cultivated and on his return to Asia Minor introduced the first embroidered saddle. On the completion of his theological studies with Mollâs Akhawayn and Mollâ Mâjahmâd b. al-Hâjiyât Hasan-sâde, Lâmi', who had an inclination to Sufism, became murid with the Nakhabandî Sheikh 'Arif bî-llâh Saiyid Aḥmad al-Bâghîri. He spent his whole life in the calm retirement of a Sûfî, free from external cares and favoured by the patronage of Sulâtan Selim and Sulaymân who frequently showed signs of their favour to him and his numerous family; he lived in Brussa, writing industriously till his death in 938 or 940 (1532 or 1533). He was buried in the mosque built by his grandfather on the citadel in Brussa.

The versatility and quality of his literary output in prose and poetry is really astonishing. But his work was not so much original as translations and
adaptations, as was characteristic of the period which regarded Slavish attachment to Persian models as the highest ideal. He usually took as his model Džami, then the most celebrated poet of Persia with whom he had a further link in their both being Našgbandis and therefore was called Džami-i Rūm. His prolificity is greater than that of any Turkish writer. We have a cycle of nine romantic poems from his pen. His importance to Turkish literature is considerable but is greatly exaggerated by von Hammer who devotes the longest monograph in his Gesch. d. eim. Dichtkunst (ii. 20—195) to him. Lāmī’s style is still comparatively lucid and simple. There is not yet any trace in him of the overwhelming turgidity of the later artificial classicism, yet it must be confessed that most that is beautiful in him is due to his Persian originals. Zīyā Paşa in his Khwarāzī has for this reason paid no attention to him.

The list of his works as given in the Sharaf al-Inānī numbers 24 but in reality there were more. His prose writings are: the translations of Džami’s Shīr: works: Nūfūs al-Ustād (biographies of Shīrs with the title Farrākh al-Maṣūḥāt id-Dawrān Kūlūs al-Maṣūḥāt) and Sharḥ-i al-Nuḥawān (‘The witnesses of prophecy’) printed at Constantinople in 1293; the Sharaf al-Inānī, “The worth of man”, considered by Lāmī to be his masterpiece which is a Turkish version of Part 22 of the 51 Arabic tractsates (Rust’ī) of the Ikhwan al-Safā, the struggle between man and animal (ed. and transl. by Diererici, Berlin 1858, Leipzig 1879 and 1881: Thier und Mensch vor dem König der Geister). His works of a religious character are Muwāwīn ‘Alla’ al-ḥusnā, translation and commentary on the 100 verses of Muḥammad Nīhābīrī on the 99 names of God and Misfār al-Miṣrī fi Khwās-i ṣamīḥ wa-ṣādī, he also wrote a collection of letters, Manqahāt, a commentary on the Dībāqī’s Gūbātūn of Sādī, and Dībāqīyāt (‘Book of examples’), a collection of tales and allegories, lith. Constantinople, n. d.); a Majnūn al-Fāṭi’ī, or Fāṭi’ī-nūnā (a collection of very often daring anecdotes, quite in the style of Roccacchio’s Decameron, which received its final form from his son, ‘Abd Allāh Lemi, also known as a poet). Finally as a kind of transition to pure poetry he wrote two Majnūnās (disputations in the mixture of prose and verse later so popular), namely: Majnūnās-i Behār u-Shāh (‘Disputation between summer and winter’), Constantinople 1290, with the title Majnūnās-i Sultanī Behār u-Shāh (Shahrā’ī Shāh) and Majnūnās-i Naqī u-Shāh (‘Disputation between Soul and Spirit’).

His very much more important poetical works include a large Divān of about 10,000 verses which contain much that is beautiful and original; besides paša’s Ghaṣl’s etc. it also contains the Ghaṣl in 1288; transl. by Pfamier, Verherrlichung der Erzgebirge (separately printed at Constantinople Stadt Bursa, Vienna 1839).

His great Majnūnās poems were of permanent influence; some deal in a popular fashion with stories from Persian legends, namely: Salātnā ba-Shāh (dedicated to Sultan Selim), from Džami’s original; ‘Ahsa’ al-Naḥwīn (dedicated to Sultan Sulaimān) the original of Fakhr-i Dārjānī (d. 440 = 1048) and a version of Nisāfī al-Arūzī al-Samārānī; ‘Ahsa’ al-Makhlīkī from the Persian original of ‘Umūr (d. 441 = 1050) translated at the express desire of Sultan Sulaimān (transl. by von Hammer, Vienna 1833); Farbāzī-nūnā (transl. by von Hammer, Stuttgart 1842); Hejīf Pēkhr, “The seven beauties” (based on Hāflī’s Hejīf Muḥār, which again goes back to Nīshān’s Hejīf Pēkhr). Besides the two allegorical dramas Gīr u-Cikat (‘Bird and Bat’) and Sīrān u-Parvānā (‘Camel and Butterfly’, the latter probably from the Persian of Ahī Shīrāzī, he also wrote two Malekānu’s of a religious nature, the Malekānu-i Imām Hūsain recalling the Shīr Tāziyā (illustrated MS. in the ‘Ahsī-i Dehānī, No. 249) and Mankhāb (or Mανήb) Uśain u-dhānūn.

Finally there are his political allegories Husn u-Dīr from the Persian original of Fakhr Pāshā Shīhānī and the Turkish version of Ahī, ed. and annotated and compared with Lāmī’s Turkish version by R. Drōfskā, Husn u-dīr, persische Allegorie von Fatṭāh (aus Niẓām), the Khwāz-nūnā (‘Book of the Intelligence’) and the Dībāqī-nūnā.


(Th. Menzel)

LAMTA, a large Berber tribe of the Barān family. Its exact origin does not seem to have been known to the Arab and Berber genealogists, who simply make them brethren of the Sanhadja, Hashtra and Gazzila; others give them a Himyarite origin like the Harrāwā and the Lawata.

The Lamta were one of the nomad tribes who wore a veil (madāhīสน). One section lived on the south of the Mira, between the Massīf and the Taghī (Tuareg) on the east; they even seem to have extended as far as the Niger. In the south of Morocco, in the Sāhara, where there were Lamta who led a nomadic life, in company with the Gazzila, the Lamta occupied the territory nearest to the Atlas. On the coming of the nomad Arab of the Maḍīlī family, the two sections of the Lamta were absorbed by this race. Jellāl the Dāwī Ḥassān; the remaining sections then joined the Shabānī, another Maḍīlī tribe, to oppose the Gazzila who joined the Dāwī Ḥassān.

In the territory of the Lamta, of the Sāhara at the mouth of the Wād Nīl (now Wād Nīl) lay the commercial town of Nūl or Nīl of the Lamta, the first inhabited place one reaches on coming from the Sahara. Several Moroccan dynasties have struck coins there.
fortified it. On the 9th Muharram (Šādahrā) 1228 (Jan. 1, 1813), Lankoran was taken by storm by General Kotliarskii after a brave resistance of the Persians. This event hastened the conclusion of the treaty of Gulistan (1813) by which Persia ceded to Russia part of Tālib to the north of the river Astanā. From 1826 Lankoran was the capital of the district. The fortress was dismantled in 1855. Since 1920 Lankoran has formed part of the republic of Adbar-dādžān, a member of the Soviet Union.

The population of the town, which was 3,970 in 1857, had reached 11,700 in 1897. The district of Lankoran has an area of 5,000 sq. miles and in 1840 had 30,200 inhabitants and in 1861 99,082. Later the district was reduced to 2,000 sq. miles: in spite of this, its population in 1897 was 125,895 of whom 46.5% were Azeris, Turks, Iranian Tālib 46.3%, Russians 6.9% (in the north) and Armenians (2.9%). The district is composed of 3 zones: to the north, an eastern continuation of the steppes of Mughān; to the east, a marshy littoral intersected by lagoons and covered with a rich sub-tropical vegetation; to the west are wooded mountain ranges running from 5,000 to 7,500 feet above sea-level which rise from the Russian frontier forming the boundary of the provinces of Ardebil. The district is rich in forests and has good fishing.

Bibliography: Cf. the article TĀLĪBAK; Zain al-Ahdiin Shīrāzī, Kustan al-Shiyyābul, Tībrīz 1321, s.v. Lankorān; Bēzeine, Fatāhī, mūsā-bāy de Faghištan, Kazan 1879, ill. 113; Semenov, Geogr. stat. Russ. imperii, St. Petersburg 1867; La Grande Encycl. russe (ed. Brockhaus-Efron); G. Radde, Reisen am persischen grünen, Leipzig 1886; Radde, Tālībak, Pet. Mitt., xxxii., 1875; de Morgan, Mission scient., Études geogr., t. 231—282; Études archéol., l. 13—125, with an archaeological map; N. Y. Marr, Tālībak, publ. by the Acad. des Sciences Pétrograd 1922 (with a detailed bibliography); B. Miller, Predați, steții și populații în Tālībak, Būk 1926 (mainly linguistic).

LĀR. 1. Capital of the district of Lārīstān, to the southeast of Fārs. Very little is known of Lārīstān and its early history. The country appears to correspond to the land of the dragon Haftān-būkht which was killed by Ardāšīr Pāpakān. According to Persian legend, Ardāšīr's adversary lived in the village of Altār in the rastāk of Kūjdārān which was one of the maritime rustāks (rastāk al-rūf) of the province Ardāshīr-Khurra (Tahuri, i. 820); Nīldeker in his translation of the Kūurvānuk (p. 50) gives the variants Gūltūr and Kūjūrān; the Šāh-nāme, ed. Mohi, v. 568: Kūjdārān. Lastly the Armenian geography of the seventh century mentions a Khojāyāstran in Persia (Khūsthratan) (cf. Margari, Erânšahr, p. 44). The prefixing of an a to the name Lār is also found in the name of the island of Lār (cf. below). Margari identifies Kishahrān with the case of Dāgūn near Strf; on the other hand the Fārābān-nāma-yi-Nāgīst mentions a village of Kūjdār-Khūkar in the canton of Galle-lār (the ancient Fīl/Pal Bil of Ibn Baṭūtā: Khūndāl = Kūjdāl + bil) immediately adjoining Lārīstān. According to a verse attributed to Firdawsi (cf. Vullers, Lexicon, s.v. Lār) but not found in the known editions of the Šāh-nāme, the town was
originally called Ład (and fell to Gurgin Milād, one of the heroes of the cycle of the Kayānīd Kāi Khwarazmī). This would be a very curious case of the changing of a to r found especially in Armenian and in the Caspian Tati dialect (Darmesteter, Eironicles, i. 73). The Fārs-nama-yi Nādiṣī mentions another legend according to which the people of Lār in Fars had come from Lār in Damāwand (cf. below) the cold of which they could not endure.

The Arab geographers do not mention Lār, for apparently the old routes linking up the chief towns of Fars, with Strāf and Kās, or Humrāz (by Fastāk and Forq) avoided the town of Lār (cf. Nushat al-Kustūrī, p. 185, 187). According to Ḥamdallāh Mustawfī, Lār is a willow tree near the sea and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa alone talks of Lār as "a large town, with springs, considerable rivers and gardens". Lār had a local dynasty. Its princes, relying on the verse already mentioned regarding the presentation by Kāi Khwarazmī of the town of Lār to Gurgin, son of Milād, traced their descent from a hero. They were even crowned with the crown of their ancestor and this treasure was among the booty taken by the Safawīs in 1517.

The first prince of Lār to be converted to Islam (about 100) was Djalāl al-Dīn Iṣṭāvī. The dates become more reliable from the time of the Amir Kūṭ al-Dīn Māyīd Fājū (7) (1504-648). Fourteen of his successors are known but their order is not so certain; when in 748 (1347), Ibn Baṭṭūtā passed through Lār, the Sultan of Lār, of Turkoman origin, was called Djalāl al-Dīn, while according to the genealogy of the Mūsāfīrīs, Bakhtānjī, was ruling there between 731 and 753. The dependence of Lār on the Mūsāfīrīs is shown by a gold coin of Shah Shīhāb (760-786) struck in Lār (S. Lane-Poole, The Coins of the Mongols in the British Museum, 1881, p. 240). In 799 the troops of Muhammad Šāhūn, grandson of Timūr, ravaged the eastern part of Fars on the lines Kārin-Fal, Djaḥrom-Lār, etc. (Zafarnama, i. 309). There are Timūrid and Cāhglī coins struck at Lār (O. Codrington, A Manual of Moslem Numismatics, London 1904, p. 183). In the reign of the Mūsāfīrī Djaḥangīr (859-883), the Russian merchant Afanasī Nīkīt, passed through Lār in 1469 on his way to Humrāz and India and in 1472 on his way from Humrāz to Shīhūr. The Mūsāfīrī Nīsrānī says "the just" (930-948) was a poet, musician and author; he died by the hand of a slave. His successor Ibrahim Khīzī submitted to the Safawīs and received the title of Amir Djaḥrom. His son Nār [Nawr] al-Dāh lived in the time of Šāh Lār Muhammad Šafawī. Under Šāh Iskandar Aḥsāf al-Mulūk, son of Nār al-Dāh, was authorized to take the name of Ibrahim Khīzī II. The young Khīzī showed signs of independence and oppressed merchants and travellers. This could not be tolerated at a time when Lār lay on the great road between the capital and the sea. As a preparation for the occupation of Gombrūn (Bandar-ı Aḥbātī) in 1614 (7) and of the island of Humrāz in 1622, the Begīrjegār of Fars, Allāh Šīhī Khīzī, in 1609 and 1610 (1601) marched against Ibrahim Khīzī and seized his possessions. Ibrahim II had to surrender to the mercy of Allāhwardī who treated him honourably and took him to Shīh Aḥbāt at Bālī, where he died during an epidemic. The government of Fars was then entrusted to Šāh ʿAlāʾ Khāsim of Lār, a sincere Shīʿī (ṣariʿī ʿAlāʾ Šīrāzī) as (p. v) fontsī) and the people of Lār (Ṭārīḵ-i Alī Amirdārī, Tihān 1314, p. 423-426. Buildings of the Mūsāfīrīs are still to be seen at Lār — a mosque and a bazaar ofewn stone covered with stucco. The bazaar was restored in 1015, by ʿAlī Beg Djaḥromī, a slave of Lār.

The memoirs of ʿAlī ʿAlī Ḥāżīn contain interesting notes on the domestic life of Lār at the beginning of the xvi cent (xvi cent) rule of the Afghān Khāndān-Khān, passage through Lār of the routed army of Shah Aḥṣāf, etc.) According to ʿAlī Ḥāżīn (p. 210) the people of a part of the Lār lands (garmūr) of LārīStan were Shamīs. They had prospered under the Afghān but Nādir, wishing to reduce them, sent against them the sardār of Fars, Muhammad Khān Balūcī. The latter met with difficulties at Lār and having come to terms with its inhabitants returned to Fars. In 1146, Muhammad Khān rebelled against Nādir and tried to raise the Shamīs of Lār. The latter maintained a waiting attitude but by order of Nādir they were massacred and scattered. Lār was later annexed by a certain Nāṣir Khān, formerly a brigand in the bālūk-i šaʿbā (a region between LārīStan and Kirmān) who received from the Shamīs title of Khan. His family (the begīrjegārs) remained more or less autonomous till 1202 (1845) when the governor-general of Fars sent troops to Lār and appointed a simple bālūkī there (Fars-nama-yi Nādiṣī).

At the beginning of the xvi century the Balūcī Ḥāżī Khān invaded LārīStan (Pottinger, Travels in Beloochistan, London 1816, p. 163). In 1256 (1840) Lār was occupied by the chief of the Ismailīs, ʿAlī Khān who had rebelled against the Šīʿī (Schindler, The Eastern Persian Iraq, p. 94).

The town of Lār lying 57 farsarks to the S. E. of Šīrāz was very frequently visited by European travellers in the xvi century when it lay on the direct route Šīrāz-Djaḥrom-Djāynūn-Lār-Bandar-ı Aḥbātī. Figueroa (1617), Sir T. Herbert (1627), J. A. Manderlo (1636), J. B. Tavernier and Thevenot (1665), Sinuau (1672), Chardin (1673), Dr. J. Fryer (1676), Le Brun (1703). At this time there was a factory of the Dutch East India Co. at Lār (Thevenot, Voyages, Amsterdam 1737, ii. 460-476). After the fall of the Šafawīs Bandar-ı Aḥbātī became the port for the province of Kirmān only, while Bābīzī became the principal port of the Persian Gulf. Lār conducted a local trade with the ports of Bandar-ı Aḥbātī, Linga (q. v.) and Šīrāz (the older Strāf; q. v.); cf especially Siffle, Ancient Trading Centres of the Persian Gulf, G. F. 1805, p. 166-173. In the xvi century, Lār has been described by Dupré and Stack. Of the 76 bulks of Lār, that of Lār called Tīzin is the most extensive (57×47 farsarks, i.e. about 45,000 square miles). It is bounded on the N.W. by Barānī, on the S.E. the bridge of Tīzin separates it from the nālīya of Bandar-ı Aḥbātī. This latter had a separate dynasty (the Kalūtī princes of Humrāz). To the south Lārīstan is washed by the Persian Gulf (the ports of Kung, Linga, Mughī, Čārak, Nakho, etc.). In 1898 A. T. Wilson found Lār quite prosperous (New on a Journey from Bandar-ı Aḥbātī to Šīrāz, Geogr. Journ., Series 1908, p. 152-170). On the west it is bordered by the cantons of Mūlītī, ʿAlī-marvād-dagh, and Kond; on the north-west by the buluk of Djīyūn; on the north by the buluk of Dārāb; on the northeast by the buluk of Šīrāz.
The country is full of mountain ranges running parallel to the shore of the Persian Gulf and has a torrid climate. Water is scarce and brackish. The river of Lārīstān, variously known as Rūdkhānā-ī shīr-i Gallādār, Shīr-i Hing, Rūdkhānā-ī Lamūz etc., runs from west to east and flows into the sea a farashk east of Kung.

The subdivisions (nābiya) of the šāhāk of Lārīstān are as follows (their orientation from Lār is given and the distance from it is in farashkā):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>south</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>south-east</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>north</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>west</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>north-east</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>south-west</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term šāhāk in the local dialect means a valley shut in by two ranges of mountains. Filuštān is derived from the word fūmnī, corn.

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

Lārīstān has Persian dialects of its own (O. Mann, Die Tijk-Mandarins der Provinz Fars, Berlin 1909, p. xxxiv, 126—131) and there is even a local literature in them. The Fārsī-nāma mentions Āk bfdū Mūsāmmad Bāχiīr ("Subḥat") who was well acquainted with Arabic, Persian and "Dari". Romākavlī has collected some of the poems in the local dialect of the poet Mahdīfār as well as Persian quarants by several popular poets, natives of Lārīstān (Romākavlī, Pers. nov., etemārīzāyīn, i, in Zepkeli, 1918, xxxii, 313, 340).


2. An island in the Persian Gulf called Abū Shīrīn. Near this island touched at it on his perilous but does not give the name, which according to Ptolemy was ʿAssāk (in Semitic ʿasāk = island of seaweed). The Greeks praised the pearl fisheries of Lār. Ibn Khurdadbhūtī calls the island Mārd. Other variants in the Arab geographers according to Le Strange are Allahān and Lān. The Fārīn-nāma, ed. Le Strange, p. 241 makes it a dependency of the island of Araslāh-Khurra. Yākūt (iv, 341) places it between the island of Kās and the port of Sīrāf. The Portuguese called it Ilha de Lázaro from the village of Lār (should this be Lāgh? — at the end of it). It is 13×24 miles in area. To the east of it lies the little isle of Shīwār (Ciwar). Some ten miles north of Lār on the coast of Fars lies the little harbour of Nākhlī. We do not know if there is any connection between the names of the town and of the island Lār. An island "Lārāk" ("little Lār") lies south of the island of Hurmūs.


3. A high valley lying in Māzandarān, on the sources of the Huszār-pet. The altitude of Lār is from 8,500 to 6,500 feet. It lies west of Damduct. The valley is deserted in winter, in summer the nomads pitch their tents there. The people of Ĥīrān also go there for summer quarters. Stahl however (Petrii. Mittelt., Ergänzungshft. ii, 1869, p. 619) found traces of ancient dwellings on the right bank of the river Lār. The locality is sometimes called Lārdījān, which must be a plural of Lār-īn, a "inhabitant of Lār" (on the suffix -īn, cf. Marquart, Belträge, Z.D.M.G., 1895, p. 666). The same derivation explains the Arabic transcription al-Lāris (Baladjuri, p. 5), one of the cantons of Tabaristan (not however found in the list in Ibn Rusta, p. 149). Al-Lāris formed part of the possessions of al-Masqūm in 131 (748) by Abī Muhammad (Marquart, Erbauh., p. 127, 137). The term Lārdījān seems to have been applied especially to the place below the high valley of Lār near the modern bridge of Pallīr; cf. Dib-palī in Ibn Isfahānī, trasm. Browne, G.M.S., p. 67. Lārdījān is said to have been the last inhabited part of Tabaristan. Its village of Warakān was said to have been the birthplace of Farīdūn. In the villages lying on the slopes of Damduct, Stahl saw a festival celebrated in memory of the death of Zohak (Aug. 11; cf. Morier, Second Journeys, p. 157). At Lārdījān there was a special reward for the inhabitants of Tabaristan under the sāhadā of Tabaristan (Ibn Isfahānī, ibid., p. 15, 153, 280). On the district of Liṭhānūd (Lārdījān) cf. Lārdījān. — Spiegel (Varona, Z.D.M.G., 1876, xxxii, p. 716—726) was inclined to suppose a connection between Warak (Ibn Isfahānī, p. 15: Waraka, native place of Farīdūn = Thaštāna) and the Avestic vears. The name of Warakān is unknown but in lārdījān there exists a village Wānāh on the disappearance of r in Persian dialects, cf. Grundriss d. iran. Phil., iii, p. 559, 551.

(V. Minorsky)
LARANDA (also called Karaman from the name of the dynasty which reigned there in the xivth century), a town in Asia Minor, capital of the kaza of the same name and of the sanjak of Konia, to the S.E. and 35 miles from this town. It is 4,000 feet above sea-level, has 2,000 houses, 7,500 inhabitants, 105 mosques, 21 Friday mosques, 4 dervish monasteries, 515 shops, 30 warehouses, 6 cafes, 4 caravanserais, 14 baking ovens, 7 baths, 5 mills, 1 military depot, 110 fountains, 1 barracks, 1 Greek school, 10 Muslim schools, 21 madrasas. There are a ruined fortress, mosques and other monuments in ruins from the time of the Kar-ban-oglu (mosque of Amir Miša with pillars from ancient buildings). The town was annexed to the Ottoman Empire in 1464. To the north is the Kara-Dagh covered with medievial monasteries now in ruins (bîl bîr bîllet = 1001 churches).

Bibliography: 'Ali Dżawad, Dżogâryâ Lâghi, p. 606; Hâjsîdji Khîlîha, Dżâhîna-muwa, p. 616; Ibn Battûta, Paris, ii. 284; Samî Bey, Kâmül Al-lâmîn, v. 3644, a.v. karamanî; Texier, Asie Mineure, p. 658. (Cl. HEURT)

LARI MEHMEDE. (See MEHMET LAKI)

Larin (r, larî), a silver coin current in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean in the xivth and xvith centuries. It takes its name from Lâr [q.v.], the capital of Lâristân [q.v.], at which it was first struck; cf. Pedro Texeira (Travels, Hakl. Soc., 1902, p. 341). There is a second edition of Lar (q.v.), in which are called Laris, a money of the finest silver, very well drawn and current throughout the East" and Sir Thomas Herbert speaking of Lar in 1627 (Some Years' Travels, London 1665, p. 150) "neither bylar nor larmes are cossed, a famous sort of money". The larin weighed about 74 grains (49.4 grammes) and had a high reputation for the purity of its silver. It was worth ten pence in English money (Herbert) or one-fifth of a French crown (Tavernier) or 60 Portuguese reis.

The larin is in shape quite unlike any other coin. It is a thin silver rod about 4 inches long, doubled back and then stamped on either side with various devices from different coin. It is admirably described by Willius Barret in his account of the moneys of al-Basra (in. Hakluyt, Principal Voyages, Glasgow 1904, vi. 136). The silver larin is a strange piece of money, not being round like all other current money of Christianity, but is a small rod of silver of the greatness of the point of a goose feather with which we use to write and in length about one eighth part thereof, which is so wrought that the two ends meet at the just half part and in the head thereof there is a stamp Turkcoce and these be the best current money in all the Indies and also of the lamas make a ducat."

The kingdom of Lâr is celebrated to issue these coins after its conquest by 'Abdül Aziz the Great of Persia (Chardin, Voyages, Amsterdam 1735, iii. 125), but its popularity led to this type of coin being adopted by other states of the Indian Ocean. The kings of Hormuz of the latter half of the xivth century issued larins as did the Shahs of Persia at Shiraz and the Ottoman Sultan at Basra. In India, they were struck in the xivth century by the 'Adil Shahi dynasty of Bijapur and other rulers and the frequent finds of larins in Western India show how extensive was their circulation there. In the Maldivie Islands in the early xivth century the king struck his own larins as we know from the Voyage of F. Pyrard de Laval (Hakl. Soc., 1857, vol. I, p. 322 sq.). In Ceylon they were also struck, not only by the natives but also by the Portuguese merchants at Colombo; in this island they were twisted roughly into the shape of a fish-hook, whence the term "fish-hook" money. These pieces are either uninscription or bear rude imitations of the Arabic script. In Ceylon the "fish-hook" money survived into the xvith century. A degenerate descendant of the larin still exists (Philly, Heart of Arabia, ii. 319) on the Arabian side of the Persian Gulf, in Hassa where it is known as a farvâla, i.e., the "long" (coin). It is only an inch long and of very base silver, if not copper, without any trace of inscription. It is described by Pulgrave (Journey, etc., London 1865, i. 479) who adds that there is a proverb "like a Hassa farvâla", applied to any one who like the local currency is of no use away from home.


AL-LAT, an old Arabian goddess. The name (from al-lâh, cf. AL-LAT) means "the goddess" but was the proper name of a definite deity, according to the Arabs themselves. (See G.) Ibn Ya'qub, ed. Jahn, p. 44, 87) the sun. She is found as early as the Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions and was later worshipped by various Beduin tribes (e.g. the Hawari; Ibn Hisâhî, p. 549, 13). An oath by al-Lat is frequently found in the poets, e.g. Al-Šââbî, ed. Ibn Hisâhî, p. 567, 7, Al-malâmî, ed. Voller, p. 2, 8, 'Abd al-Hasan, ed. Geyer, p. 51, 8, and even in al-Akhtâl, Kâb al-Akhtâl, vii. 173. She had her principal sanctuary in the valley of Wadâdî near Ta'îf, where the Mu'attî (Attab) b. Mâlik b. Ka'bah were her priests and a white stone hanged with all kinds of decorations was her symbol. She is frequently mentioned along with al-Ukzu (Ibn Hisâhî, p. 145, 7, 206, 8, 87, 8, where Wadd also is mentioned; 'Abd al-Hasan, p. 11, 8, and among the Kurash, she, along with this goddess and Manah, was held in such high esteem, that Muhammad once went so far as to recognise these three goddesses as intercessors with Allah but soon afterwards withdrew this (Sûra, ii. 157 sq.). According to Tabari, i. 1305, 8, 'Abd al-Sufîkî carried al-Lat and al-Ukzu with him into the battle of Uhud. After the capture of Mecca, al-Lat was destroyed with her sanctuary in Ta'îf by al-Mughîlî, who were related to her priests. She was not forgotten, for, according to Doughty, there is still in Ta'îf blocks of stone which the people call al-Ukzu, Hitah and al-Lat, at which they secretly seek help in cases of illness.

LAWATA, a Berber ethnic group, belonging to the family of Butr, whose eponymous ancestor was Lawat the younger, son of Lawat the elder, son of Zahik. Ibn Khaldún dismisses the view of certain Berber genealogists recorded by Ibn Hawqal who consider the Lawata as Saddaritsa and the Manas as of Coptic origin. Others say the Lawata with the Hassar and the Lamba were of Himyarite origin. In any case the oldest homes of the Lawata seems most likely to have been the eastern part of North Africa. They were found in Egypt to the north between Alexandria and Cairo; to the south in the oases and in al-Sha'd. Some Lawata led a nomadic life in the region of Barqa. In the Maghrib they lived in the Djebril Lawata (south of Gabes and Sfax) and it is probably this section that is mentioned by Corippus under the name Logmaten = Berber: Hauasiten; others lived in the country round Boughie and the region south of Tizaret (Tabert) where they had adopted the Isma'ili heresy. In Morocco there were Lawata in the Tadla (the Zanzura section), in the south of Fès and in the land between Tangiers and Arsat.

Bibliography: al-Idrisi and al-Bakiti, indices; Ibn Khaldun, Kitab al-Ibar, ed. de Salan, l. 147—150, transl. l. 171, 233—236.

(G. S. Colin)

LAWH (A.), board, tablet; the first meaning is found in the Kur'an, Sura, iv, 13, where Noah's ark is called ala-ha al-lawh. The second meaning is that of law as writing material, e. g. the tablets of the lawh (Sura, vii. 142, 149, 153, where the plural noun is used; see Li'am, iii. 421). Al-lawh wa l-lawh (Bukhari, Taifir al-Kur'an, Sura, iv, bâb 18) corresponds to our "paper and ink". The expression mä haina l-lawhain = what lies between the two boards is found in Hadith, to describe the whole Qur'an. (Bukhari, Taifir, Sura, vii, bâb 4; Li'am, bâb 84); cf. mä haina l-dafa'atun (Bukhari, Fatir al-Kur'an, bâb 16). In modern linguistic usage "al-lawh" also means a school-child's slate.

Al-lawh thus means the tablet kept in heaven which in Sura, xxxii. 22 is called lawh mähfüz (cf. ii. 1066, 1076). According to this passage, it is usually described as the "safely preserved" tablet. But it is not certain whether the words in this passage are really syntactically connected. If we read mähfüz, the word does not go with lawh but with the preceding sur' (7), and the translation is: "Verily it is a Kur'an, famous, preserved on a tablet" (see the commentaries); "preserved" i.e. against alteration.

In the commentaries on Sura, xxvii. 1, the tablet is again mentioned: "We wrote it down (the Kur'an) in the night of the decree"; this refers either to the first revelation made to Muhammad or to the descent of the Kur'an from that tablet which is said to have been seven heaven, to the lowest.

The tablet as the original copy of the Kur'an is thus identical with unnu al-kurîh.

The decisions of the divine will are also written on the lawh with the pen balam (q.v.) We have therefore to distinguish two quite different concepts:

1. The tablet as the original copy of the Kur'an. This idea is found in the pseudographical literature. In the Book of Jobbels, ii. 10, it is said that the laws relating to the purification of women after childbirth (Lev. xxii. 11—16) are written on tablets in heaven. In Jobb., xii. 28 sq. says the same of the laws regarding the "feast of booths" (Lev., xxii. 29—40) and Jobb., xxi. 15 of the law of tithes (Lev. xxvii).

2. The tablet as the record of the decisions of the divine will is also found in the Book of Jobbels. In Jobb., v. 15 it is said that the divine judgement on all that exists on earth is written on the tablets in heaven. Enoch prophecies the future from the contents of these tablets (Book of Enoch, xxii. 2, cf. lxxxii. 6, 2, 15; xlv. 19). The "scripture of truth" is mentioned as early as Daniel, x, 21, the contents of which
Daniel announces in prophetic form. These ideas are connected with the Babylonian conception of "tablets of fate".

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

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

In mystical and philosophical literature lāwāh is given a place in the cosmic system and sometimes explained as nāfi'ū būll or mūm al-nāṣrī.


(A. J. WENHICK)

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

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

The earliest Greek writers do not mention the Laz. The name Lāzē, Lāzēn is only found after the Christian era. (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, iv. 4; Periplus, of Arrian, xi. 2; Ptolemy, v. 9 s. 5). The oldest known settlement of the Lazoi is the town of Lazoi or "old Lazik" which Arrian puts 680 stadia (about 80 miles) south of the Sacred Port (Nazoromias) and 1020 stadia (100 miles) north of Tityrus, i.e. somewhere in the neighbourhood of Zoroaster. Kerseling sees in the Lazoi and in a section of the Kerketai, who in the first centuries of the Christian era had to migrate southwards under pressure from the Zygai (i.e. the Cercies [q. v.]) who call themselves Adighe (Adzighe); the same author regards the Kerketai as a "Georgian" tribe. The fact that at the time of Arrian (second cent. a. d.), the Lazoi were already living to the south of Sukhum. The order of the peoples living along the coast to the east of Trebizond was as follows: Colchi (and Sani); Machelnosei; Henichozi; Zydrinei; Lazai (Lāzēn), subjects of king Malausus, who owned the celerity of Rome; Apilans; Abasai (cf. Aghiai); Sanniga near Sebatapoli (near Sukhum).

During the centuries following, the Laz gained so much in importance that the whole of the ancient Colchis had been renamed Lazica (Anonymous *Periplus*, *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, v. 186). According to Constantino Porphyrogenetos, *De Admin. Imperii*, Ch. 53, in the time of Dioscretian (884-303), the king of the Bosphurus, Sauromatus, invaded the land of the Lazoi and reached Halys (N. Marr explains this last name by the Laz word meaning river). Among the peoples subject to the Laz, Procopius (*Hist. Got.*, iv. 2 and 3) mentions the Alasgit and the people of Suania and Skymnia (= Le-Uskan). It is prob-
names (as also was Vivien de St. Martin) proposed a theory of the identity of the name Legzi and Laz. Ewliyi’s calls Trebizond “former Legzi vilayet.” Häjdjü Kahlifa after enumerating the peoples of the district (Legzi): Mangrelians (Megtril), Georgians, Abkhan (Abaza), Cerkes and Laz, adds that the latter are those who live nearest to Trebizond. To the S.E. of Trebizond in the Čepeli mountains he mentions the Turks who “worship as their God (mənə) the Shih of Persia (i.e. are extreme Shi’is) and are associated (məstrətarik) with the Laz.” Häjdjü Kahlifa and Ewliyi do not agree on the number of the sires of Trebizond; Ewliyi only says that the value of the eyalat has depreciated through the unruliness of many of its 41 nahiye (Lıthban-numa, p. 429; Ewliyi, ii, 81, 83–85).

The first serious blow to the feudal independence of the dreh-khbar of Lazistan was only struck at the beginning of the sixteenth century by the Ottoman Paşa of Trebizond, but Koch who visited the country after his expedition still found most of the hereditary dreh-kheyl’s in power, although some of their liberties. He counted fifteen of them: Atin (two), Bulep, Ariaghis, Wisse, Kapelpe, Arkhaw, Kisse, Khopa, Markia (Makriali), Gafata, Batum, Maradit (Maradidi), Pergwan and Cat. The lands of the three latter lie however on the Coruh. They divided the mountains separating this valley from the river of Lazistan in the strict sense. On the other hand among the dreh-kheyl of Lazistan was the lord of Hamash, i.e., of the upper valleys of Kalopotamos and of Furtuna inhabited by Muslim Armenians. According to the Armenian historian Lewond, transal. Chahmaanian, Paris 1826, p. 162, the latter with their chief Hausam of the Amatani family had settled in the district in the time of Constantine VI (780–797) (the old Tumam was given the name Hamash < Hamashqum, “built by H.”). It is evidently this region that Clavijo (1403–1406), ed. Sreemski, St. Petersburg 1851, p. 383, calls “tierra de Arnauqiel”. He adds that the people, dissatisfied with their king Arnaquiel (Arakel), submitted to the Muslim ruler of Ispir. The Hamash are now Muslims and only those of Khopa have not forgotten Armenian. A Hamash lexicon was published by Kipilidwan. With the institution of the vilayets the sandjak Lazistan became part of the vilayet of Trebizond. Its capital was at first Batum but, after the Russian occupation of Batum in 1828, the administration of the sandjak was transferred to Rize (Ribizna), detached for this purpose from the old central sandjak of Trebizond. Lazistan lying to the west of the Ottoman-Russian frontier occupied a strip of 100 miles long and 15 to 20 miles broad. The kadija of the sandjak were: Khopa, Atina and Rize, subdivided again into 6 nahiye (Samey-Bey, Kamutu st’Atăm, v. 3966). Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, i. 118–121, mentions Of as a fourth kadija and gives 8 (2) nahiya (Hamashin, Karzurde, Mapawri, Wæg, Kær’ya-sah, Wisse, Arkhaw). In 1860 there were in the sandjak 564 inhabited places with 138,467 inhabitants, of whom 689 were orthodox Greeks and the rest Muslims (Laz, Turkicized Laz, Turks and “Hamashin”). The number of true Laz cannot be more than half the total population.

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

The Laz are good sailors and also practice agriculture (rice, maize, tobacco and fruit-trees). Before 1914 many of them earned a living in Russia as bakers and often came home with Russian wives, who became converts to Islam. The Laz are known for their conversation in religious matters, Turkish proverb and the marionette theater (şaray-fesi) are often very notable about the Laz (Lazallı terziyan muazzam man yemes ozn, “the Muslim does not eat Laz jelly” ; terziyan from the Greek tezizai). The Laz language is closely connected with Mingrelian (which is a sister language of Georgian) and Armenian. N. V. Marr finds in it sufficient peculiarities to consider it a Mingrelian language rather than a dialect. In the Laz-Mingrelian group he believes he can find resemblances to the more Indo-European elements in old Armenian (Grab). There are two Laz languages, eastern, and western with smaller subdivisions (the language of the Çhält). Laz is very full of Turkish words. It has no written literature but there are local poets (Kashid Hulmi, Pehlîvan-oghlu, etc.). The Laz are forgetting their own language, which is being replaced by the Turkish patois of Trebizond (cf. Firerew in Zapt, 1901, xiii., p. 147–201) in which the harmony of the vowels is much neglected (cf. a specimen in N. Marr, Tezizî ve rozbatlî, St. Petersburg, vtt, p. 55).

The Georgians call the Laz Çan but the Laz do not know this name. Çan is evidently the original of the Greek name Sanua/Tzanooi and Çan survives in the official name of the sandjak of Samos (Djanik). From the historical point of view the separation of the Laz and Çan seems to have taken place in spite of the close relationship between the two of them. In the time of Arian, the Sanuoi were the immediate neighbours of Trebizond. In an obscure passage in this author (cf. the perplexed commentary of G. Müller in Geogr. Grundzüge Minorens, ad Arrian, Peripl., 8) he places on the river Of the frontier between the Coruk (Laz) and the Samos (?). Koch mentions the interesting fact that the people of Of speak a “language of their own” and according to Marr the people of Khashnish (near Atina) speak an incomprehensible language. Procopius places the “Sanuoi, who are now called the Tsanooi” on the area adjoining the mountains separating Coruk from the sea (the Parashades range, the name of which survives in the modern Parkher/Balkhat). The researches of N. V. Marr have shown that the Çan (Tzanooi) had at first occupied a larger area including the basin of the Coruk and its tributaries on the right bank from which they were temporarily displaced by the Armenians and finally by the Georgians (Kharthi). The chronicles of Trebizond continue to distinguish the Laz from the Tsanooi (Çanî). The latter in alliance with
the Muslims attacked the possessions of Trebizond in 1348. and in 1377 were punished by the Emperor. At this period the Tranzids must have been in the southwest of Trebizond (besides, the sandjak of Djankt is to the west of this port). Thus the Georgian application of the name Caan to the Laz may be explained by the confusion of the two tribes, one of whom (the true Caan living to the south and west of the Laz) was ultimately thrust to the west of Trebizond.

**Bibliography:** The principal Byzantine sources are found in: Dietrich, Byzantinische Quellen zur Länder- und Volkerkunde, Leipzig 1912, I, 52—58; Dulois de Montpéroux, Voyage autour du Caucase, Paris 1839, ii. 73 and the Atlas, series i, pl. xiv.: map of the theatre of wars of Lazizia; Vivien de St. Martin, Études de géographie ancienne, Paris 1852, ii, p. 196—

**Lazarus** is the name in the Gospels of 1) the poor man who finds compensation in Abraham's bosom for the misery of this world (Luke, xvi. 19—31); 2) the dead man whom Jesus raises to life (John xi). The Kur'an mentions neither the one nor the other, but among the miracles with which it credits Jesus is included the raising from the dead (Sure, ii. 55). Muslim legend with its fondness for the miracles of resurrection is fond of telling of the dead whom Jesus revives, but rarely mentions Lazarus. Tabart (Amalci) talks of these miracles in general. According to him, Ham b. Nuh is revived by Jesus (I. 187). Al-Khayy only mentions Sám son of Nuh of those restored to life by Jesus. Thalāt relates, closely following St. John's Gospel: "al-Ázir died; his sister sent to inform Jesus, Jesus came 3 (in the Gospel 4) days after his death, went with his sister to the tomb in the rock and caused al-Ázir to arise; children were born to him". In Ibn al-Athir the resurrected man is called "Ázir", the st of Ela'ar was taken for the article, as in al-Ya's (Elisa) and Alexander (al-Iskander) or in Azar in the Kur'an, whose name Fraenkel derives from Ellizer. In Ibn al-Ajur we find Muslim legend endeavouring to increase the miracle, Jesus raises not only "Ázir" (Lazarus) but also his wife (children are born to him), and Sám (son of Nuh), the prophet Usair and Yahyá b. Zakariya (John the Baptist).

**Bibliography:** Tabart, Annaler, i. 187, 731, 739; Ibn al-Athir, Al-Kamil, i. 122, 123; Thālabī, ʿAṣir al-Anbiyya', Cairo 1325, p. 307. On the name Ela'ar, Elizer, Azar, see S. Fraenkel, in Z. d. M. G., 1902, liv. 71—73; J. Horovitz, Hebrew Union College Annual, 1925, ii, p. 157, 161; do., Koranische Untersuchungen, 1926; p. 12, 85, 86. (BEKKHARD HELLER)

**LEBARAN.** [See 'id al-Fitr.]

**LEO AFRICANUS, AL-HARAN K. MUHAMMAD AL-WAZZAN AL-ZAIYATI,** called Yahyán al-Asad al-Gharnâtî, in Latin Johannes Leo Africanus, born at Granada in 1401 (1465) was brought up in Fés. Enraptured with three diplomatic missions to the South of Morocco by the Banû Wâqif, he went to Mecca in 921 (1516) and then to Stambul. Captured on his way home by Sicilian corsairs he was taken to Naples in 926 (1520), then to Rome where the Pope baptised him "Johannes Leo". At Rome he compiled the following works, only the first of which has come down to us in the original Arabic text: 1. Arabic-Hebrew-Latin Vocabulary composed in 930 (1524) for the physician Jacob ben Simon (MS. Escorial 598); cf. H. Dernberg, Cat. vst. arabes de l'Escorial, Paris 1884, i. 410; 2. Description of the Africa, which he translated into Italian on March 10, 1526 (divulgated since 1531; published by Ramusio, Navigationi, viaggi, Venice 1550, i. 109—115; French transl. by Temporal, ed. Schafer, 1866; Latin by Florians; English by Pory, ed. Browne, 1866; Dutch by Leers; German by Lombach); 3. Libri de viris illustribus apud Arabos, finished in 1527, Latin transl., ed. Hottinger, 1785, then by Fabrius. These works gave the west the earliest materials for a history of Islam; cf. in the economic and social monograph on the city of Fés, Description, Bk. iv., Ch. 23—54, a remarkable résumé from the Mâlikî point of view of the historical development of theology. Before 957 (1550) Leo returned to Tunis where he died, a good Muslim.

**Bibliography:** Widmannst, Evangelia syriaca, 1555; introduction; Cassil, Bibliotheca arabo-hispiana, Madrid 1770, i. 172 sqq.; Scher, op. latus; Goldsticer, ap. Pallas Nagy Lexicon, den omnes ismerites encyklopédia, 1897, xi. 426; Massignon, Le Maroc à d'apres l'Africain, Algiers 1906, p. 4—11, 32—

According to H. de Castries (in his Sources), Signora Angelo Codazzi, of Milan, is preparing a critical work upon the Arabic materials of the "Descriptions".

(LE MASON)
LEPANTO — LEWEND

"Spiegelglocke": in view of the Greek form however it is very probable that the Turks originally pronounced it Iνε Βάκχιτ. The town is situated in the ancient Locri, north of the strait which leads from the Ionian Sea towards the Gulf of Corinth, known since the middle ages as the Gulf of Lepanto.

After forming from the xiii century part of the despoty of Epirus, Lepanto fell into the hands of the Venetians who made it one of the strongest places in Greece. Muhammad II during his war with Venice therefore undertook an expedition to take the town by land. In 1487 Khâdim Suleiman Pasha was given the task but did not succeed (Tâmârîkî, Aâlî 'Oqââmîn, ed. Giese, p. 115). It was Bâyazîd II who ultimately took the town in 1499 with the help of the Turkish fleet after the latter had defeated the Venetians near the island of Sapienza (Bursûk Râ's Aasâf) in July. The town was already being besieged by Mustafà Pasha, beglerbeg of Rûm Ili; Bâyazîd joined the army later. The commander of the garrison had declared he would never surrender until Turkish vessels should enter the strait. This happened after the battle of Sapienza, for the Venetians made a feint resistance. The Venetian commander capitulated on Aug. 26, 1499, (cf. Tâmârîkî, Aâlî 'Oqââmîn, p. 127 and 'Aâbî Pasha Zâde, p. 237-238, which gives the date as 3 of Muharram (905 = Aug. 10, 1499). Immediately afterwards Bâyazîd built two forts to defend the entrance to the Gulf.

Lepanto is particularly celebrated for the famous naval battle fought on Oct. 7, 1571, between the Turkish fleet and the Christian fleet consisting of 108 Venetian galleys, 77 Spanish, 6 Maltese, 3 Savoy and 12 Papal in addition to 8 enormous Venetian galleasses (the figures given by the Turkish historians vary considerably) united under the command of Don John of Austria. This great combined expedition of the Christian fleets had been provoked by the capture of Cyprus by the Turks under Lala Mustafà Pasha in 1570 and 1571. The Turkish fleet came for the most part from Cyprus with the ser Aferd Pervet Pasha and the Kapudan Pasha 'Alî and was joined by Ulud 'Ali Pasha (Ochali) beglerbeg of Algiers with 40 ships. After raids on the coast of Crete and the Ionian Islands it had cast anchor off Lepanto; it was here the Turks learned of the approach of the Christian fleet. The Turkish fleet consisted of 300 ships (40 von Hammer; Hâdimi Khalifa speaks of 180; it was not at the top of its strength on account of the numerous desertions. Against the advice of Pervet Pasha and Ulud 'Alî who commanded the left wing proceeded to leave the bay of Lepanto and to attack. The Christian ships entered the Gulf on Oct. 7; the battle which followed only lasted a few hours and ended in the complete destruction of the Turkish fleet; the Kapudan Pasha perished in the battle; Pervet Pasha escaped with difficulty and Ulud 'Alî who commanded the left wing succeeded in saving 40 vessels. This, their first great defeat at sea, is called by the Turks 'aeglâs damama referi, the "expedition of the destroyed fleet". The immediate results of this event were not considerable, for the Allies could not take advantage of their success and the Turks were soon succeeded in making good their losses in material; Muhammad Selîdî (q.v.) was credited with saying that the empire was rich and powerful enough to make the anchors of the fleet of silver, and the ropes of silk and the sails of atlas (Pecewi, i. 499).

The moral results however were very great and justified the great importance attached in history to the battle of Lepanto.

In June 1587 the Venetian and Austrian forces seized Lepanto, but they had to surrender the town to the Turks by the treaty of Carlowitz (1699); as Venice then held the whole of the Morea, Lepanto remained the only Turkish stronghold in this region. The Turkish history of the town ended with the insurrection of the Greeks, as a result of which Naupactos was incorporated in the kingdom of Greece.

The defence of Lepanto consisted of 3 successive lines of fortifications on a cone-shaped hill; it was the residence of a zumârâbeg of the eyâlet of the Kapudan Pasha (Hâdimi Khalifa, Tuchâs al-Kîlîr, p. 679). Its great strategic and maritime importance is explained by Hâdimi Khalifa in Rumîlîl and Bouma, transl. by von Hammer, p. 125.


J. H. Kramer)

LERIDA, the ancient Ilirida, the Arabic Lerida, a town in northern Spain, half-way between Saragossa and Barcelona, now the capital of the province of the same name, with a population of about 29,000. It lies at a height of about 600 feet on the right bank of the Segre (the Wadit Sâbir of the Arabs; Yâkü, Muğjam al-Buldân, s.v., wrongly makes this another name of Lerida), and forms an important strategical point at the entrance to the plains of Aragon.

Lerida, which is undoubtedly of Iberian origin, was taken by Julius Caesar in 49 B.C. in the first Civil War between him and Pompey. In 546 a council met there and it was occupied by the Muslims in the first half of the eighth century. It seems to have henceforth shared the fate of Saragossa and to have been an important point for the defence of the Upper Frongera (al-Mughr al-Dirâ). It was later part of the independent kingdom of the Banî Hûd of Saragossa. At the division which took place on the death of Sulaimân b. Hûd al-Mustâ'în bi 'Ilîh (1046), it fell to his son Yûsuf but was again taken by the ruler of Saragossa Ahmad al-Mu'akhtâr. (E. Levi-Provençal)


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

The lewends were a soldiery almost without discipline whom it was impossible to make use of when the navy came to be regularly organised. Even in the time of Mahmut II the use of *savâb*’s had been begun for the naval service and under Bayazid II, the first regular body of marines was formed, consisting of 400 *savâb*’s. About the same time the *savâb*’s were employed on the galleys as *ürkçüs* in place of the less loyal Christians (*Yaşâlî Myślafa, Thâtâfat al-Îlâm*, p. 109). Thus the true lewends were gradually removed from the navy. We find however that the word lewend is still used at a later period to indicate the soldiers of the navy, especially the ruffians (rûf-ıkhâr), cf. Djwadat Pagha; in Constantinople there were two barracks of lewends, belonging to the organisation of the arsenal. In a figurative sense, the great naval captains of the sixteenth century are also called lewend (e.g. by *Safvat Bey* in his article in *T. O. E. M.*, No. 24).

The lewends after having been removed from the fleet, still continued to exist as marauders, especially in Asia Minor where they were a scourge to the country. The word lewend thus acquired the meaning of vagabond and rascal; this last meaning has even passed into Persian. On the other hand, the Pagha in the province for long continued to recruit their bodyguard among the lewends (cf. the picture of a lewend in the plate on p. 136 of the third volume of *Dhâsimoan*).

From the end of the sixteenth century the government found itself forced to take steps to abolish the bodies of lewends still in existence. Ordinances of 1695, 1718 and 1720 gave them permission to join the new corps of the *alef* and *gülâle* (*Yaşâlî Myślafa, Târîkh, Constantinopol 1828, v. 13, 123). Finally a series of military expeditions in 1737, 1747, 1752, 1759 and 1763 extirpated the last bands of this turbulent soldiery, who still existed in different parts of Asia Minor (Ist, Târîkh, p. 25, 30, 78, 209; Yaşâlî, Târîkh, p. 137, 234).


**LÎTÁN**

(a) an oath, which gives a husband the possibility of accusing his wife of adultery without legal proof without becoming liable to the punishment prescribed for this, and of denying the paternity of a child borne by the wife. In the language of the Shari’â, evidence given by the husband, strengthened by oaths, by which the husband invokes the curse (bâna: from this the whole process is a *şâver*) named and the wife the wrath of Allah upon themselves, if they should lie; it frees the husband from *hâdd* (the legal punishment) for *sadâf* (accusation without proof of infidelity by persons of irreproachable character) and the wife of *hâdd* for incontinence (A. Spranger, *Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Science of the Moslem*, *Bibl. Indica*, Old Series, ii., 1300). On the technical use of the related verbal forms, cf. the Arabic lexicons and Dozy, *Suppl. aux Dict. Arabes*, s.v.; *al-Kasâllân*, commentary on *al-Bukhârî*, *Thâtâfat al-Îlâm*, 25, at the beginning; *al-Zurkâni*, commentary on the *Muwafaqat*, *Bâb mî zfî* = *‘LÎTÁN*, at the beginning.

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

These verses belong to a part of the *Kurâni*, apparently composed at one time, containing various regulations about adultery and consisting of xxiv. 1-10, 21-26; verses 11-20, which certainly belong to the year 5 were inserted later; our verses must therefore be older (cf. Nöbdliche-Schawly, *Geschichte des Quaran*, i. 210 sqq.; H. Grimmie, *Mammoon*, ii. 27; puts the *Sûra* between the battles of *Badr* [2 A. H.] and *Uhud* [3 A. H.]). They form a regulation in favour of the husband, an exception to the punishment strictly laid down in 114 Kuran, xxiv. 4 (cf. also verses 23-25) for *sadâf* and are therefore, like this penalty, primarily Muslim and have no analogies in Arab paganism in which an institution like the *hâdd* had no place at all (contrary to D. Santillana, *Istituzioni di diritto musulman*, ii. 221 below). The word *hâdd*, which comes from the *Kurâni*, is unknown to the pre-Mohammedan poetry.

The *hâdd* concerning *hâdd* are almost entirely (the oldest probably exclusively) exagetical and profess to give the occasion of the revelation of the *Kurâni* verses in question; they are to some extent contradictory (attempts to harmonise these are found in *al-Zurkâni*, commentary on the *Muwafaqat*, *Bâb mî zfî* = *‘LÎTÁN*), systematised and univocal (cf. Nöbdliche-Schawly, etc., where further references are given, to which may now be added those in A. J. Wensinec, *Handbook of Early Muslim Tradition*, p. 56 sqq. [in p. 56 ut may be added, T. 44, *Sûra* 24]). Four types may be distinguished among them: 1. the husband (unnamed) laments his sad case to Prophet in low language whereupon the verses are revealed (oldest form); 2. *‘Uwamir* b. *‘Aqil asks in the same way, first through the intermediary of a friend and then directly of the Prophet (a development of the first type); 3. *Hândi* b. *‘Umayya* accuses his wife of adultery and is to be punished with *hâdd*
for this, when Allah saves him sometimes by the revelation of the verses (this type probably a development of the first, in which Sa'd b. Ubada also is often involved, who had previously with scornful criticism called attention to the possibility of the dilemma which has now actually happened, has of the three the most schematic and not original appearance); 4) some one marries a young woman and finds her not a virgin while he disputes his assertion; the Prophet therefore orders ُّنام (not exegetic). There are of course other transitional and mixed forms. In so far as the hadiths yield nothing new about ُّنام, this brief outline is sufficient; they are only of importance when they afford evidence for the oldest juristic adaptation of this Kur'anic institution.

2. The first subject of the earliest legal speculation was the question, not touched upon in the Kur'an, whether ُّنام makes separation between the husband and wife necessary. In many hadiths this question is so expressly (sometimes polemically) affirmed that there must have been a school which approved the continuance of the marriage after the ُّنام. The statement that al-May’ab b. al-Zubair is said to have held this view (Muslim; Nasai) is however based on an imadmissible interpretation of another hadith, in which he appears as a contemporary; on the other hand that Uyman b. Burti held it may be considered sufficiently proved (al-Zurqani on the Musawat). Among the oldest representatives of the other view which later became predominant, that a continuance of the marriage was impossible after ُّنام, may be included with some probability Abd Allah b. Umar and with certainty al-Zuhri in whose time it was already sunna, and Ibrahim al-Nakhji (Kishk al-Asghr); the tracing of this opinion back to Abd Allah b. Abibl, which we find in the hadith, must however be regarded as unhistorical.

Next arises the question how this annulment of the marriage as a result of ُّنام is to be carried through, whether by a triple ta‘lak, which the husband has to pronounce against his wife or by the decision of the judge before whom the ُّنام is taken or by the ُّنام itself. The first view is undoubtedly based on a large number of traditions, while on trace of its use in law has survived; these traditions are rather interpreted in favour of the second view (cf. the ُّنام of al-Zuhri in al-Tahabi, Ta’ifir and al-Bukhari, Ta’al, b. 30 and ُّنام, b. 43; the tradition in Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 330 sq. forms in its abbreviated form only an apparent exception; a polemic against the first view in al-Tayalisi, No. 2065). The second opinion survives in the later legal ُّنام; apart from the ample testimony to it in hadith, its oldest representatives known with probability or certainty are Abd Allah b. Umar, al-Zuhri, in whose time it was already sunna, and Ibrahim al- Nakhji’s (Kishk al-Asghr) description to ‘Abd Allah b. Abibl is again not historical. For the third there is no evidence in tradition; it is only found after the rise of the maqdisah. We seem therefore to have a tendency to development in a particular direction.

Other prescriptions about ُّنام in tradition, going beyond what is laid down in the Kur'an, are of less importance. Thus, when the question is raised at all, it is unanimously laid down that the husband cannot marry the wife again at a later date, that a ُّنام may take place during pregnancy (legal ُّنام is later attached to their interpretation of this hadith), that the child has only relationship with its mother as regards kinship or inheritance i.e. is considered illegitimate. Other hadiths say that the ُّنام must be taken in a mosque and attribute the formula to be spoken there by the ُّنام to the Prophet. We are also brought into contact with questions of detail, which play a part in the later ُّنام by a tradition according to which the Prophet did not allow ُّنام unless the husband and wife were on equal terms as regards Ibad and freedom; a series of older authorities who held the contrary view is quoted in the Musawat.

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

3. The teachings of the separate maqdisah, develop the views of their earliest representatives, not entirely on the same lines (cf. the Musawat); it is to be assumed with probability that Malik followed the second view regarding the element in ُّنام which annulled the marriage (cf. above), while his school later held the third opinion entirely. The most important regulations of the Fiqh regarding ُّنام that goes beyond what has been so far discussed are as follows: if the husband accuses the wife of adultery or denies the paternity of his child without being able to prove it in the legally prescribed fashion and she denies his charge, recourse is had to the process of ُّنام. If the husband refuses to pronounce the formulae prescribed for him, he is punished with the ُّنام for ُّنام, according to Abul Hanifa, however, imprisoned until he pronounces the formulae, whereby he is set free or is declared to have lied, whereupon he is liable to ُّنام. If the wife refuses to pronounce the corresponding formulae, she is punished with the ُّنام for adultery, according to Abul Hanifa and the better tradition of Ahmad b. Hanbal, however, imprisoned until he pronounces the formulae, whereby he is set free or is declared to have lied, whereupon he is liable to ُّنام. On the question whether ُّنام is possible if one partner is or both are not Muslims or free not or not valid, there is a mixture of ُّنام, which cannot be detailed here; the same applies to the possibility of ُّنام during the pregnancy of the woman with the object of denying the paternity of the child. On this point the strength of the principle that the marriage decides the descent of the child, is remarkable, as is the distinction between two objects of ُّنام (accusation of the wife of adultery and denial of paternity) which is only a result of later developments. In the whole of the earlier period these two objects coincide from the juristic point of view. The divorcing element in ُّنام is, according to the Malikis (on their presumed divergence from Malik himself on this question; cf. above) and a tradition of Ahmad b. Hanbal, the ُّنام of the wife, according to al-Shafi‘i that of the husband, according to Abul Hanifa and the
better tradition of Abūmad b. Ḥanbal however the widow or the judges pronounced after the ḫāSa of both. Opinions also differ regarding the legal consequences of a later withdrawal of the dīn by the husband; according to Abū Ḥanifa and one tradition of Abūmad b. Ḥanbal, a new marriage of the two persons is possible in this case, according to Malik al-Shāfi‘ī and the better tradition of Abūmad b. Ḥanbal it is not; among older authorities only Sa‘īd b. Dujair is in favour of the first view, while ‘Umar, ‘Ali, ‘Abdallāh b. Mu‘āt, ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Umar, ‘Aṭī‘ and al-Zahiri are quoted as if in favour of the second (not all have historical confirmation) which was also held by al-Awzā‘ī and Sufyān al-Thawrī. Finally it is a disputed question whether the ḫāSa can only be performed orally or (in the case of a dumb person) by gestures; al-Buhārī devotes chapter 35 of his Kitāb al-Talākh to the discussion of this question and the reasons for his attitude to it.

It is easy to understand that resort was only had to the ḫāSa in extreme cases. Thus we find a scholar of Cordova in the fourth century A.D. pronouncing the ḫāSa against his wife simply in order to revive this maṣūma of the Prophet, which had fallen into oblivion (I. Goldthorpe, Muhammedanische Studien, ii, 21). But it has not yet fallen completely into desuetude, as Muslim law has no other means of disputing the paternity of a child (cf. Juynboll, Handl. pp. 217, note 2; Sanullāna, Istituzioni, p. 222).


(Joseph Schacht)

LIḤYĀN, an Arab tribe, a branch of the Ḥudhail [q.v.]. Genealogy: Liḥyān b. Ḥudhail b. Mudrīka b. al-Yās b. Muṣār. Settled like the other branches of the Ḥudhail in the country N.E. of Mecca, the Liḥyān do not seem to have had in the ḫāSa just before and after Islam a history independent of their brethren; it is only rarely that they are mentioned apart from them, e.g. in Ḥasan, p. 34, a propos of their battles with the warrior-poet Tūḥamā b. Ṣa‘d b. Ḥudhail. Meanwhile the tribe of this kind is regarded among those of the Ḥudhail — e.g. ‘Abdīb b. Khaḑlī b. Ḥudhail, al-Muṭi‘al Ḥudhail, al-Ka‘bah, etc. At the time of the prophethood of Islam we find them like the rest of the Ḥudhail under the political influence of the Quraysh. This explains their hostile attitude to Muhammad, who resided in Mecca, in the murder of their chief Sufyān b. Khaḑlī b. Nāṣrīr b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Umar at the instigation of Muhammad. This murder was cruelly avenged by the Liḥyān who slew several Muslims in their turn (wasī‘ al-Ragī, 4, 18, cf. Ḥudhail). As there is no further mention of hostile relations between the Muslims and the Liḥyān, it is probable that the latter were included in the sub-division which the Ḥudhail made to Islam.

After the triumph of Muhammad and in the periods following, there is an almost complete lack of information about the Liḥyān and there are very few persons of note belonging to this tribe; the only Sammaritan al-Liḥyān, whose full name was al-‘Abī b. Ḥudhail, was at some time a partisan of the Prophet (cf. al-Mas’ūdī, Mu‘arrab al-Mas‘ūdī, ed., Krenkow, R. S. O., xxxii, 145, No. 125, with bibliography; Flügel, Die gramm. Schriften, p. 51) especially a favorite of the two sons of ‘Abdīb, i.e. 222 or 232 (cf. al-Zubaydī, Šarḥ al-Nu‘aym, ed., Krenkow, R. S. O., vii, 145, No. 125, with bibliography; Flügel, Die gramm. Schriften, p. 51) perhaps belonged to it, but other sources (Vāqī‘, Ḥarib, ed. Margoliouth, v. 229; Tāhā al-‘Arūf, x, 324, 10) trace his nīsā‘ al-Liḥyān to the unusual length of his beard (bana‘).

There was some reason to suspect that the Liḥyān at a remote period of Arab history had played a more important part than that almost unnoticed, which they did later; this seems evident from a passage in Ibn al-Kalbī (K. al-A‘ẓā‘ī, p. 37 = Vāqī‘, Mu‘arrab, iii, 181, 10) who assigns to the Liḥyān certain priestly functions (ṣa‘īna) in the cult of the Hudhail idol Su‘ā‘ (cf. Wellhausen, Keil-Arab. Heidentum, 5, p. 18—19); the discovery of several hundred pieces of inscriptions and graffiti in the north of the Hijāz has not only confirmed this suspicion but also revealed the existence of a Liḥyān state several centuries before the coming of Islam. These inscriptions, first known from the imperfect copies of Doughty and Huber, were later collected in large numbers (over 900) by Eutin and deciphered by D. H. Müller after preliminary work by J. Halévy. They are now available in still larger numbers and better known as a result of the discoveries and publications of F. A. H. Jumaa and S. S. A. They are almost all in the vicinity of the village of ‘El-‘Ola (especially in the area fall of archaeological remains, called el-Dārreke in the rocky cliffs to the east of this) not far to the south of the great Nabataean centre of al-Hijāz [q.v.], Mā‘ṣir al-Ṣūlīb; some have even been found here although in much smaller numbers. Their epigraphy closely resembles that of the Nabataean and Sa‘ūdatic Inscriptions, in Northern Arabic and only differs from classical Arabic by several peculiarities (especially the use of ḫ as in place of J for the article, and of a participle of the form muṣī‘al in contrast to the classical muṣī‘al of the classical Arabic).

From these inscriptions we learn that el-‘Ola — the old name of which is given in the form D O of the Bible — was the capital of the kingdom of the Liḥyān, of which some of the kings were Talmaj I and II (cf. the name of Talmaj, king of Geḥār, father-in-law of Alnasir, Il Sani, iii, 3 and xiii, 17), Tādhī, Lawdhi, Hannā‘ al-MASH-M, Karb’il.

This kingdom seems to have been for a long period of remarkable size and importance; before it was formed or became quite independent el-‘Ola-Dedan was a colony of the Nabataeans which was brought the merchandise of the Yemen and India to the ports of the Mediterranean. After the fall of the Nabataean kingdom (according to M. Hartmann between 230 and 260 B.C.) the Nabataeans
replaced the Minaeans in the control of trade and settled in al-Hijr; but at the same time the Libyans, who had absorbed Minaean civilization formed an independent kingdom and arrested the southward advance of the Nabataeans; the frontier of the two states must have been between al-Hijr and al-dba. It is probable that these Libyans were simply a section of the Thamud (q.v.) whom we find mentioned in the annals of Sargon of Assyria, while there is no ancient reference to the Libyans until Ptolemy who mentions them (Hist. Nat., vi. 33, 1) under the name of Lechieni. Their power must have increased after the fall of the kingdom of Petra (106 A.D.) and it seems that from this time onwards, they also held al-Hijr, abandoned by the Nabataeans.

When and how the Libyans fell in their turn to the position in which we find them in the sixth century forming part of the tribe of Hudhail, and settled in a territory considerably to the south of their original home, we cannot tell, on account of the complete absence of documents. Muslim tradition has lost all memory of them and confounds them apparently under the general designation of Thamud with the Thamudic period and the Nabataeans of al-Hijr; a memory but a very vague one of the Song of al-Hijr of the Libyan kingdom may perhaps have survived in the isolated mention in a tradition that the Libyans were "remnants of the Djeriurum," who later became part of the Hudhail (Tabarī, Annals, ed. de Goeje, i. 749, 11-12; [cf. Djeriurum] following Ibn al-Kalbi; Tağf al-Arūr, x. 324, 2-9, following al-Hamdānī, probably in al-Idriṣī and the passage is not found in the text of the Qāfīrat al-Arūr). The Thamudian graffiti (which used to be called proto-Arab) are a development (later or parallel) of the Libyan script, the last stage of which is seen in the Safaitic graffiti; but we are completely ignorant of the historical relations of the people who used these similar scripts.

The ruins of Dibān-el-d-dba, although they have so far only been superficially explored give us some idea of the unoccupied stage of civilization to which the Libyans had attained; besides tombs, some of which are decorated with sculptures in high relief, Fathers Jaussen and Savignac have discovered a sanctuary with a central basin circular in form (for ablutions?) and ornamented with large statues several important fragments of which have been discovered. An inscription in this sanctuary mentions an afhal of the god Wadd: this term, which certainly is the name of a sacrificial office is not unknown to Muslim Arab tradition (Agānī, xxxix. 686; IbnDurait, K. al-Iṣṭiqbāb, p. 197, 7). Among the deities worshipped by the Libyans we find alongside of typically Arabic ones like Allāh, al-Iṣṭi, Wadd, Yağhūth and a god named Ḥabāt of whom we know nothing definite, gods of Aramaean origin, like Bel; a name, in the epigraphic name, Šâm; in these names as well as in the use of other Arabic terms (among them nafs in the sense of "tomb") there is apparent the influence of the Nabataeans, who undoubtedly contributed with the Minaeans to form the character of Libyant civilization. The presence of Judean elements, which Müller and Glaser thought they could recognize is on the other hand more than doubtful.

Bibliography: Wüstenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, M. 8 (Register, p. 275); Ibn Kutaiba, K. al-Mowārif, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 31; Ibn Durait, K. al-Iṣṭiqbāb, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 106; Ibn al-Kalbi, Qāfīrat al-Arūr (British Museum MS.), t. 38; Ibn al-Hīrān, Sinā, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 638—642, 582; Wākīdī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 158—160, 324; Tabarī, Annals, ed. de Goeje, l. 1431—1437; Caetani, Annali dell'islam, i. 577—578, 581—582 (4 §§ 3—4, 7); D. H. Müller, Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Arabien (Denkschriften Ak. Wien, xxxvii, 1889); E. Glassow, Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens, Berlin 1890, p. 98—127; Jaussen and Savignac, Mission archéologique en Arabie, I., Paris 1909, p. 253—271; II., Paris 1914, p. xiv—xxvii, 77—361; M. Lidzbarski, Ephemeris für semit. Epigraphik, ii. 23—48, 345—361; iii. 214—237; (G. Levi Della Vida, LIMNI, Turkish form of the name of the island of Lemnos in the Aegean Sea between Mount Athos and the mainland of Asia Minor about 50 miles S.E. of the entrance to the Dardanelles. In ancient times a possession of Athens, in the middle ages it belonged to the Byzantine empire; in this period, in 901, the island was sacked by the Muslim inhabitants of Crete. Towards the end of the middle ages Lemnos had passed into the hands of the Italians who called the island Stallaime (formed with the addition of the Greek preposition είς; and the article). When the Turks took Constantinople the island belonged to the Genoese lords of Lesbos (Midillí), the Gattelusio. Under Bāyazid I, who had fortified the Dardanelles, Lemnos passed with the other islands under Turkish rule. But when Constantinople became the Turkish capital it was inevitable that Lemnos, the largest of the three islands commanding the entrance to the Dardanelles (the others are Imbros and Tenedos, or Bodja Ada) entered the direct domination of the Turks. In 1456 took place Muhammad II's expedition against Ainos as a result of which the conqueror became lord of the islands of Tuzsa, Samothrace and Imbros. Negotiations had been going on between the lord of Lesbos and the Sultan regarding the payment of tribute. But in the course of these negotiations the people of Lemnos, dissatisfied with the rule of Nicholas Gattelusio, brother of the lord of Midillí, voluntarily submitted to the Sultan who appointed Hamma Beg governor of the island and entrusted Isma'il, beg of Gallipoli, with the task of installing him there. Gattelusio succeeded in leaving the island before the arrival of the Turks. The date of these happenings which are recorded only by the Byzantine historian, Duca (xiv. 190) and Chalcondylas (viii. 248) is not certain; but Ducas who was representative of the princes of Lesbos at the Sultan's court, may be considered a reliable authority. In 1457, a Papal fleet drove out the Turks — the Pope had intended to establish an order of Knights on Lemnos — but some time afterwards the same Isma'il Beg recovered Lemnos with the adjoining islands (Zinkeisen, ii. 253—257). In 1462 Muhammad became master of Lesbos also. The following year the Turkish possession of Lemnos was disputed by the Venetians, whose Admiral Canale in 1467 (A. H. 872 in Neckor and Sa'd al-Din, according to von Hammer) took Ainos and the islands in this part of the Aegean Sea (cf. also Münebd-ič Dəş, iii. 354); these conquests resulted in Muhammad's great expedition against the island of Euboea or Negropont (in Turkish:
Egbribo) in 1468. Soon afterwards the Turks retook Lemnos and by the peace concluded with Venice in 1479 this island remained definitely a possession of the Turks. In this year the island of Tenedos was fortified by the Sultan so that the system of defences of the Dardanelles was completed.

In July 1656 the Venetians won a victory over the Turkish fleet before the Dardanelles and as an immediate result took Tenedos, Samothrace and Lemnos. These conquests were such a threat to the capital that the grand vizier Muzaffar Pasha took energetic measures and sent an army of 4,500 men under the Kapudan Pasha Topal Muhammad; the latter besieged the citadel of Castro for 63 days, after which the Italians capitulated on November 15, 1557. Tenedos was regained from the Turks by the same expedition (Na'imi, i. 518, 585, 633). Finally in 1770 in the Russo-Turkish war Count Orloff laid siege to Castro and after 60 days had obtained its surrender, when the Kapudan Pasha Husein attacked the Russian fleet in the harbour of Mudros (Turkis: Münduro), forced the enemy to withdraw on October 24, 1770 (Wajih, ii. 118).

Linga, a little seaport on the Persian Gulf which lies between Lihristan [q.v.] and the desert. The old port was at Kung, 8 miles east of Linga; the Portuguese had a factory there where they ruled long after the loss of Hormuz (to 1711). In the reign of the Zand dynasty, 1,000 Dawsim Arabs (Bani Dāshīm, Dawsīm, Kowkis) with their chief Shāh Saḥīl came from the district al-Qalba (Qumān) and took Linga from the banīnahrīn of the district Dāhamgūrī. In 1787 the Persian government took possession of Linga and deputed to Teherān the last hereditary ushārī (Kādī). The present population is very mixed (Arabs, Persians, Hindus, Africans). On the shore at Linga are wharves for building boats for local traffic and the port is fairly busy, but the mountains which rise from 3,500-4,000 feet behind Linga make communication with the hinterland difficult (Llr is 63 farsaks from Linga).


Lisān al-Dīn. [See Jān al-Khāṭīf].

Lisbon, Portuguese Lisbon, a city at the mouth of the Tagus, now the capital of Portugal, with 455,000 inhabitants; tradition attributes its foundation to Ulysses and it originally bore the Phoenician name of Olissippo. Under the Romans it received the name of Felicitas Julia and formed a municipium. It was under the rule of the Alans from 407, of the Visigoths from 585 to 715, when it passed into the power of the Muslims.

For the Arabic transcription of the name of Lisbon we find the two forms Lisbâna and Istanbul with or without the article (cf. especially, David Lopes, Cn Arabes was abrah de Alexandre Herculano, Lisbon, 1911, p. 58—59 and the references there given). The most usual ethnic is al-Usbūdi. Lisbon was not a large town in the Muslim period but it was nevertheless frequently described by the Arab geographers. Al-Idrisi speaks of its ramparts and its castle and of the springs of warm water which rose in the centre of the town. It is built, he says, opposite the fort called al-Madān (Almada), so called from the gold dust washed up on the bank by the Tagus. It is also from Lisbon that this geographer followed by several authors makes the legendary expedition of the 8 Adventurers set out (no doubt to the Canary Islands; cf. above, p. 888, s. v. at-Kāf-/Abū8).

Lisbon very early (by 711) fell into the hands of the Muslims and under the Omaiyad caliphate of Cordova formed a part of the district of Balâq, along with Santamia and Cintra. The Arab chronicles record several risings there which were quickly suppressed. It was however from the Normans (844—847) that Lisbon suffered most in this period. During their first invasion of al-Andalus in 849 (844) it was there they disembarked for the first time. According to Ibn Idârî, their fleet consisted of 54 galleys and 54 vessels of less
LISBON — LITHAM

importance; the alarm was given to the caliph of Cordova by the governor of Lisbon, Wahh Allah b. Ham. Again, during the invasions of 966—971, in the reign of al-Hakam II, the Normans began by ravaging the plain of Lisbon after landing at Alcacer do Sal (Kaju Ali Dhlili). For further details, cf. the article MAHOMET and the literature there quoted.

After the fall of the Omeyyad caliphate of Spain, Lisbon formed part of the independent kingdom founded by the Almohads [q.v.], with Badajos (Badajuz), as capital. Under the Almoravids, it seems to have been taken for a brief period by the Christians and retaken at the end of 504 (1110) by the Emir Sir. b. Ali Bakr, at the same time as Santarem, Badajoz, Porto and Evora. It was only some 40 years afterwards, in 547 (1147) that it was finally conquered by Alfonso I Henriques of Portugal with the help of a body of Crusaders who were on their way to Palestine under Arnold van Arachot.


LITHAM (L.), sometimes also pronounced lisham, the mouth-piece, is a piece of material with which the Beduins concealed the lower part of the face, the mouth and sometimes also part of the nose (see the commentary on Harih, ed. de Sacy, Paris 1821, p. 374 a). It served the practical purpose of protecting the organs of respiration from heat and cold as well as against the penetration of dust (cf. Dhu 'l-Rumah, No. 5, 43). It is also made of the face more or less unrecognisable and thus formed a protection against the avenger of blood (Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., xli. 101). The līθam was therefore also sometimes worn as a deliberate disguise by people who did not usually wear it; thus in the rooρ Night (ed. Macnaghten, i. 785) it is worn by a princess, who disguises herself as a man, and (ibid., ii. 59) by a woman for similar reasons. A demonstrative verb has been formed from līθam, the fifth form of which in particular means "to put on the lip harness" (e.g. Aḥlī, vii. 102, 16; al-ṣul, p. 32, sī. Aḥlī, ed. Koubâ, p. 122, s.; Wright, Arabic archaics, p. 111; s.; Harih, Masāmīr, p. 433, 3), while the eighth form in the meaning "to put on something as līθam" is generally used only metaphorically (see below) Tihāshma usually means a woman's veil (Cherbonne in J. A., 1849, i. 64), but rūmash ukhādīy is also found as the distinctive dress of a particular office under the Fatimids: their chief ūsmān wore it along with the taulmān and 𝕏𝕏WW (de Sacy, Chrest., ii. 92). In general however, the līθam does not seem to have been worn by town-dwellers.

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

The custom of wearing a līθam was generally disseminated among the Sanhājī tribes [q.v.] in N. W. Africa, who are therefore described as līθam-wearers, muhālithāzn al-umūr as well as avūd al-muhālithāzn; as the Almoravids originated in one of their clans, the Lamūni, the līθam thus came to have a certain political significance. The custom of wearing a līθam below the nīθād, see Bakr, p. 170, was found in other parts of Africa also, e.g. in Kūnām (Maṭrīkī, l. 193, 20—27), and still prevails among the Tuaregs. These Africans retained their veils even on journeys into the eastern lands of Islaam, where it was not the fashion, while their women went unveiled. A tradition of late invention explains these remarkable customs by a story that on one occasion during an attack on a village where there were many women but only a few men, the men put on veils and the women took up arms to deceive the enemy as to their real numbers (Goldziher in Z. D. M. G., xlii. 101); another story has that after the fall of the Omeyyads, 200 Omeyyads escaped to Africa disguised as women and that the wearers of the līθam are descended from them (Wüstenfeld, Der Tod des Husayn, p. viii.). According to Hārīrī (text, p. 170 = transl., p. 324), they never took off the līθam if one of them fell in a battle and lost the līθam, not even his friends could recognise him till the līθam was put on him again; they also called other men who did not wear the līθam "fly-mouthed". The Almohads, particularly Ibn Tītīsīrī, opposed the veiling practised by the Almoravids. They continuously insisted that it was forbidden for men to imitate the dress of women, but they did not succeed in abolishing the custom of wearing the līθam (Goldziher in Z. D. M. G., xlii. 103). Among further passages, where the term muhālithāzn occurs in this sense may be mentioned. "Abdallāh, ed. de Sacy, p. 483, note 48 (with other references); Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, ii. 243 (discusses several passages); Marquart, Die Benamqanning, Index, s. v. Līθamträger.

The word līθam and its derivatives was very much used in figurative language especially by poets. From expressions like "to kiss the lips of the beloved one, which are under their līθam" (Dossy, Elements, p. 409; cf. mā tuḥba līθamān = the face in the mullūkīb, p. 464, 47) develops the meaning of līθam "to kiss" (Onas b. Abi Rahīm, ed. Schwar, p. 6, ṣ. Ibn al-Fārid, Fīwālīn, Marseille 1853, p. 125, l. 5 from below) and especially, ṣaḥāshama = "to kiss one another"; mualithām, the place which is kissed (Farasād in Dossy, Supplemente). A girl is given a līθam worn out of her own hair (100 Night), Brestian edition, li. 53, 9); the camel has a līθam on its fore-hoof (the mouth of Dhu 'l-Rumah, p. 76, 7), the wolf is abūmān Iwāshma = black in the region of the muzzle (Tirmanāî, p. 4, 35); in the wolf, we find it said in Hārīrī, p. 170, and şam, şamtašālāma; the wind-jar has a līθam, i.e. a piece of cloth over its mouth (mualithām; Muṣafājilīzī, ed. Lyall, N. 358, 9); cf. also Abkīlī, ed. Sebalīl, p. 85, and in Alkama, ed. Socin, ii. 43, on (art); the sun is darkened by clouds of dust and is thus given, as it were, a mouth veil (Iwāshama, Mutanabbī, p. 604, 16): "as the day (mawāf) doffed its līθam" [description of dawn in Ibn 'Arabīshīhī, ed. Sebalīl, p. 64, 4] from below; cf. also the commentary on Hārīrī, Masāmīr, p. 240, 44; tārāfīsh (tuḥba līθamān; many titles of books also begin with Kusāf al-līθam, cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 659);
the līfāna is to be taken from the walls of buildings, i.e. they are to be exposed (Ismāʾīl al-Din, ed. Lanzberg, p. 65, 13); to duff the līfāna of one's origin = to confess; freely (Hartr, Mahānī, ii. 426, 3); the archangel Idrīs has one of his four wings veiled like a vast month's veil (llāhānā) from heaven down to the seventh earth (Kaswini, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 56, below); a voice may be hidden, makhūm (Tarā, ed. Alwallāt, No. 5, 56 = Bairūt ed., 1858, p. 10); a further metaphor is found in Ibn al-Farāh in de Sacy, Christ., ii. 55, verse 24.


(W. Björkman)

LIWAʾ (a. *wall*; from ʿara to *enroll*; means in Turkish official terminology, an administrative area, several of which form a willyet, *province* and one is in turn divided into ʿadām *districts*). It corresponds pretty much to the département in France. It is synonymous with məndil (r. *flag*) and is used alongside of it. The āmmāl is governed by a məndilvî, whereas a third synonym, məndilvî-lık, the institution of the āmmāl goes back to the early days of the Ottoman empire but it was under Mahmut I in 1834 that the present administrative organisation came into being.

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

(J. Huart)

LIWĀN, (a., for al-āwān; Dozy, Supplement, ill. 563) in eastern houses is a hall, enclosed by walls on three sides and open through an arch on the fourth; it is raised two or three steps and forms the front of the house; all the rooms of which open on to this atrium, which is ornamented with plants and trees. This is a type borrowed from the Sassanian palaces, of which a specimen has survived to the S.E. of Baghdad, in the ruin called Tūgh-birāt, vault of Chooseroy, or ḏurūṭ, *hall of audience*. It corresponds to the kūf of the modern Persians. It is open on the north side to get the cool air.


(C. Huart)

LODI, the name of a clan of the Ghilji tribe of Afghanistan. A family of this tribe was established in Multān before India was invaded by Mahommed of Ghazni, for that district was ruled, in 1005, by Aiū 'l-Fath Dusdūd, grandson of Shāhīzul Nāšr, Loṭād who had established himself there, but the importance of the tribe dates from the reign of Firdūs Tughlak when some of its members entered India for purposes of trade, but soon occupied themselves with politics. Dusdūd Khan Lodi competed with Khānr Khan [q. v.] for the throne on the extinction of the Tughlak dynasty. Malik Bahram Lodi took service under Malik Marād Dusdūd, governor of Multān, and his eldest son, Shāhīzul Nāšr, served Khānr Khan at Multān. After the battle on Nov. 12, 1455, in which Khānr Khan defeated and slew Malik (Ishq Khan), Shāhīzul Nāšr received the title of Islam Khān and the fee of Sīrhind, where he settled with his four brothers and assembled a body of 12,000 horse, mostly of his own tribe. His next brother, Khānr, had a son named Bahūli (usually called Bahūli in India), whom Islam Khān adopted, to the exclusion of his own son, Khānr Khān, and married to his daughter. Khānr Khan fled to Dīli and entered the service of Muhammad Shāh the Saīyid, to whom he described his relations as a danger to the state. Muhammad sent a force against them and they were defeated and fled to the hills, but almost immediately returned, recovered their possessions, and defeated the men of Multān near Südhawā. In 1442 Dīli was threatened by Maḥmūd Khalīd II, of Multān, and Muhammad Shāh appealed to Bahūli, who demanded, as the price of his assistance, the execution of his enemy, Husam Khān and the appointment of Ḥamīd Khān as minister. The fierce king complied, and Bahūli marched to Dīli with his contingent and took command of the army. The battle with the army of Multān was indecisive, but Maḥmūd was recalled by the news of a riot in his capital and Bahūli was hailed as the saviour of the kingdom, and received the title of Khān Khānān and the government of the Pandja. He shortly afterwards picked a quarrel with Maḥmūd and besieged him in Dīli, but returned to Südhawā without capturing the city. In 1443-1444, Maḥmūd died, and was succeeded by his son 'Alam Shāh, a feeble monarch who, after a brief and troubled reign in Dīli, retired to Bagdād, which he made his place of residence. Bahūli then marched to Dīli and 'Alam Shāh abdicated in his favour; Bahūli ascended the throne on April 19, 1451, and reigned for thirty-eight years. He was succeeded, on July 17, 1499, by his son Sīkandar, who reigned until November 21, 1547, when he died and was succeeded by his son Ṣīrāj, who was defeated and slain by Bihār on the field of Pānpāt on April 22, 1558.


(T. W. Hato)

LOJA (a., Læouga), a little town in Andalusia, 36 miles S.W. of Granada, on the left bank of the Genil at the foot of an imposing limestone mountain, Periqeta. It has now rather less than 20,000 inhabitants but seems to have been more important in the Arab period. It was the birthplace of the famous Ibn al-Khaythī Līsūn al-Dīn [q. v.] who wrote an enthusiastic description of it. One can still see there the ruins of the ḳūf which commanded the town in the Arab period. It was repopulated in 280 (993) in the reign of the caliph 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad. This "key of Granada" was besieged in 1488 by the Catholic Kings who took it after a month's siege with the help of a body of English archers.

Bibliography: Vártia, Muḥāfiz al-Dīn, viii. p. 343; F. Simonet, Descriptions des royaumes de Grenade, Granada 1827, p. 95—96.

(E. Lévy-Provençal)

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

Even if we exclude the foreign traders settled on the coast towns (especially Buginese, Arabs and Chinese) the population is not homogeneous but consists of two groups which are sharply distinguished territorially also; the smaller western part is inhabited by Balinese, the centre and the east by the much more numerous Sasak. The inhabitants of the western part are descendants of the Balinese, who came as conquerors to Lombok in the xviiith and xvith centuries and gradually extended their power over the whole island; they intermarried very little with the native population, so that they do not differ very much from the people of their own homeland, and their language is Balinese, and they profess the peculiar form of Hinduism and Buddhism which is found in their mother island, with a few exceptions (they have for example adopted a dress that is typical of the Balinese). The Sasak are the true aborigines of the island; they are quiet and industrious, in their physical features they most closely resemble the Sumbanese and their language (not yet fully studied) shows a similarity in certain points with the Sumbanese. They have all adopted Islam except for the little group of the Bodha, who have remained pagan; they live quite apart from the rest of the island, especially in the northern districts of Tanjung and Bajang and on the south coast and engage in agriculture of a primitive type. They claim to be the descendants of Balinese who emigrated hither in ancient times before the great invasion; there is however no ground for this assertion; physically and linguistically they are in no respect different from the Sasak around them and the name Bodha is also found in other parts of the East Indian Archipelago as an expression used by the Malayans to indicate groups of people who have remained pagan.

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

The Sasak are of course no more orthodox Muslims than any other people in the East Indian Archipelago, but Islam has so far influenced them that we may see in it the reason why, in spite of the long Balinese dominion, there has been no assimilation between Balinese and Sasak. They are divided into two groups or sects: Waktu Limu and Waktu Tiga (1810:). The former, who live mainly in the plain of Central Lombok are the Orthodox among the Lombok Muslims; their name shows that (in theory at least) they observe the obligations prescribed by Islam of performing 5 (i.e. limu) prayers a day. In keeping with this, the name of the Waktu tiga (who live mainly in the mountains) would mean that they are of the opinion that three (tiga, tiga = 3) times a day are sufficient. This is however an improbable explanation. Many are of the opinion that the name is to be explained by the fact that the Waktu tiga only know of three times of prayer, namely the Salat on Friday (or at birth), at death, and at the end of the month of fasting; others say that the full name is waktu-tiga-tiga, which is said to be an expression indicating the old paganism (the religion of the time of the three kings, namely the kings of Selaparang, Saka and Pedanggi). There is no certainty on the point however. In any case the Waktu tiga are regarded, and not without reason, by their countrymen the Waktu Limu as half heathens. There are few mosques in their country; they have no regular performances in practised and religious observances to their religious leaders (fakih) and they do not observe the ordinances regarding the eating of pork, fasting or pilgrimage to Mecca. They only observe Muslim principal festivals and their marriage ceremony also shows that they wish to be regarded as Muslims.

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

Practically nothing is known of the early period after the conversion of Lombok to Islam; the island was divided into little principalities often at war with one another; the eastern part was under the influence of Mataram and Sumbawa, the western under the influence of Bali. In 1674 the Dutch East India Company concluded its first treaty with the princes of Lombok. Soon afterwards in 1675 took place the first serious Balinese invasion and about 1740 the king of Karangasem succeeded in bringing the whole island under his sway. Four small Balinese kingdoms thus arose on Lombok which were frequently at war with one another until in 1838 the king of Mataram overthrew his opponents and ruled over the whole of Lombok. Down to 1849 he regarded himself as a vassal of the King of Karangasem on Bali; he then placed himself under the suzerainty of the government of the Dutch East India Company. The Sasak repeatedly rebelled against their Balinese rulers until finally in 1894 the Dutch intervened with the result that they conquered Mataram; since 1895 Lombok has been directly under Dutch rule and administered jointly with Bali.

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


(W. H. RAMBERG)

LORCA (A., Lureka), a town in Eastern Spain between Granada and Murcia, with 16,700 inhabitants. It is the ancient Ilvica or Helvorea of the Romans. In the Muslim period it formed part of the diocese of Tudmir [q. v.] and was famous for the richness of its soil and subsoil and for its strategic position. Its site was one of the most substantial in Andalusia. It is 1,200 feet above sea-level on the southern slope of the Sierra del Cabece, and dominates the course of the river Guadaletein. Under Arab rule it usually shared the fortunes of Murcia and became Christian again in 1266.


LUBNAN (Lebanon). The Arabs have a somewhat confused, almost mysterious idea of Lebanon. Here they place the sown to of the Ahsuli [q. v.]. They do not distinguish it from the Anti-Lebanon for which they have no special name. *Iblam Sants* means to the Arabs the section of Anti-Lebanon to the north of the valley of the Barada [q. v.]. The massif of Hermon has been known since the time of Hasaka b. Bakth as Iblam al-Thalidi; it is the Iblam al-Shariyah of modern writers. Nor are the Arab geographers agreed on the northern boundary of Lebanon. Some include al-Lukkam (Ammon) in it. This confusion has been facilitated by the vague popular application *Iblam*, which has been applied from the Middle Ages to the present day to the range parallel to the Mediterranean running through Syria from the mouth of the Orontes to Galilee; from this comes the name Ahsul al-Iblam, Iblam al-Yahud, *mountainers*, applied by the Muslim chroniclers to the Nusairit, Mutasalleh, Druze etc. A hadith tells us that stone from Lebanon was used in building the Ka'ba. This tradition perhaps explains why the Arab geographers see in Lebanon the continuation of the long arête which separates the Hujã from Najd and Syria and Anatolia to the Black Sea. The southern frontier of Lebanon is usually made to coincide with the lower valley of the Lajüni, the modern Kasimya. Current usage, conforming to local tradition, makes the Lebanon lie between this river and the Nafr al-Kahîr (the ancient Eleutheran) on the north. This is the region which a modern historical survey will cover. The backward and the scattered population of the Anti-Lebanon has always gravitated in the orbit of the towns of Eastern Syria, while Lebanon with its towns opening to the sea and its flanks watered by the abundant rains yielded by the moisture from the sea, which it gives to the rest of Syria by its rivers, is in economic and political dependence on the centres of the ancient Phoenician country.

Lebanon is rarely mentioned by the pre-Muslim poets; for example by Nahiâbah Dhahâshin, whose patron was phylarch of Khassân. The name becomes more familiar to their Muslim successors, e.g. Abu Dâbaâl al-Qâmân, Nahiâbah al-Shabahin and Abu al-Râmaân b. Hassân, from their attendance at the Omajji court. Its territory, covered with moss and orchards, is marked with the open route cut by deep valleys and torrentious rivers, from the Arab conquest has offered a place of refuge to several small nationalities, increased from time to time by the influx of all the oppressed and persecuted.

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

Each sect, often each district, lived under the rule of petty native dynasties, supposed to be founded by successors in Damascus, Baghdad or Cairo. They received grants of investiture and were in return liable to certain obligations and military services, when the actual authority, was able to force them to it. With a remarkable agility, the fezull chiefs of Lebanon practised the art of maneuvering through all the turnzils that now successively installed in the east the rule of the caliphates, Saljûk Saljûq, Ayyûbids, Franks, Mamlûks and Turkish pashas.

Not realising its strategic importance, the Omajjids and the Ahsulis did not think of occupying Lebanon, still thinly populated except in the districts on the coast; they were less far-seeing than the Crusaders, who built massive fortresses on the frontier of the "Mountain": Hujan al-Akrîd [q. v.] and Shaqif Arrûn. This negligence enabled the Druzzjâns [q. v.] to enter Lebanon. The establishment of the Maronites in the upper regions of northern Lebanon must have coincided with the coming of these Anatolian invaders and have facilitated the organisation of this Christian group, which was destined to play a preponderating part in the Mount. At the end of the ninth century,
Arabs of Tanitah, coming from the region of Aleppo carved out for themselves in southern Lebanon a principality, that of the "cnnts of al-Gharib" in the middle of peoples, partly Arabised and influenced by Shi'a teaching. The development of this emirate was arrested in the eleventh century, by the creation of the Frankish dukedoms of Sayyde (Saida) and Barut (Byblos). The lordships of Gibelot (Jbeil), Batroun (Byblos) and the county of Tripoli depended for support on the Christians of northern Lebanon.

After the invasion of the Franks, the Maronites of Egypt, entrust the defence of Bâb el-Mandeb to the Tanitahs. The situation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the rising against the Mamluks followed by the extermination of the Maronites and their expulsion from the country south of the Nahr el-Kabir (Adonis). In the coming of the sixteenth century the Tanitahs joined the Ottomans who were conquering Syria. Weakened by internal dissensions they had to seek refuge in the Baalbek of whose Fakhr al-Din [q.v.] was the most noteworthy representative. In 1696 on the death of the last of the Mamluks, the political situation of the region was passed to the Franks, the Banu Shihab, who were originally from the Waal 'Taims, on the western slopes of Hermon.

The fall of Fakhr al-Din had opened Lebanon to Turkish intrigues. They were not long in undermining the authority of the Shihabids, constantly struggling with the Sanadis, who were the successors of the Fakhr al-Din, the last of the Maronite line. The most famous of these emirates was Bashir [q.v.], a Christian by birth (b. 1670). Resuming the scheme of the Ma'adi Fakhr al-Din, he worked for four years in forming a great state of Lebanon. Deposed in 1840 he died in exile.

Direct Turkish rule in Lebanon (1840-1861) perpetuated anarchy and insecurity there and fighting between the Maronites and Druses. This ended in the massacre of Christians by the Druses and the shedding of French forces to restore order. An international commission was appointed to elaborate a Règlement Organiqne, the charter of a new autonomy for Lebanon, under the control of Europe. At the head of it was a Catholic governor-general, appointed for five years with the approval of the Powers in whom wascentralised all the executive power. As a consequence of this, an administrative council was elected in 1850 to represent the various communities. From this Règlement Organiqne arose modern Lebanon which owes to it fifty years of prosperity and peace such as it had never before known.

The Great War upset everything. Turkish forces occupied the Mountau and a Turkish governor was appointed, famine and disease soon decimated the population. On April 23, 1920, the conference at San Remo entrusted to France the mandate for Syria and Lebanon. On Sept. 1, of the same year, at Bâb el-Mandeb, General Gouraud, High Commissioner of the French Republic, solemnly proclaimed the existence of the Etat du Grand Liban with Bâb el-Mandeb as its capital. In addition to the Autonomous Lebanon created in 1860, this new state included the districts of Tripoli, Safed and Tyre. It stretches from the Nahr el-Kabir in the north to the borders of Palestine and is bounded on the east by the chain of the Anti-Lebanon. Grand Liban is governed separately from the Confédération Syrienne, with which it reserves the right to conclude agreements. It is represented by a French official until a native governor is appointed. A representative council of 30 members is elected by vote discuss matters of general interest and the budget.

According to the last census (1921-1922) the population is 629,000. The Christians number 350,000 of different sects of whom 200,000 are Maronites; 275,000 Muslims (125,000 Sunnis, 105,000 Mutawwats or Shi'a, 45,000 Druses etc.); 3,500 Jews; 20,000 foreigners.

sleys, according to which Christ will one day return. Antichrist at the door of this church. After the church had been destroyed by the Fatimid Caliph Hikim (986-1030) and rebuilt once more, it was destroyed in 1906 by the Muslims on the approach of the Crusaders, so that the victors only found the splendid tomb when they arrived. Under Christian rule Lydda again became the see of a bishop and a new church was built immediately adjoining the ruins of the old one but was destroyed by Saladin. The town never recovered from its complete destruction by the Mongols in 1271. A mosque was erected on the site of the earlier church while the ruins of the church of the Crusaders were handed over to the Greeks who restored them in modern times.


(L. R. BOH.)

LUĐHĪNA, is the name of a district and town in the Panjab Division of the British Indian Empire. The tract is an alluvial plain bounded on the north by the river Sutlej and traversed by the old bed of that stream; the area is 1,455 square miles. There is some irrigation from the Sindh Canal. The early history is obscure; Susest is a site where ancient coins are found peculiar to the place. The tract is prominent in the annals of the Sikhs. In the year 1809 Ludhiana town became the British frontier cantonment, and the district assumed almost its present limits at the conclusion of the first Sikh War in 1849. The population of the state in 1931 was 752,624. The principal towns were List, Sikhs, fine men and excellent farmers. Gudjran, Aransi and Mafiania Radjepa come next in numbers.

The town of Ludhiana stands on the Grand Trunk Road close to the Baranhullah; it is an important junction on the North Western Railway. The founders were Lati Pathans from whom it took its name. After the 1st Afghan War the exiled family of Shah Shagha domiciled here. The population in 1931 was 51,850. Ludhiana is a busy market town famous for the manufacture of shoes and boots, of furniture and woodwork and for wool and silk dying. Military contracts supply uniforms and accessories to the Indian Army. The principal women's hospital of the Province is here, founded by the American Presbyterian Mission, which has its chief station in Ludhiana.

Bibliography: Punjab District: Gnarte, Lahore 1907, vol. 25, A.

(R. H. WHITEHEAD)

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

Nothing definite is known about the origin of Luḥayya. A. Spranger identified the town with the Maḥāja waṣṣ of Procopius but this equation seems at best only possible. The identification of Luḥayya with the old town of Sembracchu or the harbour of Luḥayya or Naḥyya adgūd, which E. G. Broussemartius, is a very improb. Niebuhr supposed that the harbour of Luḥayya was probably the object when the demands of the export trade in coffee from the interior required it. Here also, as at Mokha, the hermitage of a Muslim saint is said to have been the nucleus around which the admirers of the saint gradually collected and built the town. A chapel was built over his tomb, the vicinity of which was considered auspicious for living and dead. At the beginning of the 18th century the Portuguese who call the town Laya for the first time became acquainted with Luḥayya. In 1513 Afonso d'Albuquerque entered the harbour on an expedition into the Red Sea. Luḥayya then formed the southernmost point of the territory of the Imams of Scnū' and to whom it paid tribute. In the second half of the 18th century Luḥayya suffered from the raids of the Hīdāla and Bakri tribes, who on one occasion burned it down. In spite of this the trade of the town was constant. In 1858 it paid paying 3,000 dollars from the harbour revenues to the Imam of Scnū'. At the beginning of the 19th century the governor of the Imams of Scnū' made himself independent in Luḥayya; but when the Wahhabi invaded the Yemen and defeated the gūla of Luḥayya, the latter went over to the victors and took from the Imams of Scnū' the whole of Tihamah from Luḥayya to Bīb al-Manṣab along with Bīb al-Fakḥ and a considerable part of the coffee-growing country. Luḥayya now seems to
have a brilliant future before it; for it was to be the main harbour of export not only for the whole of this vast area, but of the Wahhabi country also and negotiations were opened with the East India Company, who were invited to establish a factory in Luhaiya. Luhaiya’s prosperity was again interrupted by the invasion of Muhammad Ali, who occupied Luhaiya in 1833, and in 1869 we find it in possession of the Turkmen whom the port and its approaches formed a bagā in the usual sense of the word. Luhaiya was also used by them as a base of operations against the never completely pacified highlands of Asir, which obtained independence with the collapse of Turkestan in the world war. Saidy Alī b. Muhammad al-


LUKĀṬA (m.), an article found (more precisely: "picked up"). The leading principle in the Muslim law regarding articles lost and found may be said to be the protection of the owner from the finder, sometimes mingled with social considerations. The picking up of articles found is generally permitted, although it is sometimes also said to be more meritorious to leave them. The finder is bound to advertise who he has found (or taken) for a whole year unless it is of such insignificant value or perishable. The particulars of this advertising are minutely regulated by special rules. After the termination of the period, the finder, according to Mūša b. al-Šāhī, has the right to take possession of the article and to keep it peacefully with it, but according to Abū Ḥanīfa, only if he is "poor"; but otherwise of the articles as religious alms (ṣaqā) even before the expiry of a year is permitted in a preferential clause in Abū Ḥanīfa and Mūša. If the owner appears before the expiry of the period he receives the object back, as he does after the expiry of the period if it is still with the finder; but if the finder has disposed of it in keeping with the law, he is liable to the owner for its value; Dāwūd al-Zahrāwī recognized no further claim by the loser in this case. The establishment of ownership is facilitated, compared with the ordinary process in Mālik and Aḥmad b. Ḥamūl. Luhaiya (as was al-Bukhārī also; cf. his superscription to Luhaiya, hist. r.): As regards the finding of domestic animals in the desert, there are special regulations which are less onerous for the finder in the case of injured animals and more onerous when they are not injured. Al-Shāfi`ī and Aḥmad b. Ḥamūl have similarly some special regulations for articles found in the Haraqm, the sacred territory in Mecca, which at bottom go back to the old idea of a special right of ownership by Allah in the Haraqm and articles found in it.

These prescriptions of the Fīḥ are based on certain hadiths which have been handed down with several variants (cf. al-Bukhārī, Luhaiya; Muslim, Bundantinopole 1329 AH, v. 133), which need not be quoted in detail here as they agree with the principles in all essentials. But it may be mentioned that in a very old stratum, later worked over, there is mention of a two or three year period. In the conception of the primitive jurist the article found is sometimes described as deposited (maṣla); further, out of special religious affinity, one is careful not to pick up dungs dates and eat them, as they might belong to the saḥārār; finally there is a hadith which forbids the Meccan pilgrims (ḥajj) to pick up articles found at all. From the superscription by Bukhārī to Luhaiya, hā. 11 it is evident that found articles might be handed over or used to be handed over to a government office, their retention in the finder’s case is justified by quoting a special tradition.

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


(AUGUST GROHMANN)

LUKMAN, a legendary figure of the period of Arab paganism, who was adopted into the Korān and later legend and poetry. The story of Lukman shows three main stages of development: I. The pre-Korān; II. Lukman al-Muhammān; III. The post-Korān. Lukman, the wise maker of the proverb (Ps. ciii. 4), is a hero of some age. He is offered a long life. He keeps a second one and so on, for six centuries. He is the seventh and last, at the time the seventh, Luhaiya. Thus the story was by far the most popular and long-lived among the Arabs (Ps. ciii. 4). Lukman, Abb. zur arabisch. Phil., iii., p. ii. 476; J. Basset (Lukman Hecbert, p.
that he had read 10,000 chapters of Lukan's wisdom. The Arabic collections of proverbs (notably Maimon) attribute much to Lukan (see R. Bassot, *op. cit.,* xiv.-liv.). Thalât devotes a chapter of his *Maktûbe* to the wisdom of Lukan. Many sayings seem to link up with the Sîra of Lukan. Sura xxxxi. 14 advises reverence for parents but warns against being led astray by parents to worship false gods. Thalât's authority makes Lukan say: "Be amenable to your friends but
be power so to you as to act against God's laws." There is much that recalls Akhîkar: Lukan teaches that the rod benefits the child like water the seed. In Akhîkar we have: "Spare not thy son for strokes of the rod are to a boy like doing to the garden*" Lukan says: "When thou seest people who remember God, join them; hast thou knowledge it will be useful to you with them and they will increase it; if thou hast none, they will teach thee; when thou seest people who do not remember God, do not join them; for if thou hast knowledge, it will not avail thee, and if thou art ignorant, they will increase thy ignorance." Akhîkar says: "Join the wise man, then thou wilt become wise as he, and join not the fools and babblers, lest thou become associated with him." Lukan gives excellent advice for one going on a journey and also adds that he should be armed, similarly Akhîkar. In Mâdînî's Arabic proverb, Lukan is credited with the following admonition: "My son, consult the physician before thou fallest ill!" This corresponds to the first saying in Ben Sira's alphabet: "Honour the physician before thou requirest him." On the other hand Lukan's warning against hypocrisy is found in a similar form in the *Disciplina clericorum.*

Muslim legend is fond of making the sages and wise men of the past into prophets. But since Muhammad quotes Lukan as a sages, the story was told that God offered Lukan the choice between becoming a prophet or a sage. Lukan chose wisdom and became visier to King David, who called him fortunate: "Hail to thee, thinke the wisdom, ours the pain!" Lukan lived down to the time of the prophet 'Imran (Joran). He is also called judge of the Jews. Muslim legend sometimes also, although very rarely, makes Lukan a prophet and even gives him the *무집* (*magîlîa*), the veil of wisdom. (Ṭabarî, *Amûla*, i. 1205).

III. Lukan, the writer of fables.

Lukan was honoured by Muhammad and after him as a maker of proverbs. A few centuries later he became a writer of fables also, perhaps because *mollhâ* meant both proverbs and fables. Lukan thus became the *Aṣâqî* of the Arabs. Much was transferred to Lukan that was told in Europe of Aesop. The tendencies to this can be traced quite early. While the very earliest legend was in Lukan the hero and Muslim legend makes him a sage, judge, visier, or even a prophet, the later Oriental legend delights in describing him as a carpenter, a sheph Kurdistan, a deformed slave, an Egyptian, Nabataean or Ethiopian slave, a feature which is obviously modelled on the story of Aesop. Lukan's master orders him to set the best before his guests. Lukan gives them the tongue and heart of a sheep. On another occasion his master tells him to set his worst before them. Once again Lukan sets a heart and tongue before them, for there is nothing better than a good tongue and a good
heart and nothing worse than an evil tongue and
an evil heart (in Plutarch) and in the Vita Apostoli
of Maximos Planudes the tongue only is mentioned
and not the heart. Lukman's fellow-slaves on one
occasion sat at his master's feet and accused Lukman.
At Lukman's suggestion the master makes them the
only slaves drink water. Lukman vomits water
only, the other slaves drink water. — Lukman's
master in his cups had wagered he would drink
up the sea. Sobered he asks Lukman's advice.
The latter demands of those who had taken up
the wager: that they should first dam back all the
rivers flowing into the sea, as his master had pro-
mised to drink up the sea only but not its tributaries.
The latter is a widely disseminated motive in fairy
tales of the type of the Empress and the Bishop
(Walter Anderson, Kultur und Alter, F. K.
Communications, No. 42, p. 134—140, especially p.
139 where reference is made to Lukman; Chavvin,
Bibliothek, viii. 50—64). These anecdotes are
also found in the Vita Apostoli of Planudes (xvth
century), but they are known as early as in Plutarch,
Chrestomathia seu Sophismum.

The older Arabic literature does not know
fables of Lukman. They first appear in the late
middle ages. The Paris manuscript published by
J.-D. Derenbourg belongs to the year 1299 and
contains 41 fables. These fables have often been
published and thoroughly discussed in scholarly
publications especially by Derenbourg, R. Basset
and Chavvin. Out of the 41 fables, No. 22 alms has
no parallels; the animals beg the gardener to
tend it so that the kings may delight in its flowers
and fruits; the gardener waters it twice a day
and the thornbush overruns the whole garden.
R. Basset recalls the fable of Iotham of the thorn-
bush which destroys everything (Judges, iv.).
All the others with the exception of the thirteenth
(midge and the bull) are found in the Syriac
fables of Sophus (=Aesopus) published by Lands-
berg. All are found in Aesop except No. 9 (the
gazelle in the well), No. 22 (thornbush), No. 34
(wasp and bee), No. 40 (the man and the snakes).
It has been further noticed that in these fables
the very animals indigeneous among the Arabs,
the ostrich, the hyena, the jalam and the camel
play no part. As these fables first appear in the
late middle ages there can now be no doubt that
we have to deal with a selection of Aesop's fables
translated into Arabic.

IV. Related legendary figures.
Lukman is a many-sided figure: he is Man'mumar, the
hero, sage, maker of proverbs, and writer of fables.
It is no wonder then that he has often been
compared and identified with other legendary
heroes, Pythamathos, Atikman, Lucian and Solomon.
Abu'l-Faradj makes Lukman the teacher of Es-
pedocles. Three of these equations deserve close
examination: 1) with Balaam, 2) with Alhijar and
3) with Aesop. The identification with Balaam is
old. Arabic legend gives the following etymology:
Lukman b. Bahr b. Nakib b. Harir. It is evident
that the Koran exegetes sought for something
very similar according to Balaam in the Bible. They
found this in Balaam as the vowels hata and legama
both mean the same; *hata douro". This then became
a Muslim tradition, which entered the Hebrew
Megile Simkhes where Lukman is one of the seven
wise teachers of the king's son (ed. Cassel, p.
220 sq.), and also the Dhikrul clerici of Petrus
Alphonsus, where the correct text is *Balaam
qui linguas arabicam vocatus Lucaman" (ed. Hilke-
Soderhjelm, p. 3). The Qur'an exegetes had no
doubt about this identity. The question arises
whether: did Muhammad himself see Balaam in
Lukman? — and next: is Lukman really Balaam?
Derenbourg, Basset and Eduard Meyer (Die Is-
raeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, p. 379) are
opposed to this view. In the affirmative. But it is quite
impossible. The pre-Koranic tradition about Lukman, the Kur'an
Sura, which shows deep reverence for Lukman,
have no single connection of the latter Balaam of the
Bible and the Haggada. This identification was
made only later by Kur'anic exegetes, who wished
to connect Lukman with the Bible at any cost, and
made him the son of Deor, i.e. Balaam, just as they
sometimes made him the nephew or cousin of Job.
Lukman's similarity to Akhikar was also noticed
long ago, but it is only quite recently that the
identification has found a vigorous champion in
René harris, who devotes the chap. vii. of his
Story of Akhikar to it. He bases his identification
on the agreement of Sura xxii. 18, with Akhikar's
warning about the voice of the sea, and an Arab
hypotheses which compares Lukman with other
figures in legend and history, notably to the
relationship of Lukman, Akhikar and Aesop. The
story of Aesop shows originally a close relation-
ship to that of Akhikar. The later legend of
Lukman has borrowed much of the story of Aesop
and thus becomes like the Akhikar story but in
reality Lukman is not directly connected with
Akhikar but with Aesop.

The development of the Lukman legend seems
varied but clear. Lukman properly belongs to the
legends or possibly the history of the monasteries.
For even this period already we know the sage
Lukman. With Mahammar he becomes the teacher
of pious doctrines. Influenced by the Kur'an
the interpreters of the Kur'an found Lukman's sayings
in many places and found Lukman himself in the
Balaam of the Bible. He was credited with fables
in addition to the proverbs and was thus made
the Aesop of the Arabs.

Bibliography: The Kur'an commentators
on Sura xxii, esp. Tabari's Tabari, Cairo 1521,
xxi. 39—50; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 253—247;
ii. 1208; Tha'labi, Kitab al-Anbali, Cairo 1525,
p. 220—222; Ah. Hijam al-Sijdjarf, ed. Goldstain, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philo-
ologie, ii. Leyden 1899, p. 2; Damiri, Hajat
al-Hayrutin, s. v. u. u. l. Many other sources in René Basset's Quellen der Schriften,
Paris 1890, where also the other Lukman.
Ad is published, p. LXXIII—LXXVII.

Importance
of other
traditions as for modern legends of folklore: C. F. Törn, The Luk-
man-legend in Proceedings of the F. Asm. O. S.,
iii. 1889, p. CXXIII—CXXXVII; J. Horovitz, Tor-
nisches Untersuchungen, Berlin-Leipzig 1926,
devotes a very full section to Lukman, p. 134—
156. — On the fables of Lukman and the
many relationships see Chavvin, Bibliothek des
ouvrages arabes, iii. 1—56. — On Lukman-
Balaam see J.-D. Derenbourg, Fabres de Lag-
mam le Sage, Berlin-Leipzig 1920, p. 5—50.
On Akhikar, see A. Nöldeke, Unters-
suchungen zum Aghab-Roman, Berlin 1913,
p. 61—59. — On Luke man-Akhikar see
LXXVII.

(RENAUD HELFER)
LULLI, one of the names for gipsies in Persia; parallel forms are in Persian, Nirit, Nit (Farhang-i Djahangiri); in Baluchi, Mil (Denys Bracy, Census of Baluchistan, 1911, iv, 143, gives the popular etymology from lor = 'lot, share').

The name lirit is first found in a legend relating to the reign of Bahram Gur (395–438 a.d.). At the request of this Sasanian King, who wished to amuse his subjects, the Indian king Shangal (I) sent to Persia 4,000 (12,000) Indian musicians. Hanza (350–961), Berlin-Kaviani, p. 38, calls them al-Zap (q.v.). Firdawsi (Mohi, i, p. 36–77), Lutiyana, Thalibis (c. 1327), ed. Zehlenberg, p. 567, says they came from the desert and descended from the black lirit (lirit, liriti-i al-zap), skilful players of the flute; the Maghribi al-Tawirshq (c. 1160), transl. Mohi, J. d., 1841, xii, p. 515, 534, confirms this origin of the lirit. The lirit (plur. liritiyen) are often mentioned by Persian poets. Mundhihi (Dughmeh–Djanjan–Ghezo, 18th/19th century), Djamal al-Din 'Abd al-Razik (d. in 388 [1192], Isfahani), Kamal bin'il (d. in 635 [1237], Isfahani), Hafs (d. in 701 [1300]), Shiraz, say that the lirit's are 'black' (like night), petulant (mubalqan) and elegant (zangaleh) that they play the flute, that their way of living (kandaghih baggaga) is irregular. The Persian dictionaries explain Tori; shahzada, gey, the dweller among gypsies, woman of light morals', etc. of Vallers (the quotations from Amr Khustawi (d. in 725 [1325] in India), ibid., v. Lur refers rather to the inhabitants of Luristan.

The origin of the name lirit has not yet been investigated. The term seems to apply to the inhabitants of the town of Sind which the Arab authors call Arūt or -al-Rū (cf. Arūt or -al-Rū; Arūt or -al-Lū). This town had been conquered by Muhammad b. Khazim before 95 (714) (al-Hallajuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 439, 440, 445). According to al-Balini, ed. Sechan, p. 100, 130, the town of Arūt (Arūt) was 700 years old. W. Muhsin and 20 farash above al-Manṣūrīa. In Elliot, History of India, London 1867, i, 641, 653, the town is called Abr. This town, the old capital of the Hindu rājas of Sind, is now in ruins (on the Indus, in the valley of Rohri). In the district of Sukkur: im. Imperial Geographer of India, Oxford 1908, iv, 4 and xal. 508: Asor and Rohri). The change of *Arūt/Kārt into Lūlit/Lūli is readily explained by the phonetic law of dissimilation of the two r's especially after the change from Arū (Indian) to al-Rūr (Arabic). The descendants of the Indian musicians of Bahram Gur (L. e., the gipsies) seem to have been called and considered by the Arab al-Rūr. The Arab wanderers had known, and perhaps before them, the Sasanians. This explanation would locate quite precisely the original home of the Lūlit/Lūli, without in any way prejudicing the ethnical relationship of this tribe.


The Luri/Lūlit gipsies (cf. the reference above to their dark skin) must be clearly distinguished from the Luri or -al-Lū (q.v.) highlanders who live in the southwest of Persia; they have a fair skin and speak a "tribal" dialect with no trace of Indian elements. The situation is however slightly complicated by certain minor points. In the first place the use of the terms Lūlit, Luri, Lur, etc. is not always quite clear. In the confederation of "Arab tribes of Fars there is a Luri clan; Sykes, Ten thousand Miles, p. 330; Rittich, Postulka u Sultānīn, fev. Geogr.-Oblčk. 1902, xxxiii/1, p. 69 speaks of a Luri section (Persian pronunciation of Lūlit) among the Luri of Kermān. Edmonds notes the existence of a Luri (clan) in Luristan in the Dehsham division of the Baluchew group. In Khorasan there is a clan Luri-i Kuhār (cf. SENNA).

Still more confusing is the fact that some Lurus follow the same profession as the gipsy-bead-sellers (cf. Cirikow, p. 277). As early as the 16th century, Shihībi al-Dīn al-Umari mentions the talent of the Lurs in these directions and in our own day we find wandering troops of Lurs as far north as Tabriz where there is a permanent colony of Kuresta gipsies, professional actors and singers. It is possible that the special qualifications of the Luri and gipsy players differ somewhat; the Sarmānī of Khorasan (cf. Sarm told and SENNA) who excel in singing and dancing are not acrobats. But we must first of all wait till a special investigation settles to what precise section the wandering Luri artists belong.

There is nothing improbable in a gipsy infiltration into Luristan. Whatever was the ethnical entity covered by the name Zajt (on the confusion of the Zajt with the Luri see above: Hanza, Thalibis) the existence of Zajt colonies in Khūrāstān is known as early as the time of al-Haschidī (q.v.) (cf. Nawar al-Zajt between Arāddān and Rūm-Homrūt; the modern town of Hindiyāni ("the Indians") may have a similar origin). According to Balbūri, p. 382, when in the second quarter of the first century A.D. the Zajt had apostatised from Islam, they were joined by the local Kurds, which provoked the punitive expedition of 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbār (cf. Mālam, the future archbishop of the Kurds, Bursarg). The alliance of the Zajt and Kuris (cf. Kuris, i.e. kuris) at so early a date is curious. Under al-Luri, Yarali, n. 835 mentions two places in Sind and a small district under Alūwāz in Khūrāstān, Schwarz, Persien im Mittelalter, v, 665, identifies this Rūr with the district of al-Luri (cf. ZAJEIEN). In the light of what has been said above one might suppose the existence in al-Luri of a very ancient Indian colony.

The language of the gipsies of Persia (Sykes, de Morgan, Ivanow) has taken its morphology from modern Persian; its vocabulary also is full of Persian words (cf. the lists in de Morgan); Indian elements seem to be rarer than in the Romant of Europe; the language of Kurrâxân and Khoraxân (Sykes, Ivanow) contains a large number of unrecognisable elements. Longworth Dumas out of 96 words in Sykes's vocabulary found 12 in Arabic, 4 Arabic, 28 Persian and 52 of unknown origin.

He would regard this dialect rather as an artificial secret jargon. Denyse Bray (quoted by Ivanow) in any case confirms the fact that the Lâ'î of Basília is learned by the children as a separate language ("is any language acquired naturally by Lâ'î children, as a language for the home circle").

The Śmârains use Kurdish mainly. According to Cirikow they are called Durnü, which must correspond to Trumän (= Dûmân, the name of a low state in India from which comes the well-known name for gipsey; *Rusu*). The vocabulary of the Dûmân (Baghdâd, Aleppo) as collected by Newbould, *J.R.A.S.*, 1856, p. 303 from an informant from Timur-kêrân, is full of Kurdish words: *shı̄var* "stone", *hûf* "wall", *dam* "house", *dûs* "dog"). A Kurd tribe in the east of Baghîdâr bears the suggestive name of Sûndî/Sûndîn (= the *Sûndîans*). According to the Şmârains the chief of the Kurrâkân clan (the Zâkât) had married a gipsy woman. In discussing the relationships of gipsies and Kurds, it should be remembered that in 220 (835) a section of the Zanj settled in Khardîn, i.e. at the gate of Kurdish territory; cf. de Goeje, *Mémoires*, p. 304; Talât, ii, 1868.

According to Sampson, two categories of gipsy speech may be distinguished according to the fate of the primitive Indian aspirated *s praemia*: the one changes them into aspirated *s*s, e.g. *Evâk*, *blikâh* > *bîkâ* (Armenia, Europe), the other preserves them as aspirated *blikâ* > *bîkâ* (Persia, Syria, Egypt). The interest of the Persian dialects lies in the fact that Persian was the first language in which the gipsies sojourned after leaving India (probably in the Sasanian period). In the gipsy dialects of Persia, as yet very insufficiently studied, we may expect to find traces of a rather archaic phonetic system. Ouseley for example found among the Kurrâxân of Tabriz the word *dûm* "sister" which must be older than *phûm* or *hûm* (cf. also *shârâb* in Gobineau).


**LULU', BAIID AL-DIN AND LULU', MALIK AL-RAJAH, A Baiseg of al-Mawşil. Lulu', who had once been his slave, had great influence with the Zahid Naur al-Din Aslan Shah I and when Naur al-Din on his deathbed (607 = 1210-1211) confirmed the nomination of his son al-Malik al-Kahir 'Iz al-Din Man'ud as his successor, he appointed Lulu' as regent of the kingdom, while the younger son İmid al-Din Zangi was given the two fortresses of al-'Ajr and Shah near al-Mawṣil. At the end of İradi, 615 (end of June 1218) al-Malik al-Kahir died after appointing his minor son Nur al-Din Arslan Shah his successor and Lulu' his regent. When İmid al-Din seized the fortress of al-Imdiya in Ramadān of the same year (Dec. 1218), Lulu' sent an army against him. Lulu' s troops besieged al-Imdiya but had to return with nothing effected, whereupon the other fortresses in al-Hakkariya and al-Zawān surrendered to İmid al-Din when the latter made an alliance with the lord of Irābīl, Muẓaffar al-Din Kökbürī. Lulu' sought the assistance of the Ayyūbid al-Malik al-Asgar, who ruled the greater part of Mesopotamia, and recognised his suzerainty, whereupon al-Asgar sent an army to Naṣirīn to help Lulu' if necessary. In Muharram 616 (April 1219) İmid al-Din was defeated by Lulu' s forces near al-'Ajr and had to flee to Irābīl. Peace was however soon afterwards concluded through the intervention of al-Asgar and the Caliph al-Nāṣir, but when the sickly Nūr al-Din died in the same or the following year and his brother Nāṣir al-Din Māhmed, who was some three years old, succeeded him, İmid al-Din and Muẓaffar al-Din began to raid and plunder the district of al-Mawṣil whereupon Lulu', who had first sent his eldest son with an army to al-Asgar to help him against the Franks, appealed for help to al-Asgar, the Ayyūbid s general in Naṣirīn. Al-Asgar set out at once and joined Lulu'. On Rajab 20, 616 (Oct. 1, 1219) Lulu' was defeated near al-Mawṣil, but while he was again collecting his followers around him Muẓaffar al-Din retired. After the conclusion of peace, İmid al-Din occupied the fortress of Kawkab, and Lulu' had again to appeal to Asgar. Muẓaffar al-Din however induced a number of emirs, among them Ibn al-Maṣḥūb, to secede from al-Asgar and take up a position at Dūnāsir to prevent the latter s passing. The emirs however soon changed their views with the sole exception of Ibn al-Maṣḥūb who went to Irābīl. He was twice defeated, first by the garrison of Naṣirīn and then by the troops of Fārāb Shah, lord of Sīrāj, who took him prisoner. While he had been released, he collected a plundering horde around him and ravaged the country far and wide. He was defeated by an army of Lulu' s and took refuge in the fortress of Tell Aṣfar. The latter was besieged and Lulu' himself came up from al-Mawṣil. On Rabi' 17, 617 (June 21, 1220) he had to capitulate and Ibn al-Maṣḥūb was taken prisoner and brought to al-Mawṣil. After Asgar had made peace with Muẓaffar al-Din he handed over to Lulu' the fortresses of Dūnāsir, Naṣirīn and the governorship of Mesopotamia, to which other fortresses were later added. After the death of Nāṣir al-Din (619 = 1223 or according to others not till 621 = 1224-1225) Lulu' was recognised as al-Asgar of al-Mawṣil and assumed the name of al-Malik al-Asgar. In 1235-1236 he became involved in war with the Ayyūbid al-Sādīr Naṣir al-Din. The latter took the Khurasanians into his service and granted them Harrān and Edessa whereupon they seized also the town of Naṣirīn. About three years later they were defeated by the rulers of Harrān and Lulu' regained Naṣirīn with Dārā. Lulu' had also to fight the lord of Harrān, the Ayyūbid al-Nāṣir Yūnīn. In 645 (1250-1251) he was defeated and Naṣirīn, Harrān and Karkhāniyā fell into the hands of the Aleppo forces. Lulu' died in 652 (1259) aged over 80, after recognising the suzerainty of Hülagū. [q.v.]

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Asghir, ed. Tornberg.
LU LU' A (A., "pearl"); a fortress near Tab Sū in Cilicia, which was besieged by the Caliph al-Ma'mūn in 817 (831). It was the strongest of the Greek citadels and the one that # roused most havoc among the Muslims; it had a large garrison and was well supplied with arms.

The caliph, not having succeeded in taking it, blockaded it for a hundred days with two forts, the troops of which routed the Emperor Theo-

plius; as a result of this defeat, the people of Lu'lu'a appealed to 'Udaif b. 'Abdās who was their prisoner to negotiate for them and capitulated on obtaining safeguards (amīra) granted by al-Ma'mūn.


(L. CHAUR.)

LU R (in Persian Lur with a short), an Indian people living in the mountains in S.W. Persia. As in the case of the Kurds, the principal link among the three branches of the Lurs (Māmākīn, Kāhlīlī, Bakhšīyār, and Lurs proper) is that of language. The special character of the Lur dialects suggests that the country was inhabited from Persia and not from Media. On the ancient peoples, who have disappeared, become assimilated or absorbed in different parts of Luri-

The name. Local tradition (Turk-e-Gustā) connects the name of the Lurs with the place Lur in the defile of Mān-rūd. This tradition is perhaps based on a memory of the town of Lur mentioned by the early Arab geographers (Jayshkhīr, p. 195 etc.), the name of which survives in Şahr-št Lur (to the north of D Şīr). There are several other place-names resembling Lur, namely Lur, a district of Dāmāleš, Bakhshīyār (Schwarz, Persien, p. 666; cf. the Kāhlīlī tribe: Bakhshīyār), which may be to Lur what Nār in Lur is to the "money" in Persian; Langjīn (Yāḥīya), Lardajarī, norzāngā, according to Jayshkhīr, capital of the canton of Sarāvān (between Kāhlīlī and the Bakhshīyār) and lastly there is a place called Lur (Lūr) near Salmār.

Masūdī, alone, in his list of "Kurd" tribes, speaks of the Lursīya tribe (which may mean the Lurs connected with the district of al-Lur). In the 6th century Yāḥīya uses the name Lur, Lūr to mean the "Kurd tribe living in the mountains between Kāhlīlī and Jayshkhīr"; he calls the country inhabited by it "Hād al-Lur, or Lurštān.

These facts show the stages of evolution of the geographical term (perhaps pre-Iranian) into an ethnomonic one. If however we seek an Iranian etymology for the name Lur, its connection with the first element in Lurh-aspd (already proposed by von Bode) at once suggests itself. According to Justi, Franziscus Nematpusch, Lur is explained by *rubās "red". The place-name Rūr in Yāḥīya may supply an intermediary form. The Turkh-i-Gustā gives a popular etymology Lur < br > "woode(d) hill" in Lur.

Etnology: If the linguistic data connect the Lur with Fār, local tradition only regards as true Lurs the tribes who came from the defile of Mān-rūd. According to the Turk-i-Gustā, p. 539, 547, there is in the māyāt of Mān-rūd a village called Kurd near which there is a defile. The place-name Lur is situated in this kūl (the word means in Lur a "little ravine", cf. O. Maan).

The name Mān-rūd much resembles that of Mādīya-rūd (the word mādīya is found as mān/mīn in Lur; Šukowski, i. 158) but certain historical considerations make us look for it near Māngarda-Mangarma (cf. Turk-i-Gustā, p. 548 on the place lying between Mān-rūd, Sāmīk and Mangarma). The clans (parshā) of the natives of Kūfšt Mān-rūd...
were later called after the places where they had settled, like the Jangalūt (Jangalūt, Jangadar) and the Urt (Awtar). The governing family of the Atibegs of Little Lur belonged to the Djalwar (the name of their clan, the Sabāb, Saghār should be corrected from Salwāni, *Alamār*stān, p. 399) Salwāni, *Ali Hazār (full beloved, p. 38) Salwāni, and the general state of the Djalwar in Horum-Schindler). The *Jurīdich-Gestalt* concludes by enumerating the 8 clans (ādawād) of the two principal gūrāh and the 18 other tribes (ādawān) of the Lurs.

A few names (Mangarā, Amānāk, Līndāk) correspond to modern names. Finally 4 clans are mentioned: Shāh (Samī), Arān (Asān, Asānī), Arāh and Baha, who, although speaking Lurt, are not Lurs; the people of the other villages of Mānūn were peasants (rīwāt). About 500 (11006), a hundred (or 400) Fūlāwī Kurd families arrived from Syria. They came by the north (Shutūrūn-Kūh) and settled at first on the lands of the Kūlār, Mūkākhā (cf. the article *Kūlār*) and the Sāqāt (cf. the article *Smāqāt*) (Mūkākhā, Smāqāt, Na. 70 under the word gīrīrāt). At the beginning of the ninth (xiith) century new tribes flocked to the standards of Husayn ibn the Great Lur. Among them were two Arab tribes: *Qalili* (Qalīlī, cf. the place of this name below Shīkhzād), and Ḥāshimi and 28 different tribes (mūtafāfī) among whom we find the Bahktārī (Makhtārī), the Djalwarī (Mānūnī), the Gōtandī (cf. the village near Shīkhzād), the Dīkār, the Lurānī, the Mānūnī (Mānūnī), etc. According to the *Sharaf-nāma* (I, 26) all these tribes also came from Syria. These waves of immigration must have had a considerable effect on the composition of the Great Lur. It is remarkable that the immigrants were Kurds and that traces of them still survived among the Kūrs whom Ibn Bagūṣ (II, 28-36) found at the beginning of the sixth century near Bahbāhān and Bām Hormez when on his way to the capital of the Great Lur. There has long been a village of Kūrīškūn on the Djalwar and it had even given its name to this river. Shīkh-ibn-Dūn-ibn-Umart (V, 9, xii., p. 320-332) mentions the existence of Lurs in Syria and Egypt and tells how Saladin (564-589), alarmed by their dangerous ability to climb the steepest mountains, kept them mounts on 1000 strong men; he then sent five lights a. m. the river on which Mānūnī, 600 a.m. of numerous Iranian tribes.

The southern part of Little Lur was exposed to intimidation by Kurds, especially through the valley of Kārīz (cf. Lur); just to the north of Sūsā is a tree *dūr-e Bāhā* bearing the name of a clan of the Kūrī tribe of Djalwar, in the history of the Hasānwāhidās; cf. Hm al-Athīr, IX, 146, 219) and exposed to Turkish and Mongol invasions (cf. the desperate fighting of the Atibegs of the Lurs-Kūris against the Bāzārs, and Alwā (= Bahkātī) Turkic. In the Sāfawid period, Turkish tribes were introduced into Luristan from the direction of the Kūris (where traces of them still exist) and Georgi and Armenian colonists to the north of the Bahkātī country. On the movements of the population under Nādīr, the Zambis and Kārgār see below. The ethnical situation gradually subsided at the beginning of the sixth century.

The names of the Lur tribes and groups are now quite well known and as we have given from 1856 to 1922 a compass enables us to note the changes that have taken place meanwhile. Regroupings seem to be taking place more rapidly among the Lurs than among the Kurds, but the general framework of the tribal grouping remains essentially the same. In 1851 (Caron, ii. 274) there were 420,000 Lurs of whom 170,000 were Bahktārīs, 41,000 Kūris of the Kūris, and 210,000 Feisil. According to Maharani this last section numbered in 1904: 31,650 tents (or 150,000 individuals) in Pāsh-Kūh, and 10,000 tents (or 50,000 individuals) in Pushkar-Kūh (this last figure seems too low).

The Māmānī (Mamassani) group includes 4 main tribes; the Bāshā, Djalwarī (Dīkār), Dushmanulārī and Kustānt (cf. the article *Kustānt*). The Kūris group (Kūris) includes 3 large tribes (Aftārī, Band, and Dīkār). The first of these tribes (cf. the name of the old Turkish tribe of Aftārī) is of a composite character, for of its 9 clans four (Aftārī, Begārī, Çagāhātī and Kurā-Bāghī) are Turkish (eventually the remains of the Shīb-Bowānī to whom the government of Kūri had been given under the Shīkārī and a fifth clan (Tīlābātī) bears the name of a district in Kurdistan of Senna [q.v.]. On the second tribe, Bowi, O. Mann: notes that it bears the name of an Arab tribe of the neighborhood of Ahwāz; but there is also a mountain called Bawī to the south of Khurram-fālī. The third tribe, Dīkār, is purely Lur and is composed of 2 main sections: Čebrānīs and Līwātīs with many subdivisions. This threefold composition of the Kūris group is typical of many of the Lur tribes. As to the Bāshā, Sewytry as long ago as 1846 said that the Lurs are thoroughly surveyed on a scale of 8 miles to the inch, nearly every tribe visited in their own encampment, everything appertaining to the Bahktāris may now be said to be known. But Caron's title (1890) are still the last word available to the student. Of the two Bahktārī tribes: Bahktārīz and Fahntār, the latter is the more important at the present day. The Fahntār, who used to be in the south are now mainly on the outskirts in the district north of the northern border (between Dīrīshān and Gālāpāghān).

The main groups of Lurs are: Turān, Elfīānī, Sīlāfī (cf. Lur, Bāzārs, and Bahktāris). The tribes of the last group are the Lurs par excellence and have important subdivisions: Dīrīshān, Sāqqādī, et al. It is possible that the Dīrīshān are the real nucleus of the Lur race. Their chiefs are called na. In contrast to what we find among the Kurds, where the individual members of the tribe are usually much attached to their hereditary chiefs, the Lurs proper (Bahktāris) are distinguished by a more democratic feeling. The power of the hereditary families of kāns is based on their "guard" (fājdā) but this power is considerably reduced by the authority of the chiefs of the tribe (jūmā). The kāns are forced to court the favours of these wild tribal chiefs (Edmond: *uneautre bending*) the latter are amenable to the solicitations of their neighbours and in this way the tribes are broken up and new groupings take place.

Little is known of the ethnology of the Lurs. The dates of Duzechotto (who commanded a Lur regiment in 1855), *Études sur la pêpèl, la Perr*., p. 38, of Kulaniçoff, *Mém. sur l'ethnogra-
manifestation who is called Hibat Khosra and
numbers among his "angels" Bahá Táhir [q.v.].
An important sanctuary of the sect, the tomb of
Sháh-áli Ahmád (the alleged son of the šáh...

The religion of the Lurs was so little orthodox
that the Shi'í point of view that at the
beginning of the 12th century, prince Muhammad
Ali Murád had to send for a mujáhid to convert
the tribes to Dálim (Rabinow, p. 24). All the
Lur and Lak tribes are officially Shi'ís (contrast
the attenuation of the true Kurds to Shi'í orthodoxy).

LANGUAGE. Down to the beginning of the 20th
century, several words were collected by Rich, to
4 Baghíyín versified in Layard and in some thirty
words collected by Houtou-Schindler. As late as
the Grymbal de la Rone, Phil., 1/4, 1898-1901,
p. 249, we find the thesis that the Lurs are
slowly related to Kurdish and may even be
described as one of its dialects. The materials
of Zabrowski (collected in 1883-1886) were finally
published in the 20th century after the death of the author
(d. 14/1198). The merit of having first
established the important fact that Kurdish and
Luri are quite separate ("these kinds of evidence"
from the Kurînische vom Lurî") is due to O. Mann.
This scholar has shown that although there are
Kurd tribes in Luristan (cf. the article TAK),
the true Lurs speak dialects which belong undeniably
to the S. W. Iranian group (like Persia and the
Lakans of Iran) and not to the N. W. group
(like Turkish and the "central" dialects).

The Luri dialects which have none
of the aspersion of Kurdish (cf. KURIA) fall into two
categories: to the first belong the dialects of
Great Lur: Mamásán, Kálguh and Baghíyín
(the latter has a few insignificant peculiarities of its own); to the second belong the dialects of the
Little Lurs, i.e. of the Padi Lurs.

Even the first group possesses very few special
features compared with modern Persian. From the
point of view of phonetics: -dm- becomes -am-, -um-
(sóhak/sohak; hamásan/hamán; xáman/xáman;
šáman/šáman); -t changes into -dt; intervocalic
a gives ut (ut); -m, -sh; -sh becomes a; -sh, -sh, etc.

Peckar to Baghíyín are the change of inter-
seastic to -y; -dáh/šáh; -ds; and the occasional
change of -d into -a: šágud = šágud. It is remarkable
that some of these phonetical peculiarities were long ago noted by Hamáallah Mustawa (Zeidán de la
Garde, p. 332-350). He says that Luri (though
full of Arabic words) does not have the peculiar
Arabic sounds, like -d, -g, -d, k, -g, -l, etc.,
Inclusion: plural in -d, -d, -d, -s, -s, -s, -s, -s,
accusative in -d; instead of -d; šáman, šáman,
šáman, šáman, etc.; this lack in Baghíyín is the
characteristic of Arabic dialects of the Luri
mainly forms the popular of active verbs as in Persian
with the help of personal endings (active
construction) and not like Kurdish and the majority
of Persian dialects (including those of Fars) which

The domestic life and manners of the Bakh-
ñáyín have been described by many travellers,
and the BAKHÑÁYÍN have been described by many travellers,
and the BAKHÑÁYÍN have been described by many travellers,
give the preterite a passive construction. Vocabulary. In the present and preterite stems Luri follows Persian: راهیتا, راهیتند, راهیت "to throw"; تریتا, تریتند, تری "to be able"; دیا, "eye," etc. From the Mongol period, Luri has kept several expressions like: کوریت, "chief of a clan," in Mongol, تیزک, "official"; ضریت, "guard of the khan," in Eastern Turkic: جمنب, جمنب "encampment," in Mongol, "camp, tent." As in the Felli group, their dialect differs very little from ordinary Persian (Mann: "weiter nützlich als ein stark abgeschlossenes Persisch"). There are in Luriistan a large number of Kuri dialects of some importance. Such are in the north the Lak tribes: کوریت. Among the Felli, the Makhsu group (on the frontier of Kirmanshah, at Hulaftan, and farther south) speaks a southern Kurid dialect like that of the Khabur. The Fashqi group (to the south of Fashqi Dagh) speaks a "kurmanji" Kurid. Linguistic conditions in the Fashqi further study is required.

Bibliography:

The principal source for the domestic history of the country is the Tołkhār: Gāndhāra (730 = 1330) based in turn on the Šāhāb al-Tūvatīrkhā, which of the Persian and Sanskrit (which belongs to the old Mongol period) only has the first volume, No. 368 from the Persian Catalogue). The Mašhmuqat al-Anbār (C 1475) based on independent oral tradition but is less accurate. The Dīnārānās al-thalāthah although late (its author Ķadź Ahmad died 1875) was unpublished date. The Mūsawmān (1380) is based on the Šahāb al-Tūvatīrkhā or perhaps a good copy of the Tołkhār: Gāndhāra. According to these sources which supplement the statements of the Arab geographers, the situation in Luriistan about 900 (912) was as follows:

The Shīt [q.v.] — who are not mentioned by the Arabs before the Mongol epoch — occupied a part ("half") of Luriistan. The lands of Shītistan, proper (Tołkhār: Gāndhāra, p. 537 and 539) had a governor named Naqīm al-Dīn Abār (according to the Mašhmuqat al-Anbār the title Naqīm al-Dīn was hereditary among the Shīt) while the Luri territory under the Shīt (probably Kūr-Gill) had a pāshā Sāfī al-Dīn Māhām whose family had been prominent in the country since the Sassanian period; he was of the Rūzbānī tribe which the Tołkhār: Gāndhāra mentions among the Luri tribes. The rest of Luriistan was ruled by a family of Lur princes (independent of the Shīt) of whom Bād ruled in the Great Lur and his brother Mānṣūr in the Little Lur. Their dates are uncertain. Bād's successor was his grandson Najīr al-Dīn Muḥammad
We do not know under what circumstances at the end of the Saqawid dynasty (Fara-nawari Nā'ūrī) the group of Maimakbi tribes, who had migrated into the Great Lur (after 600) occupied the ancient Shaliistan (cf. above).

After the Saqawids: During the troubles provoked by the appearance of the Afghans before Fahān, the wāli of Luristan, 'Alī Mardān Khān Fālid (a descendant of the Husain Khān appointed by Shāh 'Abhās), played a considerable part. With 5,000 of his men he took part in 1135 (1722) in the defence of the capital. He was even appointed commander-in-chief of the Persian troops but the other Khāns refused to take orders from him. When the Turks invaded Persia in 1725 'Alī Mardān Khān abandoned Khurramkabād (which was occupied by Ahmad Pāgāl) and retired to Khūstān from which he undertook a diversion against Fahān. The Turks who had gone through the Bakhṭiār country and reached Fardūn had to return. Cf. 'Alī Hazin, Tavkhir al-Afnwāl, ed. Balfour, London 1853, p. 115, 134, 137, 148, who was an eye-witness of the events; Hanway, The Revolutions of Persia, ii. 135, 159, 168, 238; Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1829, ii. 60–61; von Bode, Travels, ii. 281–285; Hammet, G.O., iv. 227.

About the same time several Bakhṭiārī Khāns (Kásim-Khān, Sāfī-Khān) are mentioned as resisting the Afghan and Ottoman invaders but they did not agree well with 'Alī Mardān Khān Fālid. In 1137 (1724) 'Alī Muhammad Husain Khān Bakhṭiārī recognized as his successor a certain pretender who claimed to be prince Sāfī Mīrān. The latter's headquarters were in Kūb-Gill; he was not taken.

1140 (1727) (Hanway, ii. 168, 238; Malīk-Khān, Tavkhir al-Qānūnī-Nādirī, Tabriz 1828, transl. into French by Jones, London 1770, p. xxvii). The Afghans do not seem to have penetrated into the Bakhṭiārī country and their expedition in 1724 against Kūb-Gill was a farce.

(v. Hammer, ii. 310; Malcolm, op. cit., ii. p. 449). By the treaty of 1140 (1727) the Afghan Afshars ceded Luristan to Turkey with other western provinces. The Turks kept it (nominally) until 1149 (1736), when Nādir re-established the status quo (Hanway, ii. 334, 347; von Hammet, G.O., iv. 355, 317).

Under Nādir a certain Turkman chief named Sāhī Khān Cəpənüşh (Cəpənüşh) was appointed beglerbeg of Luristan-i Fālid. On the other hand 'Alī Mardān II Fālid was entrusted by Nādir with diplomatic negotiations in Constantinople. Nādir in 1732 passed through Kūb-Gill with his troops where Muhammad Khān Bālī (the claimant to shirās) was defeated. The local Afghans had to support Nādir, who was one of their tribe. Several expeditions were sent against the Bakhṭiārī country, among whom a new chief 'Alī Mūsāl Manūsī and Kāhérī-lang) had collected together the two contents. In 1732-33 Khān Cəpənüşh was sent against him for the first time. In 1149 (1735) Nādir took the field against him in person going via Gūpşālak and Khurramkabād. The Bakhṭiārī country was several times invaded but the main blow was directed against the little explored country south of Shūm-in-khān. 'Alī Mūsāl was captured and executed. The Bakhṭiārī were decimated and deported to the regions of Fālid and Bālūchistan (cf. above).

As to the Kūb-Gill territory, it was governed by Khāns of the Turkomant tribe (Shāhīzeh), who were settled among the Lurs. In 988 (1580) a derbār in Kūb-Gill claimed to be Shāh Ismā'īl. He had a considerable success among the Kūbīs, Bāsh-Kh влиих, and Bandāstī tribes who killed several Ak-šūr governors. In 1005 as a result of the conquering committed by the Ak-šūr as well as by the Lurs, the governor of Kūb, 'Alī-shāh Kāla, established the direct centre of his government in Kūb-Gill (Tavkhir, 'Ala'ī-nāma, p. 198, 338).
The defeated Bakhtiyārīs returned from Khurasan immediately after the death of Nādir ʿAlī Khan (Tabīkhār-i ʿAbd al-Nādirī, ed. Mann, p. 26) and when the dynasty of the Lakhis was re-established, the Bakhtiyārī chief ‘Alī Mardān Khan (who is not to be confused with the two Sāhs of Luristan-i Fuhl) attempted to play a big part. In 1563 (1750) along with Karim Khan Zand he set up a Lakhīn a scion of the lateral line of the Safawīs (ʿAlī Davūd under the name ofīlamī III). The career of “guardian of the sovereign” exerted by Nādir seemed to be certain for him also but Karim Khan gained the upper hand; the troops of ‘Alī Mardān who included Lakh of the tribes of Kīhār and Zangana were defeated in 1752; he escaped to Bakhtiyār but died there by the hand of an assassin: cf. Mīrāb. ʿAbdī, Tabīkhār-i gīthīgāhā, quoted by Malcolm, in the same note, p. 2. However, G. G. A. B., iv., p. 475, 477; R. S. Poole, The Crisis of the Ṣafawī of Persia, London 1887, p. 269; Curzon, ii. 389.

Karim Khan [q. v.] who had disposed of his Bakhtiyārī rival was himself a Lakh of the tribe of Zand, settled in the immediate neighbourhood of Luristan-i Fuhl. On the movements of population in his time, cf. the articles Lakhīs and Lakh. In 1785 when Zīvar Khan Zand had to fall back on Zāvān a number of Laks and of Turks assembled at Lakhīs under former politicians of ‘Alī Mardān Khan but the town was soon occupied by Ḥādī Muhammad Ṣādārī who had nothing better to do than attack the Bakhtiyārīs (ʿAbd al-Karim Khānī, Tabīkhār-i Zandīyā, ed. Beer, p. 20; Malcolm, op. cit., ii. 179 ff) which injured his popularity among the tribes.

The Lakhī Bakhtiyārī country was never completely assimilated during the century and a half which the Ṣādārīs reigned. A resume of the history of the Bakhtiyārīs in the sixteenth century has been given by Curzon in Ch. xxiv. of his Percia. At first the Ṣādārī family, descended from the brother of ‘Alī Mardān Khan (cf. above), came to the front but the expedition of the governor of Lajakah Mānṣūr Khān Mūsāmīr al-Dawla (whose real name was Yānjābokhī, he was an Armenian from Tiān in 1841 put an end to the career of the Bakhtiyārīs, which later group and in spite of the intervention of the british in 1847 at its chief Ḥusayn Kāli Khan (Hādīīlī Lakhī) former lord of the Mūsāmīr al-Dawla which had been reduced by the autonomy under the rule of his Muzārīd and Ṣādārī.

The centralizing efforts of the Ṣādārīs had more effect in Luristan-i Fuhl (formerly Lakhīs) in as much as, as a result of the government in Kīhār through the energetic prince Muzārīd of the beginning of the sixteenth century, the old family of the Muṣṭafās and Zandīs found its rights reduced simply to the possession of Pānwāsh Kāk (q. v. and Cirkiew, p. 277). The Ṣādārīs of Luristan the Persian province of Luristan. Muhammad ‘Alī Ṣādārī with troops and artillery marched through this province. In 1836 Rūdoluf followed him at the head of his Ṣādārī regiment. After the famous expedition of Manṣūr Khān Khan (1841), his nephew ultrasound Khan Sāmān al-Dawla, governor of Ḥusayar, maintained order in Luristan but for the second part of the sixteenth century Luristan was plunged more or less into a state of anarchy. It was not till 1900 that prince ‘Alī al-Dawla was able to restore order in Luristan and at this time several explorers travelled freely in the disturbed province. But in November 1904 two British officers (Col. Douglas and Capt. Loomer) on their way to Khurshabad were attacked and wounded by Luris. A considerable agitation was stirred up among the Lurs (and in western Persia generally) by the appearance among them of the rebel prince Sāmān al-Dawla (several times since 1903). In spite of the efforts of the Persian government Luristan remained closed till 1917, when with the help of a foreign representatives several caravans from Diba were allowed to travel. About the same time the Persian government confirmed the rank of Ṣāh of Pahlavī on Ṣāhid ‘Alī Khan Amrī (cf. the article Lakh); cf. Edmonds in the Geogr. Journ., 1922.

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

LUR-I BUZURG, a dynasty of Aṭībegs which flourished in Eastern and Southern Persia, Luristan between 550 (1155) and 827 (1425). The capital of which was ‘Ismāʿīl (Mālamī). The eponymous founder of the dynasty, also known as Faḏlāwī, was a Kurd chief of ‘Ismāʿīl name Faḏlīyā. His descendants (the Dījam-ādīa mentions 9 predecessors of Aṭīāt Hādī) migrated from Syria and passing through Mālamītār and LāhBritān to where they made an alliance with the Amir Dādā (7) of Khān (they arrived about 550 (1006) in the plains north of ‘Ismāʿīl-ān Kūh (Luristan).

Their (q. v.) chief Abū Tāhir (Abi Ṣāh) Muhammad distinguished himself in the service of the Sultan of ‘Ismāʿīl (543-556) in an expedition against the Khāhān (q. v.). As a reward Sūkī gave him Khān-‘Ismāʿīl and agreed to send him to conquer Luristan. He succeeded in this. Abū Tāhir assumed the title of Aṭīātāwī and later quarrelled with ‘Ismāʿīl and made himself independent (c. 550). (The Muḥammad al-‘Aṣrī seem to confuse several individuals under the name Kāt ‘Alī, to whom it attributes the following successes: the defeat of the Shīb (q. v.), the deposition of Nājis al-Dīn, the de facto ruler of Luristan, and the defeat of the Khāhān troops commanded by the Turk ‘Ezāb). (Under the son of Abū Tāhir, (A) Mālīk (sic) Hāzārāt (600-626 or 550), Luristan prospered and new Arab and Iranian tribes flock ed into it. Hāzārāt drove out of Luristan the last remnants of the Shīb and invaded Luristan proper. The Shīb migrated to Fārs. Hāzārāt disputed with the Khāhān the possession of the fortress of Manṣūrāb (Mālamītār, S. W. of Mālamī). The possessions of Hāzārāt were extended up to a distance of 4 faršāh from Lāhān. The Caliph
Nasir (575–622) confirmed to Hazarasp the title of Atabeg. On the other side Hazarasp maintained friendly relations with the Khirvánísháth Mohammed and gave his daughter in marriage to his grandson Ghiyath al-Din (220–260). The Zanjirísháth mentioned his two sons of Hazarasp: Khushal al-Din (d. 669) and Nisarat al-Din (d. 659); the former bought Zarda-Khâh, where several members of the family were afterwards interred.

(3) Tikla (c. 655–656), son of Hazarasp and his Salghâtish wife, successfully warded off four attacks on him by the Salghâtish Atabeg of Fars, who was indignant among other things at the expulsion of the Shâh from Luristan. Tikla took from Husáin al-Din Khâshí (d. 654) certain districts of Luristan. He defeated the general sent against him from Khâshí (see the caliph). During the Baghsháthí campaign of Husáng Khan (653), Tikla accompanied him in Khâshí’s campaign (1609). He did not however conceal his feelings about the treatment inflicted on the caliph and Muslims. Husáng took hostage at this and Tikla fled to Luristan and shut himself up in Mândákhâh. Husáng pardoned him but later changed his mind and had him executed in Tabâst. Tikla was buried at Zarda-Khâh.

(4) Shams al-Din Alp Arghân succeeded to his executed brother and ruled for 15 years. He led a nomadic life. His winter residence was at Jâhid and at Sus (probably Susán on the Kârân above Shâhshâh) and his summer one at Kâshkâ and in the upper waters of the Zarda-Râh and the Pârsuft (source of the Kârân).

His son (5) Vasaf Shâh had spent his youth with Alâsh Khân (663–680) and even before appointed in his father’s stead remained at the Mongol court with 200 horsemen. He took part in the war against Turâkân (q.v.) and distinguished himself in a skirmish with the Tartars. To the preservation of Vasaf Shâh Ahiâda added Khâshí, the region of Kâh-Gilâna and the towns of Fârâdân (7 farâks above Jâhid) and Kâshkâhâh (Gurpâyagkân). Vasaf Shâh went to Kâh-Gilâna and attacked the Shâh with the modern Mânsuïshâni cavalry from Kâh-Gilâna. After the defeat of Alâsh, Vasaf Shâh was forced against his will to go with 20,000 cavalry and 4,000 foot to the help of Akmâd Târân. The latter was defeated (683) and the Lur retreated to Tâmân across the desert where the majority died of thirst. After the accession of Arghân, Vasaf Shâh went to pay him homage and interceded on behalf of the former victor Kâhâ Shams al-Din who had taken refuge in Luristan (cf. L’Othman, iv. 5).

His son (6) Afiyâlshâh sent his brother Ahamd to the court of Arghân while the himself remained in Luristan where he put to death the members of the former victor family. Their relatives having taken refuge in Jâhid, Afiyâlshâh sent his kinsmen in pursuit of them. At this moment arrived the news of the death of Arghân (690). The Lur killed the Mongol governor of Jâhid. Afiyâlshâh appointed members of his family to govern in Homâdân, Fâr and in the territories reaching to the Persian Gulf and even began to march on the capital. The Mongol general Akmâd Târân was defeated at Kâshkâ (Kâshkâ, near Kâshkâhâh). Kâshkâ Khân sent Mongol troops against Afiyâlshâh and troops from Lur-Khâh. Afiyâlshâh shut himself in Mândákhâh but after some time went to Kâhâ Khân who pardoned him. Returning to Kâshí, Afiyâlshâh massacred his own relatives and a number of the notables. Ghâdâr Khân (694–703) at first showed himself favourable to Afiyâlshâh but in 696 on the complaint of the Amir Hûrûdbâsh of Fâr, Afiyâlshâh was tried and executed at Malâwâd (7) in Fârûshân.

The rank of Atabeg was next conferred on his brother (7) Nisarat al-Din Akmâm (from 695 to 730 or 733) who had spent most of his life at the court of the Khâshí. According to the Masâni’s annals he introduced Mongol institutions (bâthi meghâli) into Luristan. Hamâlshâh Mustafâi praises his able and prudent administration which required the damage done by Afiyâlshâh. He was a friend of men of religion and several books were dedicated to him, like the Tâvâlih Mashadî of Akmâm al-Mâh, etc. Aghâb of Fâdî Allah Kâzîmî. The Masâni’s annals gives him the title of Fâr. According to Ibn Bâyûtá he built 160 mausoleums (hamehtāb) of which 44 were at Iâshâh and he had roads cut through the mountains.

His son and successor (8) Kûshâ al-Din Ya’ Dâsh Shâh II (723–740) was also a ruler. His lands (Masâni’s annals) extended from Busra and Khâshí-Abad to Lîlâmrâvân and Frâshân. He was buried in the mausoleum of Rukshulâzâd.

His successor was his son (according to Ibn Bâyûtá) his brother (9) Shâfî al-Din Afiyâlshâh II (Akmâm), Ibn Bâyûtá travelling via Mânsu-, Râmân-Târân, visited the capital Iâshâh or Malâwâd. He found the princes given to wine. The Arab traveller describes the peculiar customs of the Lur who witnessed at the burial of the son of the caliph. The latter’s possessions included Tabar Shâhshâh and extended to Garweh al-Râkh (the modern Khâvardâr in Zarâmshâh west of Fârâh). During the ten days the Arab traveller took to cover this distance he found shelter every night in a madrasa. At the same time (740) Hamâlshâh Mustafâi mentions among the possessions of the Great Lur Djhâhalâk (apparently the district N.K. of Luristan and west of Gulpâyagkân).

Next follows an obscure period. According to the anonymous historian of Mirza Isâkzâd, the successor of Afiyâlshâh was his son (10) Nâwâ al-Wâd (“roses-bud”), who ruled from 736 (7) to 756 and disposed of the treasures of his ancestors. According to the Zâhî˘lā-îrâd, Muhammad Muhsân of Fâr (715–760) learning of his dealings with Abî Isâk Khâjâ had him blinded at Sus in 756. His cousin (the Zâhî˘l-ârâb hâsr nephews) (11) Shams al-Din Pâshâ–b, Ya’ Dâsh Shâh II (7) succeeded him and ruled from 756 to 768. At this time Frâshân became involved in the civil wars of the Usâri. When Shah Mansûr, making Shâhshâh his headquarters began a series of raids on the lands of Pâshâb, Shah Sha’dâ (oldest brother and rival of Mansûr, d. 786 = 1354) came to the help of Pâshâb. We have copies of 764 and 764 struck at Iâshâh in the name of Shahâb (S. Lane-Poole, Cat. of Oriental Coins in the Brit. Mus., vol. vi., London 1881, p. 235, 237). After the death of Pâshâb a struggle began between his two sons (12) Malik Pîr Akmâm and his youngest brother (13) Malik Hûrûdbâsh in which the latter was killed. (According to the anonymous historian of Isâkzâd, if he has been rightly understood by Howorth, Akmâm and Hâ-
sheng were sons of Nasr al-Wardi and the former was the immediate successor of his father). Shah Muzaffar ad-Din Pir Ahmad and appointed in his stead a notable scholar and Malik Dinar. When Turmut passed through Luristan in 795 Pir Ahmad came to meet him at Ruma-Hormuz. Turmut later received him graciously at Shiraz, confirmed him by a decree (al-rumgha) in his hereditary possessions and allowed him to repatriate 2,000 families of Luris deported by Shah Mansur. In spite of this in 798, Turmut took as hostages Samarkand the brothers of Pir Ahmad Ahrasiyah and Mansur Shah. Turmut afterwards divided Li-rumgha (2) between Pir Ahmad and Ahrasiyah. After the death of Turmut, Mirza Pir Muhammad imprisoned Pir Ahmad in Kuhbandi. He was restored in 812 but met his end in a popular rising. The son of Pir Ahmad (137) Abu Sâ'îd, kept for two years a hostage at the court of Mirza Iskandar at Shiraz, succeeded his father and died in 820. His son (14) Shâh Hussain in 827 by the hand of his relative (15) Shâh Râh al-Dîn b. Khânt b. Hüfâng (1262). The latter seized the power but the Turmuti Khalif Isfahân b. Shahrâb got troops to expel him and thus ended the rule of the Fadlilzad. Later the power passed into the hands of local notables of the Bakhtiyari tribes (Sharaf-nama, l. 48).

Bibliography: Raghib al-Din, ed. Quatre-miêtres; Waqâli, Tadhkiraat al-Amîrî, Muhallal II, history of Turmut, 2. Rashid al-Dîn and Ahrasiyah; Tawârid-i Guzda, with the history of Mirza Iskandar of the Muradshah appendix, G.M.S., p. 353-457, 723, 725, 745; based on Raghib al-Din al-Din and the Zad al-Tawârid of Djamâl al-Dîn Khântâ; Muhammad b. Ali Shâhândâr, Mashâ'îr al-Aswâd (in 743); appendix owing to the liberality of the Royal Asiatic Society I have been able to consult the MS. Cat. Mathay, No. 49, which contains the appendix on the Lur-I Buzurg (fol. 142-145); the author's statements are somewhat confused; Zâd al-Tawârid, 438, 599, 619, 811; Mirkhond, Kaqwâsî as-sâfî, ed. Khânt b. Shâh Ju'dar; Li-rumgha (in 974), MS. British Museum, Or. 141, fol. 137-140 I owe the copy to Muhammad Khan Kâstîni, contains some useful information; Sharaf-nama, l. 22-32, based on the beginning on a good text of the Tawârid-i Guzda; Khânt Shâhândâr, Firdawsi al-Tawârid, passage on the Great Lur in the travels of the Shâhârûn of Charmy, (4, p. 358-337); Hâjî Khûstâ, Li-rumgha-māl, p. 280 (cf. Charmy, ibid., (4, p. 160-116); Maimâqûl-lîm-bâsh, (4, p. 597-599); d'Oulon, Histoire des Mongols, il. 2, 3, 4, 190, 200, 355, 595; (5, 1, 64, 94, 114, 189, 580); Denon, Histoire of the Mongols, ill. 140, 407, 753, 754, which includes the statements of the anonymous history of the grandson of Turmut Mirza Iskandar, written in 813, MS. of the British Museum, Or. 1566; MS. of the Asiatic Museum of Leningrad 566, (Y. Minorovsky).

LUR-I KÜÇIK, a dynasty of Atabegs which ruled in Northern and Western Luristan between 580 (1184) and 1006 (1597) with Khurramshâh as their capital. The Atabegs were descended from the Lur-I Buzurg of Djamâl (Djamâl-i). The dynasty is also known by the name of Khânt Shâh from the name of the first Atabeg. (It remains to be seen if this name is connected with that of Muhammad Khurash, vizier of the former rulers of Luristan before the rise of the Atabegs of Lur-I Buzurg). After 730 the power passed to another line which later claimed to be of 'Alid descent; at this time also the title mulk succeeded that of khânt.

The ancestors of the Khurashšâh had entered the service of Himûn al-Dîn (of the Turk tribe of Shâhât or Shâhát) who ruled Luristan and Khântshâh about the end of the Sa'dîsh period (c. 550-580).

(1) Shâdâj b. al-Dîn Khurashshâh b. Abî Bakr b. Muhammad b. Khurashshâh was at first Shâhâna of a part of Luristan on behalf of Himûn al-Dîn but after the death of the latter (in 570 or 580) became independent lord of the whole of Lur-I Küçik. He waged war on the Djamârnâw (the tribe in which he had originated, but which was then being ruled by his rival Shâhât b. 'Ayâr) and besieged their stronghold Dibâ-Siâyâh (in the district of Mânâvîd and in the "wilâyat" of Samâh). The inhabitants bade all Mânâvîd over to him but the caliph ordered Shâdâj al-Dîn to deliver up to himself the stronghold of Mângûr (Mângûr-north of Khânh). In compensation Shâdâj received the district of Tarsâk in Khântshâh. Shâdâj al-Dîn drove back the Bayân Turks who were ravaging Luristan. He led a nomadic life and spent the summer at Kift (in Šâhâr-Girâwa) and the winter at Darav Dibâ-Luristan in Naqsh-i Kâhistân) and at Mânah (7). He died a centenarian in 624 and his tomb was venerated by the Lurs. His son Bakr was killed by his nephew (3) Sâf al-Dîn Kutam b. Shâhâshâh b. 'Ali who became Atabeg and was a good ruler. Kutam was succeeded by his brothers first (3) Shâhâshâh al-Dîn Abî Bakr and next (4) Ibrâhîm al-Dîn Gharâshb. The latter married the widow of Abî Bakr, Mâlhà Khântshâ, who was the sister of Sulaimân Shâh Awa, later commander-in-chief of the caliph of the Musta'âlin (Abâk should be altered to Aïma, name of a tribe or a district in the time of the last Sa'dîsh; cf. Râhât al-Dîn, G.M.S., p. 346; Djamâl-nâma, G.M.S., xlvii, p. 153; Nasbat al-Kullâh, G.M.S., p. 107; Debsenmey, Recherches sur quatre princes d'Hâmânet, 3, 1847, p. 177). When (5) Hâjian al-Dîn Kutam b. Shâhâshâh b. Kutam, Shâhâshâh killed Gharâshb, a struggle ensued between him and Sulaimân-Shâh (Shâhâshâh al-Dîn). The Lurs took Bakr (near Hamadan) but finally Khântshâ was defeated and killed near Khântshâ-âst in 640 (1242).

His brother (6) Tâdâ al-Dîn Mansûrd went to the court of Mângûr and returned in the train of Hâljûl. This descent is an authority on Shâhâ's law, ruled till 616. He showed great kindness to the family of Sulaimân-Shâh, when the latter was executed at the taking of Hâljûl. The sons of Shâhâ were executed by Abâk who appointed (5) Kutam al-Dîn Kutam 'Abâk al-Dîn Khântshâl (also executed by Abâk in 677).

He had two immediate successors, the two sons of Shâhâ of whom (8) Fâlak al-Dîn Hâjian al-Dîn ruled a part of Luristan (disk, mowâ'îl) and (8a) Ibrâhîm al-Dîn Hâjian ruled the crown domains (li-rumgha). The number of their troops was 17,000. They chastised the Bayân and reunited under their control all the lands between Hamadan and Shâhâtshâh and between Ibrâhîm and the Arab lands. Both died in 692.
other son of 'Izz al-Din, took advantage of the decline of the Timurids to extend his territory. He plundered Hamadán, Gulpâygan, Ifahán and Isfahan, even undertook an expedition to Shahr-i Sabz. Therefore, where the Bābūrī Turks slew him in 871 (or 873). His son (19) Shāh Rāz was supported by Isfahān 1; at this period the birds of the Little Lur had already adopted the theory that they were of 'Aldī descent. The son of Rustam (20) Oghur (or Oghur) accompanied Shāh Tāmūs on his campaign of 940 against 'Ubayd Allah Khān and during his absence his brother (21) Ḍajāngīr seized the power. He was executed in 949. The governor (jila) of his son (22) Rustam Shāh handed over the latter to Tāmūs Shāh who imprisoned him in Alamut, while Muḥammadī, another son of Ḍajāngīr, was hidden by the Lur at Canga. An impostor in Luristan gave himself out to be Shāh Rustam Tāmūs, then released the true Rustam who recovered his seat but had to hand over a third of it (do dang) to his brother (22b) Muḥammadī. At the instigation of the wife of Shāh Rustam, the governor of Hamadán seized Muḥammadī who was shut up in Alamut. The sons of Muḥammadī plundered Luristan and the adjoining provinces into great disorder. Ten years later Muḥammadī escaped, and conquered Luristan while Shāh Rustam took refuge at the coast of the Shāh. Muḥammadī established good relations with Tāmūs and Isfahān 1 but there was no peace between them; with the Ottomans they fell into strife. Relations with the Ottomans were strained and Muḥammadī became reconciled with the Šafawīs.

(24) Shāhwardī, Shāhwardī, who had escaped from Baghāhī where he was living as a hostage, received investiture from Shāh Khusrau after his father's death. At the time of the occupation of Nihawānd by the Turks Shāhwardī showed some signs of independence. In 1000 good relations with Shāh 'Abbās were re-established between them. Shāhwardī made the most of his alleged descent from 'Abbās b. 'Ali and his Šafawī (ṣafawī) šāhī ('Abbāsī). Shāh 'Abbās married his sister and gave him a Šafawī princess in marriage. In 1002 Shāhwardī, in a pitched battle killed the governor of Hamadán Oghurī sulfurī Bayātī who was trying to levy taxes in Burūdjīrī. Shāh 'Abbās, filled with wrath, left the Khurāsāni front and hastened to Hamadán. Shāhwardī crossed the Šāmir (Kattāgh) and escaped to Baghāhī. Luristan was given to Šafawī Husain b. Shāh Rustam. In 1003 Shāhwardī was pardoned and restored but he was not long in relapsing. In 1005 Shāh 'Abbās took the field against him a second time. Shāhwardī was besieged and slain in the fortress of Canga (in Pughi-Kū). Husain Khān b. Manṣūr beg Sulaymān b. Šafawī 1 was given Luristan, except Šafawī, Hindmānī (1) and Pughi-Kū which were given to Tāmūs Kūl Isanātī. This may be regarded as the end of the dynasty of the Atlābeys of the Little Lur, although the dynasty of "wills" of Luristan (later of Pughi-Kū (q.v.) only) claims descent from Husain Khān who was a cousin of Shāhwardī.

of Turke (utilised by Howorth); Qâhrân-nâmeh; Abû al-Kâdir Ahmad Ghaffâri; Sharâf-nâme, l. 52-55; Abbas-i-Abâ Timâr; Thârân 1341, p. 320, 342, 358-370; Qâhrân-nâmeh; Mundâmî (by Shah). Hist. of the Monguls, ii. 598-600; d'Ohlson, Histoire des Mongols, iii. 250-261; iv. 171; Hammer, Gis. d. Mitt. des. 161-163; Howorth, History of the Monguls, iii. 140, 206, 754. (V. Monoszy).

A great land of the Lurs, a region in the S.W. of Persia. In the Mongol period the terms “Great Lur” and “Little Lur” roughly covered all the lands inhabited by the Lur tribes. Since the Safawî period, the lands of the Great Lur have been distinguished by the names of Kûh-Gilit and Bakhtiyârî. At the beginning of the xvith century the Mainau confederation occupied the old Shûlûstan [q. v.], and thus created a third Lur territory between Kûh-Gilit and Shiraz. It is however only since the xvith century that Lurî-Kûh [q. v.] has been known as Luristan (for greater precision it was called Luristan-Fellî). In the xviith century Luristan was divided into two parts: 1. Pûsh-Kûh (country on this side of the main line of ascent of Kûh-Kâtî and 2. Pûsh-i-Kâtî (country beyond the mountains east of Kâtî). At the present day the term Luristan usually means Pûsh-Kâtî while Pûsh-i-Kâtî means the Fellî country.

The Mamâsanî territory and the Kûh-Gilit forms part of the province of Fâr. The capital of the Mamâsanî is at Fahâlyn (cf. Shîlah). Kûh-Gilit (Kûh-Djîlîya, Kûh-Gilit) stretches from right (west of Fahâlyn) to Bûshâdah; this last town is the main centre for the tribes of Kûh-Gilit. To the south the Kûh-Gilit’s tribes descend as far as the Fârîan Gîûl. The mountains of Kûh-Gilit and the frontier between its tribes and the Bakhitiyars are not yet well known. The chief rivers of Kûh-Gilit are the Kûh-Sîthin which is formed by the junction of the Khurshâd and the Zobrah, and in its lower course runs via Zûdân and Hûshûn, and the Kûh Kûdirânî or Uzzârîh, one branch of which runs via the Kûrân [q. v.] and the other towards Dâwânîr. On Kûh-Gilit see the valuable Fârâmâna-yi Nasîr of Esmâ’îl Falî (Thîrân 1313), the itineraries of Sûsîân, the Abû al-Kâdir, and the general account in de Bode, l. 344-391; Ritter, Erdkunde, ii. 132-144 is now very much out of date.

The Bakhâtîyân land stretches from Calhâmîkîl (west of Ibfânîn) to Shûlahât, and to the south the Bakhâtîyân match with the Kûh-Gilit and to the north they go beyond the northern barrier of Luristan (Shûtûnî-kît etc.). They are found at Farsâlân, Bûshûrût, Jâzîlkhâ, and in the cataracts around Burûshîr (even before 1840 many villages had been purchased here by Muhammad Taqî Kûh Câhr-Lang). Roughly speaking the Bakhâtîyân occupy the lower basin of the Zandûrân and of the Kûtân [q. v.] above Shûlahât. The works of Lâzzîr, Shânîr, Behzad, Cèrû etc. give a very accurate picture of this mountainous country, in the centre of which rises the Khâb Rang (13,800 feet high) which forms the watershed between the Persian Gulf and the central Persian plateau. (It may be asked if the name Kûh-i-Rang is not the Mongol chûm, “mountain, larger”, found in Luristan). The frontier between the Bakhâtîyân and the Lurs proper follows the western branch of the

Abî Dîr, an important tributary of the Kûrân. Luristan (Pûsh-kît) is bounded on the east and west by the convergent streams of the Abî Dîr and the Kûrhân, while in the north the range of the Chûlân-bâlâghân, Garîn etc. separates Luristan from Nîzhân and Shûlahât (district of Burûshîr). To the west of Kûrân Pûsh-i-Kût begins. In the northwest the frontier of Luristan runs to the southwest of the districts of Hûshûn and Hûshân which belongs to the province of Hûshûn.

The chief left bank tributary of the Kûrân is the Kâshân (Kâwhîn; Kâwhâghân), which is formed by two arms. The northern arm with its tributaries drains the beautiful plains of Hûr-rûd, Abûl-ghur and Khûvân. The southern arm, separated from the northern one by the Yûsuf-kût range, takes the name of the town of Khûrûmânâbâd [q. v.] near which it passes. After the confluence of the two arms, the Kâshân, running S.W., receives on the left bank the combined waters of the Kûrân and Gîîn, which flow from Khûh-i-Habûd Pûshî (south of Khûrûmânâbâd) and the northern slopes of the Kûh-i-Gîrîh. These two ranges are covered with pine, and right angiosperms which follow the right bank of the Abî Dîr, which the Kûrân cuts through from the valley of the Kûrân. On the right bank the Kâshân receives the Madîjîân-kût, “river of the mare”. Above Kâshân the Kâshân receives on its left bank several tributaries of less importance still little known (Rûhûr etc.) Below Kâshân and also on the left bank, the Kâshân receives the Pûsàh, Leîlân (Lchîmî) and Abî Zîr. This last river with its tributaries Aûrâk etc. rises in the southern slopes of the Kûh-i-Gîrîh. The topography of the right bank of the Abî Dîr is not well known. The sources of the Baladûr and its right bank tributary the Khîrî-ûb lie a considerable distance to the north. The Baladûr flows into the Abî Dîr between Dûsfîl and Susa. The Khîrî-ûb receives on its right bank the waters of the Kûl-i-ûb which come down from the high valley of Mûngârâz, which with the peaks that surround it form a kind of natural basin and separate the basin of the Baladûr from that of the Abî Dîr. The Shûrâ-yi-Lûr plain formerly well irrigated lies north of Dûsfîl and south of Khîrî-ûb (“pitch-water”) whose naphthaly spring has been known since ancient times. It was probably here that Darius settled a colony of Greeks (Ritter, l. 201).

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

Ancient history. The land now occupied by the Lur tribes have been inhabited since the period before the arrival of Iranians in them. This region, being at a considerable distance from Assyria, was mainly under the influence of Elam; Susa where there have been found traces of occupation going back to the third millennium B.C., lies just at the entrance to the mountains of the Little Lur. The purest traces of the local culture and of this alone are found more to the southeast. Just as the Akkâbûs of the Great Lur had for their capital Ibfânîn (= Mîlâmî), so in very early times, the lords of this district, the kings of Akhir (Hapirtû), whose relations with the rulers of Susa had control at least of
the Kürün valley. The site of Malküz (cf. de Bode, Layard, Jéquier, in de Morgan, Dizges, if Persia, 1902, ii. 135-143 and Hising, Der Zugoc zu seine Velber, Leipzig 1908, p. 40-50) with its purely indigenous (Elamite, non-Semitic) inscriptions and bas-reliefs is a most important point. The recent discovery by Herzfeld (Reiseberichte, Z.D.M.G., 1916, p. 259) in the Manashtan region of a base-relief and bricks bearing Elamite characters (1500-1000 B.C.) is valuable in indicating the extent of Elamite penetration into the Lur mountains. Küh-Gillî lying between Susiana and Persis may correspond to the still unknown region of Amur (Anaúra) of which the successors of Cyrus the Great. On the survival of this name near Shaskar, cf. Grundr. d. iran. Phil., ii. 418 (according to Rawlinson: Assur).

The antiquities of the valley of the Upper Kürün (the two Susas, Luraidin, the mount of Salūr, Tār and Idrād) are insufficiently known (Layard, Sawyder). According to Sawyder, the higher Bakhthiary lands are "seriously devoid of any ancient landmarks".

For the west part of Luristan in the strict sense of the word see the articles Masarqān and 878 Infer. No monuments of great antiquity have as yet been discovered in this district except the mounds at the river (Mesopotamia) of Seroš or Mūngūr and Khoorasmāb, Kītīkow, p. 139. The early inhabitants of Luristan were the Kāshkās who imposed their rule on Babylon between 1760 and 1650 B.C. The Achaeemidian paid the Kossiioi for the right of passage by the Babylon-Ecbatana road. These highwaymen were temporarily subdued by Alexander the Great. Antiquity, pursued by Esmeres, traversed the heart of the Kossiian country, according to Rawlinson on the route Pshā-tang-Kalleil pass-Khoorasmāb (Ritter, Erdkunde, i. p. 335). The Kossiian (who should perhaps be distinguished from the Khāra) - "the language differences of that from their neighborhood, but if we already find proper names borrowed from Indo-European. Cf. E. Meyer, Gesch. d. Altert., 1/2, Berlin 1913, § 455; Humal, Der Zugoc, p. 24 and Attrum in La langue du monde, Paris 1925, p. 283. [The name Kāshkāy has perhaps survived in that of the river Kāshkāy].

It is also probable that northern Luristan was more or less dependent on the land of Ellīpī, often mentioned by the Assyrians. This region, which was considerably influenced by Media is now located in the province of Kerman, cf. Andreas, Alana, in Pauly-Wissowa, über Streck, Z. d. A., x, 379; Cambridge, Ancient History, ii. 1924, i. cf. supra.

We know very little about the Karwan people who (Herodotus, v. 49) were bounded on one side by the Armenians and on the other by the Susians (Reismich, Un peuple oublé: Les Massiqa, Revue des études gréco-romaines, 1894, viii, p. 313-318).

Here we can only call attention to various ethnical elements buried in the later strata of Iranian invasions. In the name of Paralada, a canton in the northeast of Bahgūthiārī, we have a reminiscence of the Median tribe of Parashiiennēu (Herodotus, i. 110) and of the province (Tarākās) (Streck, loc. cit. p. 380) which lay between Media and Persia (in Assyria; Parashik, Parashka; cf. Streck, Z. d. A., xx, p. 365). The translocation must have been accelerated by the formation of the great empires, Achaemenid, Māschehan, Parthian and lastly Sasanian. There are many Sasanian towns in the valley of the Karštārī. Many Sasanian buildings are attributed by the natives to the Anbheg of Luristan, who were certainly nothing more than the restorers. The complicated system of bridges is very remarkable (cf. the photographs in de Morgan, Études gene., ii. and Études Archéol., Paris 1896-1897, p. 360-374) and the roads which may still be traced on the upper courses of the rivers of Susiana. The remains of roads, paved or hewn out of the rock, may be seen at Tangi Sonak (between Bakhthiār and Mānakdrī) near the Sasanian bas-reliefs (de Bode, i. 355, 356), to the east and west of Mālamāt (de Bode, i. 350, ii. 320, qanād-yi šahābān), between Dīnhal and Kīrab (Rawlinson, A march from Zohak, p. 93), to the north of Kīwār (qanād-yi Eshfān, Cittowk, p. 210-221). All these works are evidence of a systematic and continuous penetration. But since at the end of the fourth (fourth) century the inhabitants of the plain of Khāštān had not yet forgotten the Hūrī language (Jomkstad, p. 418) colonies of the ancient stocks may have survived in the mountains. The Lur highlands only assumed their present ethnical character under the Anbhegs.

The knowledge of the Arab geographers about the Lur country is very summary although they describe the routes between Khāštān and Far (cf. Schwabe, Persia, p. 175-186; Arraīrūn-Surūn, p. 190; Arraīrūn-Surūn, between Khāštān and Iṣfāhan (the road started from Iṣfāhan; Ibn Khurdadhībhī, p. 57; Jomkstad, p. 401) and lastly between Khāštān and Dīnhal. As to these last routes Iṣtīkhur, p. 106, contends from al-Lur to Shāhīr-Ḵᵛāšt 30 farakhs, from there to Līghtar (= Alātīn) 12 farakhs, from there to Nihavand 10 farakhs (the road must lie that which follows the upper waters of the Bafāštārī). A few details of this route are established by Muḥammad, p. 401, who gives the following eight stages: Karṣād (cf. the article Nīl-Khāšt) = Wafarwāmand-Dārgān-Khurāšt (certainly = Hūrū, Hillūrī, north of Khurāštāb) = Sābur-khwās (=

Among the inhabited places in modern Luristan may be noted the following: the town of al-Lur, 2 farakhs north of Dīnhal (Baṣrāt Anīf), the site of which should be sought in the plain of Shāhīsīr-Lur near Shīlūhās; the town of Līghtar, now disappeared, was certainly in the plain of Alīhār and the town of Shāhīr-Ḵᵛāšt. The exact location of the latter is important for the comprehension of certain events in the sixth (eleventh) century (Ibn al-Asfāḥ, in. 80, 814: 211; a. 466; Zarrāk-ī Gunāz, p. 557). Rawlinson had identified Khurāštāb with Shāhīr-Ḵᵛāšt (cf. Le Strange, The Lāhūr, etc., p. 668). The combined evidence of Iṣkhpūr, p. 668, of the Nuzūl al-Kabār, p. 70, 476 and particularly of the itinerary of Muḥammad, p. 404 fully justify Rawlinson's identification (against Le Strange). The change of name, or moving of the site (cf. Schwabe) must have taken
place in the 8th century. The Naukat al-Kullah (740 = 1340) which does not include Shāhpur-Khāyat in its enumeration, the towns of the Little Land is the first source to mention Khurrāmahād (a town in ruins). It is on the other hand not at all probable that the wāliyya of Mān-rūd, the alleged ancestral home of the Lurs, is near Khurrāmahād. It should be sought to the north of the town of al-Lur near Mān-gara (= Māngara), Samahī, mentioned in the Tarikh-i Gāinda, p. 548, was in Mān-rūd; its fortress Dīz-e Sīyāh must correspond to the fort of Dīz which defends the entrance to Māngara and was destroyed by the mālī of Pūghti-Kūth in 1895 (Mann, Die Mundarten der Luristaner, p. 117). Finally the stronghold of Gīrg (Tarikh-i Gāinda, p. 549, 552) is mentioned by Chirīkow, p. 153, among the encampments of the tribe of Pāpī (to the south of Khurrāmahād).

Economic conditions. Apart from the Bakhūjiyya districts near Ifsāhān where there are flourishing villages, the Lur territories inhabited by nomads or semi-nomads only export the products of their cattle-rearing. But the future of the montaneous country which lies like an amphitheatre around the plain of Khūstāzīa is very promising. The Lur lands are rich in minerals and especially in petrol. The famous wells of Maqīd-ī Sulaimān (Māqīn-Nafīn), belonging to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company are in the middle of Bakhūjiyya's territory (between Sāhīsār and Mālāmat). The same company has concessions including petrol-bearing lands in the whole of southern Persia. It is putting into operation its claims in the Kūh-Gīr hot region (to the north of the port of Gāndāra) etc. (cf. Schwarz, Die lirdische Forschung, 1919).

On the other hand the territories now occupied by the Lurs played a considerable part in ancient times, as they lay on the route between the great centres of the Persian empire. Their southern part (Kūh-Gīr) may become of great importance for air and railway communication between Mesopotamia and India. The Bakhūjiyya caravan is now thrown on the new route connecting Khūstāzīa with Ifsāhān and controlled by Lynch Brothers. Finally Larīstan proper seems destined to be annexed by the main line connecting the Persian Gulf (Mohammāda or Khāmiyānī) with Teherān, and perhaps with the Caspian Sea. Before the war of 1914 surveys had already been begun for making the Mohammāda-Dīsīf-Khurrāmahād railway by the Persia Railways Syndicate (cf. Litten, Persien, Berlin 1920, p. 65, 88). Since the change of dynasty in Persia, the Persian government proposes to carry through this task itself; cf. Millepauch, Ifsāhān, Laristan, 1926, p. 277.


Lūt, the Biblical Lūt has in Muslim legend, even as early as in the Kurʾān, an importance which he does not have in the Bible or Hagada. As his story is associated with the downfall of the sinful Sādīm (not however mentioned in the Kurʾān) he appears to Muhammad as a prophet of punishment along with Hūd, Sālīḥ, Nūḥ and Sūlāḥ as predecessors of Muḥammad. When Muḥammad is accused of being a liar he can console himself with the reflection that before him the people of Nūḥ, Ḥūd, Ṣanūdī, the people of Ibrāhīm and the people of Lūt also called their prophets Hūd (Sūra, xix. 43). Lūt’s people (called humsin Lūt, l. 135: Ḳawāh Lūt) are usually located between Thamād and Mārān. Lūt in the Kurʾān becomes a naqīd, messenger of Allah (xxvi. 160; xxvii. 133), a raḥīm, āʾīn, a reliable prophet (xxvi. 162), a participator in wisdom and knowledge (xxi. 74). When Allah warns his people, Lūt invites them to repent (xxv. 25). He sent to sinners who forbad hospitality (xxv. 70), waylay strangers and practise sodomy and cruelty such as no other people had before them. They threaten him that they will finish those who lead such a moral life saying: “if thee preachest right, bring God’s punishment upon us” (xxviii. 28). God thenceupon sends his angels of punishment; Ibrāhīm’s intercession is in vain (xli. 77, 78). The angels come to Lūt. His people demand the visitors for sinful purposes. In vain Lūt offers his daughters instead. He feels himself helpless. The angels: “calm him, saying: ‘We shall have thee, only no one must turn round: thy wife will do it’.” The city was turned completely upside down (Lxvi. 84; xv. 74); Ḫālīf stones, marked by God, rained upon it.

The Kurʾān mentions no other name in the history of Lūt. The destroyed city is called al-māʾṣība (hil. 54) of which the plural is al-māʾṣībak (xx. 74; lix. 9) corresponding to the Hebrew māṣība, which is used in the Bible of Sodom.

The Kurʾān commentators also know the Biblical story quite accurately (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, I. 349, 347). They are able to fill all the gaps and give all names. The sins of Sādīm are fully described. Sādīm has a king of the line of Nimrod. The inhabitants worship idols. Lūt admonishes them for 40 years (al-Kaʾīrī). Then God sends three angels. Gabriel, Michael and Iṣḥāq (in al-Kaʾīrī also the soul-taker Axriel). Ibrāhīm intercedes: “will ye destroy a people among whom there are 300 believers?” No. — 300, 200, 100... — No. — 44 believers? No. — This number is assumed, Ibrāhīm comforts himself in the belief that Lūt’s wife is one of the believers. The angels must not destroy Sādīm until Lūt testifies four times to its sinfulness. They all see once more Lūt, who testifies. After meeting others they encounter Lūt’s daughter. She invites them to her father’s house. Lūt orders his people to be silent, especially his wife who has disobeyed him for 40 years (al-Kaʾīrī). But Lūt’s wife deliberately makes a light to show they have visitors or at ostentatiously procures salt (this is why she becomes a pillar of salt) or she actually says: “Young men have come to stay with us, with more beautiful cheeks and sweeter fragrance than I have ever seen.”

The people demand the young men; Lūt offers his daughters. “If we wanted thy daughters, we would know where to find them,” they reply, Lūt bars the doors. At the bidding of the angels he opens them. Gabriel bends the intruders with a blow of his wing. They tramp on another. “Save yourself!” they cry, “Lūt’s house is being destroyed!” As the hour of destruction is at hand, Gabriel (according to others the Angel of Punishment-Michael) turns the town upside down, and lifts it up so high that the angels in heaven hear the crowing of the cocks and the howling of the dogs of Sādīm. Ṣīdīl stones fall; each is marked whom it is to strike. As Lūt’s wife looks sympathetically on her people, she is struck by a Ṣīdīl-stone. The number of killed varies between 4,000 (Thāʾlīf) and four millions (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, I. 348). All perish except one who fled to Mecca, brought his Ṣīdīl-stone to the lamb where it hung for 40 days between heaven and earth, until it finally slew the man who brought it there (Thāʾlīf). The Muslim legend gives names to everything and explains them all. Lūt takes his name from Ḳūdā, “to attach oneself”, because Ibrāhīm’s heart was affectionately attached to Lūt (Thāʾlīf). Lūt’s wife is called Ḳawāhka or Ṣāḥīha, his older daughter Ḳūt (?), the younger Ṣāḥīha (Thāʾlīf), Saghīf (Thāʾlīf), or Ṣāḥīha (7) (al-Kaʾīrī). Not only is Sādīm mentioned, but also other four towns, in whom names may be recognised the Biblical
LUT - LUTFI PASHA

As a child, Adina, Sehaim, and Sohar, the sons of Sohar, Thelah says it was saved (Gen. xxia. 20-23) "because it believed in Lut".

The Muslim legend has a little in common with the old Haggada (Gen. Rabba, xxix, i.; Sanhedrin, 109b), e.g. the fact that Abraham thinks he is sure of a certain number of devout people. When Peshk X. Edser (xxvi.) describes the characteristics of Lut favorably, when "Michaiah Hagualot" (ed. Schachter, p. 287) calls the angels sent to Sodom, Gabriel and Raphael, Muslim legend may have had some influence on the later literature.

Bibliography: The principal passages are:


LUT, YAHYA. (See AME MUNEJAH.)

LUFTI ALI BEG Adjut, a Persian poet and biographer of the xvith century. He was born in Isfahan on the 20th Rabi' 1, 1293 (June 7, 1711) and spent his youth at Kuh and later at Shiraz, where his father lived while governor of Luristan and the coast of Fars under Nadir Shah. After the death of his father, he made the pilgrimage to Mecca and travelled in Persia, finally settling in Isfahan in the service of Nadir's successors. He latterly adopted a life of seclusion and put himself under the spiritual direction of Mir Sayyid Ali Manafi. He died in 1784.

Lufti Ali Beg is best known for the collection of biographies of Persian poets which he compiled between 1760 and 1779 under the title of Asbat-Khoda; in it he gives biographies of poets in Persian alphabetical order arranged according to towns and districts. The last part deals with 690 contemporaries of the author and is followed by an autobiography, The Asbat-Khoda was first published at Calcutta in 1249 a.h. and at Bombay in 1277 A.H. There is a Turkic translation printed at Constantinople in 1759 a.h. Among his poems was a maqamat, Vam-e Nakhitana, from which the author quotes many verses at the end of the Asbat-Khoda. Lufti Ali Beg was held in considerable esteem by his literary contemporaries; he was particularly intimate with the poet Hafiz of Isfahan.


LUFTI 'ALI KHAN was the last ruler of the Zand dynasty in Persia. He was born in 1769, the son of Jafar Khan of Karim Khan Zand. He was crowned in 1779 and continued the throne in 1784, and concluded the struggle against the Safar, Aqshu Muhammad, who had forced him to retire to Shiraz, where he died on Jan. 28, 1789 from poisoning. During the short period of the reign of his father, Lufti 'Ali Khan had beenentrained with the conqest of Luristan and Kirman, which he had successfully carried through. But after the death of Jafar he was forced to flee from his own army to Kirman to seek refuge with the Arab lord Bishri. With the latter's help, he was able to make himself master of his capital Shiraz where a certain Saiyid Murad had proclaimed himself king. It was chiefly through the efforts of his father's minister Haji Jibril who occupied the position of khulafa (mayor) of the town that Lufti 'Ali succeeded in getting himself again recognized as sovereign. After his accession the character of his government was one society and generosity had hitherto been so much praised as his personal bravery seems to have changed. His acts of tyranny and cruelty, decided Haji Jibril to abandon the cause of the Zands and betray it to the enemy. This he did in 1791 when Lufti 'Ali Khan had set out against Aqshu Muhammad Khan. Haji Jibril seized Shiraz and stirred up Lufti 'Ali's own troops to mutiny against him. The latter fled to the coast and succeeded in collecting a small armed force with which he tried in vain to retake Shiraz.

Then followed several years of guerrilla warfare waged with incredible vigour by Lufti 'Ali against the Khans. He went up and down the provinces of southern Persia for some time supported by the lord of Tabas and even temporarily taking Yazd. In 1794 being assisted by the chief of the district of Garmestan he even took Kirman. Here Aqshu Muhammad besieged him with a large force. After four months the town capitulated, Lufti 'Ali Khan succeeded in once more escaping and reaching Tabas but here he was treacherously delivered over to his enemy who had him taken to Tehran where he was blinded and mutilated and finally put to death. Then came the terrible vengeance wreaked by the Khans on the people of the town of Kirman (q.v.). Lufti 'Ali Khan, the last chivalrous figure amongst the kings of Persia (Brown), probably had the sympathy of most of his contemporaries and it is recalled that even Aqshu Muhammad Khan openly recognised his bravery. But as his history was written under the new dynasty of the Khans in Persia, the Persian sources could not show much sympathy for him. European sources give a more faithful account of the course of events. The more modern Persian historians like Muzaffar Muhammad, 'Ali Khan, Dastur-ud-Mulk and Tavakkil, from the history of the Zands, reproduced in Bech, Neufiratische Konvolut und Grammatik, 1784, p. 239-250 do not hesitate to describe the actions of Haji Jibril as treason. Haji Jibril who soon afterwards became minister tried to justify his conduct to Sir Jules Malcolm.


LUFTI PASHA, nephew (kuzucu) of Lufti Pasha b. 'Abd al-Muell, an important Turkish statesman, scholar and historian, grand vizier in the time of Sultan Selim I al-Kadisi. He was of Albanian descent. The date and place of his birth are unknown. He was brought up in the imperial court, which he had
Lutfi Pasha was in the author of 21 works, a list of which he himself gives in his "History", p. 1-4, ed. also the 1st in Hammam-Purgall, Geschichten der Osmanischen, Kirchen, i, 703; Filig, Katalog der Wiener Handbücher, ii, p. 232; Tschudi, Türkische Bibliothek, vol. xii, p. xv—xvi. It includes 15 Arabic and 8 Turkish works, to which perhaps may be added the Kâmil-nâme dedicated to him which he perhaps does not mention as his own because it was the result of his official activities.

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

As a poet he is praised by Sehi, who completed his Hecht Elikle in 1943 in the time of his grand vizirate. But the numerous verses scattered through his history are not by him. Veres certainly by him are very mediocre. Besides, he does not show much sympathy with poets as the contemptuous attitude to 'Ali Celebi, author of the Hecht Elikle, shows, to whom he makes the reproach that he had spent 30 years on this work instead of dealing with questions of state.

His importance as a historian cannot however be too highly estimated. His Aşaf-nâme, a kind of mirror for historians, a textbook of ethics for viziers in which he sought to make available for his successors his wide experience of administration, obtained a certain success, as the not inconsiderable number of existing manuscripts suggests (ed. and trans. by R. Tschudi, Berlin 1910; ed. by 'Ali Amiri, Constantinople 1526). But his history Ta'mül-al-Asl-i Osmanbe is still more important. It is now accessible in n, however, in other mediocritie, edition (Constantinople, 1548-50). Lutfi Pasha, Tököly, Türken Zeitung, 28, 1848; Weidemann, Verzeichniss, No. 25, from an incomplete copy found by M. Tököly in Berlin, supplemented by the formerly unique copy in Vienna by 'Ali used by von Hämmerl (Filig, ii, 234, No. 1804).

Lutfi Pasha not only models his title on those of the old Ottoman chronicles but he copies this primitive style of historiography in his manner and style, which forms a striking contrast to the elaborate Persianistic court style. Down to Sultan Edipurl he is only a copyist. Then however fol-
MA' AL-'A'INAIN AL-SHingtTY, the name by which the famous agitator in Mauritania [q.v.] at the end of the 16th century and beginning of the 17th century is best known (several explanations of his sobriquet are given; the literal meaning is "the water of the eye"; but the most satisfactory seems to be that which sees in it simply a symbolism, like that in the expression of his namesake) in which the majority of religious leaders of the Saharan countries of North Africa, like his more immediate followers, who became well known throughout Morocco by their nickname of "blue men" on account of their costume, consisting of a djellaba of Almuni (a cotton stuff from Guinea), a turban and a burnous, all blue in colour. They were also called 'Ainiyya, from the name of their master, and al-Shingtayi (Shingtayt), "the men of Shingtayi".

Ma' al-'A'ınain very soon entered into regular relations with the Sulaym of Morocco. He had already made a sojourn in the country on his journey to the holy places of Islam, in the reign of Mawlyy 'Abdl al-Rahmao n b. Hisham [q.v.] (1218-1276 = 1752-1810). Later and especially in the reign of Mawlyy al-Hamn [q.v.] (1290-1345 = 1873-1894) he travelled regularly to Marrakesh and to Fas and was welcomed by the Sulaym, whom he supplied with slaves (in which he also dealt). When the young Mawlyy 'Abd al-Aziz [q.v.] ascended the throne in 1311 (1894), he sent him his hussars and went to visit him in 1896 in Marrakesh. The Sulaym gave him a gift in his southern capital of a site for a dhargha of his order and he hired him a steamer to take him with his suite from the Moroccan port of Mogador to that of Tariku (the natural harbour of the Rio de Oro) for his capital Smara. This little port henceforth became of some importance: German ships, Greek and Spanish sailing-vessels disembarked there merchandise from Morocco and considerable cargoes of arms and ammunition, all consigned to the agitator to enable him to supply...
his followers and arm the Moorish tribes to enable them to fight French expansion beyond the frontiers of Senegal. For several years Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn was able to maintain in all the vast area under his influence an atmosphere hostile to French penetration into Mauritania. He was largely the instigator of the anti-foreign outbreaks, which after the assassination on May 2, 1905, near Tijjālīya of the explorer Xavir Copppolani decided France to occupy Tājānī in 1906.

All the paramounties, Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn, having assembled the chiefs of the great Moorish tribes who were in alliance with him, took them to Fās to demand the alliance and assistance of Morocco against France in Mauritania. He was favourably received by Māwlyāʿ Abū ʿAbd Allāh Abū Kātib and succeeded in getting a cousin of the Sultan, Māwlyāʿ ʿAbdul, sent to al-ʿAḍrār as representative of the māḥkūm. At the same time Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn was authorised to install himself in the Moorish ḥaṣb of Tissnī, to summon to the holy war and to rally around him all the warriors of the Sahara from al-Ṣūtī to the region of Sāḥyāt al-Ḥamīnī. The hopes that Māwlyāʿ Abū ʿAbd Allāh Abū Kātib had based on the promised assistance of Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn were disappointed. After the occupation of Ujda and the destruction of Sāḥyāt by the French he had to disown Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn. The latter had no longer a chance even in his own country, where a fatal blow was struck at his power as a result of the al-ʿAḍrār expedition in the course of which French troops led by Colonel Gouraud completely scattered his forces. Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn had however not lost all hope of regaining his former influence in his old territory. He aimed even higher, when in May 1908 he did not hesitate to proclaim himself Sūfīn and to attempt the conquest of Morocco, which he thought had been sold to the infidels by the Alawai sovereigns. Having united around him all the tribes of the Anti-Atlas and of al-Ṣūtī as well as his own followers, he reached Marrakāk and from this town tried to take Fās by surprise, taking the road through the Central Atlas. But he was checked in his advance near Tarīfī [q.v.] by a column under General Moinier which routed him completely on June 23, 1908. He just managed to escape and reach al-Ṣūtī where he was abandoned by all his followers and had to sell his slaves and flocks in order to live. He retired to the ḥamāma of Tissnī, where he died on 17th Shawwal 1232 (Oct. 28, 1910).

Two years later, the son of Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn, Abdur al-Hība, in his turn attempted to proclaim himself Sūfīn. Proclaiming himself the Malik, he set out from Tissnī and entered Marrakāk on Aug. 18, 1914, where he had himself proclaimed, while his troops put the city to fire and sword. But on Aug. 29, al-Hība was defeated at Bengetīrī by Colonel Mangin, who after a second encounter at Sūlī Bu Uthnā entered Marrakāk on Sept. 7 following.

Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn, who had very many open or secret followers in Morocco has left in the country the reputation of a true ascetic and a great doctor in Sīlah. The hair shaved, the face veiled, always clad in white, he only appeared in public during festival occasions. Māʿal-ʿAlāʾīn led an austere life, lived exclusively on milk, dates and mutton. A well-read man, he composed many pious works, books on theology, mystic Ṣūfīan, astronomy, astrology, books full of contemplative reveries, on theological and dogmatic controversies, on metaphysical theories, and of magical formulae to acquire riches and power by occult means. Like his father and his brother, he loved to spread among his disciples a reputation as a worker of wonders and a thaumaturgist. These magical practices much increased his prestige in Seguïat (al-Sīkṣīyā al-Ḥamīnī) and in Morocco (K. Richet, La Mauritanie, Paris, 1920, p. 126—127).

MA'ADD, a collection of laws for certain Arab tribes, in the traditional usage for those of North Arabian origin (Mujar and Sabrā), in contrast to the Yemen tribes. This contrast said to be inherent in the name Ma'add seems already to be found frequently in the early posts, always presuming the genuineness of the passages in question. Thus in a verse of Imru 'l-Kays (Ahmad, No. 41, I. 5) the term Ma'add is used apparently in the sense of excluding the Thäib, Tays, and Kinda, and in Nīqūm (Ahmad, No. 13, I. 1, 2), the Qassān. Tradition also records fighting between Ma'add and Yemen in the pre-Muhammadan period (cf. Yākūt, ii. 434; Ibn Batūtā, p. 164). At a later period the genealogical list links the two tribes in a way that contradicts their real relations in South Arabia, where the rivalry between North and SouthArabians had become the dividing political element in the fighting of the Omayyad and 'Abbasid periods (passages quoted in Goldsmid, see below. "Bibl.").

The fact that the name Bani is not found combined with Ma'add as well as the form of the word itself suggests that Ma'add may originally have been of similar foundation and meaning to Ma'adjar, a general name for "people", body of people. Ibn Duraid: (faytīya, p. 20) long ago suggested the derivation from the root "sad." To count, numbers, not however without adding other very different attempts to interpret it. The usual genealogical scheme of Arab tradition has inserted in it the name Ma'add as the name of an ancestor of an eponymous series, namely a son of the traditional founder 'Adūn: Ma'add is brought into connection with the history of Mecca by the legend that he married Ma'nāma, a daughter of the Dhūn-nāmas. From this marriage were born Nizar, father of the tribal eponym Mūsā, Rahmān and 'Yūsīd. According to Abu 'l-Fadl, "Hist. Anti-

Bibliography: Talhurt, I. 671 sqq.; Ma'add (Pseudo-Balsh), ed. Hann, p. 103 sqq. On the origin and history of the fadda between North and South Arabian cf. Goldsmit, Mu-

AMARRAT MAṣRIN or MIBRIN, capital of a nāhiya of Ḥalab. The name is also written Ma'arrat Maṣrin which has been wrongly taken as an abbreviation of Ma'arrat Kāsmīn (Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, p. 497). In Syrian manuscripts of the eighth century, the town is called Ma'arrat Maṣrin. (Wright, Catalogue of the Syrian MSS. in the Brit. Mus., 1454, dated 745 A.H., and Lewis, "Manuscripts in Libraries in Greece or Evangelica domnocephalos," London 1910, q.v.) a palimpsest under a collection of biographies of holy women, written by a monk Yohannan Styliotes of Beth Mary Kāsim, a monastery of the town of Ma'arrat-Maṣrin in the Khilah of Antioch.)

In the year 16, Abū 'Ubaydah defeated a large Greek army which had assembled between Ḥalab and Ma'arrat Maṣrin and then took the town, which capitulated under conditions similar to Ḥalab (al-Baladhurī, Futūḥ, ed. de Goeje, p. 149). In the reign of the Caliph Mutawakkil, 'Amr b. Hawwar, the native of Ma'arrat al-Burādhiyya (cf. Yākūt, Muḥa-

It is not clear who is responsible for this translation. The text appears to be a study of the Ma'add tribe, their genealogy, and their relationships with other tribes, particularly in South Arabia. The text also discusses the name Bani and its usage, and the genealogical scheme of Arab tradition. The text mentions the location of Ma'arrat Maṣrin, a town in Syria, and its historical significance. The text concludes by mentioning the defeat of a Greek army by Abū 'Ubaydah in the year 16. This translation is presented as accurately as possible, but may require further clarification or research. Please provide feedback if you find any errors or omissions. This section is part of the larger text, which may include biographies, historical events, and genealogical data.
of Shaghur and Bakra, al-Râjil and Ma'ar'at Ma'srin, which he exchanged about five years later for 'Ain Shih, Râwândah and Zîth (Kumait al-Dim, truml. Blocketz, R. O. Z., v. 64, 72; Abu 'l-Fîrîd', Annali Musulmoni, ed. Reiske, iv., Copenhagen 1792, p. 317).

The town has not been much visited by modern travellers. Jullien describes Ma'ar'at Ma'srin as a large village, lying among sacred fields and olive trees. It is said that the fertility of the country: the soil there is unusually fertile, fig. trees are numerous and roses are growing by roadside". In modern times the name of the town is often written Mašarin (with the article) e.g. by J. B. I. J. Kowalski (Descrip. du Pachaluk de Haleh, in Kungfrunden des Orient, Vienna 1814, iv. p. 11), Kütter (Beschaut., xvii., p. 1576), Garrell (Publication of an American Archæologist, Expedition to Syria, New York 1914, part I., p. 119) etc.

Not to be confused with our town is Ma'ar'at al-Ibbân (also called Ma'ar'at al-Akhdâm) e.g. of it, sometimes called simply Ma'ar'at, e.g. by Sarail (Geographia, 1787, viii., p. 241; Mašarin, p. 56), according to whom in Arabic it is strongly given this name, 'white houses bare and exposed with its white sugar-cone like roofs on a wide plain'. According to al-Djârîr of Hâlab (d. 843) and Ibn al-Shîhûm (edited by Abu S. Yûnis al-Baybarsînî in the eleventh century), Ma'ar'at was earlier called Dâbil al-Kâfîrî (Z. D. M. G., xx. 182; Ibn al-Shîhûm, ed. Cheikh, Hâlî, 1909, p. 164, 183, Lammone, M. F. O. B., 1905, iv. p. 240). But this statement is due to confusion with Ma'ar'at al-Nâmûn (cf. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale, Paris 1927, p. 213, note 4).

"Bibliographie: al-Ibbân: al-'Ibbânî, R. G. A., xiv., Suppl. to R. G. A., 151; ibn al-Hajjâ, in R. G. A., iii. 45; Ma'ar'arat, 156 (Ma'ar'arat Kinnarat); ibn Khrûshshîhî, in R. G. A., vi. 75; Vâghîl, M., ed. Wustenfeld, iv. p. 574; Sa'dî al-Dîn, Mâqûlî al-'Ibbânî, ed. Yajballih, iii. 120; Abu 'l-Fîrîd', ed. Reinsaud and de Soun, p. 251; Ibn al-Shîhûm, ed. Cheikh, Hâlî, 1909, p. 157, 165; Le Strange, Palastine under the Muslims, p. 497; Gaudemus-Demolyne, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. 199, note 37; H. Demarest, Vie d'Othman, p. 78; Alexander Trumonnd, Travels through different States of Germany, Italy, Greece, and several parts of Asia, London 1784, p. 290 (Martimichus); J. Berggren, Europa och Europa medeltider, Stockholm 1826, part ii., p. 153 (Ma'ar'arat Ma'srin); Kaspii Nihârî, Reisereisung nach Arabien und iiber den vo. unliegenden Ländern, Hamburg 1837, vol. iii., p. 100 (Masrûr Ma'srin); Thomson, Bibliotheca sacra et theologicala, vol. 18, v. 665 (Masrûr [or Ma'ar'arat], 675 (Masrûr Ma'srin) [?]; Jullien, Sinai et Syrie, Lille 1883, p. 284 (Ma'ar'arat Ma'srin); Mechi'el de Voghio, La Syrie centrale, Paris 1861-1864, passim (Ma'ar'arat Ma'srin); R. Garret, in American Archæologist, Expedition to Syria, New York 1914, part I., p. 119 (Ma'ar'arat al-Masrin).

MA'ARRAT AL-NÂMUN, a town in northern Syria, often called simply MA'ARRAT. It is celebrated as the birthplace of the poet Abu 'l-'Alî' Ahmad al-Ma'ar'at (q.v.). According to al-Sam'ânî (Alîkh al-'Awhâd, reproduced by D. S. Maqbool, 'G. M. S., xx., 1912, ed. 536, 1, 4) the name (from the place-name was Ma'ar'arat to distinguish it from that of Ma'ar'at Ma'srin. The town probably lay on the site of the ancient Ara which is called Kaños-Abîn̄ in an inscription. Yaqût says that Ma'ar'at al-Nâmûn is an old town in ruins. Nâšîr Khur-rawî in 438 (1437) found on the town wall a stone column with an inscription in some language not Arabic and Ibn al-Shîhûm also talks of old pillars. According to Hâlebî, the site of the town is called Būrûm. But the remains of a Greek inscription in the Madrasa (Foyoth, p. 203, note 4).

The town received its new name, to distinguish it from the numerous other Syrian towns of the same name, from the Companion of the Prophet, al-Nâmûn b. Bâqîr, who was governor of this district under Ma'ar'at and whom we find there. According to another tradition it is called after al-Nâmûn b. 'Adi al-Shîrî of the tribe of Tanûqî. An earlier name of the town according to Ibn Bâqîrûn and Khâlid al-fârî (ed. Ravaise, p. 43) was Dâbil al-Kâfîrî, according to al-Djârîr (Q.), al-'Ibbânî (R. G. A., xiv.), ibn Khîrshshîhî (R. G. A., vi. 75). This is strongly given this name, 'white houses bare and exposed with its white sugar-cone like roofs on a wide plain'. According to al-Djârîr of Hâlab (d. 843) and Ibn al-Shîhûm (edited by Abu S. Yûnis al-Baybarsînî in the eleventh century), Ma'ar'at was earlier called Dâbil al-Kâfîrî (Z. D. M. G., xx. 182; Ibn al-Shîhûm, ed. Cheikh, Hâlî, 1909, p. 164, 183, Lammone, M. F. O. B., 1905, iv. p. 240). But this statement is due to confusion with Ma'ar'at al-Nâmûn (cf. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale, Paris 1927, p. 213, note 4).

As early as 278 (891-892) we find Yaqût giving the title Tanûqî to the inhabitants of the town. The district around it was one of the parts of Syria most strongly settled by Maronites (al-Ma'surî, Alîkh al-Tanûqî, ed. de Goeje, 1533). As there was no running water near the town, its inhabitants had to collect rain-water in cisterns. But the country round was rich in olive, fig, pistachio and almond trees; wine was also made here as in the ancient Ama. According to Ibn Tîbîsî the orchards stretched far nearly two days journey from the town and formed one of the richest and most fertile areas in the world. South of Ma'ar'at al-Nâmûn, just beside the town wall, according to local tradition, the tomb of Joshua son of Nun; but Yaqût says his grave was really at Nâsîrûn (cf. Goldscheider, Muhamschidische Traditionen über den Grabort des Jonas, in Z. D. P. F., iv., 15-17. The Tâ'înîs Nâsîr Allah Yûsîî in Ma'ar'at al-Nâmûn still bears the name of Joshua and has an inscription (dated 604 (1207-1201) (van der Heijden, Velge in Syrie, p. 202, note 4).

When Abî 'l-'Alî came to Ma'ar'at al-Nâmûn in the year 1067 (457), the people showed him such welcome and hospitality to pay 'Umar and 'Abd al-Shîrî (al-Kalâbî, Alîkh, ed. de Goeje, 1364, 132; Câstani, Annali dell'Ottoman, iii., p. 794, 284); Th. Câlîpih, 'Umar II was buried in 1061 in the monastery of Simeon (Dal Sottà, s. al-Nâmûn (Nasîrûn) not far from Ma'ar'at al-Nâmûn (Hoffmann, Z. S., iv., 1922, p. 17). Dussaud, Topographie historique de
in Syria, Paris 1927, p. 184). 'Abdallah b. Tahir appointed by the Caliph al-Mu'āwīya in 207 as successor of his father in the governorship of Syria, destroyed the fortifications of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, while fighting against Nāṣr b. Shabib and many small towns like Ḥijra al-Kafir and Ḥijja Ḥanāfū (Kamāl al-Dīn in Freytag, Selten or historia Halab, Paris 1819, p. 20). In 390 the Byzantines under 'Alī ibn Abī al-ʿAbdīr captured the town (Batiq al-Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Hīna, Ḥanīfah, and Samalūn, six miles from the town, and captured the women and children into captivity. The Baal Kīlāb in 325 (930-935) entered Syria from al-Nejd and advanced on Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. The commander there, Ma'ādīl b. Sa'īd, went out to al-Bārāghīlī (site unknown) to meet them, but was captured there with the greater part of his army, and only later released by the Kīlāb Abū Tābīlib Abūl-Mu'min b. Sa'īd, governor of Halab. The latter and the Kīlāb Šams al-Dawla in 332 were driven from Halab by al-Hamūn b. Ša'īd b. Ḥamūn, Sulīf al-Dawla's uncle and possessor of the majority of the country. The victors, Ma'ādīl b. Sa'īd and his. Kīlāb the governor of Egypt in 333, advanced against Sulīf al-Dawla as far as Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, which he took. Ma'ādīl b. Sa'īd, whom Ikhshīd had again installed there as governor was slain in battle at Khumair by Sulīf al-Dawla. In 357 (968) the emperor Nāṣir-i 'Alī Phocco took the town and destroyed its chief mosque and most of the walls. When Kārgātiyya seized Aleppo, Zuhai'ir the governor of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān joined the Hamānīs Sulīf al-Dawla (358) and set out with him from Manbij against Aleppo; it was only when the Greeks Turbaši brought help to Kārgātiyya that the pair retired to al-Isnāfūn and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. In the year 376/1084, Nāṣir-i 'Alī Phocco and Kārgātiyya (Sulāf 359) Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was promised to the latter. Sulīf al-Dawla held out in it for three years. Bākūdūr had deposed and imprisoned Kārgātiyya in Halab and made himself sole ruler (364 = 975). Sulīf al-Dawla set out from Hīna against him and with the Baal Kīlāb whom he had won over to his side by promising them lands at Hīna besieged Zuhai'ir, who was an ally of Bākūdūr, in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. He forced his way with his followers into the town through the Hūnaqā gate; when they were repulsed, they burned the Hīnaqā gate. Zuhai'ir thereupon surrendered and was executed in the citadel of Fāsīyā; the citadel of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was plundered by the conqueror. When Kummāt, a Mamlūk of Sulīf al-Dawla ("Sulīf") rebelled in 396 in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān against Sulīf al-Dawla, the latter with Luṭū' went to besiege the town but retired to Halab on the approach of Bandjatakīn (Freytag, Loci summales, p. 45, l. 6); Luṭū' who had seized the power in Halab in 392, next year had Kafr Rūma in the district of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and the fortress in the Awūdū (the two districts of al-Rāq, cf. Rosen, Zep. imp. Arkad. Nomencl., xlv, p. 337, note 200) destroyed to prevent them falling into the hands of his enemies. Luṭū' in 414 joined the forces of the Mamlūk Mu'lī al-Dawla Tūsī, he occupied Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. In 452 on his campaign against his nephew Maḥmūd, Thamūl spent eight days in the town; the inhabitants suffered severely as the Arabs on an account of the severe winter were billeted in the houses and did much damage there. Maḥmūd after occupying Halab in 457 allotted Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān to the Turk chief Hārūn; on Shawa'il 17, 458, the latter entered the town with Turks, Daulandis, Kurds, and men of the tribe of al-Awād, about 1000 fighting men besides camp-followers. They pitched their camp before the gate at which public prayers were said. Although excellent discipline prevailed among them and no one injured the trees or plants in the courtyard of the town, the inhabitants ravaged more freely when they left the town again to assist Maḥmūd on his campaign against the Kīlāb. In 462 Turks in large numbers came out of Byzantine territory against Halab, went via Ṭumūk al-Ḥājāt, Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Kafarjīth, Hīna, Ḥanīfah and Rahilān, and laid Syria waste in dreadful fashion. The Turk Tūnūsh in 472 undertook a campaign from Damascus against the north of Syria; he burned the region of Ḥijāl al-Sa'īdīn and Ḥijāl b. 'Uqlām, exterminated enormous swarms from the people of Sārin and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and plundered the country. The last of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was laid siege by 'Alī Sharī'ī of Tall Manas (Σαλναράς) in vain and burned Ma'arrat al-Rayyātīa (the ancient Μαραταρίας) in the district of Kafarjīth. His son Rīwān in 488 gave the town of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān with its land to Ṣāḥibān b. 'Urayj. Soon after the taking of Antkiya (1491) the Franks advanced on our town, supported by the people of Tall Manas, and all the Christians in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān itself but they were defeated between these two towns. In the beginning of 492 they again besieged the town with a large army (then aρῆς μαζηστηρία, Will. of Tyre, vii. 6) and took it, killing almost the whole population, 20,000 men, women and children (C. de Wych, iii. 492 sqq.). Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was, like Jerusalem in the same year, completely sacked and the walls and mosque destroyed. During the siege the Franks had destroyed all the gardens round the town and the Kīlāb, who had come to the help of Rīwān, consumed all the supplies of the district so that the country was completely starved. In 496 Rīwān reconquered the lost fortress. At the end of 514, he concluded a treaty with the Franks by which the latter were allotted Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Kafarjīth, al-ʾIrāk and a part of Ḥijāl al-Sa'īdīn etc. In 521 (1137) the Alšag Zangi regained Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. When the inhabitants asked to have restored to them the estates of which the Franks had deprived them, he demanded the original charters of ownership from them but they had been destroyed. He therefore had search made in the books of the office of the financial department of Halab (Dast🙌ir Dīn al-Ḫalab) and found from the old payments of ḥāriyah what families had owned property and restored them (Ibn al-ʿAlī, in Tornberg, xi. 24 = Hist. or. de Croes, i. 453; Abu ʿl-ʿAlī, Annalist Islam., ed. Reiske, iii. 470; v. 374); Zangi razed the walls. While King Fulco of Jerusalem was putting down a rising in Antkiya, Turkoman tribes entered the district of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and Kafarjīth but were driven out again by the Franks who thereupon conquered Kafr Ṭalab b. Maḥāb (Kemāl al-Dīn, Hist. or. de Croes, iii. 667, where our town is meant by al-Ma'arrāt, not Ma'arrat Maqrin as Rūshīkh, Gesch. d. Königre. Jerusalem, p. 107 assumes). The Byzantine emperor John II Comnenos in 532 (1138) invaded the district of Ma'arrat al-
Nu'mân and then turned suddenly against Shairar (q.v.) which he besieged in vain. The earthquake of 552. (1157—1158) wrought great havoc in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân (Kamal al-Din, transl. Lochet, in R.O.L., v. 590).

Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân in 718 (1388) went from Halab to Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân from which he made a pilgrimage to the Shaihkh Abd Zakkariya al-Maghribi who lived at the tomb of the Caliph Umar. Towards the end of the reign of Sahib al-Din (c. 1191) the town formed part of the Syrian possessions of Taqi al-Din. (Hist. Or. d. Crois., iv. 14.) Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân is several times mentioned in the wars between Sahib al-Din's sons. Abu'l-Fath is said to have invaded Ma'arrat al-Muqafarat a fourth time but was driven out (ibid.).

Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân is a separate province (q.v.). Henceforth Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân formed a wilayet of this province (al-Ka'kashandi in Guadet's Demouyynes, La Syrie a l'epoque des Mamelouks, p. 233). In the Mamluke period the town had seven gates (according to al-Rauw al-Musir fi Akhbar al-Musir, quoted in al-Kal'kashandi, Cairo, iv. 342). the Halab gate, the great gate, that of Shihb, called after the adjoining tomb of Seth, the garden gate, the Hems Gate and the like gate (insha' probably a double gate of Hems). Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân was a station of the Egyptian pigeons-post (al-Umar, Tala'if, transl. R. Hartmann, in D.M.G., i, 591, 1; al-Kal'kashandi, iv. 393). After the battle of Marj Dhibih in 522 (1516) the town passed to the Ottoman. Delia Valle a military later found here (1616) a native chief under Turkish suzerainty and the Agus who lived there in Pucosco's time while paying tribute to the Porte retained complete independence. Troilo found in the town 'twelve houses Wirths-Hauses, das eine war sienlich baulandig, das andere aber noch wohl wunderlich, umb und umb alt und in einem langen beytern Tuffeln bedecket.' Sestrens describes Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân as the most northerly place in the Pashalik of Damascus (Sturtys). Walpole was a guest of the mutasarrif of the town. The district of the town later became a khilif (ibid. iv. 35). The fort of Halab. When Sivas passed the Euphrates it was in 1879, a king's horse was living there, the frontier with Syria was at Khân Shakhzûd. After the world-war the town was included in the district under French mandate. According to Sachi it has about 40 well built houses and with its well-cared-for gardens and fields looks a peaceful and prosperous country town, while von Berchem calls it "a large village of rather dismal appearance"; it lies in a monotonous but well tilled plain at the foot of the eastern edge of the plateau of the Djebel Rifâ'. In the north-west it is commanded by the high hill on which stand the remains of the mediæval citadel (on the map of G. Garret and F. A. Norris, in America, Arch. et Histoire, s. 50 and Peinet's Exp. in Div. ii, Sect. 2. part 3). Ka'dar in Nu'mân is wrongly placed north-east of the town, cf. however also van Berchem, Voyage, p. 202 and Ellis Smith in Ritter, Erzih, xvii. 1007 and Sachau, Reten, p. 945. Among the architectural features of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân the most notable, next to the great mosque, is the already mentioned Shihb Madrasa (built in 1557). A notable building of the Ottoman period is a large square caravanserai on the south side of which is a fine gateway with an inscription of 974 (1566—1567). Sykes was shown by the K'iznumah, a group of the sights of the place the (alleged?) tomb of the poet Abu'l-Fath.
progress in the last few years, is still often called by its original name of Udjong-pandang (Lum-pandang). The Dutch gave it the name Macassar from the kingdom of the same name. The heart of the Macassar country is the former principality of Gowa, which was not under the direct rule of the Dutch East India government in 1641 and is a remnant of the once very powerful kingdom of Macassar. The area inhabited by the Macassars is the wider area stretching over the southern part of the southwestern peninsula of Celebes, as well as over the island of Sabler and several groups of islands in the neighbourhood.

The remainder of southern Celebes is inhabited by Bugis who are closely related to the Macassars and whose language, manners and customs are very similar. The Macassars do not differ much in physical appearance from the javanese; they are of above medium height and in general well built. Their mode of life, dress and dwellings are simple. The main industry is agriculture which is very successful as the generally fertile soil in the plains is rich, and often on wet fields in the mountains maize particularly, but also vegetables and leguminous plants, and cacao-nuts. The cattle-raising also is not unimportant. The native industries which are carried on in the houses of natives are not on a very high level; the work of the gold and silver-smiths is relatively good. An unfavourable verdict has often been passed on the character of the Macassars but this seems to be exaggerated; it is found difficult to submit to a regular life but for the most part they are not difficult to govern. Among their vices are their fondness for dice and cock-fighting. Originally three classes were distinguished in Macassar society, the princes and nobles, the people, and the slaves. Slavery has now been abolished even in the districts under independent rule.

The population generally professes Islam and its laws are on the whole conscientiously observed and the Muslim principalities faithfully celebrated. But one cannot of course say that Islam regulates the whole of their social and religious life. The customs which survive from an earlier period are very numerous and form a striking contrast to the ideas of Islam. In a very village there is still found a little building which is used for the worship of the spirits of the animistic period (the chief of whom is Karang Loe, i.e. the "great prince") and where heathen priests offer sacrifices. There can therefore be no question of fanaticism and the very simple mosques are in general in disrepair. The highest Mahomedan office is filled by the kulit, usually a man of princely descent, who used formerly to be appointed and dismissed by the king. He had control of all matters relating to worship and he also gave legal decisions in questions of inheritance and played an official part in marriages and divorces. These duties are also in the hands of Muslim notables as preachers and preachers, performed the offices of a sexton and gave elementary religious instruction. Their knowledge of Islam is usually very slight. The revenues of their clergy consists of the sabbas (zakat), the jibura (jizya) and of presents on all sorts of occasions at which they take part, and of a certain percentage (jizbel) on the division of inheritances. The sabbas is irregularly and insufficiently paid, the jibura much better.

No particulars are known of the early history of Macassar, and of the regions inhabited by the Macassars in general. In the middle of the 13th century they were under the rule of the Hindu-Indian kingdom of Madjapahit. According to the native chronicles of the royal houses of Gowa and Telo, which, at least so far as the earliest period is concerned, are largely mythical, the Gowa originally consisted of an alliance of nine small districts each under a noble, after the government had passed into the hands of one man and the kingdom had expanded, to include for example the lands of what was later Telo. Gowa is said, after the death of the sixth king (at the same time the first whom the chronicles regard as an ordinary mortal), to have been divided between his two sons: the one became the king of Gowa and the other of Telo. It is certain that, so far as our knowledge goes, there were always close relations between these two kingdoms and that there was a certain degree of unity about them; they were known together to Europeans as the "kingdom of the Macassars". About the year 1512 Malays from Sumatra were given permission to settle in Macassar and it was perhaps they who first brought Muslim ideas to South Celebes. When the Portuguese appeared there in the middle of the century, they found only a few foreigners there, who were Muslim; it was not till the beginning of the 17th century, that the arrival of Macassars in general adopted the new religion. During the reign of Tumidjallu (1555-90), Usbithul, king of Terano, came to Macassar, concluded a treaty and at the same time attempted to introduce the Muslim religion into South Celebes. In 1603 Sultan Ali-Muluk and one of his brothers became converts to Islam, which then spread rapidly over Gowa and Telo, chiefly through the influence of Karmang Motawary, administrator of Gowa and prince of Telo. We find traditions about the first preaching of Islam in South Celebes, similar to those of other parts of the archipelago. They are particularly associated with a certain Dato-ri-Sulung, a Minangkabau peasant from Tidunggal, who is said to have landed about 1606 in Telo and to have preached the Muslim faiths, at the same time performing all kinds of miracles.

Next to him, the two main apostles of Islam are said to have been his contemporaries Dato-Si-Tiro and Isto-Patimang. Their tombs are still much visited. In the first half of the 18th century, the kingdom of Macassar extended very much, so that it brought under its sovereignty almost the whole of the Celebes, but the Portuguese, French, Spanish and the eastern coast of Formosa. The Dutch East India Company, which had a good deal of trouble with the Macassars, did not succeed till 1629, in concluding a treaty with them, which permitted freedom of trade but allowed them no permanent settlement. But in Macassar caused the Company further difficulties in the Moluccas, a war was concluded in which the town was burned. By the peace concluded in 1650, the king lost a portion of his territory; the Portuguese were forbidden to remain in the kingdom while the Company were allowed to settle and trade freely in Macassar. Peace was again broken in 1665 (the Act of the Dutch East India Company, Speelman, sailed with a large fleet to Celebes, destroyed the Macassar fleet and forced the king to sign a treaty of peace ("Koninklijk Verdrag", 1667; confirmed in 1669), whereby
MACASSAR — MADAGASCAR.

With its area of 225,340 sq. m., Madagascar is the third largest island in the world after New Guinea (234,770 sq. m.) and Borneo (283,670 sq. m.). Its area is a little greater than that of France (520,000 sq. m.), Belgium (317,750), and Holland (41,774) combined. It is oriented from N.E. to S.S.W. and measures 1,000 miles in its greatest length and 350 miles in its greatest breadth with a coast line of 3,000 miles. The latest estimates put the native population at three millions.

The island was called al-Kornu by the Arabs, Buxini (lit. where there are (al) Bade), by the Bantu of the neighbouring East African coast and by certain Malagasy tribes. The Bantu called it "Island of St. Lawrence" because they discovered it on that saint's day, August 10, 1506, and finally it became known as Madagascar from Marco Polo's name for it. The orthography ماداگاسکار vulgarised gave rise to the false etymology Diancubal al-Kornu "island of the moon," with which the Portuguese historians became acquainted in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and which survived down to the end of the eighteenth century among the sailors of Southern Arabia.

The name Kornu appears for the first time in the Küch Schir Afar of Muhammad b. Miss al-Khudadim (d. 220 = 833 or 320 = 845), in which mention is made of the famous "mountain of Kornu," جبل الموemet في الروضات, in which the Nile was reputed to rise. But the interpretation by جبل الموemet أب صغير "mountain of the moon" was already old in the ninth century for it is found as early as the 6th century of Ptolemy, who put the whole of Arab geographers and notably al-Khwarizmi took as a model. The mountain called "of Kornu," or "of the moon," is mentioned by all the Muslim geographers who dealt with eastern Africa. We shall see below how and to what degree the name of this mountain is connected with that of Kornu = Madagascar.

In my memoir entitled Le Kornu dans les sources géographiques antiques (1901), I have endeavoured to trace the origin of the name Kornu; the documents there utilised enable it to be connected with the name of the Kornos and of the Kornos

Kuan-lun of the Chinese. The Chinese sources speak also to East Africa in which the Lu fan is a Kao Ju-ku (1225) reproducing word by word two passages of the Liang shu of Cow Ka-lo (479); it is a land of Kornu-lun 昆侖 "mountain of the Zang of the qu-hin," which is close to a large island (Madoq) which is the regular home of the fēn or redha of the Arab, whose feathers are large that they can be used for holding a little bucket of water. The old name of Madagascar has survived in modern geography in the name of the Comoro Islands, the little archipelago lying to the N.W. of the island.

In his Explorations portugaises et Madagascar (Toulon, 1843), F. T. Chevalier, a member of the French Consular Service, speaks of the connexion between Madagascar and the sub-appliance Moros in Asie, as Toulon explicas, 1914, p. 393; F. H. v. d. Kemp, P. F. T. Chevalier's work was a result of the commission for the survey of Madagascar and sub-appliance furnished by the Government of the Dutch East Indies in 1885-1887 (Exped. Archipel. Naut., 3, 1897, p. 317). It is to be connected with the Malagasy word mahuha "king-
dom, subjects” (phonetically: malagash), which is a plural Bantu form (w-a-Rah) malagasson => Bantu plural form, -a-. It is phonetically not the same as Malag. -a-Rah, which reflects nothing, whether we take the form with soft letters malagasi or that with hard noted by the Portuguese: matava-hi. Not do we know whether we have to deal with a western Indonesian root or a Bantu stem. In any case it is probable that we have to deal here with a foreign tribal name, the eastern or western origin of which can no longer be explained from an ancient or modern language.

In the Arab geographers the first detailed account of the island of Komor-Madagascar is found in the Kitâb Nuzhat al-Maghâth fi lâqâdat al-Ifrîqî (1154) of al-Idrisi who included the large African island in the country of the Zang. The people of the island of Zbang = Sumatra” he says in the seventh section of the first cime come to the country of the Zangi in large and small ships and use it as a centre for trading in their merchandise as they understand one another’s language” (MS. 221 of the Bibl. Nat. Paris, f. 296, l. 15). This passage is very important as it shows that in the sixteenth century, Madagascar, wrongly located in the country of the Zangi, had been long before colonised by immigrants from Sumatra who had introduced their language into the island and Malagasy was derived from it. In the eighth section of the same cime the island of Komor (Sumatra) is situated seven days’ sail from the town of Malasy. Its king lives in the town of Malasy. This is an island of months’ journey in length. It begins nearly the Maldives and ends in the north opposite the islands of China. The geographer of Roger of Sicily, as his map shows, has combined into one huge island Madagascar, Ceylon and a part of Sumatra. In the ninth section, we are told that the people of Komor and the merchants of the land of the Malährâsi (= Sumatra) come to the inhabitants of the east coast of Africa and are welcomed by them and trade with them (cf. my Relations de Voyage, Index, s.v. Komor and Komor).

Yâhil in his Madjum (completed in 1824) says simply (vol. v., p. 174) “al-Komor is an island in the centre of the sea of the Zangi, which contains no larger island than this. It contains a large number of towns and kingdons. Each king makes war on the others. Amber and the leaf al-komor (ibid.) are found on its shores. This is a perfume; it is also called bsef flower. Wax is also obtained from it”. The Kitâb al-Maghâdir of the same author contains identical information taken from the Madjum (ed. Wutenfeld, p. 338) but the latter text has more correctly “the leaf al-komor”.

Abu l-Hassan Ali b. Said al-Maghribi, best known as Ibn Said, was born in 32 08 or 1314 near Granada and died at Damascus in 1374 or in Tunis in 1386. The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has a copy catalogued as Ms. n° 2234, a treatise on general geography, which runs from f. 1 to 117 and is entitled: “The book collected and annotated by Abu l-H. Said al-Maghribi the Spaniard of the Book of the Geography (of Ptolomy) in seven climes; and he has added to it thelongitude and latitudes from the book of Ibn Pûtnus”. This copy of the original manuscript is dated 714 (1314–1315) and belonged to the celebrated geographer Abu l-Fidâ’i. The text contains in a few lines information of the highest importance to the following effect: “The Komor who have given their name to the mountain of this name, situated in eastern Africa are brethren of the Chinese. They originally lived with the Chinese in the eastern regions of the earth, i.e.
in the interior of the Asiatic continent. Discouraged by their experience, the latter crossed the Komor to these islands. After a certain period of time, dissensions broke out among them, and the Komor who had migrated into these islands, the king and his family migrated once more and went to the large island of Komor - Madagascar and the Komor lived in a town of this large island, called Komory. These Komor immigrants to the large island increased in numbers and spread through the different centres of the island; but new dissensions broke out and provoked a new exodus and many of them went to settle in the south at the beginning of inhabited land along the mountain which bears their name.(cf. Relations de voyage, ii. 315 sq). If we translate these successive migrations into terms of modern geography, we get the following: The Komor, related to the Chinese, originally inhabited Central Asia, migrated from the interior of the continent where they were neighbours of the Chinese to the adjoining maritime islands of the Indian Ocean, Malaya Peninsula and Java; in Decaëns ii. Book i., Chap. iv. of China, p. 352 of the little edition of 1777, the Portuguese historian Juan de Barro says that the Javanese claim to have originally come from China). They later migrated from Indonesia, more accurately from Sumatra (cf. my Empire suarnatrani de Ceylonaya in J.A., 1822, vol. xx.), to the large island which bears their name, the island of Komor - Madagascar and from there to the land of the mountain of Komor, the famous mountain which in the Nile was called Mount Sinai, West Africa. The first migration, that from Central Asia to the coasts of Bassa-Gueule etc. certainly took place long before our era. Several centuries must have passed between the departure of the immigrants from the plains of Eastern Tibet, their expansion in the region of the coast, from Burma to Indo-China and their crossing to Indonesia. Ibn Sa'd lived in the 8th century. How then would he have known of events that took place several millennia before his time and are not recorded elsewhere? Neither the history nor legends of the Far East contain anything of such happenings. The Indonesians, Simogresians, and Indo-Europeanists whom I have consulted cannot think of any text that would bear this account directly or indirectly referring to them. I am surprised at such an assertion being raised by a comparatively late Arabic text and I know no satisfactory answer. I was prepared by my studies on Madagascar to accept Ibn Sa'd's statement that the large African island was colonised by Somatians whose ancestors had come from the Asiatic Continent; this is exactly what Ibn Sa'd tells us. The agreement between the Arabic text and historical events is striking; but this undeniable agreement is unjustified for we do not know as well as we ought how and where such information could have been obtained in the 8th century. I put forward the hypothesis (Relations de voyage, ii. 330) that Ibn Sa'd might have got the information at the court of Hilal or where he spent some time in the 8th century. But we know from his biographers that the Spanish traveller lived in Baghdad, studying medicine at the 8th Institute of that city, and making extracts from manuscripts. He may have found in these works the statements he has so fortunately preserved for us.


The following geographers: Shams al-Din Abu 'Abdallah Sulayf al-Dinaghiri (d. 1335), Abu 'l-A'abbas Ahmad al-Nawawi (d. 1332), Abu 'l-Fida' (1273-1313), Ibn Khaldun (d. 1375), Makrizi (1365-1442) tell us nothing particular about the island of Komor. The town, which some of them locate in the great African island, are really in Ceylon or further east or cannot be identified (cf. Relations des Voyageurs, index, a. e. Komor and Komor).

In the 6th century Ibn Majid (cf. shams al-Din Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Majid) in his Kitab al-Fawaid (cf. Instructions générales et cérémonies arabes et portugaises, vol. i., p. 68, sq) in his Kitab al-Komor among the ten large islands of the world and mentions it after the Arabian peninsula: "The island which is the second in size", he says, "is the island of Komor. It is now an island (sic). The information I have collected orally does not agree with its size, but it is quite apart from the world and the inhabited climes of the earth. This is why there is doubt on the subject. In the large books on geography it is said to be the largest of the inhabited islands. Between it and the land of Sofia and the islands dependent on it (the Mozambique Channel) there are islands and reefs. In spite of this sailors are able to pass among the islands and reefs. The island of Komor takes its name from that of Komor, son of 'Amur son of Shem son of Noah. To the south it has the sea which the Greeks called Ogygias; this is the ocean surrounding the world (al-Mahs in Arabic). It is the beginning of the southern darkness, which is to the south of this island of Komor". Ibn Majid frequently mentions the island of Komor in his other Nautical Instructions also and it undoubtedly is Madagascar. With Susinmø al-Ma'īr (cf. below) our information becomes more definite. In his al-Ma'ārif (Chap. iv., dealing with the islands and sailing routes along their coasts (cf. Instructions générales et cérémonies arabes et portugaises, vol. ii., P. 221), he says: "Let us begin with the island of Komor: because it is a large island which stretches along the coast of Zanz and Sofia. Its northern extremity is called Rās al-Milh (= Amber Cape); it lies in 11° 32' of N'aah (4° 47' of the Great Bear = 8° 37' South; the true latitude is 11° 37'). Its southern extremity which is called Miftah (= Cape Sainte Marie) is in 3° 18' of Naga (4° 57' South; the true latitude is nearly 25° 38') according to some, in 3° 30' of Naga (4° 51' South) according to others. This latter latitude is the most accurate. There is a discussion of opinions about the direction of the sea-routes along its coasts, because this island is remote from the inhabited earth. There are two opinions regarding the direction of the route along its eastern coast: according to one some should sail S.W., W. according to others S.W. There is a third opinion that one should go W.S.W., from one end to the other of the island. This last view is that of the older sailing
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western. In my opinion, adds Sulaiman al-Mahri, it is possible that the route should be W.S.W., then S.W., then S.W., and in another direction still for two reasons: the first that it is a large island, that its coast is long and the route is also long. The second reason is that the directions given have not been verified on account of the fewness of the voyages made to this island and the insufficient nautical knowledge of those who have been there. Sailing-masters (nawā'īlim) of Zanz have told me that the route on the east coast from Rūs al-Mīlīm to the place where Naḥš is in 6 ḫarīb (13° 50') south is to the south and from this place to the south end of the island is S.-1-S.W. I have recorded that the route on its west coast from Rūs al-Mīlīm to the place where Naḥš is 6 ḫarīb (13° 50') is to the south and from this place to the south end of the island S.-1-S.W. On the west coast from Rūs al-Mīlīm to the place where Naḥš is 6 ḫarīb (16° 44') the coast is perfectly safe; from 6 ḫarīb to its south end there is a āshūr (bank or shallow) about 2 sahūr (6 hours) sail or more in length to the neighbourhood of the coast. Between the island of Komr and the coast (east coast of Africa) there are four large inhabited islands, near one another, to which the people of Zanz go. The first of these islands is Ḥabishayda (Great Comoro). It is in 11 ḫarīb of Naḥš (9° S. approx.; Murl, the capital of Ḥabishayda, is in exactly 11° 40' South). Between it and the African coast it is 16 sahūr (48 hours) sailing. The second, Mūlaḏ (our Mohandis), is in 11 ḫarīb of Naḥš (8° 37' S., true Lat. about 12° 20'); the third, Dūmān, (capital of Anjouan) which is in 11 ḫarīb of Naḥš (8° 37' S., true Lat. 12° 15') is to the east of Mūlaḏ; the fourth, Mawwūt (our Mayotte) is in 10 ḫarīb of Naḥš (9° 25' S., true Lat. 12° 46' 55''). From the east of these islands lies a great reef of rocks, with sand 4 sahūr (12 hours) sail, usually called ʿAin al-Fakhr (eye or source of the sea). The harbours of the west coast of Komr are Lāngānī (15° 17' S.), Sūdā (true Lat. approx. 15° 34' and Mansābūlī (the bay of Mahādsamba, whose west point is in approx. 15° 42' Lat.). Those of the west coast are Bender Bani Isma'īl, in the same latitude as Lāngānī, on the south side, and Tūmānī, Vohemar in 15° 21' 15''. All these ports are dangerous (for ships) except Lāngānī. Know that between Rūs al-Mīlīm and the coast of Zanz, there are 50 sahūr (150 hours) sail; and 20 sahūr (60 hours) to the east of Rūs al-Mīlīm there is an inhabited island called Munawwarī (one of the southern Maldives?). To the southeast of the island of Komr lie numerous islands called Triqānī (the Mascarene Islands); they are 12 sahūr (36 hours) sail from the island of Komr.

In his Ḧabīb al-Mundhīrī al-Fāhrī (f. 73b of the same MS), Sulaiman al-Mahri gives another description of the island of Komr which does not differ from that given above. Four pages earlier on f. 72b he mentions several other harbours on the island of Komr with their latitude calculated from the altitude of the Great Bear.

Island of Munawwarī by 11 ḫarīb; Bender Isma'īl or Bani Isma'il on the east coast and Lāngānī or Lāngānī on the west by 10 ḫarīb; Bimarūt on the east coast, Amsānīl on the west by 9 ḫarīb; the island of Ambūr (Qūṣārat al-ʿAmar) on the east coast and Bender al-Nūbī on the west by 3 ḫarīb; Noshaqī (f. 73b) on the east coast and Malāwūn (f. 73b) on the west by 7 ḫarīb; Malāwūn on the east coast (true Lat. 24° 38' 50'') and Bender al-Shūḥān (port of the banks), by 6 ḫarīb; Bender Ḥaddū on the east coast and Bender Kūrī on the west by 4 ḫarīb; Wābūya (according to the Turkish text of Sūdī, the name is illegible in MS. 2559) on the east coast and Bender Hit (or Hāt) on the west coast by 5 ḫarīb; Bender Ḥaddū (sic) on the east coast; no name known on the west coast in this latitude by 2 ḫarīb; Bender Kūrī (or Kus) on the east coast and the bay of Kūrī on the west coast by 1 ḫarīb; the majority of the names of harbours, which are sometimes found on both coasts recall nothing known elsewhere.

Malagasy undoubtedly belongs to the western Malagasy-Polynesian group of the Malayoe-Polynesian family. Down to the adoption of the Arabic alphabet, the language was only oral and, so far as we know, never written down in any alphabet. The lack of epigraphic material on the one hand and of ancient monuments on the other deprives us of any chance of regaining the past history of this vast island. Before the 18th century, a few Arabic and Chinese texts would constitute our only documents, if the linguistic substrata did not yield us some valuable information. These substrata are of two kinds, Bantu and Sanskrit.

These former are divided into three categories: 1. The borrowings of relatively recent date from Swahili, which is in turn got them from Arabic, of the type: Malag. kibutu, "sea" &c. ; < Arabic kibbat ; Malag. kombu, "coconut fibre" &c. ; < Swahili kombu &c. ; Malag. masita, "udder" &c. ; < Swahili masita &c. These loanwords are practically only found in the maritime dialects of the N.W. and W. coasts.

2. The borrowings from Swahili of the type: Malag. buli, "sea" &c. ; < Swahili buli &c. ; Malag. sūna, "master," &c. ; < Swahili sūna &c. ; Malag. bibita, "measure of rice" &c. ; < Swahili bibita, "measure of about a quart," &c. Like the preceding, these loanwords are found almost solely in the maritime dialects of the western coast; it may therefore be assumed that they also are of recent introduction.

3. The following words are, on the other hand, used mainly in the old and modern coast dialects or in the dialects of the centre and east, that is outside of the zones frequented by the sailors of the east coast of Africa, Zamibor and the Comoro. They are found in manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale and in old records of travel; they are not borrowings, but belong to an old substratum of the language: Malag. anonda "dog" &c. ; Bantu mwebu ; Malag. akungi "guinea-fowl" &c. ; Bantu kunga ; Malag. amplanandr "eas" &c. ; Bantu dama ; Malag. akinutu, akinutu, akiri "fox" &c. ; Bantu ngwembo ; Malag. anglabem "tail, fable" &c. ; Bantu angwembo ; Malag. akonvintre, akonvintre "sheep" &c. ; Bantu imbili ; Malag. veveka, veveka "green pigeon" &c. ; Bantu imweka ; Malag. larea "kind of lemon" &c. ; Bantu ngedere "little black monkey" &c. ; Malag. kโป" "in the tribal name Kasi-mumti "madame" &c. ; Bantu mosei, mosei, mosei, mosei, mosei;
Skr. śāle "glass" > Malag. ə̀sä > old Malag. ə̀säta; Skr. śāla: "melon, pumkin" > Malag. ə́sàtn; Batak ə́säta > Malag. ə́sätna.
Skr. mṛgha "cloud" > Malag. mga > old Malag. măga; Skr. mąhā "hotel" > Javanese mıhá > old Malag. māhā; Skr. māla "kind of palm-tree" > Batak mala; Malag. Javanese, Sundanese lanta > Malag. dava "kind of palm-tree"; Skr. aṃguśa "fast" > Malag. punvina > old Malag. ofa "act of fasting"; Skr. catun "four" > Atilhene catu "a square game played by women" > Malag. ə̄ṭra; Skr. māndapa "building erected on the occasion of a festival, a pavilion" > Mal. mānḍapā, pavilion, building in which guests are received > Malag. mān̄a, in composition mān̄a, "royal residence, court, palace, tribunal, a roof in the centre of the village under which business is discussed"; Skr. catura "manual, book, magic treatise" > Balinese catur "story, fable, in which animals are the principal characters" > Malag. catūhā "story, legend, tale"; Skr. tawrī "copper" > Malag. tawrī > Balinese tawrī "red copper" > Malag. tawrī, tawrī, tawrī; Skr. varunama "ginger" > Malag. bavařānu and the form with metathesis bavānu, etc.

INTRODUCTION by Muslims speaking Arabic, Islam has left numerous traces in Madagascar; the first and most important is the Arabic alphabet. The task of adapting the Arabic alphabet to the transcription of Malagasy was delicate and difficult. It was however satisfactorily accomplished. The Malagasy sounds a, i, y, e, a, e, ø, ø, ø, ø were transcribed by the corresponding Arabic letter.

The other sounds were rendered as follows: Malag. g by ֕, page; gutural ֕ by ֕ and sometimes by ֕; the group ֕ also by ֕; the sounds ֕ and ֕ which in Merina represent practically the d or t or the English d or t (they are pronounced a little farther back in the non-Merina dialects) generally by ֕, sometimes by ֕ with a tanwin (e.g. antandré, "date-palm" is rendered by ֕ and the context alone indicates whether ֕ is to be read or or or) Malag. by ֕ with a point below; ֕ by Arabic ֕; Malag. by ֕ but the Arabic ֕ is also pronounced ֕: Arabic ramaññā : Malag. ramaññá; Malag. by ֕ pronounced ֕: "little child"; the sound ֕ by ֕ and in modern Arabic-Malagasy sometimes by ֕.

The Islamised non-Semitic peoples, who have adapted the Arabic alphabet and who have to transcribe the occlusive ! have employed various notations: The Malagasy have rendered it by ֕; the Persians and following them the Muslims of the Comoro archipelago by ֕; the Swahilis of East Africa by ֕; the Malagasy adopted an unexpected solution of the problem: down to the 18th century they rendered ֕ by ֕; i.e. ֕,
contrary to Malay, each letter is vocalised, which renders the reading of Malagasy-Arabic texts easy in spite of the variations in orthography, which are too numerous to be given here.

The Arabic-Malagasy alphabet was once used over a very considerable area; at the present day, it is only used on the S.E. coast where very many natives were still using it at the end of the sixteenth century. The Malag. Muslims of the N.W. and W. prefer to use the Arabic-Comorian and Arabico-Swahili alphabet. The latter renders by the Arabic letters _redirect to Malag. 19 but this form is only used in the island of Anjoan. The dialect of this island which has a transcribes it by 19, the 1 of Persian and Turkish. The Arabic letters 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, and 19 are only found in Malagasy, when Arabic words are quoted and they are pronounced respectively 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, and 19.

Malagasy manuscripts in the Arabic character bear the generic name of 19"68 prototype; i.e., "special writing". They used to be difficult to obtain; the owners gave them an esoteric character, which did not allow their contents to be communicated to a stranger. I was able to get some copied and to acquire a few others between 1890 and 1894. The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has ten, of which eight are undoubtedly old. MSS. 2, 3, 4, and 5 came from the old Abbey of St. Germain des Prés; No. 6 is also old, although it was only acquired in 1820. Thanks to an inter-linear transcription and Latin translation by a European, which can be dated on palaeographical grounds between 1595 and 1620, it may be presumed that No. 7 reached Europe in the second half of the XVII century and must therefore have been written before that date. According to MS. No. 1, by the famous Mansa, who has been brought to France in 1743; the MS. 3, 5, 5, 5, 5 exactly classed with the Arabic manuscripts is also an old Malagasy manuscript. MS. 6, given by the Due de Donze to the Abbey of St. Germain des Prés has coloured drawings, coarsely executed of man, animals, trees, and zambalistic figures but not a single line of text. MS. No. 13, is a copy of four short modern manuscripts. With the exception of 1 and 13, all the manuscripts are on native paper, written with the 19, with native ink. Flacourt gives a detailed description of them in his Histoire de la grande ile Madagascar (p. 154 sqq. of the edition 1661). The subject matter of the manuscript is very varied. There does not seem to have been a 19"68 prototype out of which all the others proceeded. In an apparent disorder, the result of the fancy of the author or the抄手, we find collected slurs of the Kariim, interlinear lists of the names of Allah, and of names of angels, Arabic religious texts with interlinear Malagasy translations (e.g. the facsimile publ. in N.E. vol. xxxviii., 1904, p. 1577); Arabic-Malagasy glossaries, magic texts, and invocations in large numbers, magic squares and formulae, texts showing the magic influence, good or bad of the planets, signs of the zodiac, lunar mansions, months, and days of the year, of the male and female character of the twelve Muhammadan months (Malagasy is male, 19, and female, and so on, in MS. No. 2 sqq., 267), of patterns for amulets (biroz < Arabic 667), etc.

The slurs of the Kariim are not reproduced in the order which was settled at the revision ordained by the Caliph 'Uthman. MS. 6 gives them in the following order: 667, 667, 667, 667, 667, 667. Then come verses 1-4 of Sura xxiv., verse 256 of ii., verse 16 and beginning of verse 17 of iii. The same MS. also contains Sura xxxi., (f. 136v.) and f. 136v.-138v., verses 158-159, 137, 256-259, 284-286 of Sura ii. and verses 25-26 of Sura iii.

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

MS. 5 contains from f. 32v. to 38v. an Arabic poem with Malagasy translation in honour of a certain Lallia (I have not yet been able to ascertain if this is the lover of Madinin, or of some Lallia in Arabic literature). The piece begins "The poet said..." and ends ..., the girl who possesses beauty and kindness." The Arabic verses are of an unusual accuracy and show that whoever reproduced them had a very superficial knowledge of the language and poetry.

MS. 8 (f. 52v. to 56v.) preserves a 667 in Arabic entitled 667, son of Sultan 'Uthman. The mention of the last of the 667 caliphs seems to indicate that the Malagasy converts to Islam, among whom this 667 was in use, had been converted by Annu who had left Baghdad or a country under the Muslims in this caliph's reign, i.e. between 640-656 (144-150). We cannot explain otherwise how the title "Commander of the Faithful" in a 667 used in Madagascar. As to the Sultan 667 (perhaps we should read 667 and translate "Sultan 667 who is here", the 667 then indicating the Sultan in question), I have not been able to identify him. As it is written, the name is neither Arabic nor Malagasy. MSS. 7 and 8 contain two identical versions of a religious text which I published in N. E. (xxviii. 440 sqq.). In a passage devoted to the glorification of the month of Ramadan, the anonymous author succes-
sively invokes the prophets of the Old Testament, Jesus and Mary, the Prophet Muhammad, the first four caliphs, Hasan and Husain and finally Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿman, the great Sunni Imām, and Muhammad b. Idrīs al-Shīfiʿi, the founder of the Sunnite school which bears his name. The mention of these two learned men and the ḍāha ḍ already mentioned are evidence of the orthodoxy of certain Muslims of Madagascar and perhaps one may say of the generality of Muslims on the southeast coast. But the same manuscript No. 5 contains a Persian text which prevents us putting forward this conjecture. The latter text which is still written is found on f. 225—278. The last line invokes the ʿajār al-muḥāṭa, then, the first night Imām's of the Shiʿa sect of the ʿTwelveers" (cf. ʿIRRISH ʿAHDARIYA) to whom the author has added "All Akbar ("All al-ʿezar") son of Hussain and half-brother of ʿAlī Zain al-ʿĀbidin. The mention of these Imām's of whom the last named, "All al-Řidā, reigned from 183 (500) to 202 (518) is valuable, for it implies that the writer of this text belonged neither to the schismatic sect of the Žaidīya founded in 695 ʿA. 1 by the schismatic Shiʿa sect of the Jamīʿ, which dates from 765 ʿA. 1, but to the orthodox Shiʿa sect of the ʿTwelveers". The Persians who followed the Persians who were drawn from the Persian historical tradition make come from ʿIrāq and colonise Kīwa on the east coast of Africa and the island of Anjouan in the Comoro Archipelago were Žaidīya (cf. G. Ferry, Les Collection de Kīwa, in Journal de l'École Française du Maghreb, in press) who cannot come into consideration in the present case. The Imām's, whose presence in Madagascar is evident from MS. No. 5 also form a separate group different from that of the Persians who had immigrated to the adjoining coast of ʿIrāq.

The Arabic-Malagasy manuscripts which I possess, those of the University Library of the Faculty of Letters in Algiers and others which I have been able to examine, are of the same type, similar in contents to those of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with the exception of the Žuhāṭa and the Persian text, which so far as I know are found nowhere else. Quite a considerable number of manuscripts like MS. 13 contain genealogies of kings of the South- east, from which all these documents come, and local histories. One of these gives details of La Cosa's campaign in the Island of 1639—1663 (cf. N. E. 1907, xxxix).

The majority of the religious texts which are found in the Arabic Malagasy MSS. of the ʿIrāq. Nat. are translated into Malagasy. The Arabic past is very incorrect and the Malay translation seems that the exegetes of Madagascar understood very little of it. The illustrious and lamented Gombe, to whom nothing Islamic was foreign, was interested in the texts which I published. Comparing three translations of the Malagasy text with the Arabic text he concluded that "the meaning of the fundamental ideas was most gravely misunderstood" (L'École française des Lettres et des Méthodes d'Algérie au XIXe Congrès des Orientalistes, in K. H. K., 1905).

The borrowings of the Malagasy from the Arabic are overwhelming, there is no limit. Many are many and are found throughout all the tribes of the island without exception. The most notable are the names of the days of the week: al-ʿāshātun, šibilla, al-ṣihāba, al-šabtabi, al-šaʿbūtun, waḥa, al-śabta, al-ṣibbi. We may note that the Arabic article has been retained for Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday and Sunday but dropped for Tuesday and Friday. The names of the days are here given in the Merina dialect; the forms of the other dialects show the regular phonetic variations.

2. The names of the twelve months in Merina and in the dialect of some other tribes reproduce the Arabic names of the twelve signs of the Zodiac: ʿal-ḥārim, ʿal-ḥātātan, ʿal-ḥāmar, ʿal-ḥābbīth, ʿal-ḥārābīth, ʿal-ḥāmarī, ʿal-ḥāmarī, ʿal-ḥāmarī, ʿal-ḥāmarī and ʿal-ḥārātun in which we readily recognise: ʿal-ḥāram, ʿal-ḥātan, ʿal-ḥātan, ʿal-ṣuqā, ʿal-ṣuqā, ʿal-ṣuqā, ʿal-ṣuqā, ʿal-ṣuqā, ʿal-ṣuqā and ʿal-ṣuqā. Quite a number of tribes do not know the Merina series, but still use the names of Sanskrit origin given above (p. 68, col. a).

3. The names of the 28 days of the month (the S. E. Malagasy however once had a year of 366 days) which are recorded by Flacourt (Histoire, 1661, p. 174) recall those of the 28 lunar mansions of the Arab. According to the empirical method adopted by al-Sūfī and other writers, i.e. dividing the 28 mansions by 12 the latter are evenly distributed among the signs of the zodiac. *Know* says al-Sūfī, "that each of the signs of the zodiac has two mansions and a third" (A. C. de Molyneux, Les Mansions Considérées des Arabes, texte de Muhammad al-Maqrī, transl. and annot., Algiers, 1899, p. 68). In Madagascar as well the 28 days of the month have been divided into 4 weeks of 7 days each, a division which is not completely accurate, but is used as a general rule.

Signs of the Zodiac         Lunar Mansions
1. ʿAl-ḥāram            1. ʿAl-ḥāram = al-ḥāratun
2. ʿAl-ḥātan            2. ʿAl-ḥātan = al-ḥurātan
3. ʿAl-ḥāmar            3. ʿAl-ḥāmar = al-ḥurātan
4. ʿAl-ṣuqā            4. ʿAl-ṣuqā = al-ṣuqā, al-ṣuqā, al-ṣuqā
5. ʿAl-ḥāmar            5. ʿAl-ḥāmar = al-ḥakā
6. ʿAl-ḥāmar            6. ʿAl-ḥāmar = al-ḥanā
7. ʿAl-ṣuqā            7. ʿAl-ṣuqā = al-ṣuqā
8. ʿAl-ḥāmar            8. ʿAl-ṣuqā = al-ṣuqā
9. ʿAl-ṣuqā            9. ʿAl-ṣuqā = al-ṣuqā
10. ʿAl-ṣuqā           10. ʿAl-ṣuqā = al-ṣuqā
11. ʿAl-ṣuqā           11. ʿAl-ṣuqā = al-ṣuqā
12. ʿAl-ṣuqā           12. ʿAl-ṣuqā = al-ṣuqā

The Arabic names of the lunar mansions thus become the names of the 28 days of the Malagasy months. Mentioned along with the day of the week, they take the place of the ordinal which the Arab-Malagasy texts rarely indicate by a figure. This method seems to have been used in Madagascar and in the succeeding centuries, so that it is hardly used except in memory.

4. The ʿshīṭī (dialecical variants: ʿshīṭī, ʿshīṭī; ʿshīṭī, "figure") is the art of divination; its object is to find out what is not known and the means of discovering a remedy against it. Used throughout the island with slight variants from tribe to tribe, it is a direct derivative from the ʿshīṭī al-ṣawal, lit. the science of sand or Arab-germancy (cf. the Kitāb al-ṣawal fi ṣawal 'al-ʿanf of Shāhīd Muḥammad al-Zamātī, lit. Cairo, n. d.). Shāhīd al-Zamātī's treatise from which is derived all those in use in Madagascar comprises the following 16 figures:
Each figure of the table bears a name of its own and is composed of a certain number of dots, maximum eight (IV) and minimum four (XIII). Four figures have five dots (V, XII, XV and XVI); six have six dots (II, III, VI, X, XI, XIV) and four have seven dots (I, VII, VIII, IV). Each figure governs a certain number of things or beings; according to the question put to the diviner, the latter considers very carefully the figure relating to the question asked. The influence of each of the figures comes from the sign of the zodiac, planet, day, Arakh month and from one of the four elements to which it corresponds. It is also lucky or unlucky, male or female, fālāh (applying to the person consulting the fates) or maṭṭāb (applying to the question asked); it is more or less strong and powerful in such and such conditions, and it also shows in what state the thing asked shall be realized. The 16 figures of the table are divided into different groups each bearing a particular name:

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

- the shawārī, "those who go out" are three in number (III, X, XII). If they are several times represented in the ṣubīk directed by the diviner, it is an unlucky omen and the object sought will be unobtainable. If one of the ṣubārī proves to be the first figure, the object "goes out," i.e., is lost to the seeker;

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

- the ṣundhāī, "those who are fixed, who do not vary" are the figures I, II, XI, XII, XIII, XV. They are lucky and assure that the seeker will gain his end;

- the maṭṭābī, "the dismal" are figures III, VII, VIII, XI. If the first figure is one of the maṭṭābī the questioner will not obtain what he asks or will not escape the misfortune he fears.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure I of the preceding table is called al-ḥulūlī or ẓāhiq. The first of these names has passed into Malagasy as the word alakhbarī. It represents the person who comes to consult the diviner; its zodiacal sign is Libra; its planet Jupiter; its day Thursday and its element, the fire.

The corresponding figure is the fifteenth. It is lucky, male and fālāh; i.e., it is one of the eight figures representing him who consults the fates. Its month is Dam 'Ukhālī. If in the preparation of the ṣawādī it occupies the first place, the thing demanded will be realized after an interval of three days. The amount of happiness and success which it brings will be greater if it occupies the first place.

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

Figure III (bâbût al-khârijîâ, Malag; alânû) is that of the family, especially brothers and sisters. Its sign of the Zodiac is Râs Djawâghtî (<Pers. râs Džwâghtî; "the head of the Dragon"); its planet Saturn; its day, Saturday. The corresponding figure is the tenth. It is unlucky, male and fâlîh. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval necessary for the accomplishment of the desire formulated is 150 days. It reaches the maximum size in the ninth place and strength in the third. Its metal is gold.

Figure IV (al-djumâa) > Malag; âwma, ruma) is that of the country, gardens and borders of the dead. Its sign of the Zodiac is Virgo; its planet Mercury; its day, Wednesday. The corresponding figure is the fourteenth, its element blank earth. It is good or bad according to circumstances and maghrib. Its month is Djamâd al-Khîrî. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before the realization of the desire expressed is 26, 53 or 150 days. It is large in the sixth place and strong in the fifth and tenth. Its metal is silver.

Figure V (al-kumma) <Pers. kumât or al-fîramî; Malag; akhânah) is that of children and babies. Its sign of the Zodiac is Libra, its planet Venus, and its day, Friday. The corresponding figure is the twelfth. The south wind is its element. It is neither good nor bad; it is fâlîh and female. Its month is Djamâd. If it occupies the fourteenth place the desire expressed is satisfied the day following. It is large in the twelfth place and strong in the fourth, eighth and eleventh. Its metal is gold.

Figure VI (al-akhir) > Malag; akûkû, akânû) is that of the sick, of aunts, of war, of slaves, of the property, of remedies and of ships (sailing ships of the West, i.e., Indian Ocean). Its sign of the Zodiac is Aquarius; its planet, Mercury; its day, Saturday. The corresponding figure is the seventeenth. Its element is the west wind. It is good or bad according to circumstances, fâlîh or maghrib. Its month is Djuhâl al-Ka'da; it is female. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before accomplishment of the desire expressed will be fifteen days. It is large in the ninth place and strong in the eighth, eleventh and twelfth. Its metal is silver.

Figure VII (anîrî > Malag; alikirî) is that of husband and wife, of women and of sexual relations. Its sign of the Zodiac is Capricorn; its planet, Saturn; its day, Saturday and its element earth. The corresponding figure is the sixth. It is unlucky, fâlîh or maghrib, male or female according to circumstances. Its month is Shawwâl. If it is in the fourteenth place, it indicates an interval of 56 days before an answer to the question asked the diwan is obtained. It is large and strong in the second, ninth and twelfth. Its metal is silver.

Figure VIII (amûsû > Malag; akhâmû, akâmû) is that of death and removal. Its sign of the Zodiac is the Ram; its planet Mars; its day, Tuesday. Its corresponding figure is the sixteenth, its element, sun. It is unlucky, fâlîh and male. Its month is Muharram. If it is in the fourteenth place, it indicates an interval of 21 days. It is large in the first and strong in the seventh. Its metal is iron.

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

Figure X (bâbût al-khârijîa) > Malag; alânû) is that of strength and of rulers. Its zodiacal sign is Leo, its planet: the sun; its day, Sunday; its element fire. It is male, fâlîh and very lucky. Its month is Djuhâl al-Ka'da. In the fourteenth place the interval before the accomplishment of the desire is 52 days. It is large in the tenth and strong in the thirteenth. Its metal is gold.

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

Figure XII (bâbût al-khârijîa > Malag, karîdan) is that of enemies, cunning and ambushes. Its sign of the Zodiac is Djuhâl al-Djawâghtî, the Dragon's tail', its planet Saturn, its day Saturday. The corresponding figure is the third, its elements are: water and earth firms. It is unlucky, maghrib and feminine. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before the accomplishment of the desire is 66 days. It is large in the twelfth and strong in the thirteenth. Its metal is iron.

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

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

Figure XV (bâbût al-djumâa, Malag, akâmû) is that of the judge. Its zodiacal sign is Pisces; its planet is Jupiter; its day, Thursday and its element, water. The corresponding figure is the
first. It is lucky, male or female and pilik its mouth is 'Shawwal. In the fourteenth place the interval before accomplishment of the desire will be 55 days. It is large in the fourth and strong in the eleventh. Its metal is iron.

Figure XVI (nafi al-adhamid > Malag. kimis') is that of the end of all things and the last of the sikili. Its sign of the Zodiac is Scoepio; its planet Mars, its day Monday and its element water. The corresponding figure is the eighth; it is lucky or unlucky, male or female and molfi; its mouth is Djinmad also 'Awali. In the fourteenth place it indicates an interval of seven days before the realisation of the desire. It is large in the fourth and strong in the eleventh which is its own and its opposite is copper.

There are the sixteen figures of the sikili and the significance given them in Madagascar.

As its Arabic name shows, this 'science of the sand' was first practised by tracing lines or dots on the sand; in Arabic one says jarias al-rum. 'to strike the sand', to describe the preparation of the ibn al-rum. On the east coast of Africa Swahili the same operation is called kipucu haa, lit. 'to strike the planchet' (which implies that the dots forming the sixteen figures are inscribed on a planchet) or rami, a Bantuised form of the Arabic rami 'sand'. At the first the lines or dots were traced on the sand, then on a planchet of wood and lastly as in Madagascar on paper. According to another Malagasy method, the diviner also uses grains of sand, or seeds, especially those of the fano tree (Fistacia ventricosa, Bhi).

When requested to consult the fates by the sikili, the diviner first of all pronounces the invocation: 'Awake, O God, to awaken the Sun! Awake, O Sun, to awake the Cock! Awake, O Cock, to awaken Man (albhumulum). Awake, O Man, to awaken the sikili; not that it may lie, not that it may lead us to error, not that it may make us laugh, not that it may say foolish things, not that it may deal with any matter of no importance, but that it may search out secrets, that it may see what is beyond the mountains and the other side of the forest that it may see what no human eye can see. Arise! for thy skill which comes from the Muslims with long hair (al-bhumhum) or from the high mountains, from Niaparabika from Tapelakatsaketsia, from Zafihimani (eponym of a tribe of the south-east converted to Islam), from Andriamivohitrahi, from Rakeliharanana, from lanaharo (eponym of another south-eastern tribe, converted to Islam), from Andriamihisahamba, from Yasima (a dwarf tribe, of African origin as the name shows; the old owners of the soil), from Anakandriamanahatra, from Rakeliharaha (lit. the little man with long hair) Arise! for we do not have thee for nothing; for thou art dear and cause expense! We have taken thee in exchange for a fat, well-fed cow with a large hump. And for money on which there was no dust (i.e. coins) which are still circulating. Awake! for thou hast the confidence of the ruler and also the respect of the people. If thou art a sikili that can speak, a sikili that can see and that does not repeat (only) the gossip of the people, the man killed by its owner, the ox killed in the market, the dust which clings to the feet (i.e. a sikili who does not repeat what everyone knows); awake, on the mat which is on this very spot.

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

When the diviner works on paper, he traces the julum a line in the form of the arc of a circle, the centre of which is indicated by a dot. The sum of the dots and initial and final curves (each of which counts as a dot) must not exceed 4, although the uprisikili is understood to make the dots without counting them. He then draws three other concentric curves in the same way. This done, the dots are counted two by two and line by line from left to right. A vertical line separates the groups of two dots from one another. After the last vertical line there remains either the final curved line which counts as a dot, either a point or a line, i.e. two dots. This or these are written opposite each line and given figures I, II, III, IV:

The four first figures are called in Arabic non-merah 'the mothers':

Figure V is obtained by transcribing vertically from right to left the line a, b, b, b and a give in the same way figures VI, VII and VIII. These four new figures derived from the four first are called malum 'the daughters':

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

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

A diviner or a seer may be man or woman (I have never known a woman seer but have heard that there are such). The seer may be of royal birth, noble or freeman (I have never heard of a seer or diviner who was a slave, although slaves have been executed on charges of divination). The diviner or the seer is very often the son or daughter of a diviner or a divineress, which assures him an extensive clientele, for he or she is supposed to inherit the paternal (or maternal) secrets. The seer or diviner may be either native or foreigner. I was taken for a diviner during a stay of forty months at Mananjary (S.E. coast) by the Muslim māqīlīhīs of the district, who treated me as a collegue after I had shown them my knowledge of Islam. It was in this way that I was enabled to be initiated gradually into the practices of diviners and appeal was sometimes made to it. The art of divination of the 'Ina al-rūmī in Africa is considerable. It is found in Dāirī and the Travels of Harries in Dahoméy reveal the existence of practices closely allied to āshādī among a West African people who are however not Muslim (cf. G. Fernand, Missionnaire à Madagascar, iii., p. 187 sqq.).

The great annual festival of the fahārmāra or the bath is only a survival under another form of the old ṭiū ṭihṛ. (q.v.) On this identification cf. G. Fernand, Notes sur un Calamètre malgache de ṭiū ṭihṛ.

According to the evidence of the Portuguese discoverers and especially of Vincenzo, the Muslim Malagasy of the S.E. of the 17th century founded during Rania's, recited the obligatory prayers, read the Kurān, but drank fermented liquors and washed and ate pork. They were dhīmmī in the S.E. not that assemblies of the faithful took place; but there is no mention of the existence of mosques in the early travellers and Pluquet says definitely in his preface that "the nation of which he is going to speak, has no idols or temples". As in Sūr (q.v.) the success of Islam was only mediocore in Madagascar. Malagasy does not readily assimilate foreign beliefs and customs and the latter do not profoundly modify native beliefs and customs. His whole philosophy is contained in the proverb mānū ni amin, "Life is sweet"; he thinks it good to be alive; the strict observation of the Kurānic prescriptions would have upset too much his usual life and customs. Allāh prescribes fermented liquors, standing stones, games of chance and consulting the fates as abominations invented by Sāmī. But these abominations are particularly dear to the Malagasy; they are particularly devoted to alcoholic liquors and to gambling, believe firmly in soothsaying and standing stones (trangānbantara) are held in honour throughout the whole island. No doubt they venerate Allāh, the Kurān, the Prophet and saints of Islām but it is a purely vatai reverence and they are not really Islamized to the degree that, for example are the negroes of the adjoining east coast of Africa.

The conversion of the Malagasy to Christianity was also a failure. At the time of the conquest of the island in 1605 they were quite disposed to be converted en masse to Roman Catholicism, thinking it would please us; they had to be warned that the French government only attached importance to respect for the laws and respected the religious convictions of every one whatever they were. This fact, of which I was a witness is more eloquent than any other and throws an illuminating light on the past.

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

I. Many legends give the old yasāmba, now disappeared, as the first or second or third masters of the soil i.e. the autocrats. The name which is found in East Africa is clearly Banī and represents an older wāsāmba Malag. vasmāna. They are said to have been of small stature. They were perhaps negroid.

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

III. There was next an important immigration of Hindūised Indonesians from Sumātā (cf. G. Fernand, L'Empire sumatran de Chindia) in the second-fourth centuries A.D. A word like the Malag. ʿālif < old Malay, ʿālif = 100,000 < Malay ʿālif = 100,000 < Sanskrit, bhūpi = 1,000,000 is over many others testifying to this fact. These Indonesians modified the somatological, cultural and linguistic type of the negroid Bantu who peopled Madagascar.

IV. Arrival of Arabs in the six-ninth centuries and conversion of the Malagasy to Islam. These Arabs probably came from the Persian Gulf and belonged to the Sumātā.

V. Another immigration of Sumatrans at the end of the tenth century I consider the Wātāwātā to be western Indonesians, as I shall explain in the article Wātāwātā. The Book of the Wonders of Islam (ʿAṣāfīḥ al-Hind, ed. by van der Lbb. and tr. by M. Devic) mentions a piratical campaign by these Wātāwātā in 334 (945) in the Western Indian Ocean. It is probable that we have here a reference to the migration led by Ramuni the
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- G. Granddidier, *Bibliographie de Madagascar,* Paris 1906 (it contains all the works published at this date).


**AL-MADIHN, a medieaval Arab town or rather a group of towns in al-Trak (Babylonia) about 20 miles S.E. of Baghdad lying on either side of the Tigris in two almost equal portions. The name al-Madīn (plur. of al-Madīn) "the town" is explained from the fact that the two capitals situated opposite one another, Sennaces on the west, the city founded by Seleucus I between 312 and 301 B.C., and Ctesiphon on the east (the first reference to which is in 221 B.C.), the winter residence of the Parthian and Sasanian kings, with several other places close at hand were regarded as forming a whole. The Sasanian Aramaeans who formed the bulk of the population under the Arsakids and Sasanians comprised the whole group under the name Malis or Madīn al-Madīn "the towns" which latter term the Arabs adopted in the plural form al-Madīn in particular to their language. Following the Sasanians, the Arabs reckoned seven towns in al-Madīn, the official names of which they partly arabised.

On the west bank lay Web-Ardaghih, corrupted by the Arabs to Behar (often wrongly read Beharast and Nahr Shih or Shyr; cf. Streek, *Babylonia*, p. 263, note 3). The name does not mean "good (is) Ardaghih" as it is often explained but "house (i.e. foundation) of Ardaghih" (cf. thereon, *Nödeke, W.Z.K.M.,* 591, 1902, p. 7; *Web = Arab. Be*). In Syriac and Talmudic literature Behar is usually called *Noghih* (= Koheh of the late classical writers) and Madīs (= "the town"); it occupied the lower southern half of the former Syrian city. A parasang (c. 3 miles) north of it was the village of Darrastan and Daražan (also Darašata), an abbreviation of Darāšān. On the east bank stood Ctesiphon. The Arab historians and geographers reproduce this name, which is not Greek but very probably indigenous (Jastān) by *Tašīmān*; but we also find *Tašīn* and *Tašin* corresponding exactly to the presumed Pahlavi form (Tašīn, Tašīn). On these place-names cf. the very full discussion by Streek in *Syrije-Wiss.,* Suppl. iv, 1102 ff. Not uncommonly the town on the east bank, much more important for the Muslims, is called al-Madīn (e.g. in al-Iṣṭahib, *B.G.K.,* i, 57 f.). About an hour's journey away, south of Ctesiphon stood Web Anīshqī Khosrow (= Antiocha, house of Khosrow). The Arabs usually called this city founded by Khosraw I Anāsrabbā, which was settled with the deported inhabitants of Antioch ad Cragum, destroyed in 540 and is said to have been planned on the model of the Syrian capital.
Kmuysa = Rome in. (New) Rome or Byzantium. The Syriac sources distinguish this new foundation from the older towns by the name Makkia, which in Arabic became "New town".

We know nothing further about the three other towns of al-Mad'in, which made up the number seven so popular in the east and was hence doubtless deliberately chosen. The exact forms of their names are not even known.

As early as the Parthian period there was a stone bridge across the river between the two thickly populated banks of the Tigris, which the historian Hâmûr al-Kalâshân (cf. his Ta'âlî, ed. Gottwald, p. 31, sq.) describes as a marvel; but already in his day (beginning of the fourth century) there was no longer any trace of it. Under the Sasanian a second bridge (of boats) was erected. In the Muslim period however there was still only a bridge of boats.

In Mu'min-Ctesiphon two main quarters are distinguished, the northern "old town", Arab. al-Mad'in al-su'a, and the southern Asfahân (Asbahân, Asfâr, and other variants of the name).

The "old town" probably represents the oldest settlement on the east bank, the foundation of the Parthian period. In it was a royal palace which the Arabs called astâr al-mu'ayyad = "the white palace" (there were other palaces of the same name elsewhere; cf. the article KÂLÂSHÂN, probably the residence originally of the Šâsiân kings built by one of the last Annakids or first Šâsiân. The southern quarter Asfâr also included a royal residence, the tun ( = pillared hall, palace), usually described more definitely by the Arab authors of the middle ages as Mâsâs ( = Pers. Mâsâs, Ctesiphon, the general title of the Šâsiân kings among the Arabs; cf. Streck. Seleuc. u. Ktesiph. p. 37, note 1). Its builder is known with certainty to have been Sapor (301–379 a.d.). It may be noted that later Arab historians often confuse the "white palace" and the town.

It can hardly be supposed that the site of al-Mad'in, so favoured by nature, at the point where the Euphrates and Tigris must nearly approach each other, was without any considerable settlement until the time of Seleucus I. There is on the contrary every indication that the town of Ma'din (written geographically in the usual buq'â, dating back to remote antiquity like its successor Mâsâs) of the ancient city, cannot well be located anywhere else than on the site of the inner towns of Seleucia and Ctesiphon or in the immediate neighbourhood. What the Arab writers say about the founder of al-Mad'in is worthless. They ascribe the foundation to mythical kings of the old Median epic like Tiwwânsh and Talabûrshan or other celebrated rulers of the east (like Nimrûd in Iskander-Almahârak; see Nimrûd's see Abr. 1-Paradisiachus, Te'âlî, Mâsadân, Behût ed. p. 20).

For the pre-Mahâammad history of al-Mad'in which does not fall within the scope of this work cf. Streck. Seleuc. u. Ktesiphon, and the article above under Annakids, Asfâr, and others. The Arabic sources contain much valuable information for the Šâsiân period; the most notable in Târist's history (cf. Nöldeke, Briefe der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden, Leyden 1879). We may here mention that under the later Šâsiân, Ctesiphon, to some extent lost its popularity as the winter capital, for they, especially Khorâshân and the Prophet, preferred to travel to it, three days journey to the north on the very old "royal road" [cf. DASTÂRÎ]...

We have fairly full information about the conquest of al-Mad'in by the Arabs, especially the great chronicles of Tabari (i, 245–246) and Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tämmig, iii. 396–403) and also al-Cârati, Annals dell' Irâq, iii. 734 sq.; Wulffen, Ereignisse und Forschungen, vi. 65 sq., and Streck. Seleuc. u. Ktesiphon p. 30–34). After the glorious battle of al-Ka'dâiya, which made the Arab masters of the east, the conquered the Tigris (cf. above, ii, p. 612 sq.), the Caliph 'Omar ordered Sa'd b. Abi Waqqâs, who was then in command of the Muslim troops operating in the east, to march on the Persian capital. Sa'd advanced, fighting several battles on the Tigris and appeared before Behistun in the first half of January 637 (= end of 10 a.a.). The strongly fortified town, which was heavily defended was besieged and stormed in vain for two months. In the end the Persians whose supplies were exhausted fled by night unnoticed over the river so that when the Arabs advanced the town soon afterwards they found it quite deserted. A few days later the invaders were able to raise the siege and return to the Tigris, much swollen by the spring floods. This almost miraculous rescue effected without any loss is a much celebrated event in Muslim history; it is one of the famous "days" of the period of the conquest. The Persians had not expected that the Arabs would win their way across the king had taken refuge with his family and court in Hûšâk (q.v.); the army had retired to Djar Nahrâm (about 24 miles north of Ctesiphon). Only a few regiments remained at the palace in the capital. At the end of March 637 Sa'd made his triumphant entrance through the deserted streets. The progress of the Arab operations had not given the Persians sufficient time to carry off the vast treasures accumulated in Ctesiphon. Those all fell into the hands of the victors. The Arab sources give many interesting details of the various valuable objects which were captured not only in Ctesiphon but in the pursuit of the Persian army. The total value of the booty taken in Ctesiphon was estimated at 900 million dinars (of a nominal value of nine pence but it varied a great deal).

The occupation of the Šâsiân capital, the greatest royal city in western Asia, may be said to be the most important event of the period of Islam's splendour, the period of the great campaigns of conquest. In the "old town" the victorious Sa'd built the chief maqsûn = the first Muslim place of worship to be built in the east.

Al-Mad'in was not destined to be the residence of the Arab governor of the east, on the contrary it sank under Muslim rule to be a mere provincial town. It was soon overshadowed by the newly founded Arab military colonies of Kâfâ, to which the goods of Ctesiphon were transported. A symbolic custom found elsewhere in the Arab east. — Baṣra and Wasit, Baṣra and Kâfâ now became the political and intellectual centres of the Arab east. — Baṣra and Wasit, Baṣra and Kâfâ now became the political and intellectual centres of Mesopotamia, until the Caliph al-Mansûr built Baghîdad and the political and cultural centre of gravity of the land gravitated thither. The foundation of Baghîdad dealt al-Mad'in its death blow. It was now called upon to yield the building material necessary for the new capital of the caliphs
just as Babylon had done for Semitic centuries before.

In the history of the 'Umayyad and 'Abbasid period, al-Madain was as a rule no longer of any prominence. It only played a part of some importance in the civil wars of the first two centuries of Islam, those provoked by the Khaṭrids as well as those provoked by the 'Abdids. The Muslim inhabitants of al-Madain were, it seems, always strong supporters of the Shi'a. They were also hostile to the Khaṭridi movement. As early as 658 there was fighting around al-Madain between 'Ali and the Khaṭrids. An attempt by the latter (in 664) to seize Ctesiphon from Behrašt was thwarted by the commander there who had Shī'ī sympathies, by destroying the bridge of boats. The Khaṭrids however later succeeded in twice gaining temporary possession of al-Madain, e.g. in 688 when the Khaṭrid group of the Arākīya (q.v.) wrought great slaughter among the Muslims who did not belong to their party. The second occupation of al-Madain in 696 was achieved by the Khaṭrid leader Shalḥī b. Yazid. On these events cf. J. Wellhausen, *Die religiöse Politik. Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam* (= Abh. G. W. G., N. F., vol. v., Nos. 1 (1901), p. 21, 36, 43, 45, 57; R. Bürnow, *Die Chrestomathie unter dem ersten Osmanschen Weltyrnen* (Eydyan 1884, p. 22, 97). With the death of Shalḥī b. Yazid, the power of the Khaṭrids was broken, but as late as 752 'Abbāsid troops had to be sent to suppress a leader of these rebels; cf. A. Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande*, l. 440.

As regards the 'Alid war in the 1st-3rd, the most important campaign was that of Hasan to al-Madain in the year 661. Hasan lived there in the "white palace". Cf. on this expedition, the Arab chronicles which differ not inconsiderably: Well, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, l. 244; Flügel, *Gesch. der Araber*, Leipzig 1867, p. 158-159; A. Müller, *cf. cit.*, l. 336 and especially J. Wellhausen, *Das arabisch-riech und sein Staat*, Berlin 1902, p. 67-68. In the later Shī'ī troubles al-Madain appears in 684-686 and 744 as supporting the 'Abid, cf. Wellhausen, *Die religiöse Politik*, Opp. p. 72, 73, 80, 98. The importance of al-Madain as an objective in these civil wars is evident from the fact that in these days the military road from Basra to Kufa did not go through the desert along the Arabian bank of the Tigris but went across the canals to the Tigris at al-Madain and from thence over further canals to the Euphrates; cf. Wellhausen, *Die religiöse Politik*, Opp. p. 85, note 3.

The Caliph al-Mansūr was repeatedly forced to lead an army against al-Madain: in 811, when the rioters who arose over the succession on the death of Hārūn al-Rašīd the Barhebečī 'Ibrāhīm b. Must defended the town against Ma'mūn (cf. l. p. 685), and in 815 when an 'Alid rebel Abū 'Abbud al-Sarīr b. Mansūr, cf. l. p. 170, who had seized the town was besieged in it. For the rest we do not hear much more of al-Madain in the 'Abbasid period; its two main components, Tarsaftin and Behrašt, continued for several centuries more to enjoy the modest existence of small country towns. As regards Rūmiya which was included in the system of towns forming al-Madain, the Caliph al-Mansūr had temporarily held his court there in 754 and had caused 'Abī Muslim (q.v.) to be treacherously murdered there (Yākūt, l. 807, s.v. Streck, *Byblosien*, II. 288). But about the middle of the 10th century this place according to al-Maqrīzī (*Maqrīzī al-Jāhidī*, ed. Paris, 1920) was already completely deserted: the wall round it built of thick bricks was the sole relic of it left. When Yaḥyā wrote in the early decades of the 11th century (cf. his *Maqālim*, l. 768, t. 447, p. 755) the whole of the east side of al-Madain, i.e. Tarsaftin in particular was already completely deserted; on the west bank still stood Behrašt, a small town, practically a village, inhabited by peasants who practised only agriculture. It was now known as al-Madain.

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

The author of the *Mawādirī al-Hīlī* (ed. Jeynali, ii. 64) who wrote an epitome of Yākūt and died in 1358, is also acquainted with Behrašt as a little town inhabited exclusively by Shī'īs, as is also Bākūr, who about 1403 prepared a synopsis of the geography of al-Kashfī (q.v.), cf. the French translation of the latter *Voyage de l'Àgha de Galipas* in *M. E.*, ii. 1789, p. 424. When Behrašt became deserted is unknown. Presumably the disastrous invasion of the Mongols under Tūnūr at the beginning of the 13th century which was so fatal to so many once flourishing towns of the lands of the Euphrates and the Tigris also caused the collapse of this last settlement in the territory of al-Madain.

It was not till the 18th century that a modest village arose on the site of Ctesiphon, a little north of the ruins of the *Jām Shīrāz*, in sight of the highly venerated sanctuary of Sabūna Fakr and called after him. This occurred on my visit in 1917 of a single street of mud-houses and Khāns where the numerous Shī'ī pilgrims who pass through here are put up. The building material is mainly supplied by the ruins of the *Jām*, especially of the north wing of its great hall which collapsed in 1888; cf. Hertzfeld, op. cit., ii. 65.

In the Great War the site of al-Madain was the scene of desperate fighting, momentous in its results. This is usually called the Battle of Ctesiphon. When the Anglo-Indian army under General Townsend in the late autumn of 1915 began an advance from the fortress of Kūt al-ʻAmāra along the Tigris to the north to try to take Baghdad, it was defeated on the 22nd and 23rd November 1915 in the district of the ruins of al-Madain by the Turks. The fighting took place mainly by the east bank; the British lines of battle ran on the east of the ruins of the Iwán and the little village near it. This reverse forced Townsend to retire to Kūt al-ʻAmāra, which was soon afterwards surrounded by the Turks and capitulated after five months' siege on April 29th 1916. For further particulars of this battle, the greatest on the Mesopotamian front in the world war, see the works on this subject; cf. especially General Townsend's *My Campaign in Mesopotamia* (London 1919), p. 193 sqq., 171-184, with plans of the battle (map 7).

In connection with this brief sketch of the history of al-Madain it may be mentioned that one of the most distinguished scholars in the
field of Arab history was born here, namely, Al i b M. al-Madai'in [cf. the next article], born 753, died, between 830 and 845. His work itself has survived, but may be partly reconstructed from the numerous extracts in Hakluyt, Talh, Viktil, the Kitāb al-ghāyba etc. as that we have had an idea of its contents; G. Röschelmann, G. d. A., i, 140—44, ii, 169, i. f. Herr, Die hist. und geogr. Quellen Täpke's Geogr. Wörterbuch (Strassburg 1898), p. 5—6, 67—68 (on the chapter al-Madai'in in Hakluyt). Darzamah (Darzāmān), already mentioned above and included in the haptaplos of al-Madai'in, was the birthplace of the famous traditionist and historian al-Khālid ibn al-Baghdadī (d. 463 = 1071); on him cf. vol. ii, p. 929 ff., and Bergsträsser, in Z. A., h. 207—308. In the introduction to his biographical lesson, he gives a brief sketch of the history of al-Madai'in, making a special point of noting the companions of the Prophet who came to this city and took part in its conquest; cf. G. Saltmarsh, al-Wāḥis ibn al-Baghdadī, Inscriptiones Graeco e Hieroglyphica à Phil. de Bagaud (Paris 1904), p. 13—25, 175—181, or p. 85—93 of the Arabic text.

As to the mint history of al-Madai'in, neither the name al-Madai'in, nor as we might perhaps expect, Ištānīn or Behriais is found on the coins of the Muslim period; on the other hand, we have a considerable number of pieces with the inscription al-Bāḥi 'the gate' which undoubtedly belong to our city. The Arabs adopted the custom of the Sabians who gave their coins strack in Ctesiphon the mint name Bābi 'the gate', which is to be interpreted like 'Sublime Porte' as an official epithet of their royal capital (cf. the official designation of Constantinople as Πόρος τῆς Αἰγίς "Gate of Ilissus"). We have not only a series of Arabic coins with the mint name al-Bāḥi down to the end of the Umayyad period but also a few pieces of Sabian type with the legend Bābi, on the latter (specimens of the year 67—68) cf. Naum, Katalog der orientalischen Münzen in den kgl. Museum zu Berlin, i. (1898), p. 102. Coins are also found occasionally with the mint al-Madai'n al-Ablah, the name of the northern quarter of Ctesiphon (with the Sabian royal palace, etc. above). For the Arab coins of the mint of al-Bāḥi, cf. articles of various writers in J.D.M.G., xxii. 1891, 148 sq.; xxiii. 601; xxiv. 23, 38; xxv. 907; cf. also Streek, Sot. und Ktes., p. 37—88 and the references there given.

Here we can only refer briefly to the important part which al-Madai'in played in the church history of the east independent of Rome, especially Nestorian Christianity. The see of Sebastea, said to have been first established in the time of the apostles, was the premier diocese in the east. As supreme head of all the Nestorian bishops, in the Sabian period as well as in that of the Caliphate as patriarch of the east the occupant of the see of Sebastea bore the title of Patriarch. A number of offices were held at his official residence in the course of centuries. The episcopal cathedrals were in Behriais (New Sebastea) which the Syrian sources usually called Kirkel (cf. above) hence the official title of the patriarchate, "Church of Kirkel". Besides the official church of the bishop there were in al-Madai'in in the quarters on either bank a whole series of other Christian churches, the names of which are occasionally found in Syriac and Arabic texts. From Sebastea the Nestorian church developed considerable missionary activity, extending even to the Far East and reaching its zenith in the period from the sixth to the ninth century. Under the 'Abbāsids 25 metropolises — the first in rank after the Katholikon was the bishop of Kaskar [q.v.], each of whom in turn had 6—12 suffragans under him, acknowledged the authority of the see of Sebastea. All the metropolises received their investiture in the cathedral of Kirkel. Soon after the foundation of Bagdad (762) the Katholikon also moved from Behriais (Kirkel), new declining politically and commercially, to the new capital of the empire in order, as religious and political head of the Christian communities, the more effectually to champion their interests there at the court of the Caliph, where he usually enjoyed considerable prestige. But each new patriarch continued to be ceremonially installed in the mother church at Kirkel (probably down to the end of 'Abbāsid rule). For further information on the significance of al-Madai'in in oriental church history cf. Streek, Babylonien, ii. 274—275, ds., Sot. und Ktes., p. 42—7; 84 (sources in Syriac literature); J. Lafont, Le Christianisme dans l'Empire perse, Paris 1904.

That al-Madai'in was also for some time an important centre of the gnostic sect of the Manichaens may be mentioned here; but it is doubtful whether their founder, Mani (Mānas), as is often supposed came from Ctesiphon itself; cf. thereon most recently Schaefer, in Z.D.M.G., 25.

Finally it may be briefly recalled that al-Madai'in possesses considerable interest for the history of Judaism, especially for the Talmudic period of it. As in the Hellenistic period, the Jews under Sabian and Arab rule had also their main settlement on the west bank in Behriais which in Jewish sources is usually called Mahfud, "the town". There, as in the Greek Sebastea (cf. Streek, Sot. and Ktes., p. 10, 21), they formed an exceedingly high percentage of the inhabitants, indeed at times they seem to have been in the majority. That they are described as very rich is not surprising in view of the great importance of al-Madai'in as a trading centre down to the time of the rise of Bagdad. At the same time their character is unfavourably depicted by the same sources; it differed from that of the other Jews of Babylonia which is perhaps mainly to be explained by the fact that there were many proselytes among them. They also had a famous college, which was however only the intellectual centre of Babylonian Judaism under Rabī' bbar Joseph (b. 220 A.D.), a native of Mahfud, and at other times was inferior to the other Jewish centres of learning in Babylonia, Nakhuda, Sura and Fombellah. For further Jewish accounts of al-Madai'in, cf. A. Berliner, Beitr. zur Geogr. und Ethnogr. Babylonium im Talmud und Midrash, Berlin 1853, p. 19, 23—24, 39—43; 61—62; see also Streek, Sot. und Ktes., p. 87; 83 and 84 (bibliography).

Apart from the wretchedness of the modern village of Saimāt Pāl the whole of the area of the town of al-Madai'in measuring about 60 square miles is quite uninhabited. It is only from the middle of the 20th century that we have more or less full accounts of it by European travellers; cf. Streek, Sot. and Ktes., p. 47—8. The first systematic topographical and archaeological examination of the extensive ruined site was made by E. Harefeld, who visited it five times between 1903 and
1911. He dealt fully with the results of his examination in 1914, in the second volume (not published till 1920) of his and Sarre's Archäologische Relte im Fakāsh- und Tigrisgebiet; cf. lii, p. 46-76 and the pictures in Plate xxxix-xliv (Vol. iii.) and xxxix-lxviii (Vol. iv.), Herzfeld gives (ii. 51) the first plan of the whole area prepared by him in 1911; cf. this reduced to 1:1 of the original also in Streck, Sel. u. Babylon, p. 50 and in Palmyra-isswa, op. cit., Vol. iv., 1105.

Of the towns on the west bank, notably Seleucia, there has survived from the Hellenistic period only remnants of the old city wall (el-sir), a double wall of gigantic dimensions, on the sea shore and (less considerable) south side. The whole west side of the old city is now sunk in a permanent swamp (dhū'ba) formed since 1900 of the annual inundations. Within the south half of the ancient city walls, there now rise from the otherwise flat plain two mounds of rubble about 15 feet high (dhawrā'a), which in the 'Iraqi is practically synonymous with 'abwā', namely the Lujārat el-Bardān and the Lujārat el-Kasāf. The former which takes its name (powder-millhill) from a powder-mill which used to stand there to supply the Turkish troops, may, from the finds of pottery, conceal an important part of the Sasanian foundation of Behistūn. The second hill with the legendary name Lujārat (or Kāriy) bint el-Kasāf = "hill or castle of the Kasāf's daughter" may very well mark the site of the several times mentioned central of Seleucia-Kūkān. Beyond the above mentioned permanent swamp, further hills may be seen:—

Tell el-Umar (or Lujārat el-Union, Khisdāf or Abu Halafiyat, al-Šaffāt, al-Khiyāniyat and Tell al-Ishāfa. They perhaps all fell within the area of Seleucia, and probably come from suburbs of it.

The ruins on the east bank, those of Ctesiphon, begin about a mile above the village of Salīm Pāk. After isolated wall-like ruins of walls and canals, the first considerable ruin we reach is a large quarter of the town running for a mile along the Tigre opposite the Hellenistic Seleucia averaging 400 yards in breadth enclosed by a primitive much destroyed wall of clay:— hence the name el-fumāt, "the little clay-wall". Within this area lie a few farmplaces with palmyre trees and mulberry trees and fields. Al-Fumāt with its inadequate vicinity now marks the site of Mādīn al-Abrāg on the northern quarter of Ctesiphon. A second area filled with ruins is found around the village of Salīm Pāk and around the 'Ablān.

The village street of Salīm Pāk leads in a straight line to the much excavated tomb of Salīm al-Fārisī (Salīm the Persian) as, it is usually called locally, of Salīm Pāk, "the Pure". He is said to have been the first Persian to have adopted Islam and as "Apostle to the Persians" is one of the most popular Shi'i saints. According to Muslim tradition he died at an advanced age in 636 or 657 in al-Mada'in, where the Caliph 'Umar appointed him governor; it should be noted however that the Arab accounts of Salīm's share in the conquest of the Iraq and in the government of al-Mada'in are little credible. Cf. on Salīm vol. iv., p. 116 and Streck, Sel. und Khu., p. 53-54. The mausoleum with the alleged grave of Salīm which is crowned by a dome (it used to be shown in the vicinity of Ḥisbān!) stands on the south side of a court enclosed by a high white terraced wall and in its present form may date from the first half of the xvith century, when it was renovated by Sulṭān Murād IV (1623-1640). In 1903-1905 the building was restored. A description of the interior by Kāşīn al-Da'īfī is given in Herzfeld, op. cit., ii., p. 262, note 1.

South-west of Salīm Pāk about 1,000 yards from it close to the back of the Tigris is a large Muslim tomb with a dome, that of Ḥusayn b. al-Yāsamīn, one of the "councilors" of Muḥammad. The latter, an ardent champion of the 'Ahl cause, obtained, we are told, great merit by building the first mosque in al-Mada'in and died in 657 in Kufa; an he was also buried in Kufa, p. 289;Tabari, i, 2452; Streck, Babylonien, ii, 262; Herzfeld, op. cit., ii, 59.

The tradition that these two companions of the Prophet are buried here is old and goes back to the third (ninth) century — the earliest reference is in Yāqūt, R. G. A., vii. 320. Of the thousands of Persian pilgrims who annually visit the great Shi'a shrines of the 'Iraq (Kerbelah, Najaf, Kāşīn, and Samarrā) many choose to visit Salīm Pāk as one of the stages on the way out or home. K. Niebuhr (cf. his Reisebeschreibung nach Arubien, Copenhagen, 1778, ii, 79-80) heard of a tomb of a third companion of the Prophet in al-Mada'in, namely that of 'Abd Allah b. Salām, [p. 71] a Jew of al-Madīnah. The latter — a strenuous opponent of 'All — never came to the 'Iraq so far as we know. The Salāma-Baghdād of 1347 (1906), p. 256 (according to Herzfeld, op. cit., mentions in addition to Ḥūdūsī a certain 'Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī, buried in al-Mada'in, but I think his statement like that of Niebuhr (or rather his informants) is not to be relied upon. There is possibly some confusion with 'Abd Allāh b. Sādā, who is said to have been of Jewish origin and accompanied the Caliph 'All to the 'Iraq, but was later honori by him, as his extravagant enthusiasm for him made him a nuisance to al-Mada'in, where he may have died. Details of his end are not known. Herfeld suggested 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥalabī, who, according to Mas'ūdī (iv. 410), was murdered by the Khirriyya in 38 (658) while acting as 'Ahl's representative in al-Mada'in. As the interior of Salīm's sanctuary is said to contain two graves, the second may be claimed as that of this uncertain 'Abd Allāh and not as that of the last Caliph Muṣ'ta-jeim executed by Hāfolī, as Migno, Travels in Chaldæa, London 1829, p. 73 says: he is followed by W. Ainsworth, Narrative of the Exploits Expedition, London 1888, i, 276. For the existence of a tomb of a Caliph at al-Mada'in there is no literary authority.

As to the second area of ruins, which begins south of Salīm Pāk, its centre is formed by the great half of Taḵ-i Kīš ("Arch of Kīsha"), the glory of the celebrated Ḥraw, which will be dealt with briefly below. In the immediate vicinity of the Taḵ, four groups of ruins may be distinguished which the most notable is an oblong mound 20 feet high in the south, called locally Herbī al-Ḥāra al-Ṭāfībī, the "green hill". It certainly conceals a single building. All these groups of ruins which fringe the Taḵ on the four sides undoubtedly belong to the palace of the Ḥraw, which must have covered an area about 400 yards long and 300 broad. Some 500 yards S.E. of the ruins of al-Taḵ, behind an irrigation canal the surface shows fewer but continuous remains
of buildings, which stretch to a corner of the wall, called *Bustān-i Kārā, the garden of ʿAlī*; which perhaps enclosed a park for animals. A thousand yards S.W. of Bustān-i Kārā rises another mound, 20-25 feet high, almost square at the base, Tell al-Zubāb = *Gold-hill* in Khuwāṣt Kārā = *Treasury of Kārā*. It is apparently one large building, perhaps the treasure-house built by Khosrow II (cf. Taʿzir, i. 1942).

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

The most impressive memorial to its great past is now the Tāh-e Kārā, which stands in the centre of the ruins of al-Madīn. The surviving portion consists of a gigantic façade 103 yards long divided into two unequal portions by an arc 80 feet in width thrown boldly across. This, the front wall, originally over 100 feet high, divided into three stories is effectively relieved by open and isolated doors, arcades, pilasters and half-columns. Through the gigantic archway one reaches a spacious hall 150 feet deep, on either side of which are four parallel side-chambers. A wide door in the back wall of the hall leads into a wide court apparently square in plan.

For the place of ʿIwān in the history of art and the date of its origin, the reader may be referred to Hersfeld, e.g. cit., p. 74 f., and according to him the building shows a mixture of Oriental and Hellenistic styles. Saper (Sahra) i. (244-272) is the only possible builder; Khosrow I (531-579) seems also a possible candidate for a considerable restoration of the whole. The most characteristic part of Iwān, which clearly shows it was mainly intended for a palace of audience, is the great hall, in the Sassanian period the scene of ceremonial public audiences and receptions by the sovereign. Nothing has survived of the architectural details of the Iwān, and the stucco or mortar coating in which these found expression has fallen off. The Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum in Berlin possesses stucco reliefs, which Hersfeld (Z. D. A., i. 1927, p. 268) identified as ornaments from the Iwān. In the interior, the palace, as we know from the records of the Arab, was adorned with pictures and images in gilt relief. When the Muslims, pending the building of a mosque of their own, used the great hall of the Iwān provisionally after the capture of Ctesiphon, the paintings remained intact and were still to be seen two centuries later. For example in the ninth century we find the poet Abū Ḥujjāj al-Madīnī (cf. L., p. 773), who was very fond of describing palaces, describing the Iwān in a famous poem from his own observations; see this poem in the appendix of his Diwān printed at Stambul in 1300 (1882) (Vol. I., pp. 478 f.). Almost the whole text is also given in Vāqī, i., 478-483; pieces of it in al-Khurṭib al-Baghdādī (ed. Salma, p. 90-91) and in Ṣawānī, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 304.

The majestic remains of Ctesiphon, which from early times have always made a deep impression on the Oriental mind, very soon inspired the imagination of the poets. The Persian poet Ṣafāl al-Dīn b. ʿAlī Ḥājī (d. 595 = 1200 [q.v.]) wrote an elegy on al-Madīn, one of his best works; cf. Ethe, in Grundriss d. iran. Phil., ii. 264. This was printed in Stambul in 1330 (1912) and in Berlin 1843 (1924). This latter edition entitled al-Madīn, un poème de Khusroh, adapté et augmenté par quelques poètes contemporains (n.d. No. 5 of the framschall press) has a critical historical introduction by Dr. Rü(n) Tschirch and a commentary by the modern Persian writer Ḥusayn Diniš; on it, cf. E. G. Browns, The Press and Poetry of Modern Persia (Cambridge 1914), p. 307.

Muslims regard the abandoned and ruined remains of the Persian royal city as monuments of the victory of their religion, (on the alleged causes of the collapse of 14 pinnacles of the Iwān in the night of Muharram's birth, see Strech, Sel. und Babyl., p. 6, and as impressive symbols of fallen greatness. Like the pyramids, we find them in Arabic poetry as the regular symbol of the transitoriness of worldly power: cf. for example the verses of al-Tīfānī in Maqrīzī, al-Maqrīzī, the chapter on the pyramids, ed. by E. Graafe (Leipzig, 1911), p. 47 and 88 (and 94). The Haydūr Sulṭān Ḥujjāj al-Dawla (1025-1042) recorded his visit there by inscribing on the wall of the Iwān two verses proclaiming the transitoriness of worldly things (see Vāqī, ii. 429, 57); cf. also Strech, op. cit., p. 61. The Arab geographer reckoned the Iwān, like the pyramids, among the wonders of the world (cf. e.g. Ibn al-Fakhrī, B. G. A., v. 255): indeed it was held to be not the work of man but of the demons, the Djinn [q.v.]. Quite early many legends became associated with the Iwān, most of which centre round the figure of Khosrow I Anūbāwān, still proverbial in the east for his generosity: e.g. the story of the old woman's horse which the king took whilst wandering within the precincts of the palace (see Suruki, Babylûnoûn, ii. 256-258; Strech, Sel. und Krit., p. 56 and 7, A., 1834, Vol. 15, p. 489) which Hersfeld (op. cit., ii. 68) traces to the lack of symmetry in the façade; also the story of the chain of justice, to which petitions were attached (imitated by Ikhān in Taḥfrīz, ed. v. Hammur, Geschichet der Ikhān, Dorndorf 1845, ii. 339) which according to Bentzon still seem to be known among the people; see al-Madīnī: of the legend published by him in Le Liban, Le Royaume de Damas, May 1926, p. 10-11: Le Légende du Melon d'or taken down from the lips of a Bedouin thence.

Down to the accession of the Abbadid in Iraq, seems to have been practically intact; then they began to use it as a quarry but this was abandoned as too costly, the yield being far below the cost of obtaining it. As to the Caliph who ordered it to be taken down, authorities differ. Al-Manṣūr is usually given (754-775) but very often Ḥārūn al-Rašīd also (786-809). In any case the partial destruction of the Iwān, under the early Al-ʾAbbasid is an assured fact; cf. Suruki, Babylûnoûn, ii. 255-256, 259; do. Sel. und Krit., p. 61-62; Herznfel, ii. 63. The Iwān with the exception of the great hall and two wings of the façade had been destroyed by this time, for the part that was spared, the name Tāh-e Kārā—now popularly pronounced Tāh-e Kesā—was
came into use, first, I believe, in Baghdad al-Jan (Ebn. ad-Ma'mun, ed. Quatremère, p. 266). Volkt (443), as well as Iskandar (c. 1400) after him, used only the arched half built by two wings as remains of the twin. The building remained in this state practically unaltered till 1888, when on April 31st on the occasion of a high flood the northern front wing collapsed, probably undermined by the ruthless robbery of bricks. An attempt was made a few years ago to save the threatened south wing by securing its foundations. Pictures of the Taq-i Kisra before and after 1888 may be found in Fr. Langenegger, Die Baumeister des Iran (Osnabrück 1911), p. 16.

The Kazr al-Abajir, the "White Palace," has completely disappeared. At the capture of Ctesiphon it was spared by the Arabs like the Iran. The Muslim general Said took up his quarters in it. It met its fate in the reign of the Caliph al-Mu'tasim (962-908) who had it destroyed to provide building material to complete the Taq-i Kisra palace on the east side of Bagdad. See Streck, Babylonien, l. 122, II. 259; Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 63.

Systematic excavations have never been conducted on the site of al-Madīn. The antiquities found here come from isolated chance finds; for a list of these see Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl., iv., p. 1166-1197. The Deutsche Orientgesellschaft has just (the autumn of 1927) begun excavations here and it is to be hoped that this enterprise, which is on a considerable scale, will yield valuable results for the archaeology, history, and topography of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, especially on disputed points which can only be decided by the spade.


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

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

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

MADINA. [See Madina.]

MADIHAB. [See Figh.]

MADHJAB, an Arab tribe of Yemen origin, traced by the genealogists to Malik b. Uhair, who is said to have been descended for four generations from Kašīf and to have received his name Madhijā from a hill of this name on which he and his brother Tāy were born. His sons are said to have been: Sa'd b. Ather, Uqayl, Yūḥūb called Murad, and Zaid called Ann. The Madhjāb whose tribal lands are said to have lain near Tāzīd "on the road to Yemen" (Yūḥūl, e.a.) and whose brother tribes were Kāṭher and Murād, were according to tradition, at war with the Anas b. Ša'īq about the time of the appearance of Muḥammad. In the course of this war was fought the battle of Šaff al-ʿArab. In the Muslim period, families of the tribe of Madhjāb were prominent in Kašīf also along with those of Kinda and Ādhamān.

Bibliography: Tabari, Injīlāt, 1:18; Wāsénfeld, Die Geschichtsbücher des Arber, N. 47; Brockelmann, G. A., L. 140. (C. Brockelmann)

MADAR. [See Marīj Mīrāk.]

MADRĪD, a philosophical term meaning 'a place', or 'the place', or 'a seat', or 'the seat', a word of varied significance. In general it is used in a phrase that one can possibly exist (Posse: esse) but which really is not (non esse) but may become something through the adoption of opposed determinatives (forms). As the realization of the possible is conceived as advancing by stages, a lower stage of the form may again be conceived as material for a higher form of development. The question is further complicated even in Aristotle by the distinction between a physical and a logical material (this stems in the conception of species, which is formed by the specific differentia) and by the division of the physical into a heavenly and an earthly material. In addition there were further different, especially non-Aristotelian, influences among the Arab philosophers.

Bibliography: Tabari, Injīlāt, 1:18; Wāsénfeld, Die Geschichtsbücher des Arber, N. 47; Brockelmann, G. A., L. 140. (C. Brockelmann)
AL-MADINA, a town in Arabia, the residence of Mahommed after the Hijra, and capital of the Arab empire under the first caliphs. The real Arabic name of the town was Yathrib, iathrippa (this is the correct reading) in Procop. and Stephan Byzantinus, Yathrib in Masegon inscriptions (M. Harms, Die aramäische Epigraph, p. 232 sq.). Al-Madina on the other hand is a descriptive word, the town and is taken from the Avamie, in which Medina means strictly, "area of jurisdiction" and hencetown (of same size). In the Meccean section of the Koran it is found as an appellative with the plural al-Madina, while in the Medina Sira al-Madina is used as a proper name for the new residence of the Prophet (ib. 107, 127, 233, 60, 31. 5). The old name Yathrib on the other hand is found only once (xvii. 13). It is evident from these references that the real explanation of the name as the "town" (of the Prophet) is a later one. It is rather to be supposed that it was a result of the existence of a strong Jewish element in Yathrib that the Arabic loan-word became the regular name of the town. It is analogous to the originally South Arabian Hadyat (q. v.) "town," which is applied to the capital in Babylonia. Of the Madinan seats, Ray h. al-Khalib was the name Yathrib exclusively, while Hassan b. Thalith and Khb. al-Mahlak was both names, which is also the case with Muhammed's "ordination of the community. (Ibn Haldun, p. 344 sqq.)

Medina is situated in the Hijaz, on a plain sloping very gently towards the north, the boundaries of which are marked in the north and west by the hills of Simud (q. v.), and "Air about eight miles from the town, two outer spurs of the range, which forms the boundary between the Arabian Highlands and the low lying lands (Tabuk). West and east the plain is bounded by the Hassa or Luhayz, barren areas covered with black basalt but the eastern Hassa lies at a greater distance and there is no water between them and the town rain. For roots of the black basalt, to the south, the plain stretches away further than the eye can reach. Its noteworthy feature is its watercourses. The south of the Hassa is marked by a few low black hills. In the south the plain stretches away from the watercourses that separate the Hassa from the central part of the town. One such flood was particularly threatening in the reign of the Caliph Uthman. He built a dam in a factory with the water and made it into a swamp. After heavy rain the open square of the Madina (see below) forms a lake and considerable inundations are not rare and may even be dangerous to the buildings in the southern part of the town. The watercourses have different names; in the west, al al-Aqib with W. Duhair and Rihan, in the east, W. Duhair with Dahar and Mudhajir, or-nah. The soil is of rocky sand, lime and loamy clay and everywhere very fertile, particularly in the south. Dates are grown excessively, also oranges, lemons, pomegranates, bananas, peaches, apricots, figs and grapes. The winters are cool and wet, the summers hot but rarely saltry. Modern travellers say the air is pleasant but not very healthy and fevers are always present. The weather is usually pleasant, especially for newcomers as Muhammad's followers had frequently to flee (Baladhuri, p. 11; Faraadaj, ed. Goeccker, p. 23 sqq. Burchardi, Liber in Arabum, p. 525 sqq.; al-Wahidi, p. 176 sqq.; Wesemann, Mahommed in de Funden, p. 56; H. Leumme, Fatihon, p. 44; Mahomedische Studien, ii. 243). The best place to stay is the town "the Elthy" in contrast to the hammita al-mahfalah in which the Prophet is said to have given: (Goldsche, p. 402, H. 237).

The way in which Medina is favored by nature forms a striking contrast to Mecca which lies in a rocky valley whose corn does not grow (Sura xiv. 40). From the very beginning it was not a regular town but a collection of houses and enclosures which were surrounded by gardens and cultivated fields, the inhabitants of which were engaged in agriculture and therefore contemptuously called "Naharaian" by the Medina. The scattered settlements gradually became consolidated to a townlike agglomeration, which however lay further north than the later town, as the name Yathrib according
to Samhūtit (Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, p. 37) was especially associated with a place west of the tomb of Ḥumayd where the Banū Ḥāṭih settled. The town which arose in this way was not surrounded by a wall so that its defences were the thick groves of palm and the orchards which surrounded the houses. As they wereless thick on the north and west sides, these were most exposed to hostile attacks. The little forts (ʿaṣāf, plur. ʿaṣāf, or ʿaṣāf, plur. ʿaṣāf) which were built in considerable numbers formed a substitute for a wall and the inhabitants could retire into them in times of trouble.

There were in later times no reliable traditions regarding the origin and earliest history of Medina and the historians endeavored to fill the gap themselves and as elsewhere made the Djuhrum (q.v. and also Krauss, in Z. D. M. G., lxx. 152) and the quite unhistorical Ḥamzahites play a part in it (cf. also Hasān b. Thābit, ed. Hirschfeld, No. 9, verse 6). It is only with the coming of Jews to Medina that we are on surer ground, but the historians know so little of the exact period of these settlements that they connect them sometimes with Mosen, sometimes with the deportations of the Jews under Nebuchadnezzar, and sometimes with the conquest of Palestine by the Greeks or by Ayyubids or Romans. According to various references in the Talmud there were Jews in Arabia in the early centuries of the Christian era and this certainly means North Arabia in the main (see Hirschfeld, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Koran, p. 49 sq.) and that they were numerous is evident from the existence of Jewish communities in Taʾmīn, ʿIṣāṣ, Jausan and Sāvaq, Mission, p. 190, 244), Khāṣbah, Wāṭiʿ al-Kura, Fadāk and Maknūn, to which might be added that in Medina. Everywhere in these cases they took over and developed the cultivation of the soil, and it was probably due to them, that these scattered settlements each developed into a kind of town; evidence of this is found in the Arabic name Madīna for Yathrib. According to the definite statement of Hasān b. Thābit (No. 9, verse 8 in Hirschfeld) they built a number of small forts in this town. But that they were not the first to do this may probably be concluded from the fact that the earliest inhabitants were not pure Bedouins (according to Lammens, T.A.F., p. 72, these forts were built after the model of those of the Yemena). The Jewish tribe of Kainajah played a prominent part in the immigration, as at a later period one of the principal markets in the western part of the town was called after it. But gradually the tribes of Ḳarrsah and Ṣadār came to be the leading ones in Madīna Jewry. The former dwelled with the Bāḥil on the W. Mahāsah, the Ṣadār on the W. Buṭṣān (Ḳ itch b. Ḳ itch, šaṭa, 95, where Jewish tribes and the judaized Arab tribes are detailed). While in this passage, as usual, the Ḳarrsah and the Ṣadār are numbered among the pure Jews, according to a notable statement in the historian Yaḥyāh (ed. Houtmann, ii. 1, 52) they were not pure Jews but judaized clans of the Arabian tribe of Ḥijāj, which Nieleke has repeatedly emphasized as a genuine tradition. Now it is historically certain that at that time there were many Jewish proselytes (cf. Ibn Rithaʿī, Ḳ itch b. Ḳ itch, p. 299) but in spite of this there are decisive reasons for believing that the Jewish element in Madīna did not arise in this way. It is of special significance that the Kurras and Ṣadār are frequently called the Aḥāmēd, the "two (tribes of) priests", which shows that the Jews knew their genealogy and laid stress upon their descent (cf. e.g. Ibn Ḥishām, p. 660, 18: "thou revilest the pure of the two tribes of priests"). The same thing is seen from the fact that Ḳarīf Ṣaffa was married by Muḥammad as belonging to the family of Arūn (Ibn Saʿd, viii. 86, 2). But the decisive fact is the way in which the Prophet speaks in the Madīna sūras to the Jews there. He apostrophizes them as sons of Israel and reminds them that God has raised them above all men (ii. 44, 116); he embraces them with the ancient Israelites as if they had taken part in the Exodus from Egypt (ii. 26, 42); Allāh gave Moses the scriptures so that they might be rightly guided (iii. 50); they break the laws which he bound them to observe at the treaty of alliance (iii. 42, sqq.) etc. Such statements suggest hardly as possible that he regarded them as true descendants of the ancient Israelites. There must therefore have been in addition to the judaized Arabs a stock of true Jews, and indeed it is obvious that without such there could have been no proselytes. Wellhahn moreover has aptly pointed out that the Arabian Jews by their language, their knowledge of the scriptures, their manner of life, their fondness for malicious mockery, secret arts, poisoning, magic, and cursing, and their fear of death, make an unusual impression which cannot be explained simply by the judaizing of pure Arabs. But on the other hand it must not be forgotten that the Jews in Arabia were very much influenced by their surroundings and had assumed a character of their own. For example we find among them the division into tribes and families, characteristic of the Arabs, with the obligations associated with this. The names of these tribes cannot be traced to old Jewish names but are thoroughly Arabic in appearance, which is also true of their personal names among which true Jewish names like Samawāl and Sāra are rare. The arabisation of the Jews is particularly notable in the poems which are ascribed to Jews, most of which might have been equally well written by Beduins (see Nöldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poetik der alten Araber, p. 32 sqq.). While the Jews were supreme in other places like Khāṣbah, al-Fadāk etc., the position was changed in Madīna as a result of a new immigration which the Arabs associate with the burning of the dam at Marīb [q.v.] and the migrations of South Arabian tribes produced by it. In this way the two so-called Kaila tribes, Sāw and Ḳarrassad [q.v.], came to Madīna. No particulars of their coming are recorded, but there is an interesting verse in Ibn Khūdād்ஶ (B. G. A., vi. 128) and Yaḥyā, iv. 460, it is evident that they were for a long time subject and tributary to the Jews and that this part of Northern Arabia was at this time under Persian rule, in keeping with the usual Jewish policy of maintaining friendly relations with Persia. Later the Kaila Arabs however succeeded in casting off the Jewish yoke and bringing the Jews under their rule. According to tradition the occasion of this was that a powerful Jewish king named Ḳifūm, who exercised the jus primae noctis, was murdered by a Ḳarrassad Malik b. al-ʿAdīf to save his threatened sister—a widely disseminated motif (cf. K.
Schmidt, "Dea primae noctis," 1882, and also E. E. T., 1883, p. 156 (n. 44), on which too much stress should not be laid. As to later events, there are two different traditions; some make Malik after his death seek the help of a Ghassânid ruler, Abu Daibula (cf. the name Daibula among the Ghassânids), others of a South Arabian Tuba'is, Tha'āl Abulkhirī (c. 430; M. Hartmann, Die arabischen Prüge, p. 488, 497). In this second story, Wellhausen finds some support in some old verses and assumes that Tha'āl the nephew was the most popular name for a later Abyssinian victory. There is however nothing in these verses about an attack of the South Arabsians on the Jews of Madīna alone but on the inhabitants of the town together, so that Wellhausen further supports this attack may have occurred weakened the Jews hitherto predominant that the Arab inhabitants succeeded in breaking their supremacy; but this is of course no more than an attractive hypothesis. In any case the name Abraha in Kais b. al-Khaṭīm, No. 14, verse 13, cannot be used as a basis for further hypotheses for it is certainly not the celebrated Abraha (q.v.) who is meant. Besides, these stories contain legendary allusions to Muhammad's future appearance on Madīna, which betray at least a later recasting by Muslim historians.

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

The Kaṣā tribes at the time of their immigration to Yathrib had been heathens like the great majority of the Arabs. The principal deity they worshipped was Manāt (q.v.), after whom the Awwālī were originally named but they also reverenced among others al-Lat (cf. the name Taim al-Latī already mentioned). Through living alongside of Jews they became influenced by their religious and moral ideas, but unfortunately we know very little of their spiritual outlook before the coming of the Prophet. The poet Kais deals in the Beduīn style mainly with the quarrels between the tribes and families and rarely refers to religious matters. He nowhere mentions the local deities but refers to Allah (No. 6, verse 22) whom he calls the creator (5, 6; cf. Goldscheider, Z. D. M. G., viii. 398), which is in itself sufficient to prove Jewish or Christian influence. Of him he says in No. 11, verse 8: *Allah will only what he will*; verse 13, 12: *Praise be to Allah, the lord, the lord of the building* refers to the Kab'a in Mecca, the masjida covered with carpets (5, 14). The three days in Mina are mentioned in 4, 4 which shows that they then as later in the Muslim ports gave the young men an opportunity for love-affairs with women of other tribes. In rejecting a life after death, 6, 22, he is quite on a level with the poet Meccan. Alongside of such representatives of a mixed religion there were others whose conceptions had developed further through contact with Jews or Christians, so that they were reckoned staunch [nūn] as they definitely rejected the popular deities and had assumed a tendency to asceticism. Abu '1-Halīhām and Abīnād b. Zūrā for example professed monotheism before they became acquainted with Muhammād (Ibn Sa'd, iii/ii. 22, 139). A Kharradjī, Abī Kais Simra b. Abī Anas, wore sackcloth and laid stress on devotional purity; he actually thought of becoming a Christian but gave up the idea and adopted Islam when an old man (Ibn Sa'd, p. 347 sq.). A man of the Awwāl tribe,
Abd Al-Karim 'Abd 'Aziz b. Saif was known as the "man of the hour" from his ascetic mode of life; he later became an enemy of the Prophet, left Medina and fought against him on the side of the Muta'im. He is also said to have supported those who built a rival mosque at the time of the Tabuk campaign (Ibn Hisham, p. 411; Ibn Sa'd, iii/s. 90; Al-Walid b. Damen, p. 310). In evidence of such influence, the Christians in Medina might quote a verse of Harun b. Thabit (ed. Hirschfeld, p. 153, n.), but this probably refers to a later period and opportunities of mixing with them were to be found in many places in Arabia. One result of living alongside of Jews in Medina was that the art of writing was quite well known then (Ibn Kathir, Kitab al-Mu'jam, p. 134 sqq., ed. Thabit). 

The spiritual influence of the Jews on the Arab inhabitants of Medina became an important factor in the relations between them and Muhammad, for it made them receptive to his religious ideas with which they became acquainted by visits to Mecca and in other ways. Now finally a treaty was concluded between him and several representatives of the Muta'im, by which the latter pledged themselves to take him into their community and to defend him as if he were one of themselves, and now he and those of his followers who were still faithful to him were allowed to return to Medina. This treaty is dated in the year 9 H. After a brief stay in the southern suburb of Kubab he entered the town and took up his abode with a Khaṣṣā Ḥanāfī b. Zaid, with whom he lived till a dwelling was arranged for him. He is said to have left the choice of the site to the movements of his camel — if the story is true, a very clever man was not only not from the religious but also from the political point of view. In any case it is certain that hardly anything ever showed so clearly his gift, based on his unshakeable belief in his prophetic call, of leading men to follow his will, as this treaty was a very short period in bringing about a kind of order into Medina, hopelessly split up by feuds, and making a kind of unity out of the heterogeneous elements in the town, the earlier Arab inhabitants of Yathrib, the later immigrants, composed of the tribes of Ka'b, the Muta'im from Mecca and the Jews of Jabalum. We get a glimpse of the first steps towards the order from the ordinance of the community presented in Ibn Hisham, p. 342 ("Book of the Laws"); cf. Tawil, Usul umma, al-ṣalāh, p. 67 sqq., and following him, Ahmad al-Iṣbāni, Siyāsah, i, 385 sqq.; and Wesselsch, Muhammed de Prophet en de Moslim, p. 78 sqq., have discussed it. It is most interesting for its Muslim and lacks the market degree, clear and logical fundamental ideas, because Muhammad was content temporarily with what could be attained and avoided everything that might cause strife. In it he calls himself the messenger of Allah, but there is no reference to his divine inspiration. The object is to form a united group out of the inhabitants of Medina and this is defined from the religious point of view as the community of believers from Mecca and Yathrib. But the non-believers are not excluded, for the same ordinance, rather with the town of Medina which included the Jews and heretics, of whom it is not demanded that they should adopt Islam. The tribes retain their autonomy as regards blood-vengeance and ransom of prisoners, but against the rest of the world generally the offering of protection was obligatory on every member of the community without exception, and no one could conclude a peace separately with the enemies of the community (particularly the Quraish). All important matters, out of which mischief might befall the community, were to be brought before Allah and Muhammad. The valley of Yathrib was to be Jannah (or Jannat) for all who were bound by this ordinance. The whole document thus alternated continually between religious and purely political phrases in a very opportunistic fashion. It was written in great importance and it soon fell into oblivion as it was rendered obsolete by the rapid progress of events, certainly not against the wish of Muhammad whose plans went far beyond what was laid down in it. The main cause of its loss of importance was the breach which soon occurred between Muhammad and the Jews, which the latter proceeded by their scornful criticism of Muhammad's revelations, especially of the weak points revealed in his reproduction of stories from the Old Testament. This meant a serious threat to his authority and in addition the Jews endeavoured to destroy the agreement reached in Medina by endeavouring to revive the old hostility between the two Kudayt tribes (Ibn Hisham, p. 385 sqq.; cf. Sīrī, i, 143 sqq.). To meet these difficulties, which of course were very welcome to his enemies in the town, Muhammad worked hard to split his followers for a common object, the war with the Muta'im, by which he could at the same time avenge the resistance offered him there. It was at first difficult for him to arouse enthusiasm, for this war among the Muta'im and even more the Quraysh but finally, when a fortunate incident occurred to help him, he succeeded in bringing about a war with the Muta'im which led to the triumphous victory at Badr. On the further fightings of this campaign, the battle of Uhud, and the war of the ditches of the article Muḥammad. The latter campaign gets its name from the ditch (Qal'ab, p. 113), which Muhammad, in order to protect his town and the inhabitants of the fortified parts of the town and which, in spite of its modest dimensions, it is said to have been a, (ath, large, formed a serious obstacle to the enemy. Ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min in the 8th century still saw traces of it, an arrow-shot west of the town. On his further course cf. Wesselsch, Muhammed en de Dichters, p. 28, 31. The Meccans in this fighting gave him very material assistance by their lack of warfare ability and energy, and the war contributed to consolidate his position in Medina, sided not a little to the lack of resistance among the Muta'im who never managed to seize opportunities favourable to them. He was thus not only in a position to continue the war against his native city but also to repay the Jews in ruthless fashion for all the annoyance they had caused him. After the battle of Badr the Quraish were driven out of the town and after the battle of Uhud, which was against the Prophet, the same fate was meted out to the Quraish, who were, however, still out of the town, the Najjarin, that the word waqt was used at the time of the surrender of the town, he had measured, at the same time the events however do not show the Jewish tribe in a favourable light as they made no attempt to help one another but left each other
in the breach is most cowardly fashion. The Kurans then, at the massacre showed a courage which to some extent atones for their previous atrocity. In this way Muhammad succeeded in dissuading the danger that threatened him from the Jews for the Jews, who were left in Medina, were of no importance and caused him no serious difficulties.

The news of Hudhayfah in the year 8 A.H. [cf. sūrah al-Ma'ād] the war with the Quraysh was practically finished, for in it his genius for diplomacy succeeded in bringing them to recognize Medina as a power equal in importance to Mecca. The official conclusion of the struggle was the bloodless occupation of his native city in 8 A.H. However great a triumph this was for the Prophet, it produced a new feud which was to prove fatal for Islam after the death of Muhammad. Even before the decisive turn in the struggle with Mecca, in the campaign against the Basrīs Musallah, the ill feeling between the migrants and a section of the people of Medina came to a head in a breach of fashion and the death of Abd Allah b. Ubdul Aziz. The latter delivered several boisterous speeches and threatened to expel the migrants and other intruders (cf. Sura, 10, 8), which he unanimously denied when the Prophet later took him to task. But when Muhammad had entered Mecca, his faithful followers in Medina became anxious, as they feared he would now abandon their town and return to his native place. He calmed them however, and declared that he would live and die with them (Tim Hughens, p. 383). But when he began to treat the Meccans with great clemency and after the battle at Hunain was striving to win them over to his religion by rich gifts, the Ansar with justice felt themselves slighted and once again feared that he would abandon them. But he delivered them a speech in which he reminded them how he had united them when they were in hostilities to one another and declared his gratitude for all that they had done for him, and when he concluded by asking them to be satisfied if others went home with captives and not with the messenger of Allah, they burst into tears and withdrew satisfied (Tim Hughens, p. 383). While in such stories there may be an echo of the later antagonism between the Ansar and the Quraysh, they undoubtedly give a not inaccurate idea of the feelings which found expression at this time. It is all the more remarkable that according to various indications there must have been an opposition to Muhammad at the time of the Tabuk campaign in Medina. His actions against the Munāfiqūn in the ninth Sura round unusually caused him to flee to Medina and take refuge in the Meccan period with their threats of punishment. There is also also the notable, but unfortunately not quite clear story of the Māqṣid al-Dhahr (cf. also Lammer) which some men had built south of the city in the land of the Amīr b. Awf and which he sanctioned until he saw that the object was to provoke discussion among the believers for the benefit of his former enemies (Sura, lit. 103. 777 sqq.), whereby he had it destroyed. According to one story, the already mentioned Hamīd Abī Amīr was the moving spirit in it, (Tim Hughens, p. 392 sqq.; W. J. Wellhausen, p. 410 sqq.; Tabari, ii. 770 sqq.; Ibn Sa'd, iii. 348 sqq.) in any case Muhammad succeeded in again restoring peace, probably assisted by the fact that the leader of the Munāfiqūn died soon afterwards.

As his promise, the Prophet remained in Medina till his death on June 9, 632. According to a reliable tradition (Tabari, ii. 1837; Ibn Sa'd, ii. 37, 58, 59, 71, 99), his corpse lay unburied for a whole day, so that its putrefaction was far advanced when it was finally buried under 'Aisha's house, apparently a result of the great confusion into which his death had thrown the town. The unity created by his strong hand at once fell to pieces; the Ansar assembled and chose the Khārāmī Shā'īh b. Ubād b. As-San'āni as their chief, while others proposed that the government should be shared between the Ansar and the Muhājirūn. 'Umar's rapid and vigorous intervention however succeeded in thwarting these plans so threatening to fallin and carrying through the election of Abū Bakr as Caliph. He and his two successors were at Medina, which thus became the capital of the rapidly growing empire. Abu Bakr and 'Umar, like the Prophet, were buried under the house of 'Aisha, while 'Uthman's body was brought in the darkness on a door to the Jewish cemetery amidst Notions of stone-throwing. In this period on one thought of strengthening the defences of the capital, not even during the ribāts after the Prophet's death, and still less later when the holy wars were waged exclusively in foreign lands. 'Uthman had the forts taken down, but remains of them could be seen as late as the tenth century (Mas'ūdī, Kāmil al-Tāhīth, vii. 246).

'All's reign brought a complete change. While the great civil war was broken out between him and his rivals and the decisive battles were fought in the provinces, the Caliph recognized the vast empire could not possibly be governed from the remote corner of the world in which Medina lay. While the earlier caliphs had remained in the capital and sent out armies of conquest from it, 'All placed himself at the head of his troops and set out from Medina in Oct. 650, never again to see it. He made Kufa his capital and after Mu'tawiyah's victory Damascus took its place. Medina now sank, like its old rival Mecca, to the rank of a provincial town, unaffected by the current of the world's events. What pious old folks thought of this change is reflected in a characteristic tradition (Dinawarī, p. 152 sq.), according to which several prominent Ansar tried to induce 'All to abandon his plan of leaving Medina: 'What thou dost love in the form of prayers in the mosque of the Prophet and the course between his tomb and his pulpit is of more value than what thou expectest to find in the Hezib; reflect how 'Umar used to send his generals to war; there are still just as capable men amongst us as thou'! But the Caliph replied: 'The wealth of the state and the armies are in the Hezib and attacks threaten from the Syrians, and I must be near them'.

Medina with its venerable associations and the tombs of the Prophet could not out of course become quite insignificant; on the contrary, its ascendancy increased in the eyes of Muslims, the more the figure of Muhammad became important in their conceptions; but the life of the town became more and more remote from the real world in which actual history was being unfolded. His termites all who wished to keep themselves from the turmoil of political happenings, like 'All's son Hasān, after he had abandoned all his claims (Tabari, ii. 9; Dinawarī, p. 232). Hussein also went there from Kāth, and left it again to make desperate attempts to gain his rights, and it is significant that none of the Madīna Amīr
went with him (Wellhausen, Die Oppositionspartei, p. 86). When he was slain, his wives and sons were brought to Madina, where they lived in peace under an unimportant functionary, M. b. Abi-Hunya, residing in Madina (Dewaart, p. 508). It was not among only relatives and ardent followers of the Prophet, who preferred to live here in his city, but several of his former enemies, the Umayyads, also felt attracted either by the quiet and easy life and would not go to Damascene (Lammens, Histoire sur le califat des Omeyyades, p. 35). In this way Madina gradually became the home of a new population, consisting of people who wished to enjoy undisturbed the great wealth which the wars of conquest had brought them. Life there became more and more luxurious until finally the holy city became so notorious (Ktib al-Aghani, xxi. 367 note), that during a visit in the year 745 (137) the last Umayyad Caliph Marwan II could see one of the participants in it, how it was that the wine-songs of Madina had brought him back from taking part in it (Tabari, ii. 1910). Such stories remind us of Doughty's description of the present inhabitants of Madina (Travels in Arabia, 3rd ed., p. 351: *carving, playing, tippling in arak, bristly hemp smoking, ribald living*). This was the golden period of Madina about the glory of which the poets sang. Flourishing, well-watered gardens and meadows surrounded the town, and there was a number of splendid palaces built by wealthy Kuranids, especially in the Wadi al-Mughir, of which traces can still be found (cf. Biaurozd, Rdp., p. 261 sq.; Lammens, Madina, p. 228).

Another section of the people of Madina was attracted thither by the quiet life, although for other reasons. Their object was not worldly enjoyment, but they devoted themselves to the memories of the town of its past greatness, by collecting and analyzing the legal and ritual enactments dating from the Prophet, so far as they were based on the model of Madina and the style there. The most distinguished representative of this group was Mutamir b. Sharar (646-705), the author of the Muqaddim, who was founder of the Muqaddim school gathered many pupils around him (Goldschmidt, Al-Andalusiana, Madina, p. 237 sq.). On the death of this great man, the first caliph of the town of Madina (690 = 844) but it has not survived. Madina was now ruled by governor appointed by the Calif, list of whom are given by Tukari and Ibn al-Allah. The town was however not entirely unafflicted by the wars of the first century after Muhammad. In the reign of Yazid, feeling it Madina, even among the Umayyads, was not less on less hostilities to the Calif and many took the part of their rival, and took the part of the Caliph at Zahiria in Mecca. The expedition under the governor Amr b. Aswad, which Yazid ordered, was a failure. In 63 (942) the Madinans rebelled openly, opposing 'Abd Allah b. Hamuda as their leader and building a wall with a ditch to defend the town on the north. The Calif sent an army under the leadership of Uqba b. Ummayah which took up its quarters on the Huray N.E. of the town and fought the battle of the Actara which ended in the defeat of the Madinans, according to the usual story, a result of the treachery of the Banu Hashim. These inhabitants were abandoned to the ill-omen of the Syrian troops, probably a malicious
sight: earthquake which increased to seven each succeeding day. This, a glowing stream of lava burst forth which, as the chroniclers tell us, devoured rocks and stones but fortunately flowed to the east of the town and thus continued its way northwards. The inhabitants sought protection in the Mosque of the Prophet, praying and confessing that the town was lost. The belief in the latter's inviolability, which was thus strengthened, was soon to be shattered by the conquest described below.

Under the rule of the Turks Madina continued to lead a quiet life, little heed being taken by the outside world, and it is rarely mentioned, circumstance much facilitated by the fact that the holy city could not be entered by non-Muslims. Radical changes only came about in the sixth century. In 858, the Wahhabis took the town, plundered its treasures, and prevented pilgrimages to the Tomb of Muhammad. An attempt to destroy the dome over the tomb failed, but the great treasures in pearls, jewels etc., presented by pilgrims to the mosque were carried off. It was not till 1823 that Muhammad 'Ali's son Taimur succeeded in reaching the town. But there are the treaty of peace in 1825.

'Abd Allah b. Sa'Id recognized Turkish suzerainty over the holy places in the Hijaz. Muhammad 'Ali however paid no attention to this, but sent another son Ibrahim to continue the war against the Sa'id and in 1838 he took Dar'ya and raised it to the ground, whence he returned to Madina. The sacred cities once more belonged to the Turks and the Grand Sharif of Mecca even forbade pilgrims from Ibn Sa'id's territory to enter Mecca. This restoration of Turkish rule brought at least one important innovation: the building of the Hijaz railway from Damascus to Madina in 1908. It was primarily intended for pilgrims but was also of military importance and therefore suffered severely in the world war. Through the intervention of the Grand Sharif Husain b. 'Abd al-Malik, the fighting and the intrigues in North Arabia became more and more involved. He first posed as a faithful servant of the Turkish Sultan but later he rebelled and on Nov. 6, 1914 had himself proclaimed king of the Hijaz and joined the English. After the peace which ended the world war the Turkish troops evacuated Madina in 1918. In the meanwhile a stronger opponent to Husain had arisen in 'Abd al-Aziz b. Sa'id, who had once more raised the Wahhabis to a position of supremacy. Husain's bold move in assuming the title of caliph found no support among the Arab chiefs, and the people of the Hijaz forced him to abdicate. Ibn Sa'id seized this opportunity and at once captured Mecca. Thus was induced Husain's son 'Ali to leave the town. The two holy cities are therefore now both in the hands of the Wahhabis, who are however more tolerant and permit visits to the Mosque of the Tomb and other holy places and only forbid actual worship there.

In spite of the success of Madina, all non-Muslims and the reports of various modern travellers enable us to form a fairly clear picture of it, which can only be briefly outlined here. In keeping with the configuration of the ground, the plain on which Madina lies is divided into an upper southern part and a low northern part, al-Shiyah and al-Shijkh, issues found even in the earliest writers. Al-Shiya is reckoned to run to the above mentioned village of Kula, 3 miles away, al-Shijikh to the hill of Umm. The older wall encloses the town proper; the already mentioned later wall which is now partly in ruins encloses the eastern rather large sahn of al-A Rashid and "camp of the summer," luce al-muharrad, 400 yards from the old town and the town. Here is pointed out the traditional site of the muqalla, the Prophet's place of prayer, a tradition probably worthy of credence, as otherwise it would have been natural to locate it in the great mosque mentioned below. Along the south side of the wall runs the road of the funeral processions, Darah al-Djamah, which leads to the old general burial-place, Bab al-Qasr (so called after the plant aitrus retusus) in the east of the town. Among the thousands who are buried here are the little son of the Prophet, Thalib, his wife (whether also his daughter Fatima is disputed: see below), many of his companions, al-Shahba, Muhammad al-Bekir, Dja'ls al-Salih, the already mentioned jurist, Malik b. Anas, and many others. At the north-west corner of the town and partly on the wall there are several gates in the walls, including the Bab al-Sham in the north, the Bab al-Djam in the east, and the Bab al-Arshayya in the west. From a spring of fresh water in the village of Kula an aqueduct runs into the town, first laid by Marwan when governor of Madina. It frequently fell into disrepair and was restored for example by several Ottoman sultans, on the last occasion by 'Abd al-Hamid after the Wahhabis had destroyed it. The damage not infrequently done by floods has already been mentioned. In 1734 the Madinans were prevented for six months by an inundation from visiting the grave of Hanan. The streets of Madina are, clean but narrow and only the main streets are paved. The houses are well built of stone and a number have two stories. Several of them are surrounded by gardens, but the houses with gardens are mainly found outside the north and south wall, especially towards the south where vegetable gardens and orchards alternate with palm groves and cornfields. The dates of which there are 70 varieties are, as in ancient times, one of the principal products. The pilgrim traffic is however the most important source of revenue for the inhabitants, who let their dwellings to the strangers and guide them to the sacred places and instruct them about ritual duties. The astronauts here play the same role as the sufi sheikhs in Mecca. Burton (ib. 182) gives the number of inhabitants at 16,000—18,000, in addition to 400 men in the garrison. Wavell (p. 63) in 1908 put it at 20,000, including soldiers and pilgrims, while Balfour gave 60,000 including many foreign visitors. The results of the world war have of course altered these conditions in many ways. The population used to increase gradually by visitors settling after permanently in the sacred city, Of the inhabitants of the old Ansar there are very few left in Madina; according to Burckhardt there were only ten families in his time. There are a number of Sh[J]'is in the suburbs. Madina possesses no sanctuary, some remote times like the Ka'bah, on the other hand it possesses compensation for this in innumerable rail in. Muslim eyes is the most beautiful mosque in reality and is the goal of countless pilgrims. Several teachers even put this sanctity higher than the Mecca one, but this view is not general, and the visiting of the mosque is not obligatory like the pilgrimage to Mecca.
and also may be undertaken at any time. According to
numerous traditions the Prophet was buried under
'Abd Allah's house, where also the two first caliphs
rested on their last resting-place. Further, all the
earlier sources agree that Muhammad soon after
his arrival in Medina had a mosque built, which he
erected after the taking of Khaybar, and they
were also agreed that the dwellings of his wives
were close by so that 'Abd Allah's house with the
garden could easily have been taken into the mosque.
That there is nothing improbable in itself in a
mosque having been built in the time of the
Prophet is shown by the mention of a real mosque,
Sūrā ix. 108 (97), cf. xi. 26, 36. But Castani, Amozzi, p. 432 (163), has disputed
important arguments the correctness of the tradition
and various statements drawn the conclusion
that originally on the site of the later mosque
there was more probably only the ärre of Mu
hammad with a courtyard and various dwellings.
If this is right, it is not known who built the
mosque; but probably it was erected not long
after Muhammad's death, for the rapidly increasing
reverence for the Prophet must very soon have
aroused the desire to build a resting-place in
touch with his religion. To this mosque, early
built, can then be referred that tradition tells us of Muhammad's mosque; — a simple building
of brick with pillars of palm-stone and a roof of
branches. According to the same tradition, 'Umar had it extended and after him 'Uthman who replaced
it by a building of stone and a roof of
leak. When Marwan was governor of Medina,
he had a maqṣar of colored stones erected; but no
important advance was made till the reign
of Walid, who commissioned the then governor,
afterwards caliph, 'Abd Allah-al-A'īs in 87
(766) to adow the building in greater splendour.
For this 'Umar used Greek and Coptic builders,
and the Byzantine emperor is said to have contributed
1,000 caelit of gold and a large quantity
of mosaic stones towards it. On this occasion four
minarets were placed at the corners of the sanctuary
covered with plates of lead. The mosque remained unaltered till the reign
of Al-Mahdi. After this Caliph al-Hajib had visited Medina, it was rebuilt and extended in 182 (778-779)
and its length was now 300 and its breadth 200 coll.
In the following century another restoration was
necessary and was carried through by al-Mu'ta-
awahh in the year 247 (861-862).
Of the mosque which thus came into existence there are very full descriptions by Ibn 'Abd Rab-
bih (d. 326 = 939), Makhdadd (375 = 985), Ibn 'Uqayr who travelled in the end of the years 576-
578 (1182-1185, and 1187) and lastly of al-Ma'mun, a very minute work, given by these authors only a few
can be quoted here. As is quite evident from several of these descriptions, the mosque had the form,
always retained later, of an open court-yard
covered with and or gravel, which was surrounded on all four sides by rows of pillars.
In the eastern part of the southern pillared hall
was the holy of holies, the tomb of the Prophet,
with the tombs of Abū Bakr and of 'Umar. It
is described by Yāḥīyā (iv. 458) as a high building,
surmounted at the top only by a space from the
roof of the pillared hall. Regarding the relative
positions of the three graves there are in his
description different views. North of them, according to some traditions, was the tomb of Fāṭima, while
according to others this was in the general burying
ground. The part of the pillared hall lying west
of the graves bore the name al-naṣūra, the gardens,
from an alluded utterance of the Prophet. The
total number of pillars is said to have been 956; those in the southern part were stuccoed, with
 gilt capitals, the others were of marble. The walls
were adorned with marble, gold, and mosaic.
Along the southern border of the naṣūra ran a barrier,
with which several highly venerated relics
were associated; — the remains of the trunk of a
tree, on which Muhammad used to sit, and especially his miter of pulpits. According to
the tradition Muhammad wished to remove these; but
immediately a tremendous earthquake began, and he
abandoned the idea and instead raised it by an
upper structure five steps higher. Al-Mahdi later
wished to remove this addition, but he was dis-
suaded from doing this as the masts had been
driven into the old minbar (Yaḥīyā, ed. Horimau,
ii. 283; Ṭabari, iii. 483; Makhdadd, ed. de Goeje,
p. 81). According to the descriptions it had 8 steps
and there was a slab of ebony over the seat which
visitors might touch. The remains of the tree
trunk were kisn and smoked with the hands, an
interesting imitation of ancient Arabian religious
customs. Among the various treasures of the
mosque was the Mazar of the Madīna, i.e., the
canonical text of the Korān prepared by
'Uthman. The mosque had 19 doors of which only
four, two in the east and two in the west, were
opened. There were three misarrays, two at
the corners of the north side and one at the
southern corner.
While the Mosque of the Tomb escaped the
volcanic eruption already mentioned (654 = 1256), it suffered in the same year from a fire due to
the carelessness of a caretaker, which destroyed a part
of it. An appeal to the caliph of Baghdad for assistance to rebuild it remained unanswered
as the Abbasid dynasty was then tottering before
the Seljuk Turks, which was to last for another 70
years. Only the roof was repaired. The fire in sackcloth fashion, the rubble was not even
clared away from the tombs but remained there
for over two centuries. Several of the Manṣūrī
Sulṭāns showed some interest in the sanctuary,
among them Kāhin I, who, according to Muhyī
al-Dīn (Cairo 1283; p. 454), placed a railing round the tomb of the Prophet and had its roof gill,
while others sent workmen and materials, and
notably al-Mansūr Kāhin in 676 (= 1279) to mark
the site of the tomb built a dome over it covered
with plates of lead. Al-Farāḥ Shīrīn Kāhin (735-800 = 1485-1545) was however the first
rebuild and to deal with the mosque in an entirely
new and original fashion and he had the mosque at the southern corner, al-Mustaṣaṣṣa, taken down and rebuilt. A great
number of buildings were built upon the mosque for, in a terrible
thunderstorm in 886 (1483), it was struck by lightning
and partly destroyed, and the library with its valuable manuscripts of the Korān perished.
Sulṭān, who lost his own library on this occasion,
gave an account of the catastrophe. The most
famous Sulṭān Sulṭān however sent a large number of
workmen with tools and materials, and in 889 (1484)
the building was restored and among other alterations the dome over the tomb was enlarged; he
also presented the brass railing which surrounds
the naṣūra. On this occasion, the Sulṭān also
presented to the town baths and a hypocaust for
them, an aqueduct and a water mill, as well as a large number of valuable books to replace those destroyed. Its misfortunes however were not at an end for in 898 (1492) it was again struck by lightning; the Qāʿa, the northeast corner was destroyed and had to be rebuilt. The mosque received its present form by an addition to the north, made by 'Abd al-Majīd in 1270 (1853-1854) which Burton saw before its completion. The many inscriptions which cover the walls, include various Sūras and Korans and the mystic prayers and verses of 'Abd al-Majīd.

In modern times we have descriptions by Burckhardt (unfortunately incomplete), as he was ill during his stay, by Burton (1853), a brief one by Wavell in 1808—1809 and a good one by al-Batūnī in 1910. In their main outlines they give much the same picture as the older ones. The mosque stands in the centre of the town proper, a little to the east. Al-Batūnī gives the length from north to south as 385 feet, the breadth on the north side as 285 feet and on the south side as 230 feet. The court (jaʿfar or al-baṣāl) is covered with sand or gravel and enclosed by four sides by pillared halls, of which the longest on the south is 360 feet. The actual mosque itself, the pillars in this part are covered with marble with gild ornamentation. All the pillars in the mosque, 347 in number, support arches on which rest little domes like divided oranges. Of the pillars 32 are in the eastern part of the southern hall (the qubba), the sanctuary proper with the tomb of the Prophet. "The Garden," i.e. the area between the tomb and the minbar, is 70 feet long and 50 breadth. The qubba is enclosed on the south, where the mosque is extended by a row of pillars, by a brass grille with the relics already mentioned, and the beautiful mecbīra of the Prophet with an indication of the direction of prayer. The present marble is of marble with gilding, a gift of Murād III in 998 (1590). The mecbīra, the holy of holies, in the south, is 50 feet long from north to south and 47 feet broad, is surrounded by a green polished brass railing through which a door, 88 by 125 by 135, leads to the Rawżah. It encloses an area which is called al-ṣaqa, in allusion to Aṣūr's house. It cannot be accurately described as it is covered with green silk and is not seen by visitors. The covering, which recalls the covering of the Ka'bah, is said to have been first presented by the mother of Hūrin al-Raḥilī, Nim al-Din Zangī is said to have cleaned a new area round the other salaysa to protect the tomb. In the jaʿafars are the tombs of the Prophet and of the first two caliphs, according to the usual belief in the following order: the most southern is the tomb of Muhammad; next to it is ʿAbd al-Majūd, next Bes al-Bakr with his head beside Muhammad's feet and on the north ʿUmar with his head beside ʿAbd al-Bakr's shoulders. A fourth, empty grave is said to be intended for Jesus after his passion. On the north side of the large mecbīra, another smaller one adjoins it, which, according to an assumption still disputed by many, contains the tomb of Fātimah. Two doors on the east and west side connect it with the large mecbīra. Two hanging lamps are placed in this the most sacred part of the mosque, and in addition in the Rawżah there are candelabra of crystal. In the court of the mosque, approximately east, is a quadrangular area shut off by an iron grille, which is called Fātimah's garden. Of the 15 palms which grew there in the time of Ibn Dabbūs, Burton saw only 12; al-Batūnī mentions several small palms planted round a high one. Behind the boundary wall is called "Prophet's wall". The mosque has four minarets at the four corners and according to Burton a fifth in the centre of the west side, but this is not mentioned by al-Batūnī. Five domes give admittance to the sanctuary: on the west the Bāb al-Salām and Bāb al-Raḥim, on the north the Bāb al-Majūd, on the east the Bāb Dīlān (or al-Dīlān) and Bāb al-Naṣr. They are all closed at night. From the descriptions already quoted, the mosque was not impressive when seen from the outside, as the houses were built so thickly round it that an open view of it could not be obtained. Even the richly ornamented Bāb al-Salām only looked like the termination of a street running from the west. But this seems now to have been altered, as according to Maull, "Zur Zelt- und Ruhigkeiten von Arabien," p. 344, all the houses in the immediate vicinity of the mosque were removed in 1916.

The immediate vicinity of the city of the Prophet is of course very rich in places with which are associated anecdotes and traditions of him. The most important of these is the hill of Uma or Umm, with the graves of those who fell for the faith there. It is riddled by the village of Kuba′, where Muḥammad on his arrival in his new home stayed from Monday till Thursday (Ibn Humayd, p. 335). The village, which was at that time occupied by the "Aṣūr or ʿAsīf, according to the Arab geographers, 2 miles, according to Ibn Hāmid, 3 miles, 1½ hours from Madīnā; to be accurate, it is about 3 miles. The surrounding gardens which are exceedingly rich in all kinds of fruit and vegetables extend for 4 or 5 miles (Burckhardt). Burton describes how the village appeared to him as he approached it: "a confused lump of huts and dwellings, houses, chapels and towers, with trees, between oil lamps, heaps of rubbish and yelping dogs". Tradition marks the spot where the Prophet's camel knelt (al-mقщ)& and here also was the mosque mentioned in Sīra, i.e. 139 built out of stone, as well as its counterpart, the Masjīd al-ʾAʿzīz, destroyed by Muḥammad's orders (cf. Wāḥidī—Wellhausen, p. 411; Ibn Ṣa'd, III, 32, 33 and above). The mosque of Kuba′, with its simple minaret was in ruins in Burckhardt's time, but has since been replaced by a stone structure.

Al-Madinat al-Zahirah, the ancient capital of the Umayyad Caliphate in Cordova, the ruins of which are still in existence about 3 miles to the west of this latter town, as the place called Cordoba in Spain, on the last spurs of the Sierra Morena overlooking the valley of Guadalquivir (q.v.).

The western Arab historians give us a great deal of information on the foundation of this royal town, upon the period which marked its prosperity and upon the causes which led to its fall. It was the great Caliph 'Abd al-Rahman III al-Nasir (q.v.), who decided upon building it, and its construction was begun during the reign of the sovereign at the end of the year 325 (936). The chroniclers say that one of his companions having left him a large sum of money, al-Nasir wished to utilize this sum for the payment of the ransom of the Spanish Muslim prisoners of war in the kingdoms of Leon and of Navarre. As the envoys who had been sent for this purpose failed to find any prisoners whom they could ransom, the Caliph's favourite al-Zahirah is said to have advised him to employ the legacy to build a town to which she would give her name. This amicable act was without doubt legendary, at least in several points. The work of building the town was carried on for many years (from 325 to 430 years according to historians); it lay around the palace of the Caliph. Six thousand town stones were used every day, not to mention other materials; the necessary marble was chiefly imported from Afriquia, and no less than 4,373 columns were required, if we may believe Ibn 'Idhārī. According to the same author it was the crown prince al-Hakim himself who directed operations. The name of the chief architect, Mathamah b. 'Abd Allāh, has also been preserved.

The building of Madinat al-Zahirah engaged not less than 10,000 workmen. Account was taken in the planning of the town of the very steep slopes of the site. The town was given a plan in which the central mosque occupied the centre. The town was built on three terraces; the lower one contained private dwelling-houses and the Great Mosque.

'Abd al-Rahman removed with all his court to Madinat al-Zahirah, as he felt the Caliph's palace of Cordova which faced the cathedral mosque and overlooked Guadalquivir too small, and this became his favourite residence. His successors al-Hakim II and al-Hakim III lived there for the most part during their reigns, and further embellished the town of al-Nasir. It appears, however, that they were not so well received in it as the previous sovereigns. In the year 395 (1005) marked its final fall, A century and a half afterwards in the time of Idriss, the walls alone remained and vestiges only of the palace. A few inhabitants still lingered in it.

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

**Bibliography**


**AL-MĀjejRA**

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

The Name. It is probably taken in the first place from the Greek γαλακτός: *al-ḥabba‘ū al-bakīhah* or *al-dhahr al-dakhir*; the circle or path which looks like milk. Other names are *fisr al-ghalib*; the road of milk, as it has the colour of milk, *farīr al-ghalib*, the road of the place where there is milk, and hence metaphorically name of heaven, mother of heavens, who feeds the heavens as milk; *farīr al-ghalib*, path of straw and milk or *al-dhahr al-dakhir*, path of the place where there is milk. Similarly the Milky Way is called in Persian گلکسِی, straw-puller, or گلکسِی, path of the straw-puller in Turkish گلکسِی, گلکسِی, straw or fodder-thief. Whether names connected with straw go back to Greek or Oriental ideas is uncertain. Guindel (op. cit.) holds the latter view. In the East the Milky Way is the sky, straw and meal, which Peter or Saint Vincent (Venna) lost and blessed by God gave to heaven. Another Turkish name is گلکسِی, path of the pilgrim.

Other Arabic names are *al-tam‘*; gate of heaven, and *al-saw‘* or *al-saw‘*, gap probably from the idea that the Milky Way corresponds to a gap which one can see the sky beyond. Another name is *awr al-majjar*; mother of the stars, because no part of the heavens is so rich in stars. The stars are also to have legs (دَارَة al-majjar). Among the Kazan Tatars the Milky Way is called *Fat‘ al-Wil-Goose* and among the Altai Tatars (*Fat‘ al-Grose-Feast*; front way).

The name of *al-majjar*; River of the Majjar, is noteworthy. The Milky Way is regarded as a river; this is evident from the passages in *Abū al-Rahmān al-Safī* in his work on the constellations, in *al-Bīḍāl* in his *Kitāb al-Tafsīr* towards the end and in the *Chronology* (text, p. 345; transl., p. 348), in *al-Kawāf* in the *Camograph* (text, i, p. 37; transl., p. 18) and in many others. In these passages the constellation of Segittarius or the eight stars forming the lower station of the moon which are called *Segittarius al-majjar* are described. *Four* of the stars which lie on the Milky Way are called *al-majjar al-safī*; the eastern going to drink, the four others lie at the side of the river of the Milky Way and are called *al-majjar al-dā‘ir*, the cattle returning from drinking (cf. e.g. L. de Verte, op. cit., p. 184 and Hyde, *Ulysses’s Table*, Oxford, p. 28).

**Description of the Milky Way.** A description of the Milky Way, the stars and constellations in it, is given by Podenay in the *Almugāri* (Dh. viii, Ch. 2) and the Muslim translators have borrowed from this. The editors have treated it in different ways. Al-Ṭūsī for example in his commentary of the *Almugāri* gives the description of Podenay fully as in *Polemies*; but he does not give the translation by al-Majjarī, as I was able to show. Ibn Sīnā, the other hand, who gives a brief synopsis of the contents of the *Almugāri* in the *Šaybān* (Hersing) gives no such description; he deals here in the same way as he does with the Tables which he includes.

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

An independent description of the whole Milky Way as full as that in *Polemies*, I have not been able to find in Arabic works. A brief description is given by Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dimawri in *al-Maṣūfik*, *Kitāb al-Amrīn wa l-Ahwiq* (Cairo 1325, ii, 9–12). The description of al-Dimawri leaves much to be desired and the text is not quite correct. The former is in keeping with Abū al-Rahmān al-Safī’s verdict, according to which al-Dimawri was very well acquainted with the verses on the Milky Way but his astronomical knowledge was insufficient (it may be noted that Abū al-Rahmān mentions Ibn Khuzayma, while there is a Muhammad b. Khuzayma in al-Masūfik).

The anonymous writer mentioned in the *Bibliography* gives a brief description of it. Abū al-Rahmān al-Safī unfortunately only gives a description of one part of it; he mentions the part of the Milky Way between the bright, the bright Milky Way (al-Majjarī al-qāmiyum) and the falling eagle (Lyra) (bīz al-majjarī; here at y Gygoi the Milky Way divides). Abū al-Rahmān follows this stretch up to *Scorpio*. In many cases the position of stars e.g. in the Ship is given from their position with respect to the Milky Way. Schjellerup has given details in the tables appended to the synoptic accord. (p. 544). In the *Kawāf* of al-Ṭūsī the Almugāri and al-Majjarī of the Arabs, Kāthir of the Persians and Kah Bihich of the Hindus is an aggregation of a very large number of small stars.
They form an almost perfect large circle, which runs between Gemini and Sagittarius, sometimes narrow, sometimes wide, in some places it is dense, in others not. Aristotle thinks that the Milky Way consists of stars surrounded by vapors like the halo round the moon and the mist (in the sky) and the sameness.

The Theory of the Milky Way. On the nature of the Milky Way and the cause of its shape, there are a number of views, which follow the same lines as those of the ancients (cf. O. Gilbert, Die astrophysischen Theorien der griechischen Alterthumer, Leipzig 1907, index v, p. 275). I may give al-Karīmi's account of it.

Al-Karīmi (1125-1286) who wrote a work on Optics (Noteworthy consideration of what the eyes grasp in 50 questions or problems), says in the 45th question: "Why do we see a black haze on the moon? Is this an illusion or reality?" and concludes:

"Commented on this question is that of the Milky Way which looks red in the sky. We are told that it is due to the vapor. 2. It consists of small stars which are crowded so closely together that the eye cannot distinguish one from the other. 3. It is said to be a vapor, which has risen from the earth and solidified under the sun of the fixed stars. One forms a black, cloudy body. This is the case in the central Milky Way. A part lies in places which are far away from those in which there is burning; these are the two sides of the Milky Way. These phases appear white. 4. Finally we are told that the Milky Way consists of something whose shape is inverted in the heavens and which is in some part of the earth, to which the eye cannot be found and which cannot be reached."

Of these four views, the second is nearest the truth.

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

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

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

Some learned men agree that the Milky Way, al-Madjara, has its origin in the fact that small stars have become combined in this figure (1168) and offer themselves jointly to the view.

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

"We say that the Milky Way is a limit of the sphere of the fixed stars. As it is a thick limb, which is thicker than the other limbs, it completely absorbs the light of the sun, corresponding to what the other limbs take up, i.e. as the stars do. This corresponds to the view of him who says that the matter is thick limbs of their nature. Each limb takes up light in proportion to its density, but the density is the same, light being reflected at an angle.""

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

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

Abu 'Isar (Has Hbrebsa) in his work (Invention of the splitters) on the shape of heaven and earth, (translated by F. Nau, Paris 1899, p. 92 sq.) has a section on it (he ḥafaš nājīdā) and the Milky Way. He says: "In the heavens there are some white patches, vapor-stars. Some think these are a part of the Milky Way as like it they resemble clouds. They also think that they consist of a very large number of very small stars lying very close to one another, like the mane below the lion which is in the shape of an ivy leaf. Those who believe this also say that the whole Milky Way consists of very small stars joined together. The Milky Way is obviously neither made nor kept in the air, nor is it outside the sphere of Saturn, but on the contrary it affects the Milky Way."

The following note may be added on patches of nebula:

Among the nebulae known to the Muslims are the Magellanic clouds which were observed by merchants in Makka. They saw there a white patch of cloud which never came down and never changed its position (al-Karimī, Aṣāī al-Majāshīr, vol. II, p. 40).

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

1) According to this, the anonymous writer would believe that the fixed stars, the Milky Way, etc. are seen light from the sun, a view that is contradicted by the al-Haitham and others of below.

2) In the tables and astronomical works only the separate patches mentioned by Poliklet are given.

3) There is an error here: The Milky Way should have to be below tne sphere of Saturn but above the atmosphere like the planets. — The deviations in the brightness of the Milky Way are phenomenon caused by dusting.

The Milki Way is mentioned in a whole series of verses, particularly in the hands of modern poets. I have published 22 of these in the S. P. F. M. S. Erlangen with the help of A. Flower (Leipzig), Kowalinski (Cracovia), Heil (Erlangen) and Krenken (Bonnheim).


(M. F. WIEDEMANN)

MAJID AL-DAWLA, Abi ‘Ali, Rusun al-Din. Abi ‘Ali, Fathur al-Dawla, Abi Rabi. After the death of his father Fathur al-Dawla (q.v.), Majid al-Dawla, who, according to the usual statement, was then four years of age, according to another source (while Ibn al-Aziz, Abi ‘Abd, N. 43 says he was born in 379-909-900) which does not agree with either of these statements, was proclaimed as successor to the regency of his mother Suyyid. In 388 (998) Kasha b. Wadhambugh (q.v.) esteemed the two provinces of Dajjajun and Tabaristan, to which was added by the treaty of peace Maimana the also, and later he brought Gillin al-Dawla under his rule. In 397, 1006-1007, Majid al-Dawla with the help of the vizier al-Khatir Abi ‘Ali b. Abi Rabi and al-Ruzzu, in the east of al-Dawla whose attempt to overthrow his mother he was taken prisoner by his brother Shams al-Dawla and the kadi that his brother, Abi Rabi, was deposed, whereupon Shams al-Dawla took control of the government. But al-Dawla did not last long; however, when Majid al-Dawla was released and again recognized as ruler, while his brother retired to his government of Maimana. In 405 (1015) the latter succeeded in seizing the town of al-Kayy. Suyyid and Majid al-Dawla had to take to flight, but were soon able to return because Shams al-Dawla was prevented from following them by a routiny in the army and had to leave the field. Suyyid held the reins of government until her death (410 = 1019/1020), while Majid al-Dawla, who although extremely interested in learning, otherwise cared only for his numerous harem, paid no heed to affairs of state. After Suyyid’s death, the complete chaos reigned. (see the previous paragraph). In 419 (1028/1029) Sultan Mahmud b. Sulaiman b. Sulaiman b. Al-Shakirah (q.v.) undertook a campaign into the tribe. When Majid al-Dawla wrote to him and complained of the rebellion spirit of his army, the Sultan sent a considerable body of troops against al-Dawla and ordered the commander to take Majid al-Dawla. When the troops opposed the latter went to them and was at once seized along with his son Al-‘Ali. The Sultan himself then set out against al-Dawla, seized the town and had Majid al-Dawla sent to chains to Kasr el-Din.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEDT)

MAJID AL-DIN. [see HUBAT ALLAH MUSAMMAM]

MAJID AL-MULK, Abi ‘Abd al-Rahman Muhammad al-Harawi. Governor of the Sultanate of Sur and Harāt. As early as 485 (1093-1099) we find Majid al-Mulk mentioned among the high officials, and in time he became more and more powerful, while Barqiyuyk’s weakness and incapacity became more and more obvious. But as a Shī’ī, Majid al-Mulk became suspected of being the real instigator of the murder committed by the ‘āliids and after the murder Barqiyuyk [q.v.] had fallen a victim to ‘āliid fanaticism, the troops mutinied (Shawwal 490 = Aug.-Sept. 1099) and demanded that Majid al-Mulk should be handed over to them. He offered to sacrifice his life and proposed that the sultan should have himself exonerated to satisfy the troops. But Barqiyuyk wished to save him. After the soldiers had sworn not to slay Majid al-Mulk, but only to imprison him, he was handed over. In spite of their oath, the soldiers fell upon him and set fire to him to places. His death is derived from Barakshah, a village near Kurna; cf. Yakut, q.v.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEDT)

MAJIDHUB (as, "attracted") denotes in the terminology of the Sufis a person who is drawn by the Divine attraction (Qadghin), so that without effort on his part he attains to union with God. In other words, the Sufis experience the ecstatic rapture of losing himself in God, and is thereby distinguished from the akhri ("travellers"), who makes the journey to God, stage by stage, with conscious endeavors and purposes. The opinion favored by the rationalists, it is, that the Sufi is superior to the akhri finds expression in the saying: "One Qadghin (act of drawing) from God is equivalent to all the inward (rational) work of manhood and isms (‘ilm al-Qadghin);", but it is generally recognized that, whether akhri or Qadghin (q.v.) properly describe both are needed in order to reach perfection. Those in whom Sufism prevails possess such and constitutes the predominant element in their spiritual life are called ‘ālim as-Dawla, while conversely those whose sufism comes first are known as ‘ālim as-Sīlah. Although the terms ‘ālim as-Dawla and ‘ālim are employed by Husain (Masighon, Persien, ii. 905) and occur
frequently afterwards, their application in a narrower sense to those who speculate or acknowledge the moral and religious law is characteristic of the derisive franknesses, which, as is well-known, differing widely from others in their theory and practice concerning this matter.


(M. A. NICHOLSON)

MADID (A.) [See AL-MINH.]

MADINUN. In Arabic, Persian and Turkish literature the epithet al-madinun, i.e. "the man possessed by a djinn," the "madman," is prominently associated with Kāsī ibn al-Mu'āz wa'far (according to others, the name of his father is Muḥammad), the author of the Bara' ʿAbd ar-Rahmān ibn al-Sa'd, the story of whose passages for Lālā, daughter of Saʿd, a woman of the same tribe, is celebrated throughout the Mughal world. Kāsī is said to have died about 1300 A.H. (Farsū, Ḥādīj 328, li. 172), but it seems doubtful whether he can be regarded as a historical person, and this view is supported by the statements of early Muslim authorities (Aḥmad, I, 167-169; cf. Ibn Ḥallāl, ed. Wetschenski, N. 103, p. 542, and Ibn Ḥallāl, Muḥaddisima, ed. Quatrench, t, 106, f. 20 r. = Aḥmad, I, 169, d. 604, where he describes one of three persons who were visited, while Ibn al-Kalīt declared that the story of Madinun and the scenes attributed to him were fabricated by a man of the Banū Umayyah (fābd, li. 167, b. 20 v.). Stripped of the picturesque details with which later poets have embellished it, the story is a simple one. Kāsī meets Lālā amidst a party of women, falls in love at first sight and slaughters his horse to make a feast for her. His horse is returned, but his father refuses to give her in marriage, and soon afterwards he perishes in manner similar to traditions in sanitary matters. The story is a fine one of the past of his days in solitude, wandering half-baked in the hills and valleys of Najaf, making verses on the subject of his unhappy love, and only seeing Lālā at rare intervals until his death. The development of this love-tale of the Arab desert into one of the popular themes of Persian romantic and mystical poetry was begun by Nuqūmi of Gondā, in whose Khānam the Lālā al-Madinun occupies the third place. Of other poems bearing the same title, the best-known in Persian literature are those by Abū Khurshūn of Dīlū, Dubās, Nūḥ, by Ḥusain (see the abridgment in Gilot, History of Ottoman Poetry, li. 175-190) and Jābīlī (ibid., vii. 83-88; 100-1054). Sīh writers find in Madinun a type of the sort which through tribulation, self-abnegation and self-abasement aspires to be united with God.


(M. A. NICHOLSON)
MADJUS. [See VADJUS WA-MADJUS.

MADJUS (n. the Zoroastrians. The Greek word Ἱδωράθη (which itself renders an Iranian word, cf. old-Persian magas, new-Persian mag) passed into Arabic through an Aramaic medium. According to the Arabic lexicographers, Madjus is a collective like Yatūr; in the singular Madjūs is to be used; the religion of the Madjūs is identified with Al-Madjūsīyya. The lexicographers cite from the root  y m  a form (maghzūla) and a verb (magdīya). In a poem, cited in the Liwa and the Thaqaf-al-arm, the phrase fat magāju is found. If we also add, one could be sure, that this word is really (as is asserted in the Liwa) a composition of  gallery is and Al-Tawān Al-Yashābūrī conjointly, the word would already occur in the oldest Arabic literature extant.

In the lexica, the word Madjūs is derived from the proper name, Mīndī Kīs, which name, according to them, is the Persian equivalent for Arabic مَنْدِي الكس (*a. little ear*). This man, named Mīndī Kīs, they say, is not the same as Zoroaster, but lived before him, and was the first among those who proclaimed the religion of the Magi. This is one instance of the many etymological and etiological enormities of Arabic antiquarians (cf. Liwa, viii. 98 sq.; Thaqaf-al-arm, iv. 245; Lane, Lexicon, s. v.). Incidentally, it may be noted that in Arabic literature the word Madjūs is also used to denote the peoples of Northern Europe, viz. the Scandinavians (cf. Deay, Nicholson, ii. 250 et al.; Appendix No. xxxiv. p. lxxiv.; Reiske normannicorum fontes arabici . . . collegii et al. Selpell, i., Christiania 18396).

In the Kurān the word Madjūs occurs once (xxii. 17); with this verse, ii. 59 and v. 73 are to be compared. In these three places the Ah al-Kišt [q. v.] are mentioned, but it is only in xxii. 17 that the same Madjūs is also found. In this same verse, however, the Madjūs's also are mentioned, who, of course, can by no means be included in the term Ah al-Kišt. Now, in Muslim law, the Zoroastrians are, it will be seen, treated as if they belonged to the Ah al-Kišt. But this conception cannot be based on the Kurānic verse xxii. 17. Also, the commentators (al-Bahāwī, 57; Flügel, p. 629; al-Zamakhšārī, Kastrij, p. 917; al-Raṣī, Majbūt al-Gīrāb, ii. 554; al-Nāṣīrī, in marg. tafrīz, ed. Cairo, xvii. 74 et al.) give nothing that can point to the fact of the Madjūs being, theoretically, Ah al-Kišt. The words of al-Raṣī, who states that the Madjūs are those who do not follow a real prophet, but only a soothsayer, might suggest, that he takes Madjūs to be a sect intermediate between the Ah al-Kišt and the sunnābi, the heathen. Al-Naṣīrī also says that the prophet of the
MADJIS — who, moreover, are dualists — is no real prophet but a muwādī; the muwādīs, on the other hand, have no prophet at all, nor a sacred scripture. In Arabic historical literature the Zoroastrian Persians are themselves occasionally called waḥdānī, e.g. al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 302, 303, 350, 387 (muwādī); p. 407 (muwādī). Finally it must be added that the Kūrā-verse xxii. 17 seems to be a late addition to this Sūra (cf. Nöldeke-Schwalbe, Gesch. des Qorān, i. 214: the verse must be Māliinitic).

In the Ḥadīth, which represents the theory of Muslim law, there is not very much to be found on the Madjīs in particular (cf. A. J. Wensinck, Handboek van oude Muhameedanen Tradition, p. 7, Madjīs). The substance of the Ḥadīth concerning the Magians is, that they are to be treated like the Aḥḥāt al-Kīthāb, and, in consequence, are bound to pay the qiyya. Practically, the rising Muslim state power could not follow any other way. The subjection of Iran would have become impossible, had the Arabs considered the Zoroastrians as mere heathens, who were to be given the choice either of Islam or the sword. And, even before that time, dealing with the Zoroastrians of Bahrain in this rigorous way would have been a grave constitutional fault. Thus tradition, though it also hands down an account of how the prophet gave the Zoroastrians of Bahrain the choice of either Islam or death, reports that 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Uwāfi stated that the prophet had accepted the qiyya from these Madjīs. This tradition was regarded as authoritative afterwards, and the other, stating that the prophet refused to consider Magians otherwise than as muwādīs, was abandoned (cf. Aḥḥāt al-Dāwād, ed. K. 29 = vol. ii. 30). 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Uwāfi is said to have delivered his statement on an occasion when the Khalīfa 'Umar felt doubtful whether he should accept the qiyya from the Iranians, or not (cf. al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 267: the prophet, according to 'Abd al-Raḥmān, had said: *waḥdān khān manan aḥḥāat al-kīthāb*). There is a tradition relating that 'Umar, a year or two before his death, wrote to Dīzār b. Maḥdīya, regarding the Madjīs, instructing him, to put to death every sorcerer (sāḥīr), to separate each Madjī from his wife and children, and to forbid the practice of usnamma (the muttering of Zoroastrian prayers, now-Persian ʿāst or ast). Dīzār began to execute these rigid orders, and 'Umar refused to accept the qiyya from the Madjīs, until 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Uwāfi assured that the prophet had accepted it from the Madjīs. (Aḥḥāt al-Dāwād, loc. cit.; Ibn Hānbal, Musnad, i. 182, 1942; al-Baladhuri, Sābīḥ, Cairo 1904, ii. 144 sqq.) Al-Baladhuri, moreover (ii. 145) cites the following answer given to a Persian ambassador: *Our prophet has commanded us to fight you, until you serve God, and Him alone, or until you pay the qiyya*. So here likewise the Madjīs are put on the same level as the Aḥḥāt al-Kīthāb. The determination of the position of the Zoroastrians in respect to the Muslim state, is the main point of the Ḥadīth concerning them. Moreover, there is a tradition in al-Dāwād, Fawā'id, bab 45, regulating the hereditary portion of the Zoroastrians (capital: altogether clear, however). Other, not so important traditional matters respecting the Madjīs is cited: Lāzīm, vii. 47. Lāzīm, Lūzūm, n. v. jībār; the article Kātibāxiya.

The traditions of the Muslims about Zoroaster are in accordance with their idea of the Zoroastrians being a kind of inferior Aḥḥāt al-Kīthāb. Al-Ṭabari relates, that Zurādīḏ b. Isfīmān (Isfīmān is an adaptation of the Avestic Esphāma, the name of the ancestor of the family to which Zoroaster belonged) laid claim to the title of a prophet, after three years of the reign of King Bīshāpa (the Avestic Bīshāapa) had elapsed (l. 675 sq.); the same historical reports, on the authority of Ḥīqāḥ b. Mahāmed al-Kallāb, that Zurādīḏ, who by the Madjīs is said to be their prophet, was, according to the learned men of the Aḥḥāt al-Kīthāb an inhabitant of Palestine, and a servant of one of the disciples of the prophet Jeremiah. He committed a fraud against his master, who caused him, so that he became leprosa. Zurādīḏ then went to Adharbājījān and began to promulgate the religion called Madjīsīya; afterwards he proceeded to Bahārā, where Bīshāpa resided. This king became a convert to the religion of Zurādīḏ, and compelled his subjects to embrace that religion also (l. 649; cf. al-Thaʿlabī, Histoire des rois des Perses, ed. Ziegenbalg, p. 256).

Another tradition, likewise preserved in al-Ṭabari's work, brings Zurādīḏ together with a Jewish prophet ʿaṣm (vocalisation uncertain), who was sent to Bahārā, and, at his court, met with Zurādīḏ, and the sage Dīzārīs (Avestic Diṣtaṣta, the minister of Bīshāapa and son-in-law of Zoroaster). Zurādīḏ is said to have noted down in Persian the teachings which the Jew delivered in Hebrew, Bīshāpa, and his father Lūzūm (Avestic Lavūstāspa) had been Sīlānīs before ʿaṣm and Zurādīḏ proclaimed their religion (Ṭabari, i. 681, 683). These traditions aim at throwing the Zoroastrian faith into a certain connection with the Jewish religion in the one, Zoroaster is an apostate Jew, in the other, he acts in agreement with a Hebrew prophet. In the Ḥadīth there is a saying of Ibn ʿAbbas: *when the prophet of the Persians had died, Ibn wrote for them the form of the Madjīs* (īnna aḥḥāt Fārisum ʿammum ibnum lūzūm umm al-Madjīsūm; Ibn ʿAbbas, Kāfird, bāth 29 = ii. 30). This isolated tradition might perhaps in some way be connected with the reports about ʿaṣm.

Some Arabic authors, of course, had a better knowledge of Zoroaster and his religion, cf. for instance al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 331, where it is stated, that according to the Madjīs, Zurādīḏ came from Urmīya, and, especially, al-Shahrūsīān, Kīthāt al-Mīlād (ed. Curton, p. 143 etc.), whose scientific treatise, however, contributes nothing to the knowledge of the ideas about Zoroastrianism prevalent among the Muslims. It is enough to say, that al-Shahrūsīān whose information goes back to Isfīmān sources, gives a succinct, but, in general, correct account of Zoroaster and the Madjīs, whom he subdivides into three principal sects: the Kātibāxiya, the Zorāwīsīya and the Zorādāxiya, the latter, according to him, properly the followers of Zoroaster. The Madjīs are, he rightly remarks, not Aḥḥāt al-Kīthāb, but, like the dualists, only possessing something like an inspired scripture (shmāhita kīthāb, p. 179): before the rise of the Madjīsīya, the Persians professed the religion of ʿĪrāhīm (p. 180).

Respecting the treatment of the Zoroastrians during the Iskand conquest, the following data may be given:
1) al-Yaman. Muhammad had sent envoys to that country, who, among other things, had to collect the *ṣirāfa* from those who preferred to remain Christians, Jews, or Medjūs (al-Baladhūrī, p. 69). The Zoroastrians of al-Yaman (the so-called *Medjūs*) were said to be descendants from the pers of the army of Wahriz, who, by order of Kharrawāl, carried back Saif b. Dhi Yasam to that country. Muhammad, when sending an army to al-Yaman against the pseudo-prophet al-Awād, recommended its general, to try and win over to his side these Zoroastrians, who were treated tyrannically by al-Awād. One of these Medjūs, Fāris b. Dalalami, had already embraced Islam; the most distinguished man among the *Medjūs* was Dādghawal (Dādghīya), also became Muslim, and, at his advice, the remaining *Medjūs* followed. They helped energetically to put down al-Awād. So we see, that in al-Yaman the Medjūs were treated like *Abī al-Kīthār*, after which followed their spontaneous conversion to Islam.

2) *Umar*. There was a tradition that the prophet commanded Abū Zaid to take the *ṣirāfa* from the Muslims of *Ushk*, and the *ṣirāfa* from the Medjūs of that country (al-Baladhūrī, p. 77).

3) Bahrayn. In the year 3 (629/630) Muḥammad sent out al-*Abī* b. Abdallāh al-Ḫadramī to Bahrayn; most of the Arabs of that country embraced Islam, and so did Ṣawāh, the Persian *mirād* of Ḫālij (the capital), and some other Zoroastrians. The greatest part of the Medjūs of the country, however, remained faithful to their religion, and had to pay the *ṣirāfa*, like the Jews and the Christians, who, in Bahrayn, did not embrace Islam. Some Arabs criticized Muḥammad, because he pretended to accept the *ṣirāfa* only from the *Abī al-Kīthār*, and now accepted it from the Medjūs of Ḫadram. On that occasion Ṣawāh v. 204 was revealed (al-Baladhūrī, p. 78 etc.).

Here it can be seen, that in the oldest Islam it was by no means regarded as a matter of fact that the Medjūs were to be reckoned under the *Abī al-Kīthār*. During the Khilāfat of Abū Bakr an insurrection took place in Bahrayn, the Medjūs refusing to pay the *ṣirāfa*. This rebellion was not put down before the khilīfat of *Umar* (ibid., p. 83).

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

In Iran, the regular treatment of the places which surrender themselves is the imposition of the *ṣirāfa* and the *ṣirāfa* (which, as at this time, in most cases were identical terms for "tribute" in general, cf. *ṣirāfa* and *ṣirāfa*), but cf. al-Baladhūrī, p. 314, where *ṣirāfa* = capitulation and *ṣirāfa* = ground-tax. Thus, the inhabitants are reduced to the state of *ṣirāfa*; if they really were *Abī al-Kīthār*. This is the case e.g. on the

subjection of Mahrūd; Bandanāḏīn (al-Baladhūrī, p. 265). Ḫulawān, Karmān (ibid., p. 301), Nihāwān (ibid., p. 306), Dūnawar, Sirwān, Sarmāmar (ibid., p. 307), Ḥamadān (ibid., p. 309), Isfahān (ibid., p. 312 sq.), Ahvāz (ibid., p. 377; here the prisoners of war were released by order of *Umar*, to cultivate the land, under the obligation to pay *ṣirāfa*; there being not enough Arabs for the purpose), Ḫusayn b. Saḥīr (ibid., p. 382), Ḫurma, Arādūn, Ḫursūz, Darabāḏīd (ibid., p. 385; at Darabāḏīd, the chief authority in the town was a Zoroastrian priest, a *bērka*, Tahtāz and Kurān (ibid., p. 403); they concluded a treaty with *Umar*, which later was confirmed by *Uthman b. Affān*, Naṣīr, (ibid., p. 404). The (ibid., p. 405), Harūt, Baghātūz and Būṣhānd (ibid., p. 405), Mars (ibid., p. 405 sq.). The term *ṣirāfa* is often occurring in our source, must be understood as meaning a tribute; this appears from the last mentioned passage, p. 405 sq.

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

When the Zoroastrians were received as *ṣirāfa*, their religious practices must, of course, be respected. Thus al-Farābī made the Muslims, on behalf of the inhabitants of Rāy and *Kūsim*, 500,000 *dirhams*, while the Muslims promised, among other things, not to destroy any fire-temple (ibid., p. 318). When Adharbījān was subdued and made tributary, the treaty, which its *marshān* concluded with the Arab commander, contained also the stipulation, that no fire-temple should be destroyed, and that the people of *Sīra* were not to be hindered in their dancing-festivals and other practices (ibid., p. 385). It goes without saying, that in the countries, inhabited by Zoroastrians, soon after the appearance of the Arabs, mosques also were built, destined in the first place for the religious worship of the conquerors; the *marshān* *ṣirāfa* which Saʿd b. Abī Waqqas constructed at al-Madīnā, was the earliest building of that kind in al-Sawād (ibid., p. 280). Under the khilīfat of *Uthman*, a *marshān* was built at Rāy, in which town later on, under the khilīfat of *Al-Mansūr*, a *marshān* was erected by order of the future khilīfat al-Mahdī, in 158 (775) (ibid., p. 309). At *Tawwādūž*, its conqueror *Uthman* b. Abī
As caused mosques to be erected for the Arab population, which he transported to that country. In Aradjan a marqued was built by the governor al-Hakam al-Hugamleh. (ibid., p. 392)

Already at the period of the conquest, there occur numerous conversions from Zoroastrianism to Islam. As T. W. Arnold (The Preaching of Islam, p. 177 et seq.) observes, there were several reasons, why it was not very difficult for the Persians to exchange their religion for Muhammadanism. The grysa, moreover, which the Zoroastrians were bound to pay, could no longer be required from those who had become Mussulman. Soon after the battle of Pulwar, some akhshans embraced Islam, and, consequently, became freed from paying the grysa (al-Baladhuri, p. 265).

The inhabitants of Isfahan, on the other side, being invited by Al-Ash'ath, to accept Islam, preferred to give the grysa, but some noblemen from the same town became Muslims, and had, therefore, only to pay the gharab (for their lands: wo-um-fit min al-qarab f-umal-sit; ibid., p. 312 sq). The inhabitants of Kwarin likewise became Muslims out of aversion to the grysa (ibid., p. 321), and so did those of al-Khizr. (ibid., p. 373).

A Zoroastrian, who had become Muslim and then apostatized, foretold, of course, his life: this happened e. g. with the akhshans of Mazara, who was killed by Al-Mughira b. Shabaz (ibid., p. 345). Other instances of the progress of Islam, we find in the case of Adharbadjlu, whom Al-Ash'ath for the first time governed this country, he ordered the Arab settlers whom he himself had brought into the land, to invite the population to Islam. These efforts were successful; as Al-Ash'ath, under the Khalifate of Ali, a second time became governor of Adharbadjlu, he found, that most of the population had become Muslims (ibid., p. 328 sq).

A conversion to Islam of some individuals seems to have been brought about chiefly by the administration of the rapid successes of the Muslims (immanee be found in al-Baladhuri, p. 374. 381); a case of forced conversion is that of al-Harmazdz (q. v.). Converts to Islam, whose original name had a too pronounced Zoroastrian meaning, had to exchange that name for an Arab one: the Khilaf al-Ma'mun, e. g. appointed a certain Maysazd (comp. Fahlawi, legends, the Zoroastrian offering of food; the jung i of the Arabic transplantation cause, however, a difficulty for this explanation) governor of Bavastan, Krypt and Isfahawand; this Maysazd, in order to change his name into Muhammad (ibid., p. 359). Also the father of Hasan al-Bozk (q. v.), who was one of the prisoners, taken after the conquest of Maestal, altered his name, Fakhr to Yastr (ibid., p. 344), although this Persian name could scarcely offend a Mussulman; but, after he became a mezbah, a change of name became necessary.

After the conquest, Zoroastrianism, for the time being, continued to exist in many parts of Iran, not only in countries which came relatively late under Muslim sway (e. g. Tabaristan, cf. Al-Bagdawi), but also in those regions which early had become provinces of the Muslim empire. In almost all the Iranian provinces, according to al-Mas'udi, first-temples were to be found. The Musulman, he says (ed. Barthier de Meynard, iv. 86), venerate many fire-temples in Irak, Fars, Kirman, Siufistan, Khuristan, Tabaristan, al-Dibbi, Adharbadjlu, Aran (he adds also "in Hindu, Sind and Shad"). This general statement of al-Mas'udi is fully supported by the medieval geographers, who make mention of fire-temples in most of the Iranian towns. The toleration, then, from the part of the Muslims, must have been greater in mediaeval times than in modern ones. That, however, not all Zoroastrians felt happy under a non-Zoroastrian government, appears from the fact, that a number of Mids, the ancestors of the Parsis of to-day, emigrated to India. Their landing on the coast of Gajarat is said to have taken place in the year 716 of the Christian era.

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

Occasionally, the Muslim magistrates, it seems, imitated the Zoroastrian clergy against heretics: al-Shahsrastani (K. al-Mi'd wa'l-Nihal, ed. Curot, p. 187) relates, how Abu Muslim of Neishkour, on an accusation from the part of the malhak of the Zoroastrians, caused a sectarian to be killed. It seems, however, that this man, who had been a Zoroastrian, and now proclaimed a new creed, held tenets calculated to cause disturbance.

A history of the relations between the Muslim state and the Persian Zoroastrians (for neither the Indian Zoroastrians, the Parsis, nor the internal history of the Zoroastrian community concern us here) can only be written, when the mass of Persian historical literature of the Middle Ages and modern times will be completely accessible. The position of the Zoroastrians has become worse in course of time. Their number seems to have greatly diminished by the disturbances which ended after the death of Nsir Shah (1159 = 1747), when the Afghans destroyed the Zoroastrian quarter at Kirman, and by the war between Agha Mmmad Khan Khatu Kadjar and Lutf Ali Khan (see also Kirmen). In modern times the number of Zoroastrians in Persia is estimated by v. Houtum-Schindler (1879) at 5,449 at all; by Browne (1887/1888) at 7,000-8,000 for Kirman, and Yazd and environs alone [but elsewhere (A year among the Persians, p. 370) he gives for Yazd and its environs alone 7,000-10,000 and for Esfahantest 25-25. The Emerg, Britannica (1911) has the number 9,000 for the whole of Persia. In 1854, there were in Yazd and its environs 6,658 Zoroastrians, of whom ± 25 were merchants, and the rest small husbandmen and labourers (Karak, History of the Persians, i. 55). The same author gives for Kirman (in 1888, the date of the book) no more than 450, for Shiraz ± 30 merchants, and a small number of humble position, who were employed as gardeners in the palace of the Shah. At Shiraz, some Zoroastrian families were found, who exercised the trade of shop-keepers. Further more, there are Zoroastrians at Kesh and Esfahan (v. Houtum-Schindler). The Ghebers of Bisk are Indian Parsis (cf. Kuki).

According to Browne, there are in Persia...
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dāghmā's (tower-shaped buildings, where the Zoroastrians dispose the bodies of the deceased to be devoured by birds of prey); one South of Thirūn, at Kirmān, and one in Yazd. The number of fire-
temples is given by v. Houtum-Schindler as 4 for Yazd, 18 for its environs, and 1 for Kirmān. Karaka.
(I. 60) knew (1854) in Yazd and its environs as many as 34 greater or lesser fire-temples. V. Houtum-
Schindler says, that the social position of the Zoro-
astrians in those places, where there are only few
of them (Thirūn, Kāşān, Shīrāz, Bāshahr), was a toler-
ably good one, because they were respected as being
honest traders. But at Kirmān their condition was
less favorable, and at Yazd still worse. In the first
half of the sixteenth century, the levying of
the dāghmā was still a source of misery for all Persian
Gebers, because they were helplessly exposed to
the extortions of the government functionaries.
However, even at the time of v. Houtum-Schindler
(1879), the Indian Pānī, in virtue of a
convention with the Persian government, paid the
dāghmā (valued at 1,920 tāmūl) for the con-
collecting that tax came to an end. In 1882 the
dāghmā of the Zoroastrians was abolished (Karaka,
l. 74). For this, and other improvements, as also the
foundation of schools, the Persian Zoroastrians are
indebted to the "Persian Zoroastrian Ame-
lization Fund," a Parsi institution.

But, especially at Yazd, the situation of the Gebers,
during the second half of the sixteenth century,
was far from good. Brownes relates, that at
Yazd they were treated with more contempt, by the Jews
than the Zoroastrians. They were not per-
mitted to ride on horse-back; fire-temples which
had decayed, were not to be restored, etc. The
then government, jawīl-al-dawla, had, it is true,
paid out a sum to some of the more serious iniquities,
e.g. the putting into practice of the quint maximi,
that a Zoroastrian, who had become Muslim, ac-
quired by that conversion a right to the property
of his non-converted kinsmen. Although at Kirmān
the treatment of the Gebers was better than at
Yazd, Brownes had heard of wrongs done to them,
e.g. forced conversions to Islam of children and
young girls.

The Bibliography regarding the Persian Zoro-
astrians (and also the so-called Gurbis, cf. especially
K. Hadičk'a Introduction to O. Mann, Die Mund,
darten von Kirmān, p. 17, 1874) has been given
in the article Kirmān.

V. F. BECCHER

AL-MADJUS. The historians of the Maghrib and of
Muslim Spain give the generic name of Madjus
pajama, fire-wishippers" to the Scandinavian
pirates known in England as Northmen (Norse-
men) and also to the Normans of France
who on several occasions in the middle ages
attempted landings on the coasts and expeditions
against the frontiers of the Muslim west.
The first invasion of Spain by Northmen was in
230 (844). In the month of Dich'el-Hijdjas 230
(Aug./Sept. 844), a fleet of 54 large vessels and
as many small harks anchored before Lisbon (q. v.)
and the forces they carried landed at the mouth
of the Tagus. The Caliph Abū al-Manṣūr il-
warned by the governor of Lisbon, Wahh Allah
b. Hāzim, gave instructions to the governors of
his semi-provinces to prevent any surprise attacks.
The Norman forces seized Cadiz from Lisbon,
then the province of Sídama (Shādīfliat) and
finally Seville (q. v.) which they took by storm
on Oct. 4, 844. It was not till November that they
were forced to seek the shelter of their vessels by
the Muslim armies sent against them. Other bands
at the same time ravaged, with fire and sword
the whole coast from Lisbon to Trafalgār and one of
these reached a point in Africa where the little
town Astil (Arrīlā [q. v.]) was founded soon
afterwards, but took to flight on the approach of the
Berbers of the region.

After this invasion, the leader of the Norse
hordes seems to have sent an ambassador to the
Caliph Abū al-Manṣūr II. to propose a peace.
The Umayyad sovereign agreed to his request and
sent to discuss the terms of the treaty a diplomat
of his entourage, Yabīya b. al-Hakam al-
Hājijāmi, known as al-Ghurānī. The latter reached
Silves, where he entered a ship, which after various
adventures took him to the Norse leader. Al-Ghurānī
returned to his master after an absence of 20
months. The account of his embassy has been
preserved for us by Ibn Dībāya, who got it from
the visitor Tāmmān b. Alkama, a friend of al-Ghurānī.

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

We have fuller details of the invasions which
followed. In 235 (946), the Danes, who had come
to the assistance of the first Duke of Normandy,
made an expedition against Muslim Spain, on the
interested advice of Richard I. This lasted three
years. The invaders, always called Madjūs by the
Arab historians, appeared first at Kṣar Abī Dānūs
(Algaz a-Dam) and landed in the country round
Lisbon which they laid waste. The Caliph al-Hakam
sent against them a fleet from Seville which met
their in the estuary of the Tagus. At the same
time a battle was fought on land near Lisbon in
which the Muslims were defeated. The Danes then
extended their efforts to Galicia and in 236 seized
St. Iago de Campestuel. In the next year, they
again attacked Muslim Spain but they were much
weakened by the losses; they had suffered in the
north of the Peninsula and they do not seem to
have dared to land anywhere.

It is also to the Madjūs (the name being accom-
panied by the more precise one of al-Akkūdāmān
= Al-Akkūdāmān) that the Arabs attribute the
celebrated taking in the following century of the
town of Barbastōr (Barbujat) to the N.W. of
Saragossa, on the borders of Aragou. The historian
Ibn Hājīr wrote a detailed account of it, which
is preserved by Ibn 'Ilīhār. A Norman expedition,
in which French knights shared, which was evi-
dently led by Guillaume de Montreuil, succeeded
in capturing Barbastōr in 456 (1064). This suc-
cess and the barbaric treatment inflicted on the
population made a deep impression on Muslim
Spain. In the next year the king of Saragossa,
Almād b. Sulaimān Ibn Hūd al-Muḥātādīn,
with an army reinforced by a contingent of cavalry
sent by the Seville ruler, al-Mu'taṣib Ibn Abīlākh,
repulsed Barbastōr, where a weak garrison left
by the Normans on their return to France could offer only a brief resistance and was almost entirely wiped out.


1. *Madinah* in Arabic is the legal institution of the *jumān* [q.v.], a term which occurs in the following connections: *jumān* or *wadā' dohār* madīnah, *lāhū* or *àlāhī* *edarīt*, *mağniṣ* (الْمَغْنِيْشَ) "pawn." For the parties to the agreement and the article in question in a bond, the rules hold which apply to all other contracts.


2. In the chapters of the Fīh books which deal with the law of obligations, *mağniṣa* is used for the thing for which one is liable or responsible, i.e., is bound to replace. In this way *dānūs* comes to mean, in the wider sense, "liability, obligation to restore" in contracts. This liability consists either in the producing of something identical (mišīl); i.e., a of the thing of quality and quantity (tīfāsah, *mawṣūla*), or, e.g., in edible things (mišīlīyā), which are measured by quality, weight, or number (mawṣūla ma-makhlaysa-makhrūf) or in the value of the thing (kimā) e.g., in inedible things (ma'dānīsah), which have a special individuality, and are therefore *ṣā'īl* = species.

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

---

**MADRAS.** Presidency, the southernmost province in British India, occupies the whole of the southern portion of the Peninsula with an area of 1,42,160 sq. m.; total population (1921): 22,10,855, of whom 2,81,488 (nearly 7%) are Muhammadans. The majority of these are Sūnīs, 2,68,043 (93-06 per cent.): Shā'īs: 54,114. The only Native State with a Muhammadan ruler is Banaganpalli (255 sq. m.); population 36,633, of whom only 1,076 are Muhammadans. The language spoken by the majority of the Muhammadans of the province is Malayalam (1,16,8,656 c. 387 per 1,000, including almost all the Māḍīpas [q.v.]); Hindī, 335 per 1,000; Tamil, 209 per 1,000.

*History.* Southern India began to suffer early in the sixth century from plundering raids carried out by the Muhammadans established in the north, until the rise of the Hindu kingdom of Vijaynagar in 1336 erected an effective barrier against the southward expansion of Muhammadan power for more than two centuries. When in 1564 the four Sultans of the Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan, — Bijāpūr, Bijār, Ahmadnagar and Golkonda, — joined forces against this powerful Hindu state, in a decisive battle (Tālīkota, January 1565) they effected the ruin of Vijaynagar and utterly destroyed the capital, and its territories were for the most part incorporated in the kingdoms of Bijāpūr and Golkonda. In 1686 and 1687, Aurangzeb [q.v.] conquered these two kingdoms and made them part of the Mughal empire. After Agra 1630, the first Nizam of Hyderābad, had made himself independent in 1748, the other of the Carnatic [q.v.], also styled the Nawab of Arcot (Arkāt) from the name of his capital, became his chief subordinate in the South of India. When in the middle of the xvii th century the English and the French were in conflict with one another in Southern India, each espoused the cause of a different claimant for the office of Nawab of the Carnatic. The support of British troops under the command of Robert Clive assured the success of Muhammad Ali (ob. 1795), but papers seized at Seringapatam after its capture in 1799 having proved that both he and his son and successor, though nominally allies of the British, had been in secret correspondence with Tippu Sultan [q.v.], Lord Wellesley, then Governor-General of India, declared them to be public enemies of the British Government, and in 1801 concluded a treaty with a grandson of Muhammad Ali, named A'qīm al-Dawla, according to which he resigned the government of the Carnatic into the hands of the East India Company, but retained the titular dignity and received a considerable pension. The present representative of the family bears the title of Prince of Arcot and has the position of the premier native noblemen of Madras. The greater part of the existing Presidency of Madras consists of the territories annexed by Lord Wellesley.

**Madras.** City, on the shore of the Bay of Bengal, in 3° 4' N. and 80° 15' E., is the capital of the presidency of the same name; population (1921): 529,011, of whom 145, in every 1,000 are Muhammadans.


**MADRASA.** [See Massūf.] **MADRAS.** The present capital of Spain has kept the name it had in the Muslim period: *Madrīs* (الْمَدْرِيسِ). Arab geographers describe it as a little town grouped round a strong fortress, with a khartuţ mosque, at the foot of the Djabal al-Šādrāt, the Sierra de Guadalarrama, and a dependency of the province of Toledo. It was especially known for its patricies. It had only an unimportant history, but gave birth to several famous Muslim scholars, among whom the most important was Abu l-Kārim Maṣīma i, Ahmad al-Madījī, who lived in the second half of the fourth century and of whom cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L. 1. 245. Madrid was taken in 1476 (1083) by King Alphonso VI. According to a Christian tradition, Ramiro II had previously held possession of it for a short time during his campaigns against the Muslims in 1037 (939). It was on the site of the old cathedral (el Guzmán) of Madrid that the king
of Castile had the church dedicated to the Virgin of the Almudena built.


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

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

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

MADYAN SHU'AI'I

MADYAN SHU'AI'I, a town on the east side of the Gulf of Akabah. The name is connected with that of the tribe of Medians known from the Old Testament (lxv.: Madian; Madias; in Josephus Madavssan, & Madamn xwak) but it can hardly be used without further consideration to identify the original home of this tribe, as the town might be a late Medianite settlement and besides it is difficult to fix the real home of such wandering tribes. In the Old Testament a town of Midian is not mentioned (not even in 1 Kings xi. 18 where “Mesoron” should possibly be read). On the other hand Josephus (Ant. xiv. 228) knew Mediasa (or Mediasa) known as a town on the Erythraean Sea as Erythras (Onocytus, ed. Lagarde, p. 276) in Ptolemy (vi. 7, 1) is mentioned as a town on the coast, and called Medisa or Medima while in another passage he gives it as an inland town under the name Madiasm, a difference which is explained by the actual position of the town. In Mahanian's time there is only one reference (in Ibn Ishaq) to the town of Madian, when the Prophet sent an expedition under Zaid b. Haritha thither. There are occasional references in the poet Kalbiyir (yetik, d. 723) who speaks of the monks there and in the record of Muhammad b. al-Munafiyah's journey to Aila. In the geographical we find Madian only as a town near the coast, six days' journey from Tabuk; it was the second station on the pilgrim's road from Aila to Madina and was a dependency of Tabuk. In the sixth century A.D. Ishaq speaks of its position in the desert, rich in springs and watercourses, gardens and date groves and of its mixed population. Isajkhty says it is larger than Tabuk and describes from his own observations the spring there, from which Moses watered the flocks of Shu'ail (see below), it was now covered by a house which had been built over it. The town then began to decline gradually. In the eighth century Ibrahim says it is an unimportant little trading centre with scanty resources; in the tenth century Abu al-Fida says it was in ruins. Only in recent times has it been visited e.g. by Rüppell, Burton and Musil. The extensive ruins, which the Arabo call Maghrit Shu'ail after the caves-tomb, lie about 15 miles east of the port of Novak in 28° 28’ N.Lat. in the southern part of the valley of al-Bat which is rich in streams and palms and other trees. According to Burton the whole district between 29° 28’ and 27° 40’ is called Arad Madayan.

In the Kurban following the Old Testament there are repeated references to Madian as a people: for example in the stories of Moses' stay with them (xxv. 47; xxvii. 21 sqq.; 45), where his father-in-law (Jethro in the O.T.) is still anonymous, or in one of the stereotyped legends of prophets in which the Madian are punished because they would not believe their prophet Shu'ail (viii. 92–91 xi. 85–98; xxix. 35 sqq.). This Shu'ail was later identified with the father-in-law of Moses, for which there is no authority in the Old Testament. But perhaps the real truth is that Shu'ail had originally nothing to do with Madian. In the Surae (xxv. 78; xxvi. 176 sqq.: xxviii. 18; l. 23) it is not the Medianites but the Ashab al-Absa (the people of the thickets) who are his enemies and it is therefore very possible that Muhammad only later combined an indigenous story of the people of the thickets and their Shu'ail with the Midianites of the Old Testament.

MAGNATIS, MAGNATIS, MAGMHTIS, Lodestone and Compass.

I. The Lodestone and Magnetism

The lodestone is a widely disseminated mineral, and is therefore frequently mentioned by geomancers and cosmograpbers, for example in the pseudographical "Petrology of Aristotle," by al-Diminiti, al-Kazwin, al-Farabi, Ibn al-Farisi, al-Kalkhashandi, etc. Of Amir and Hashadili, it is said that the lodestone is found there as a hard rock. According to Ibn Sumi, the Indian is the best and al-Jibini makes it come from India. Like the Greeks and Romans, the Arabs also discussed the properties of the lodestone and its effects on iron. They found that the lodestone can hold an iron needle (a ring), this a second, a third and so on, so that a chain is formed.

The power of attraction of the lodestone was defined. Most writers say that a lodestone can lift double its weight in iron, and one from Baghdad three times. Djibiri b. Huyayn al-Safi possessed a particularly strong one. Djibiri b. Huyayn ascertained that it could work through bronze. Other information is given by Shams al-Din al-Diminiti, p. 73, and 85 of the work mentioned below (cf. also E. Wiedemann, "Briefe, ii. 5: Uber Magnetit, S. B. P. M. S. Erlang., xxxvi, 1904, p. 322").

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

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

The Arabs devoted much attention to the theory of these phenomena — with how little satisfactory results is evident from the remark of Ibn Butbun: "It is very annoying for us to feel that we do not know this with certainty (the cause of the attraction of iron), although we perceive it with the senses." Djibiri b. Huyayn explains the lodestone as a spiritual one, confusing it with sacred. Al-Tughtani includes the lodestone among the "malikatul mahd" by which certain spirits (see E. Wiedemann, "Briefe, ii. 4: Zur Alchimie bei den Arabern, S. 8. P. M. S. Erlang., allii, 1911, p. 82). Al-Kazi seems to have dealt with the lodestone through the "al-amir" which is attached to making objects with scents. Al-Tughtani includes the lodestone among the "malikatul mahd" which contain spirits (see E. Wiedemann, "Briefe, ii. 4: Zur Alchimie bei den Arabern, S. 8. P. M. S. Erlang., allii, 1911, p. 82). Al-Kazi seems to have dealt with the lodestone through the "malikatul mahd" which is attached to making objects with scents. Al-Tughtani includes the lodestone among the "malikatul mahd" which contain spirits.

II. The Compass

The Arabs of the East became acquainted with the compass through Chinese sailors, without however at first giving it a special name; there was considerable traffic between the Persian etc., ports and Southern China. Thence it came to Syria and then to the Mediterranean ports of Europe. The compass had very probably however already reached the north of Europe by the trade-route of the Russian rivers. As early as the eighth or ninth centuries. This explains why the compass was known earlier in the north than in the south of Europe and perhaps explains also why the Chinese were able to undertake long voyages by sea (cf. R. Hettig, "Der Mikhail, der Geograph, Deutsche Naturforscher etc., 8. Versammlung 1942, Allii, p. 95").

In designing the direction by means of a magnetic needle, the Muslims used the end which pointed to the south; as Mecca lay to the south of most places in Syria etc. the Kibla [q.r.] corresponded almost exactly to the south.

The oldest passage in which the word "haram" is used to correspond to "magnet" (calamut) occurs in Dizzy for the year 339 (554) inSuplement, ii, 337 who found it in al-Tabrit al-Maghrib (Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne) edited by him. Serious objections have however been raised by historians as to the correctness of this passage (Al. S. O. S., Berlin, t. 1—2, 1900, p. 263). From the fact that al-Masudi (933) in his "Histoire" on compasses, G. Ferrand concludes that the compass was already in use then. The next oldest absolutely certain reference is in the "Dizain al-Alshin" of 'Awfii: it is in his "Dizain al-Alshin" (ed. Brown and Mirah Muhammad Kazwin). A
A very full description of the compass and its use in the Mediterranean was given in 1430 (142/43) by a certain Balkāk al-Kahdāfī in his Kitāb l.Khitāf (Balkāk 1270, l. 240; Cairo 1324, f. 357; Z. f. Phys., xiv., 1924, p. 165).

A needle which was enclosed in a "sudden lodestone is placed diagonally through a rush or piece of straw etc. Sometimes a cross made of two straws is used. The arrangement is floated on water so as to rotate by a lodestone held in the hand and moved in a circular direction; the latter is then quickly withdrawn. The needle places itself pointing to the south, which is the same as the ūyala. The turning is probably regarded as magical, but it has a physical significance. By the turning often very tenacious skin of the water is broken and the apparatus bearing the magnet is enabled to move freely. The turning is however not always done, but the needle with its support is simply placed on the water.

Al-Zarrūḥī describes several forms of compasses in a work on mechanical toys, for example a small beautifully painted fish, in which a magnetic needle is placed. In place of the fish, which might hurt the feelings of pious worshippers, a wooden disk with aśībūd drawn upon it is also used. Finally an apparatus just like our compass is described. Two magnetic needles are placed symmetrically in the centre under a circular piece of paper. Under the centre of the paper a funnel is placed which turns on a point; the whole is enclosed in a cylindrical receptacle with a glass top and is called kāfūl al-wašīl, "container for the kūla", or hūṣ al-alwū ṭ, "gourd of the needle"; according to Nicolaus the same name is still given to the compass. At the present day similar compasses are used along with a simple sundial. Another very full description is given by a certain Muḥammad b. Abī l-Khayr al-Ḫaṣṣāni in his al-Najāmi al-gādiatātī (cf. E. Wiedemann in the Z. für Physik, xiv., 1923, p. 113). There is a manuscript in Berlin in addition to those mentioned here. Whether the Cambridge one was written in 1063 or 1588 cannot be ascertained with certainty. The needle is fastened to a copper plate hollowed out or raised in the centre and placed on a copper stand. One end of the needle, no doubt the south end, has something put on it to mark it.

An important passage in an anonymous work "preparation of the bowl (kūla) to ascertain the kūla and points of the compass" is in a Berlin manuscript (Ahwārī, No. 3811). Here the point of the needle points south, the eye to the south. (The rubbing [ṭāẖā] of the needle explains the peculiar modern name ṭāẖā for the compass).

It would take us too far to deal here with the box compass proper which is called in Turkish e. g. şarbasi from the Italian. We will only note that on the rhomb-card the south is called ḍīẖū and the north ḍīẖūn (cf. thirteen for example K. Foy, Die Pflanzen bei den Osmanen und Griechen mit Besonderer Rücksicht auf die Geschichte des Admiralitäts Firl-Reis vom Jahr 1527, M. S. O. S., Berlin 1908, 234 sqq.).


In the Beiträge ii., the earlier literature is collected. This is also done in other works e. g. by Clément Mullet on the Compass. Of special importance are the works of A. Schuck (Der Kompass etc., Hamburg 1811, 1815 sqq.), which also deal with the Boustole in China.

(E. Wiedemann)

MAGHRĀWA, a large confederation of Berber tribes, belonging to the Zanata group and located to the confederations of the Banū Ḩam [q. v.] and Banū Irmān. These tribes, who live in a nomadic life, in the middle ages roved over the country between the valley of the Chelif as far as Tlemcen and the mountains inhabited by the Moulīya. They were easily converted to Islam and their chief Sīlah b. Wāsālīn is to have gone to Madīna to the Caliph "Uthman and been confirmed by him in his rule over the Maghrīb. This is why this confederation came to control themselves clients of the Umayyads of Spain and supported, sometimes by force of arms, the cause of this dynasty in the Maghrīb. This chief Sīlah was succeeded by his son Ḥaṭ and his by his son Khātār, with whom the Arab amirs of al-Kairawān had to deal at the time of the rebellion of Ma'āzūn in 1227 (759). On his death his son Ma-
HAMMAD after the early successes of Idris I in the Maghrib, brought his submission of the Maghrawa and returned Tlemcen to him, which he had just taken from the Banu Ifran; the Maghrawa thus became one of the principal supports of the Idrisid dynasty at its beginning.

The grandson of this Hammud b. Kharas, a contemporary of Idris I, also called Mahamad, resisted the Fatimids (q.v.). When the general of the Mahdi 'Ubayd Allah, Musa b. Habbas, had seized the Idrisid possessions in the Central Maghrib and placed over them the chief of the Mirdas, the Musa b. Abi 'l-Asyfa, the chief of the Maghrawa rebelled and brought under his flag a large number of Berber tribes in 309 (921-922) he routed the army sent against him under Musa, whom he slew with his own hand.

But the next year, the Maghrawa, faced with a new Fatimid offensive, had to take refuge in the region of Sidjlmas, but some time afterwards, the Umayyad Caliph of Cordova 'Abd al-Rahman III al-Nasir, wishing to annex the Maghrib to his dominions, summoned the Maghrawa to his assistance and with the help of Muhammad b. Kharas was able to bring under his sway all the central Maghrib except the region of Tafurt. The son of the Maghrawi amir al-Hajjar b. Muhammad was installed as governor in Orant. The Banu Ifran and Musa b. Abi 'l-Asyfa also joined the Umayyads (first half of the tenth century). But all these submissions to the wishes of the Umayyads were only dictated by self-interest and when Muhammad b. Kharas died at al-Kairan in 350 (961) he had become the vassal of the Fatimid sovereign al-Mu'tiz.

The successor of 'Abd al-Rahman III in the caliphate of Cordova, al-Hakam al-Mustasim, having no father, summoned the Maghrawa in their old allegiance; their chief Mahamad b. al-Hajjar b. Kharas therewith threw off the Fatimid suzerainty. Knowing the motives of this defection, it was going to cause him, al-Mu'tiz invited Ziri b. Mamdouh, chief of the Sanhadja to attack the chief of the Maghrawa. A battle was fought in 360 (970-971) between the Maghrawa and the Sanhadja commanded by Bologgin. Ziri: the Maghrawa were completely routed, but a little later they were able to take their revenge, owing to the assistance of Da'far b. 'AlI b. Hamdan, lord of al-Ma'da and al-Zab. Next year Bologgin b. Ziri in the name of the Fatimids led a great expedition against the Sanhadja and subjugated them completely in the Central Maghrib. The Maghrawa had once again to take refuge in Sidjilmas and, after the return of Bologgin to Irrikiya, they definitely abandoned central Maghrib and settled in Morocco. It is from this time that two of their families were able to found two short-lived kingdoms, that of the Banu Ziri b. 'Atiya at Fas and that of the Banu Khassan at Sidjilmas and at Tripoli.

The Maghrawa of Fas. After the defeat suffered by the Maghrawa in the central Maghrib, the descendant of Kharas, Mahamad b. al-Khalif, crossed the sea to seek the help of the famous 'Amirid 'Abd al-Majid b. 'Abd al-Amir (q.v.). The latter sympathised with him in his troubles and sent an expedition to the Maghrib under Da'far b. 'AlI b. Hamdan. The Spanish army with contingents from the Banu Ifran and the Maghrawa took up a position near Centa and in view of its strength Bologgin b. Ziri refrained from attacking it and set out to subdue all Morocco.

In 373 (984-985) the Maghrawa, after the departure of the Spanish governor Ibn al-'Asqaladja, were chosen by al-Mansur to rule Morocco in his stead. In 377 (987-988) the haddjib appointed as his vassal to rule the western Maghrib, the amir of the Maghrawa, Ziri b. 'Atiya b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Kharas. The latter made Fas his residence and settled his tribe around the town. By orders of al-Mansur he waged war on the Sanhadja and notably increased his dominions towards the east. In 382 (992) he made a journey to Cordova on the invitation of the haddjib. In spite of the admonitions of his father, it seems that the reign of Ziri 'Atiya was rather troubled and that changes of fortune placed on the throne of Fas sometimes the Maghrawi prince and sometimes his Iraniid rival Yafsa b. 'AlI. On his return to Fas, Ziri found his place occupied by 'Imran Ya'qub and it was only after a powerful struggle that he succeeded in regaining his throne. But, finding Fas not sufficiently central in position, he decided, like his Spanish suzerain, to build a capital for himself and the principal chiefs of his confederation. In 384 (994) he laid the foundations of the town of Wadja (Ujda) and came with his court to live there. At the same time he tried to throw off the suzerainty of Cordova and relations were finally broken off between him and al-Mansur. Ibn 'AlI 'Amir sent against him an army under the freedom Wajiji a battle was fought on the banks of the Wad Radd and the Spanish army defeated. The haddjib then sent another force under the command of his son 'Abd al-Malik al-Mu'assaf. On this campaign Ziri was twice routed in 387 (997). He sought to take refuge in Fas, but the inhabitants prevented him entering it and 'Abd al-Malik soon afterwards entered the capital. Ziri had to go to the Sahara; later he tried to create a principality for himself in the land of the Sanhadja. He laid siege to their capital Azhir (q.v.) but before he could take the town, he died of the consequences of an old wound in 391 (1000-1001).

On the death of Ziri b. 'Atiya, the Maghrawa proclaimed his son al-Mu'assaf; he began his reign by endeavouring to regain the favour of al-Mansur, 'Abd al-'Amir. The latter recognised him, and his successor 'Abd al-Rahman al-Mu'assaf appointed him governor of Fas and western Maghrib in 393 (1002-1003). He received from Cordova letters of investiture for all Morocco, except the land of Sidjilmas, which was kept for the Banu Kharas. Morocco seems to have had peace and a certain degree of prosperity in the reign of al-Mu'assaf, who died in 417 (1026) or 422 (1031).

His successor was his cousin on the father's side Hammama b. al-Malik b. 'Atiya. Hammama took advantage of the anarchy then prevailing in Spain to strengthen his position. He surrounded himself with literary men and legal authorities. But in 424 (1032-1033) the pretendre of a rival dynasty Abu l-Kamal Tamhum b. Ziri al-Harrani marched from Salé on Fas. Hammama took the field against him with the Maghrawa but they were defeated. Hammama entered Fas the same year and persecute the Jewish population. As to Hammama, he reached Wadja (Ujda) and Tenes and gathered there considerable forces, with which he marched on Fas in 429 (1037-1038). Hammama had to withdraw from Fas and returned to his own capital, Shella (q.v.).
Hamana then continued to reign till his death, which took place in 425 (1039-1040).

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

The successor of Dinka was his son al-Fathib, but on his accession his right to the throne was disputed by his brother Adja'a. He also claimed the title of master of part of the capital, the Kasbah (kesara) of al-Kasrawiyya, while al-Fattih established himself on the opposite bank, that of al-Anhalas. The two brothers fought in the town itself and the inhabitants were divided into two camps. Morocco was agitated in anarchy, and it was only after three years of fighting that al-Fattih was able to reign undisputed in al-Fas, after Adja'a had been killed. A great city of this kind perched in the south-west wall still bears his name; another in the north wall bears the name of his brother in a slightly corrupted form (Adja' Azf).

Al-Fattih was driven from his capital in 454 (1062) by the Hamidid sovereign Bologgai b. Mahammad. This was the time when the Almoravides were beginning to invade Morocco. After the departure of al-Fattih, the Maghrawes appointed one of his relatives to succeed him, Muanazir (or Muanazir) b. Hammsid b. al-Mu'izz b. Adja'a, who was proclaimed in 455 (1063) and took up the struggle against the Saharan invaders. He succeeded in defeating the Almoravides lying siege to the city, the amir of the Maghrawes attempted a sortie in the course of which he met his death (460 = 1067-1068). The people of Fas then proclaimed his son Tamir. But the capital was taken by Yufai b. Talhifa two years later and the young ruler put to death along with a large number of Maghrawes and Banu Ifran. This was the end of the dynasty of the Maghrawes of Fas. This city, which had enjoyed a certain amount of prosperity under the early members of the dynasty and had been extended by them, later suffered a great deal, according to western historians, from their tyranny and exactions.

According to the Khalidin, in the period of the decline of the Maghrawes power in Fas, there was at Agissan, at one of the entrances to the Great Atlas on the plain of Marrakesh, a little dynasty of amirs belonging to the same confederation. The last of these chiefs who flourished about 450-460 (1058-1067) was called Laggul b. Yusuf b. 'Ali. He was defeated and slain by the Almoravides when they made their successful thrust to the north of Morocco.

The Maghrawes of Sidjilmassa (Banu Khazru).—At the instigation of the hadjib of Cordova, al-Mansur ibn Abi 'Amir, a Maghraw chief in 366 (976/7), had taken Sidjilmassa from the Mhiznas, which for over two centuries had been governed by amirs of the Mhiznas branch of the Banu Mithal. This chief, who was called Khazru b. Fakhir b. Khazru, proclaimed the supremacy of the Umayyads of Spain in Sidjilmassa and sent to Cordova the head of the last Almoravid ruler Al-Mu'izz li-l-Mahran. Khazru received from al-Mansur the governship of the town and kept it till his death. He was succeeded by his son Wannan. The latter had to defend himself against the invasion of the Sahidjan in western Maghrib and in the end was confirmed in his governship by the Umayyads in 390 (999) after a period of dispute. On the fall of the Spanish caliphate he proclaimed himself independent, seized the region of Dza (Dara) and in 407 (1016-1017) took Sufry (Sefrou [q.v.]).


**MAGHRIB**, the name given by Arab writers to that part of Africa which modern writers on geography call Barbary or Africa Minor, and which includes Tripolitania, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. The word "Maghr" means the West, the setting sun, in opposition to "Maghrib", the East, the rising sun (Levant), but as Ibn Khalidin remarks, the general denomination was applied to a particular region. The extent of this area, moreover, varies according to different authors. Some Oriental writers include in the Maghrib not only Northern Africa but also Spain; the majority, however, reserve the name Maghrib for the first of these countries. But they are not in agreement upon the boundaries to be assigned to it on the East. On the other hand they are in agreement about the Northern, Western and Southern boundaries. To the North, Maghrib is bordered by the "Roman Sea" (Mediterranean). To the West it extends as...
far as the *Surrounding Sea*, also called the *Green Sea*, the *Sea of Darkness*, and by foreigners called, according to Ibn Khalidun, Oceanos or Atlantic (Atlantic Ocean), which stretches from Tangier to the desert of Lumtûn (Abu 'l-Fidâ'î) or only, according to Ibn Khalidun, as far as Asafî (Saffî) and Derun (Great Atlas). To the South it stretches as far as the barrier of moving sands, separating the country of the Berbers from the land of the Negroes, that is to say the Arab [cf. *axen*] and as far as the rocky region called *Kammade* (Ibn Khalidun). Some districts situated outside this limit, such as Bûma, Tamenrit, Gûrra, Ghâdames, Fazzān, Waddân, are sometimes considered as belonging to Maghrib although they are in reality countries of the Sahara. As regards the Eastern boundary, certain authors made it extend as far as the sea of Kûrûm (the Red Sea) and thus include in the Maghrib, Egypt, and the country of Barka [see the article *Barka*]. Others, whose opinion is adopted by Abu 'l-Fidâ', make it coincide with the actual frontier of Egypt, from the oases as far as the *Akabat* which is on the sea island of Barka and Alexandria (Abakâbât, Abakûbûn). Ibn Khalidun does not accept this collocation, because he says, the inhabitants of the Maghrib do not consider Egypt and Barka as forming part of their country. The latter commences only at the province of Tripoli and encloses the districts of which the country of the Berbers was composed in former times. Ibn Sa'd and the later Maghribi writers such as al-Zaydi and Abu Sa'id limit themselves to reproducing with few variations in detail, the boundaries of Ibn Khalidun. As to Ya'qûb he confines the Maghrib to the country stretching from Miliana to Sit (see *Watentbeld*, iv. 573).

Confined within the sixth *cima* the Maghrib is divided into several regions. Ibn Hawqal (*Description...*; transl. de Sane, J. A., 1841) distinguishes two of them: the Eastern Maghrib from the frontier of Egypt, as far as Zawiya in Tripolitania and the Western Maghrib from this point to Sit al-Aksâ; but the division commonly accepted is into three regions, Irîkiya, Central Maghrib and Farther Maghrib (Abu 'l-Fidâ', Ibn Khalidun et al.). Ibn Sa'd adopts a slightly different division, Irîkiya, outer Maghrib, and further Sûs, Irîkiya stretches from Kays al-Hamad near Mersa (Ibn Sa'd) to Bougie, Central Maghrib from Bougie to Melilla (Ibn Khalidun), Farther Maghrib from Melilla to Asafî and Derun, to which must be added al-Sûs which forms as might be said, according to Ibn Khalidun, an island or country detached from all others and surrounded by seas and mountains.


**MAGHRIBI, the name of several writers.**

1. *Ali b. al-Husayn, Abu 'l-Hassan. Like his father, Ali was one of the intimate friends of the Hamudîdî Sa'id al-Dawla of Halâb. He had also great influence with his son Sa'id al-Dawla, but when a cloud came over their friendship, Ali left Halâb and went to al-Rajja to Bak'dûr, who had been one of Sa'id al-Dawla's Mamlûks and persuaded him to enter into negotiations with the Fâtimid caliph al-'Azîz bi 'l-'Abbâs [q. v.] with whom 'Ali had had relations for a long time. When Bak'dûr had been given the governorship of Damascus by al-'Azîz, at the suggestion of 'Ali whom he had made his vizier, he set out against Halâb but was defeated by Sa'id 281 (April 991) whereupon 'Ali fled to al-Rajja. When Sa'id al-Dawla took this town, 'Ali fled to Khûfû, whence he wrote to al-'Azîz and asked permission to come to Egypt. In Dîjamât I of the same year (July–Aug. 991) he reached Egypt and by his advice the caliph sent an army in 383 (993–994) under Mangûtûq, then governor of Damascus, against Halâb where Abu 'l-Fadîlî, son of Sa'id al-Dawla, had now succeeded his father. 'Ali, who took part in the campaign as Mangûtûq's secretary, was bribed by Farîq, the leader of the Hamudîdîs and persuaded Mangûtûq to take the reverse, pretending that he lacked supplies. When the Caliph heard of this, he ordered Mangûtûq to resume the siege without delay and dismissed 'Ali at once, who therefore returned to Egypt. 'Ali made himself very popular with the caliph al-Hâkim, who succeeded his father 'Abd al-Hâkim in 266 (966) as did his son al-Hassan also. After a few years, however, he was sacrificed to the suspicions of al-Hâkim and on the 3rd Dhu al-Kinda 400 (June 18, 1010) 'Ali was executed along with his brother Mahammed and two sons.*


2. *Al-Husayn b. 'Ali, Abu 'l-Kâ'im, called *al-wâhir al-Maghribî*, son of the preceding, was born in Egypt on the 13th Dhu al-Hijja 370 (June 19th, 981). In 400 (1010) when his father was executioned, al-Husayn fled from Egypt to al-Ramlîs to Hâssân b. al-Mafrûrî, amir of the Banna Tâiyî, and induced him to foresee his abdication and to assign to the Caliph al-Hâkim and pay homage to the 'Abd al-Mannîr of Mecca, Abu 'l-Farîthî al-Hâsim b. Dîjfar. The latter came to al-Ramlîs and was proclaimed caliph. But when Hâssân was bribed by al-Hâkim Abu 'l-Farîthî had to return to Mecca while al-Husayn sought refuge with FâhÎr al-Mulk, vizier of the Buïyd Buïyd, of al-Dawla. Although as an Egyptian he was an enemy of the *Abbadîd* caliph al-Andalusi, he was permitted to accompany FâhÎr al-Dawla to Wâmiq and remained there till his death. He then went to al-Mawâli where the *Ugâidî Kârîwâzî took him into his service as secretary. In 448 (1053) the Buïyd governor of *Irtak* Muhammad al-Dawla appointed him vizier. But the very next year he quarrelled with the **Ugâidî** Caliph on some trivial matter, he had to leave al-Mawâli in the same year. He then went to the court of the ruler of Dihî Bâkî, near al-Dawla [cf. al-Mawâli] who gave him a sanctuary. Al-Hâsim died at Mâmiyâhirîn on 15th Ramazân 418 (Oct. 17, 1027) and was buried in Kûsa.*

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khallîkân, *Wasfujî,*
MAHALLA AL-KUBRA

MAHALLA AL-KUBRA is the modern name of an important town in the Delta of the Nile at some distance to the west of the Damietta arm, north-east of Tanta. It lies on the Tur'at al-Milhî canal, a branch of the Bahî Shahîn.

In view of the large number of Egyptian geographical names compounded with Mahalla, the identification of the town with the names mentioned by earlier Arabic writers is a matter of some difficulty. Maspero and Wiet indentify it with the Coptic Tighaîr (Amélineau, La géographie de l'Égypte à l'époque copte, Paris 1893, p. 263), but this identification is rendered doubtful by the fact that al-Mahalla is a purely Arabic name (and it also remains to be proved that it is a rendering of the Coptic name just mentioned), and because the work of Abu Ṣâlih on the Christian buildings of Egypt makes no mention of this town. The earliest author who knew a town called al-Mahalla or al-Mahalla al-Kubra is al-Ma'mûnî (p. 55, 194, 196, 200); he tells us that it was a town of al-Rif built in two parts, one called Sandafâ (or Sanafa), but the statement that the town was situated on the river by Alexandria (p. 200) seems to be an error. Al-Bakrî seems to know the same town under the name Mahâlât Mahûmî (Kifâ al-Malîk wa'l-Mahâlât, Brit. Mus. MS., XI, 183), Description de l'Afrique, p. 158, calls the town simply al-Mahalla and knows a canal called al-ajîr. Yâkût’s statements are confused, for he speaks of a town called Mahâlât Dâkahlî and of another Mahâlât Sharîkîyûn (iv. 443), both of which seem to refer to the same place. Mahâlât Sharîkîyûn in Yâkût— which should be Mahâlât al-Kubrâ—forms one town with Sandafâ in Al-Idrîsî and others and he says that Mahâlât Dâkahlî between al-Kahtâr and Dumîyat, is the largest of the Mahâlât that he knows (cf. also Abu'l-Fidâ‘ī, ii. 160), while the geographer Al-Dimashkî (p. 231) knows Mahâlât Dâkahlî as the capital of the Kûm of Dâkahlâ; Ibn Dâkâlî (v. 82) says that the governorship of this town was regarded as “the little viceroyate” (al-mâlîk wa'l-mâlîk).

The name Mahâlât Sharîkîyûn is again found in al-Ma‘mûnî (ed. Wel, ii. 2577). It is clear from these writers that the town was an important commercial centre from the tenth century onwards. It does not seem however to have played any considerable part in history, although Al-Idrîsî Ma‘mûrî quotes some events that took place there, from al-Ma‘mûnî and al-Di‘antar. In Egypt in the ninth century the town had to give way to Tanta, which became the capital of the ma‘malât of al-Gharrîba, while al-Mahalla became the capital of a smaller administrative area; Al-Ma‘mûrî estimates its inhabitants at 50,000, while the 1928 Baedeker only gives it 55,000. It is at present a centre of the cotton trade; raw cotton is there cleaned in the factories. Of the many individuals who bear the name al-Mahâlî, the most celebrated is Djâlîl al-Din al-Mahâlî (q.v.) who was born here.

Bibliography: Maspero et Wiet, Ma-
MAHALLA AL-KUBRA — AL-MADHI

A negrito tribe also called Kotoko, living on both banks of the Lower Logone below Musgum and on both banks of the Lower Chari from Lake Chad to Fort Lamy and Kusseri.

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

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

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

There are few isolated homes in the Makari country; they are generally grouped in villages of which the most important are Logone, Gana (Little Logone), Kanari Logone and Logone Berri (Great Logone) and Kusseri. They used all to be surrounded by circular ditches and clay walls pierced by several narrow gates. Their defense were intended to protect the inhabitants from the frequent attacks of their neighbors.

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


MAHBUB, the name given in North Africa and Egypt (cf. Dossy, Stephenu, q. v.) to the Turkish gold sequin, contruction for Ternagte [q. v.].

MAHDAWIS, the followers of Saffih Muhannad Mahdi, of Dasmir, near Baniara, 847-910 (1442-1504), who declared that he was the promised Mahdi [q. v.] and by his preaching gained a number of adherents in Ahmadabed [q. v.] and other parts of Godjirat. His followers credited him with the power of working miracles, raising the dead, healing the blind and the dumb, etc. For a time they were allowed to profess their faith unmolested and add to their number by proselytizing, but in the reign of Murshid I, Sultan of Godjarat (1513-1526) they were persecuted and many of them put to death. Avrangaz [q. v.] also persecuted them when in 1645 he was governor of Ahmadabed. In consequence of these persecutions, the Mahdaws fled to the present day practice islyia [q. v.] and wish to pass as orthodox Muslims; their exact number is therefore uncertain, but they are found in small groups in most parts of Godjarat, in Bombay, Sind, the Dakhan [q. v.], and Upper Hindustan. They believe that Saffih Mahabba was the last Jesus, the promised Mahdi, and in consequence of his having come, they are said by their religious opponents neither to repent for their sins nor to pray for the souls of their dead. They observe certain ceremonies peculiar to themselves at marriages and funerals. By their enemies they are styled (Mahdawa, i.e., those who do not believe in a Mahdi) who is still to come; but the Mahdaws themselves apply this designation to other Muhammadans as having failed to recognize the Mahdi who has already appeared.


AL-MADHI (A.), means literally "the guided one", and, as all guidance (huda) is from Allah, it has come to mean the divinely guided one, guided, that is, in a peculiar and individual way. For Allah, in the intense and immediate way, for Ishaq, in the intense and individual way, for Ishaq, in the intense and immediate way, for the weakness of the lower nature, to his knowledge of Himself and to what is needed for their existence and continuance (Lisa, xx. 238, foot). One of his names is al-Allahi, the Guide (Kur.), xxii. 33: xxv. 33), and the idea of His guidance is reiterated in the Kur. For statement of its different kinds see Bandi on Kur., i. 5 (Fleischer's ed., i. 8, ii. 21 n.).
of al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī, p. 560 of ed. Cairo 1324; al-Maḥṣūl al-wṣāri' of al-Ghazālī, p. 80 of ed. Cairo 1324. But it is singular that the word mahdī (the passive participle of the 1 Stem) never occurs in the Kur‘ān and that the passive of that stem occurs only four times. In the usage of the Kur‘ān, the VIII stem, iḥdida, strictly “he accepted guidance for himself”, is used as a quasi or reflexive passive. Thus the man whom Allah guides is not simply “guided” but reacts himself to the divine guidance.

There seems to be no original authority for the vocalisation al-Mahdi which Edward Pococke gave as No. xvi. of the Signs in his Porta Mosis, ii. 263 of ed. 1655, with the meaning "director"; cf. Lane's note in the Supplement to his lexicon, p. 373a. Margoliouth (article cited below, p. 337a) suggests that it may mean “the giver” and refers to traditions (see below) of the Mahdi bestowing uncounted wealth; but there does not seem to be any oriental authority for this epithet. Also, the verb used in these traditions is ofia.

But one who is mahdī, or al-mahdī, is in a different position; he is absolutely guided. It is used of certain individuals in the past and of an eschatological individual in the future. Thus the Isḥāq (xx. 229, 9 from below) quotes from a tradition “the usage of the Khalīfa who followed the right way and were guided” (sunmān la yakhlaṣ al-‘alā ‘alā maḥdī al-umma), meaning the first four Khalifs, and gives on state that it is applied especially, as a name, to the Mahdi of whom the Prophet gave good tidings that he would come in the End of Time. There are many other instances of the non-eschatological application of the term mahdī to historical personages. Goldziher (Vorlesungen, p. 267, v, note 12, 3) has gathered a number of such cases; Thus Ḥajar (Nāṣīqīd, ed. Bevan, No. 104, v. 39) applies it to Abūsaid and Ḥassān b. Thābit (Dīwān, ed. Tunis, 24.) to Mahammad; and, too, Ibn Sa‘d (xii. 94. 4). It is often applied by Sunnites to Allāt, in distinction even to the other three Khalifs; thus in ‘Um al-‘Abd (v. 31, 4) he is kāfirīn mādīsīn, and Sulaimān b. ‘Umar calls Ḥussain, after his death, allāhīsīn al-sālihīn of the Mahdi” (Tabari, Tārīkh, ed. Lcliden, Ser. ii. 540, 19). Farābī and Dārīrī applied it as an honorific even to the ‘Umāyid Khalifs. As applied by the poets to ‘Umar II, the ‘Umāyid (Ibn Sa‘d, v. 243, 2), it seems to have been more than an honorific; he was regarded as a real muṣaffādī (q.v.) and under peculiar divine guidance. In the view of later Isra‘il he was the first of these “renouncers” of the Faith and the eighth and last of these would be either the Mahdi, a descendant of the Prophet, or Iṣā‘ (al-maṣīh al-muḥtadī), according to the two positions; cf. article Iṣā‘. See on the whole question of the Muṣaffādī and his relation to the Mahdi; Goldziher, Zur Charakteristik... in-Sayyī’s, in S. B. d. Wien, lxxix, p. 100. It is characteristic of ‘Umāyid to take a very pessimistic view of human nature; men always fail away from the faith and have to be brought back. This will be so especially towards the end of the world. Men will become thoroughly secular and Allāh will leave them to themselves. The Kāfā will vanish, and the copies of the Kur‘ān will become blank paper, and its words will vanish, also, from the memories of men. They will think only of poems and songs. Then the end will come.

In a similar heightened sense the term Mahdi was applied by Ibn al-Ta‘awwsh (Dimashq, ed. Margoliouth, p. 103, 3, 6) to the ‘Abbasid Khalīfa al-Nasir (A.H. 575–638). But is the Mahdi and no other eschatological Mahdi need be looked for. In a narrower but more true etymological sense it came to be applied to converts to Isla‘m; Allāh had guided these to the right Way. For such, Turks use the more Kur‘ānic term mahdāti; see above for the distinction. Goldziher (p. 268) gives cases. In a heightened sense, also, the term was applied very early (A.H. 66) to Muhammad b. al-Hanafīya, a son of Ali by another wife than Fatimah. After the death of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marzūq, a son of ‘Abd b. Marzūq, a son of the legatee (al-mayyīf); a term applied to ‘Ali by those who asserted that the Prophet had bequeathed the headship of the people to him (Tabari, Tārīkh, ii. 534). This was after the deaths of ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Malik, and the two sons of ‘Ali by Fathimah, the daughter of the Prophet, and shows a different drift as to the inheritance of the Imamate from that of the Shi‘ite legitimists. This Muhammad was heir as the son of ‘Ali and not as possessing the blood of the Prophet. He seems himself to have declined the dignity thus thrust upon him, but, maiyīf, he became the founder of the Kāfīniya sect which looked for his return from his grave in Mount Ra‘d, where he remains undying. This was maintained by the poet Kauthārīy (d. 105 = 723) and by the ‘Abd al-Haymār (d. 173 = 789; al-‘axāl, viii. 32; cf. Mas‘ūdī, Paris ed. v. 180 seq.). Muhammad thus became an “expected Mahdi”, makābī muṣaffār, like the Hidden Imam of the Twelve Shi‘ites. For the position of the Kāfīniya see Shahristānī’s Mishk wa-Nīshāl, ed. on margin of Ibn Hibat, i. 196; Makhtārī, disgusted with Muhammad, eventually founded the Makhtāriya sect which was strict Shi‘ite and upheld ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marzūq, a son of the Imamate (p. 197). The whole episode is interesting as showing the extreme fluidity of the religious-political parties at the time. It also shows very clearly how the term mahdī gradually hardened from being a general honorific into a special designation, and even a proper name, for a restorer of the Faith in the last days. The Hidden Imam of the Twelve Shi‘ites, whose return (ra‘īya) is awaited, is also called, by the Shi‘a, al-Mahdi. But his status is entirely different from that of the future restorer looked for by the Sunnites. The very essence of Sunnite Isla‘m is that the Muslim people shall rule itself and can attain truth and certainty by its own exertions. When, at any time, its qualified scholars (mawdūfātī) have applied the three wujūd — Kur‘ān, Sunna, Śiyār — to any point of Isla‘m and have come to an agreement (ta‘līf) on it, that point is assured and the acceptance of it as of faith is binding on all Muslims. The idea of an absolute Mahdi, therefore, as an infallible guide, suggests too much that ṭabī‘ (q.v.), which the later Sunnite theologians rejected. Sunnite Isla‘m, as Goldziher has taught us, is a recoil against the idea of blind submission to any human teacher. Even Iṣā‘, as restorer, is called muṣaffādī, which is much less emphatic in its suggestion of infallibility. Yet the masses demanded an absolute restorer and it was among the masses that the belief in a Mahdi was, and is, strong. To return — the
Mahdi, or Ḥāli when he comes as a restorer and ruler, will restore and apply that Consensus of Islam which has been reached by the successive generations of mujaddidān. Thus the Muslim people not only rules itself but is also the ultimate and infallible interpreter of the revelation through the Prophet. The Shi‘ites, on the other hand, admit no such authority either in the Muslim people or in their own mujaddidān; by Kur‘ān, Sunna, Kaysā, and Ḥajjū there can be no certainty. They can only be gained from the instruction (ta‘lim); cf. Goldscheider’s Streitkreise der Glaubigen gegen die Bahā‘isya- Secte, passim) of the hidden Imām who is divinely protected (muntakib) against all error and sin, and whose function it is to interpret Islam to men. The mujaddidān of the Ḥujjātas are his intermediaries with men; but they in their intermediation may err. When the Hidden Imām returns he will rule personally by divine right. He is called a Mahdi, but it is in a different sense from any Sunnite use of that term. The idea of protection against sin and error in a Mahdi (al-muntakib) seems to have been introduced into Sunnite Islam from the Mu‘a‘talah system by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Razi (d. 689/1290), see, further, Goldscheider in Itinera, vi. 238—245), but there it has been limited strictly to prophets. No “successor” (khilāfat) can enjoy it and the Mahdi, for those Sunnites who expect him, is strictly an ultimate khalifa of the Prophet. For those Sunnites who look to ʿIsa to play the part of the Mahdi he will not return as a prophet in his own right. It will not be a return (ra‘b) in his case but simply a “descent” (mush‘il) and he will rule according to the law (ʿur企业发展) of Muhammad; see article ʿIsa above, ii., p. 525. As all Shi‘ite sects agree on this status of their Imām it is unnecessary to go into further details on them; see in general, article ʿIsa.

Another important point of difference between Shi‘ites and Sunnites as to the Mahdi is that he is an essential part of the Shi‘ite creed but not of the Sunnite. That there will be a final restorer of the faith all Sunnite Islam believes as a part of its eschatology, but not that he will be called Mahdi. There is no mention of the Mahdi in either of the ʿAskar, of Musli of or of Bahāri. Similarly Sunnite systematic theologians do not deal with him. The Musābīj of al-Qādi has nothing on him; nor, indeed, on any of the Signs of the Hour (ʿāyat al-sunna; cf. article ʿAYAMA). Nāṣrī in his ʿAṣba has, of these, only al-Dājdjal (see article above, vol. i, p. 886) and the Descent of ʿIsa; Tafsīrī in his commentary, gives ten Signs but not the Mahdi. Even al-Ghazālī, a popularizing theologian, has nothing on the Signs in the last Book of his ʿIsyā, that on eschatology, and he makes only a slight allusion in the Book dealing with the ʿIsyā (ed. 1334, l. 218; ʿIsyā, the commentary of the Seyyid Murattāl, iv. 379) to the coming of al-Dājdjal, the descent of ʿIsa and his slaying of al-Dājdjal; there is no mention of the Mahdi either in the text or in the commentary. Al-Ghazālī’s whole point in this passage is to stress the final falling away from the faith of all men to which reference has been made above.

It was, then, in the hearts of the Muslim multitude that the faith in the Mahdi found its resting-place and support. In the midst of growing darkness and uncertainty — political, social, moral, theological — they clung to the idea of a future deliverer and restorer and of a short millennium before the
Karujbi died in 617 (1272) in the first years of the Nasrids of Granada when Granada was the only part of Spain left to the Muslims. He and those around him felt glowly the need of such a restorer and Mahdi, and detailed traditions sprang up as to his coming. The situation called for a man and the more specific champion of Islam than Ḥāfiz whose business it was to kill al-Dājjal. Devotion, also, to the blood of the Prophet, of whom the Mahdi was to come, and which was so strong even in the Sunnite Maghrib, may have helped this. Al-Kurtubi’s Mahdi was to come from the Maghrib as opposed to the earlier ones who were to come from Syria or Kūthurins. He will come from a place in the Djabal of the Maghrib, on the shore of the sea, called Masān; they will swear allegiance to him there and again, a second time, at Mecca. Here the tradition joins and attempts to explain an earlier one, given by Abū Da‘ūd and quoted by Ibn Khaldūn (p. 148; see, also, below), telling of an expedition against Kullab and of the booty of Kullab, thus linking up with the earliest inter-tribal conflicts. This western Mahdi will also kill al-Sufyānī who is supported by Kullab. This is not the place to enter upon the story how the Mawāniḍh branch of the Umayyads supplanted their cousins, the Sufyānīs. But from the mystery connected with the voluntary abdication and speedy death of Mu‘awīya II, the succession of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam and the sudden death or assassination of Walīd b. Uthmān b. Abī Sufyān (p[wa֑saspberry]atlaswāqiwāsqijawāisk; Maxmi, Paris, ed., v. 170) at the burial of Mu‘awīya II, it seems there have to sprung an Imāmī party among the Umayyads (qawūl al-Umayyāt min al-Mi‘āwīya, al-Qāsimī in Goldschmidt’s Streitschriften, p. 14 of the Arabic text); yet this Walīd appears later alive in Tabarī’s narrative. In the account of Kūthurī, b. Yūsuf in the Aṣḥāb (xvi, 88) there is a story that he was the first to start this (wa‘dāt al-Mallah al-Sufyānī wa-khabārah wa-shirād al-yakūnā 6m‘ālī fihī rā‘āwsw), although that is also denied and a more general and earlier origin is asserted. In the civil war at the rise of the Aḥbāsids one of the “white”, i.e., Umayyad, revolts was in support of the claims of “the Sufyānī of whom there were to be mentioned” (wawalqil hādha l-Sufyānī ni‘lghat hānū fi‘lhabaw, Tabarī, Turāh, Cairo ed., x. 138, anno 132; Ibn al-Αḥbāt, Kāmil ed. [of Ed. Cairo 1301]. Apparently the Sufyānīs continued to assert their claims in the under-ground Imāmī fashion against the Marwānīs and, later, the Aḥbāsids, supporting themselves with traditions, as all the parties did. The details are exceedingly obscure for this was one of the lost causes of Islam and has left only a name and that name under the general opposition which fell upon the Umayyads in all later Islam, Sunnite and Shi‘ite. An earlier stage in this appears in a tradition quoted by Tabarī (d. 724 = 838) in his commentary on Kurān, xxxiv. 50 (Part xxii, p. 63 foot). The Prophet mentioned a dissension (saxma) which would arise between the East and the West. Then there would come forth al-Sufyānī from the Dry Wādī (al-wādī il‘-līsah); otherwise unknown; in Yākūt, iv. 1000, *the Wādī of Yāḥūs: from a man; it is said that al-Sufyānī will come from it in the End of Time*) in that outbreak of his*, or when his time comes” (fi fa‘urbi l-Qālib). Much is said of the armies he will send out and the destruction he will spread, slaying 3500 chief of the Banu ‘Abas until Dājjal is sent against him and destroys him. His appearance, thus, for Tabari, is not eschatological and there is nothing about the Mahdi and the End of Time. But in an apocalypse incorporated by Muhāyil al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī in his Muḥāfaraat al-akhir; and studied in detail, historically and astrologically, by Richard Hartmann in his Islamische Apokalypse aus dem Kreuznägebiet and dated by him about 1576 (1580), this tradition is used, expanded and brought into the eschatological picture, and al-Sufyānī is finally killed by the Mahdi. A hundred years later al-Kurtubi expands it still further and calls al-Sufyānī Muḥammad b. Uraya. For other references on al-Sufyānī see Goldschmidt, Streitschriften, p. 52, note 1, Srah Ehringer, Der Mahdi, in Verspreide Geschichten, i. 155; De Goede, Frag. hist. ar., ii. 526; Van Vloten, Recherches sur la domin. ar., p. 61; Lamens, Le califat de Yūsuf, i. 177; Mu‘awīya II ou le dernier des Sufiyānīs, p. 42.

It is obviously impossible to give in detail the traditions bearing on this restorer, but their types can be indicated and some recurrent characteristics. The great majority are put directly in the mouth of the Prophet, a very few go back to ‘All. If there remain of the world a single day, Allah will lengthen it until he sends this restorer; the world shall not pass away; the Hour shall not come until then. He will be of the People of my House (min asl bih); of my kindred (min ‘arab); of my Nation (min ummat); of the offspring of Fātimah (min wa‘dāt Fātimah); his name will be my name and his father’s name; my father’s name. He will resemble the Prophet in disposition (khalīf) but not in appearance (ḥāl). This is put in the mouth of ‘Ali. He will be bald of the forehead, hook-nosed, high-nosed. He will find the world full of evil and oppression and inglorious; if a man says: ʿAli! ʿAli! he will be killed. He will fill the world with equity and justice; he will beat men until they return to Allah (al-khāliq). The Muslims will enjoy under him a prosperity like of which has never been heard of; the earth will bring forth its fruits and the heavens will pour down its rain; money in that day will be like which is trodden under foot and is not reckoned; a man will stand up and say: ‘O Mahdi, give me’ and he will say: ‘Take!’ and he will pour into his robe as much as he can carry. It is suggested that this is a sacrilegious, legitimate or illegitimate, of a tradition in the Sahih of Muslim: ‘There will come in the end of my nation a khalīf who will scatter wealth, not counting it’. See many references for this munificent khalīf and the abundance of money in the last days in Wensinck, Handbuch der Tradition, p. 1002, foot. But in this tradition, as in all Muslim and Bukhārī, there is no mention of the Mahdi. Again: the Mahdi is of us, the People of the House. Allah will bring him suddenly and unexpectedly (qawōl qalīliyya tālān fī l-ikfā). He will rule five, seven, nine years. There are frequent allusions to his coming in a time of dimension (fi‘lham). These will be such that it will take a voice from heaven to still them; saying: ‘Your Amir is saved and so’ (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 152). This is very like an ironical comment, but it is cited as a simple foretelling. In these earlier traditions he will come from the East (al-Mashrik; Khurāsān), from beyond the River (Dijbīr); in later times (e.g., Karujbi
and Ibn Khaldun, p. 171—176) he was to come from the wide, unknown, lands of the Maghrīb. The original Black Banners (frāhat šī'ah) tradition about the 'Abbasids, apparently forged to lead them to support the 'Alids, does not mention the Mahdi (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 533), but in an evidently later form there is added, "for he is the khalifa of Allāh, the Mahdi" (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 159). One long tradition (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 145) may be given entire as an illustration of a type and because of the later expansion and use of it by Kurjūtā: "There will arise a difference at the death of the khalifa and a man of the people of al-Madīna will go forth, fleeing to Mecca. Then some of the people of al-Madīna will come to him and make him go out (apparently rise in insurrection) against his will and they will swear allegiance to him between the Kūhān and the Maḏāmūn. And an army will be sent against (or, "to," lāh) him from Syria but will be swallowed up in the desert (al-ba‘āda) between Mecca and al-Madīna. Whenever the people see that, the 'Abādūn ("Substitutes" or "Nobles") of Syria and the 'Abādūn ("Companions" or "Territories"); see Lane, p. 205g) of al-Irāk will come to him and they will swear allegiance to him. Thereafter, there will arise a man of Qurash with maternal grandparents of Kāth. So he will send against them an army and it will overthrow them and that will be the expedition (jihād) of Kāth. And oh! the disappointment of those who will not have part in the booty of Kāth! He will divide the wealth and rule over the people according to the sunna of their Prophet and he will subject himself to the support of Īlam. He will remain seven or nine years and then die and the Muslims will pray over him. This is evidently an echo of the early 'Alids conflicts and is not eschatological nor does it mention the Mahdi. But its motifs of the 'Abūdūn and of the earth swallowing up in the desert (al- ba‘āda) re-appear in other traditions which are concerned with the End of Time (p. 156, 161) and it is worked into al-Kurjūtā’s tradition of the Mahdi from the Maghrib. Again, in a traditional context evidence is seen between the 'Abbasids and the 'Alids, the Muslims are exulted to turn to the youth of the tribe of Tammān (al-tammān) for he will come from the East and will be the standard-bearer of the Mahdi! (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 162). But it is plain, too, that the doctrine of the Mahdi arose late and was not generally received. Thus the doctrine of al-Dājdžāl is fixed in all Muslim eschatology, official and popular, but a tradition tries to assert that belief in the Mahdi is more of Faith than belief in him: "Whoever denies the Mahdi is an unbeliever but whoever denies al-Dājdžāl is only a denier" (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 144). On the other hand a tradition asserts that there is no Mahdi but Īṣā. The upholders of the Mahdi tried to turn this by saying that it means that no one ever spoke in the cradle (maḥdā; Qūrān, iii. 41) except Īṣā (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 163; Kurjūtā, p. 118). For al-Kurjūtā, another restored who is not mentioned in any of the collections of traditions used above, see article GAYTAN, above, vol. ii., p. 630f and Snouck Hurgronje’s article Der Mahdi, p. 12 (Verehr. Geogr., 1. 156).

The later, therefore, we go and the more popular are our sources the more fixed do we find the belief in the eschatological Mahdi. The more, too, the Muslim masses have felt themselves oppressed and humiliated, either by their own rulers or by non-Muslims, the more fervent has been their longing for this ultimate restorer of the true Islam and conqueror of the whole world in Islam. And as the need for a Mahdi has been felt, the Mahdis have always appeared and Islam has risen, sword in hand, under their banner. It is impossible here to give the history of these risings. See for details upon them the article Mahdi by Margoliouth in Hasting’s Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, viii. 336—340 and Goldziher, Vorlesungen, p. 231, 268, 291. For the Sudanese Mahdi, see especially Snouck Hurgronje’s article Der Mahdi, reprinted in Verehr. Geogr., 1, p. 147—151. This contains, also, a fundamental discussion of the origin and history of the idea of a restorer in Islam; see also beneath, s.v. Muhannad Aḥmad.

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

AL-MAHDI, ABU 'ABD ALLĀH MUḤAMMAD, an 'Abbāsid Caliph. His father was the Caliph al-Manṣūr, his mother was called Umūr bint al-Manṣūr b. 'Abd Allāh and belonged to the family of the old Himyarite kings. When the governor of Khurāsān 'Abd al-Dājjāb b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān [q.v.] rebelled, the Caliph sent his son Muḥammad al-Mahdi with an army against him; the real commander was Khāṭīb b. Khurāsīma. After taking 'Abd al-Dājjāb prisoner, al-Mahdi by his orders undertook an expedition against Tabaristan which had to submit to him [cf. Dā%xīva]. In 761—762 he returned to the Irāk where he married Raita, the daughter of the Caliph Abu l-Abhāb al-Sa‘fākīh. For the next few years he lived in al-Ra‘ī, lāh b. Mūsā had long been designated as successor to the throne but he was persuaded by al-Manṣūr to waive his rights in favour of al-Mahdi, and after the death of al-Manṣūr in Dhu ‘l-Hijja 158 (Oct. 775) al-Mahdi was recognised as Caliph. He made himself very popular by his liberality and gentleness, although several cruel deeds are credited to him. For example he had the son of the vizier Abu ‘Abd Allāh Mu‘awwiyā b. 'Ubayd Allāh [q.v.] executed on a mere suspicion and another vizier Ya‘qūb b. Dāwtūdī, who had fallen into disfavour with him, was thrown into a prison so dark that he lost the use of his eyes. In 767—775 a rebellion broke out in the always unruly Khurāsān; the leader of the rebels, Yūnāf b. Dākhilīna, was however defeated and taken prisoner whereas the Caliph had him executed in the crudest fashion. The war against Byzantium was continued under al-Mahdi. In continual raids to plunder and devastate the marches, the two opponents sought to do each other as much harm as possible; there was however never any thought of permanently occupying any territory temporarily conquered. On the whole the advantage lay with the Muslims and in the early stages they advanced as far as Arsacra. Michael Lachanodrakon however with a Byzantine army advanced against them, destroyed the fortress of al-Hadīth [q.v.], which however was soon rebuilt, and laid the land waste as far as the Syrian frontier (162 = 775/779). In the following year al-Mahdi equipped a great expedition in which his son Harīm took part against
the Byzantines and in 165 (782) Hārūn took the field again, accompanied by the Caliph's favourite al-Rabi' b. Yūnus, later vizier. This time the Muslims penetrated to the Boaphorous and the Empress Irene was forced to make a three years' truce and to promise to pay an annual tribute. In Rāmādān 168 (March/April 785), however, the truce was broken by the Byzantines and hostilities lasted till the death of al-Mahdī, without however any decision being reached. In his reign appeared the sectarian fanatic al-Ma'ṣūma', who gave the Caliph's troops much trouble and sustained a long siege in a fortress in the region of Kusāya, till finally he poisoned himself in 165 (770/785) in order not to fall alive into the hands of his enemies. In other parts of the empire also, heresies, especially real or alleged Manichaean (Zindo), were treated with the utmost severity. Al-Mahdī acquired great merit by his work for the peaceful development of his empire; new roads were laid down and the postal system improved; trade and industry reached a prosperity hitherto unknown and scholars were richly rewarded. At the same time there appeared an undesirable tendency to extravagance, which in the end was to prove really fatal, and with al-Mahdī began that expenditure of the revenues on useless luxury, which contributed not a little under his successors to the ruin of the 'Abbāsid empire. In time the Caliph fell under the control of his courtiers and in particular allowed himself to be guided by his chamberlain al-Rabi' b. Yūnus and especially by his wife al-Khairūnā, formerly a slave who was the mother of two sons, Mūsā and Hārūn. As early as 160 (770) homage had been paid to the former as successor designate under the name of al-Hādi in place of 'Isa b. Mūsā [q.v.]; and six years later al-Mahdī had his younger son Hārūn proclaimed as successor to al-Hādi. But as Khaīrūnā preferred Hārūn and he was also supported by the Baracdees, the Caliph decided to alter the succession in favour of him; al-Hādi, who was thus in Dārā al-Nūr refused to agree. Al-Mahdī thereupon set out to discuss the matter with him in person, but died suddenly on the 23d Muharram 169 (Aug. 4, 785) in Māshhadān at the age of 43. As a ruler he was undoubtedly one of the best among the 'Abbāsids.


(K. V. Zetlërstejn)

AL-MAHDI. [See Ibn Tūmārt.]
and his Christians. In spite of all the efforts of al-Mahdi, the blockade of Cordova became more and more strict. He then tried to put on the throne the caliph Hishâm II b. al-Mu'ayyad whom he had himself deposed and then given out that he was dead, but this was in vain. On 16th Rabi' I, 400 (Nov. 7, 1010) the palace of the caliph was in the hands of the besiegers. Al-Mahdi’s only hope was to hide himself. The pretender of the Berbers, Sulaimân, received the oath of allegiance at al-Cordova and assumed the honorific title of ‘al-Musta’s in b’Illah.

The following month al-Mahdi was able to leave Cordova secretly and seek refuge in Toledo where he was well received by the inhabitants. He then sought and obtained an alliance with the Catalans (frandjû) who marched with him on Cordova in Shawwâl 400 (May-June 1010). The town was taken and the second reign of al-Mahdi began with a bloody persecution of all the Berbers in Cordova. To avenge the wrongs of their fellow-countrymen in the capital, the Berbers in the army of Sulaimân al-Musta’s in returned to besiege the city. Al-Mahdi, betrayed by his servants, was slain during the siege in the palace in Cordova by some ‘Amidir slaves on the 8th Dhu’l-Hijja 400 (July 29, 1010). His first reign lasted nine months, the second less than two.


É. Lévi-Provençal.

MAHDI KHĀN, MIZZJU-MUHAMMAD MAHDI ASTA’NAZAD ET MUHAMMAD, HISTORIAN OF NAĐIR SHAKH OF PERSIA, whose deeds he recorded in the Tarikh-i Qâhân Gughâî-n Nâdirî; this work written in Persian is an excellent complement to those by James Fraser and Jonas Hanway on the conqueror. In it Mahdi Khan details the life of Naadir from his birth to his death while other Persian writers only deal with periods of life (e.g. Muhshin b. Hanif records only the expedition to India in his Qamwani-s Samâin; Abd al-Karim Kaghfurî in his Ba’yan-î Wazî) confines himself to the period from this expedition to 1784). W. Jones in his introduction to the Tarikh of Mahdi Khan says that “the narrative of these perpetual rebellions...is somewhat dry and fatiguing”; as to the boundless praise which he bestows on the author’s style, especially the descriptions of spring at the beginning of each year, it is exaggerated; in these descriptions all the images used had been employed to satisfy for years before. It is true that some works of the period are still more hackneyed. Mahdi Khan himself gives free train to this vaxatious tendency in another version of the history of Naadir which comes down to the year 1748 only: Durvîi Nâdirî, in a style uniformly artificial and elaborate. Malcolm (History of Persia) reproaches Mahdi Khan with having been too flattering to Naadir; he recognises however that the historian has spoken frankly of the cruelties which were a blot upon the latter part of the reign. Mahdi Khan was ‘Abd Nâdir’s secretary. This is revealed not only in the accuracy of his details but in certain statements also. Mahdi, for example, says that he was with the prince when the latter received news of the birth of a grandson (transl. Jones i. 191); at the end of his reign ‘Abd Nâdir sent him on a diplomatic mission to the Sultan of Turkey (ii. 179). H. Brydges (Abd-er-Razzaq, History of the Kajars, London 1833, p. clxxi, note) also credits him with secretarial duties. Besides his historical works, Mahdi Khan compiled his celebrated Eastern Turkish-Persian dictionary entitled Sangâlîkh (1173 = 1760) a valuable thesaurus enriched with examples taken from the Turkish classics (Mir ‘Ali-Shir, Bahar-Nâmâ etc.); the publication of this work of which there are two abbreviations is highly desirable.


MAHDI AL-MAHDI ALLAH AHMAD, a title and name of several Zaidi Imams of the Yemen: About 250 years after al-Hâdi Yâhya, the founder of the Zaidiyas [q.v.] dynasty of the Yemen, his direct descendant, the Imam al-Mutsawakkî ‘ala ‘lîhah Ahmad b. Sulaimân had, between 532 and 566 (1134–1170), restored the kingdom to its extent in al-Hâdi’s period, with Sa’da, Nadirân and for a time also Zabad and ‘Anân. A generation later (593–614 = 1197–1217) the hill country from Sa’da to Qammar was again ruled by one man, the ‘Abbasî b’Ilâh ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd, not a descendant of al-Hâdi but of a Rashid, i.e. one of the family of al-Hâdi’s grandfather, al-Kâsim b. Ta’zâbâhi, the spiritual founder of the Zaidiyas of the Yemen. The ‘Abbasî was twice able to enter ‘Anân; he was also recognised as Imam by the Rashid ‘Abd’Allah, the Nakatwî; but even before his death his power had become restricted by the last Ayyubid Sultan of the Yemen, al-Malik al-Mas’ûd, once more to the land of Kaysabâhân. After his death his sons, first Mâlamîmad ‘Isa-al-Din, then the Imam Ahmad al-Mutsawakkî tried their fortunes in the south, while one of al-Hâdi’s descendants and his namesake al-Hâdi Yâhya b. al-Mahdi created a petty imâmât around Sa’da. An attempt to unite the divided forces of the dynasty was made by

a. AL-MAHDI AL-DIN ALLAH; his full official title, one previously met with among the Zaidis, was al-Mahdi al-Din Allâh, Ahmad b. al-Husain b. Ahmad b. al-Kâsim b. Ahmad b. Isa’âl Abî ‘I-Barakat. The uncertainty about his genealogy, that occurs may be explained from the fact that, as is also found in the superscription and signature of his Khilafah al-Qâ’rân (see Bâl.) there is a jump from Isa’il Abî ‘I-Barakat to Isa’il al-Dâhîdî (of de Zambur, Table B.); he himself expressly says that his genealogy meets that of al-Manṣîr in al-Kâsim b.
Ibrahim, i.e., that he was a Rasid. His reign of ten years during which the Yamam was harassed by plague and famine does not reveal a great ruler nor even any real and consistent authority, but gives a remarkable picture of conditions in South Arabia, when for want of a definite line of succession, success alone decided how far an 'Ali' pretender was able to hold his own among his kinsmen. In the event he could gather to make a stand against foreign foes. In 646 (1250) Al-Mahdi had himself proclaimed Imam in the fortress of Thula in the highlands of Hadhramut, northwest of San'a', by arrangement with the Banu Hamza, i.e., the family of the late Imam al-Mansur, and with the benevolent tolerance of Assad al-Din Muhammad b. al-Hassan, the brother's son of the first Rasidid Sultan, al-Malik al-Mansur Nuri al-Din 'Omar b. 'Ali b. Rasul. But he was defeated by Nuri al-Din and besieged in Thula, and in 647 (1250) we find him having to fight with the Banu Hamza who had again deserted him. He was saved by the death of Nuri al-Din when he was killed by his own Mamluks in Zabid, an event which is probably connected with contemporary Mamluk attempts on the Egyptian Ayyubids; Assad al-Din who wished to make his governorship in San'a' independent, is also accused of intriguing it. The latter continued active under Nuri al-Din's son and successor al-Muqaffar Yathub, rebelling and suing for peace alternately, sometimes on the side of the Imam and sometimes intriguing against him. Al-Mahdi, who in the meanwhile had bound Shams al-Din Al-Mahdi, son of the late Imam and chief of the Banu Hamza, to joint action with him, took San'a' in the beginning of Dhumadas (July 1250); although harassed by Assad al-Din who held the fortress of Birash, he was able to extend his rule to the south as far as Dimashq. But before a year had expired al-Mahdi had to abandon San'a'. Assad al-Din indeed sold him the fortress of Birash, but it was just on account of this that the final breach occurred between them. Assad al-Din again went over to al-Muqaffar who had the governorship of the Yamam, granted him by the Caliph al-Mustahfin, who is even said to have sent assassins (Siva, see Beit., fol. 2378) against the Imam. In a thoroughly Rashid fashion, however, his fate was decided not by foreign foes but by the Zaidis themselves. He quarrelled with his eldest and most ardent supporter, Shibli Al-Mahdi al-Rasid. With the help of the Rasidids, Shams al-Din made himself Imam of the Zaidis in 652 (1254) in the old capital of Sana'a. Al-Mahdi was again confined to his original territory. The very next year a Zaidi army, probably comprising his deposition, as unworthy. Of the 10,000 men and 500 camel-borne soldiers of the earlier fighting, he had still 2,000 infantry and 300 cavalry, but these also left him in the decisive battle of Wadi Shawaha, which runs from San'a' parallel to the Wadi Khatri. He was slain at the age of 42, his head sent round as a trophy and treasured shamefully but finally turned with his body in the little Wadi of Light Bus (Dhushcha). His inglorious end did not prevent his tomb from becoming a wonder-working abode of grace; his biographer tells us that the *martyrs on the path of Allah and the commander of the faithful* are remembered of him even from his lifetime. His assassination at the beginning of 656 (1258) falls in the same year as the execution of his old enemy, the last 'Abbasid Caliph, al-Mustahfin. Legend says that the messenger who was to carry the news to Bagdād learned on the way that the caliph had met his fate on the same day.

While in his Dā'ā'ir (see Bibi) al-Mahdi collected the usual Zaidi arguments with the regular saying from the Kanz al-Usul practically in the traditional form as a general appeal to support the Zaidi cause and himself, his Khalfu is a passionate personal protest against his deposition and an attempt to bring back his enemies especially Shams al-Din Ahmād, to the loyalty they had sworn to him. This, he reproaches them, was as unrighteous as the recognition of Muhammadd's authority as a Prophet by the Usūlīs.

The Shams al-Din Ahmād above mentioned, who adopted the official title of al-Mutawakkil and recognised the Rasidids as his overlords, was at once challenged by a rival Imam in the person of Alī Muhammadd al-Hassan b. al-Wahhāb. The position remained the same for the next 50 years. The Ta'ilimaa gives nine men, the last being al-Nāṣir Sa'il b. al-Din Muhammadd b. Alī, who succeeded in obtaining some recognition as imams in the period between al-Mahdi Ahmād b. al-Husayn and A. AL-MAHDI AL-DIN ALLĀH AHMAD B. VAYYĀ. B. AL-MURTADĀ' B. AHMAD B. AL-MURRĀDH B. AL-MUNAFIDJAL B. MAŠUR B. B. AL-HUSAYNI B. B. AL-HUSAYN B. B. VAYYĀ B. AL-MANṣUR B. AHMAD B. AL-NĀṢIR. The last named ancestor was the son and successor of Vayyā al-Harīrī. After the death of al-Nāṣir Sa'il b. al-Din, a khalīf 'Abd Allah b. al-Hassan al-Dawārīī made himself Imam, with a few partisans on behalf of his sons who were still minors. But the 'Usūlīs, anxious to consolidate the power which was gradually breaking up, placed in the mosque of Dhumadas al-Din in San'a's three claimants: Alī b. Alī 'I-Fadżā'īl, al-Nāṣir b. Ahmād b. Muhammadd and Alī b. Vayyā b. al-Murra'dh, and these three were to decide on one of their number. The choice fell on Alī b. Alī 'I-Fadżā'īl, the youngest of them.

In spite of his objections, he had to give in to their argument that "one who has gone deeply into learned problems with their subtle points cannot be incapable of conducting worldly affairs". They at the same time promised him their advice and support (Zatīmu,s, fol. 724). But on the very night on which he was proclaimed, the hāji al-Dawārīī succeeded in getting hostage paid to his candidate (end of 793 = 1391). Ahmād b. Vayyā and his adherents at once left the town; a body and withdrew to the hills to the Banī Shihāb, a clan of the Hamdānīs. His abode was betrayed by one of the Shihāb, Fighting went on for 13 days in which the enemy lost about 50 men and the Imam 10. The latter then went farther into the mountains and his claims were recognised in Anis also. Among his special supporters were Alī al-Hady b. al-Mu'ā'īyāh, son of the former Imam, and Ibn Alī 'I-Fadżā'īl. He was also asked by people in Ṣa'da to receive his homage. But he was surprised by his enemies and as he would not interrupt his ritual ablutions and prayers in fight, he surrendered under a promise that no harm would befall him. In spite of this, as the Tatīmu,s tells us, which is however much biased in his favour, 80 of his men were massacred, he himself was taken to San'a', where he was kept a prisoner for 7 years.
and 3 weeks (794—801). Liberated with the help of his warders, he lived a further 40 years, 'basking up and down the country', devoting himself entirely to learning until he died in Zafar (either 1430 or 1437) of the plague in the Yaman, which had already carried off with many notables including the rival Imam Ali b. Salih b. al-Mas', on the island. According to the Tawwāna (fol. 754) Ibn al-Murtazā was born in 775 (1373) in Timbuktu, according to other sources (see Rien B. Rett. Mus. Cat. Suppl., No. 305) in 764 (1362) at Timbuktu.

The choice of Ibn al-Murtazā as Imam was a mistake, as much as he lacked the necessary wisdom and administrative ability. On the other hand he had another qualification in perfection. As a result of his careful education and a thirst for learning from his youth upwards, he wrote a great deal, dogmatic, legal and panegyric; he was also a poet and worked at grammar and logic. The kindness of his warders, who supplied him with ink and paper, enabled him to compose the new work Al-Asrar fi Fī Bahā al-Anāma al-Mušā'īd (Berlin MS. 4919) on which he wrote a commentary. His most valuable work is still his theological and legal encyclopedia, Al-Bahr al-taḥkhir (Berlin MS. 2894—9699) on which he likewise wrote a commentary. Although not the work of an original scholar, it is a rich and well arranged compilation, which deserves attention, if only for the part of the introduction which compares the various religious, as the distinctions between them are seen from a quite a different point of view to that of Ash'arī or Shahristāni.

About 80 years after al-Mahdi Ahmad b. Yahyā, from 922 (1516), the Turks had begun to occupy Yaman and to hold it with varying fortunes (see Kufah al-Din al-Makki, al-Barā' al-Yamanī fī al-Fath al-Ōzamīni, in S. de Saady, in N.E., iv. 412—44 and A. Roiger, Historia Summatet sub Hassānā Fatshā, Leyden 1838), in his struggle with them al-Mas'ūdī b. al-Kāsim b. Muhammad, a descendant of al-Hāshī, in the 17th generation, was able about 1000 A.D. to restore the present imāmate in San'a (see A. S. Tritlett, The Rise of the Imāmate of San'a, Oxford 1943). Of his sons, Muhammad al-Mas'ūdī succeeded him. Even in his reign but still more after his death in 1054 (1644), when his successor Ismā'īl, another son of al-Kāsim, was making his way with difficulty against his many brothers and nephews, one of al-Kāsim's grandsons began to come to the front, afterwards the Imam.

c. AL-MAHDI II-DIN ALLĀH AHMAD b. AL-HĀSN b. AL-KĀSIM. His father was not Imam but distinguished himself in the wars against the Turks and was also a scholar. In 1049 Ahmad appeared in the hills of Wushāb; in 1051 he besieged Khāber without success; in 1053 he was in Mecca with many members of his family on the pilgrimage. Just at the accession of Ismā'īl, he set out with another cousin against San'a. At first he came to terms with the Imam but then fought in different places for his own hand, e.g. at Thula'a and again in the Djibhat Wushāb. In 1070 he won the Jafr (Sana) for Ismā'īl, to which the Zaidīs had been summoned by the disputes for the throne. When in 1087 (1676) on the death of Ismā'īl he himself assumed the imamate a nephew, al-Kāsim b. Muhammad al-Mušā'īd, proclaimed himself Ismā'īl and was recognised particularly in the remoter territory in the south towards al-Thā'ma in Zabīl. A Zaidī assembly of leading Shā'īs and 'Ulama' met, at which Ahmad was with some difficulty recognised as the legitimate Imam. Although this did not mean that he enjoyed the authority of a sovereign, since his rivals and the other amirs remained as independent as before, yet peace and security reigned in the country. But Ahmad b. al-Hāsn died soon afterwards in 1092 (1681) in al-Ghīrān near Shābān which had been built by the first Turkish conqueror Hāsan Pasha. After the short and weak reign of his son al-Mu'tawakkil Muhāmmad b. Hāsan (to 1097 = 1688), family feuds broke out again. Among the later Imāms of this Šā'ī course another Ahmad b. al-Hāsan b. al-Kāsim (from 1221 = 1806) again bore the official title of al-Mahdi II-Din Allāh.
gaining genius, in the end his own astuteness and love of power brought about his undoing. Nevertheless it was to him that 'Ubaid Allah owed his throne and title. While the former was sowing the seeds of sedition amongst the Berber tribes of North Africa, 'Ubaid Allah was making his way with his family from Salamia in N. Syria to Kairawan (522 A.D.). In passing through Egypt disguised as a merchant he narrowly escaped imprisonment at the hands of a suspicious governor. Perhaps judicious bribery helped him on his way until he found himself with his son thrown by the Beni M'dkr, supporters of the 'Abbdus-Salam, into a dungeon in Sidjillaoua. Meanwhile his generalissimo was operating elsewhere in his favour with the help of the wild Beni K'tama whose services he had enlisted. A victorious entry into Sidjillaoua marked the release of 'Ubaid Allah — though there are suspicions that the real prisoner was slain before the surrender — and his proclamation as the true spiritual head of Islam, al-Mahdi, Commander of the Faithful. The Aghlabid monarch Ziya al-Din ('Ubaid Allah II) was overthrown and driven into exile in Egypt; while on Jan. 15, 910 A.D. (25th Rabii' II, 297) the new Mahdi and his son made their triumphal entry into Kalkada.

Following his elevation to supreme control 'Ubaid Allah entered on a policy of extending the bounds of his dominions. Not only had he enemies on all sides; even within his own camp lurked traitorous allies and fickle adherents. Those who had raised him from the dungeon found very soon that he was now their master. The estrangement between him and his chief supporters is said to have originated in the disappointment felt by the latter that he was incapable of working the miracles expected of such a divine personage. About 'Abd Allah was forced to play a subordinate part, and becoming embittered thereby, began spreading sedition amongst the unsettled Berber tribesmen. But the Mahdi was quite capable of dealing with the situation. A Shafi'i of the K'tama Berbers, heading a deputation asking for clear proofs of his spiritual claims, was summarily beheaded. Shortly after this he waylaid 'Abd Allah and his brother 'Abd al-'Abbas and had them assassinated (298 = 911). The other brother 'Abd al-Zakki was sent to Kairawan with a letter ordering his execution. As the Mahdi himself said in justifying such acts against quondam supporters: "Satan caused them to slip and I have purified them by the sword". Riots ensued, but the bold handling of the populace by the Mahdi and his personal courage averted disaster and firmly established the secular power, if it did not demonstrate the spiritual virtues, of the Fatimid dynasty.

'Ubaidallah's foreign policy led him to despatch Jassan b. Kalebi of the Beni K'tama as governor to Sicily in order to further the Fatimid cause. The Huwara and Lusa tribe of Tripolitains were vanquished, while the Mahdi's forces were also victorious against Muhammad b. Khasar at Tiharet. But following 'Abd Allah's death, the Beni K'tama, who were murmuring against the Mahdi, were attacked in April 912, chiefly by their old enemies, the people of Kairawan who never liked their savage manners. The Beni K'tama rose to a general revolt and appointed a new Mahdi, named Kahlil; but after considerable fighting they were defeated. The Tripolitains were also involved in a struggle with the Berbers (300 A.H.). But the most important events of this reign were the attacks on Egypt. The Mahdi's son, Abu 'l-Kaisim, was sent in command of the forces; while a fleet operated under Khabubas. Tripoli, Barca, and then Alexandria (302 = 914) were taken, until the victorious army was chased outside Fustat by the eunuch Muns, the Egyptian commander. A second expeditionary force (916-917) repeated the feats of the previous one and devastated the Delta and ravaged the Faiyum, only to be checked once more at Old Cairo, while the fleet of 80 vessels was destroyed at Rosetta (307 = 920) by the Khalifa's smaller but more efficient fleet of Greek mariners. Once more the Fatimid ranks had to withdraw. Nevertheless the domination of the Mahdi extended from the borders of Egypt to the confines of the Idrissid stronghold in Morocco. His fleets spread terror throughout the Mediterranean, Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, and the Balearic Islands felt his influence; while his secret-service agents were to be found throughout Andalusia. A revolt in Sicily in favour of an Aghlabid prince Ahmad b. Ziyadat Allah affected his sway in that island, but his administration generally was strong and secure, albeit rigorous and unmerciful. The year 926 found him taking up his residence in the new city he had founded on the Tunisian coast, named after himself al-Mahdiya (q.v.) (the "Africa" of Groissart). This became his capital instead of Kairawan (16 n.m. distant). The new town was founded in 303 (916) and was situated on a projecting peninsula called Djenzrat al-Far. It was strongly fortified with high and massive walls, and colossal heavy gates, enclosing the palace and the royal barracks. A natural harbour was improved to shelter 100 vessels of war. On the mainland lay the faubourg of Zawila intended as a place of residence for traders and the general public. After a reign of 25 years 'Ubaid Allah died on the 4th March 934 (14th Rabii' II, 328) at the age of 65, and was succeeded by his son Abu 'l-Kaisim under the title of al-Ka'im bi-Amraillah.

Yemen, its early mediæval history, London 1892, p. 192 sqq.; 294; Abulfeda, Annals, ed. Adler, ii. 356 sqq.; iii. 8; Lane- Poole, The Muhammadan Dynasties, Westminster 1894, p. 96; E. de Zambhan, Manuel de génieologie et chronologie, Hanover 1927, p. 118. — (Principal original source: Al-Khaṣṣāṣī, Al-Naṣṣāḥ wa l-Fīṭān, Ms. Leyden 805, not seen, but used by Kay).

R. STEOTTMANN

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

The Mahdi ‘Ubaid Allāh after leaving Raṣīq al-Daraj near al-Kairawān, came to live at al-Mahdiyya in the year 308 (912). Having become the capital of the empire, the town prospered. It was, according to Iḥṣāṭ, the richest city in Barbary. The son of ‘Ubaid Allāh, al-Kāʾim, was besieged there for over five months (January-September 945) by Abū Yazid, “the man with the saw,” a Khuḍāji agitator, who starting from Taẕwīr made himself master of the whole of Iṭrīyya. The failure of the blockade of al-Mahdiyya was the first stage in the downfall of the heretic. More than a century after, al-Mahdiyya, which had been the refuge of the Fāṭimid when in danger, served also as an asylum to their unconquered vassals, the Zirid Amirs, the victims of the Ḥillal invasion. In the year 449 (1057) the Zirid al-Muʿūz abandoned al-Kairawān for al-Mahdiyya. From that place he and his successors set themselves to recover the lands they had formerly ruled. From there they also turned their activities to the sea. Al-Mahdiyya, where the corsairs were now equipped, became and was to remain
AL-MAHDIYA,
formerly called AL-MA'SURA, a town of Morocco, on the Atlantic coast at the mouth of the Wādī Sabū (Sahū), built on a rocky promontory which dominates the valley of the river. Situated on the southern extremity of the plain of Gharb and 30 miles to the North East of Salé (Sāli) it enjoys a geographical position of the first importance. A port is shortly to be created here for ships of heavy tonnage, which cannot sail up the Wādī Sabū as far as the river port of Kenitra (Ar. al-Kumaitra, "the little bridge") situated 6 miles as the crow flies from the mouth of the river.

It is generally agreed that the site of Al-Mahdiya corresponds to that of one of the earliest Phoenician settlements founded by Hanno in the fifth century B.C. on the Atlantic coast of Morocco: — the factory of Thynisteria. Nothing is known of the later history of this foundation and we have to wait till the fourth century A.D. to get the first mention in Arabic writers of the town, at the mouth of the Wādī Sabū under the names al-Ma'īr or Hālīk ("the mouth") or Hālīk Sabū. According to the chronicler Abu l-Kāsim al-Zayami [q. v.] the modern town was founded by the short-lived dynasty of the Banū Ifren [q. v.] which settled on the Atlantic side of Morocco at the end of the tenth century of our era. In the second half of the XIIth, the Almohad Sultan 'Abd al-Mu'min built there one of his dockyards for his navy (dār al-mu'āṣir). Later, down to the XVIth century, al-Ma'īr's history is obscure — it was a small trading centre to which European ships came for the products of the country.

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

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

The Spanish occupation of al-Ma'īr was to last 67 years during which it was several times forcibly attacked by the Muslims, particularly the "volunteers of the faith" (Mujāhidūn), who mobilised to drive the Christians from the various points on the coast where they had established themselves under the active leadership of the chief al-'Ayyash of Salé. The principal attacks on San Miguel de Ultramar were delivered in 1628, 1630.
and 1647. In 1681 (1092 A.H.) the 'Alawid Sultan Mawly Isma'il [q.v.] laid siege to the town and finally took it by storm. He then gave it the name of al-Mahdif: the name of al-Mammar was added, as that of the great forest of cork-oaks which lies between Sahl and the lower valley of the Wadi Sahib. It may be noted that for a few years at an earlier date the name of al-Mahdifa, which was borne in the Moghul empire, was used. The Almohad Caliph 'Abd al-Mammar was on the site of the future Rabat al-Fath (Rabat), on the southern bank, at the mouth of the Wadi Sahib (the modern Wadi Bil-regreg) [cf. the article Rabat]. During the French occupation, the town was occupied by French troops in 1911.

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


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

MAHDIYA (A.), technical term in metaphysics, quid di, frequently used as equivalent of gzm-bar, substance. Abd Hanif, Dirar (and al-Nadjar) used it to designate the pure divine essence; cf. 'Abd al-Kahir al-Baghdadi, Al-Farāb khatn al-Farā'ab, p. 201-202; al-Shahrazuri, Kitāb al-Mīlāw wa 'l-Nihāl, Cairo, i. 114; Kitāb al-Su'a' wa 'l-Turāqq, ed. and transl. Huart, i. 85. On the question whether the quiddity is identical or not to existence (wujūd) cf. Djumā'ī, Sharh al-Mawrid, Cairo, p. 92.

(L. MASSIGNON)

MAHKAMA. See MGLKMB.

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

According to Maqrizi the custom of sending a mahmal to Mecca was first introduced in 670 A.H. by the Mamluk Sultan Baibars but others attribute it to the 'Abbāsids and 'Abū Nūaymī. It is also said that it was a princess going on the pilgrimage in a splendid litter that gave Baibars the idea of sending one with the pilgrimage. This is however only a story; and it is a much more important question whether the custom did not arise at an earlier date and whether it did not originally have a direct religious significance. It is natural to recall the portable sanctuaries of the Arabs and the mahmal particularly reminds one of the description which Musli (Die Kalifat, 1910, p. 849) gives of the 'Abbāsids and the Mahmal (or the Reba tribe): a framework of thin pieces of wood adorned with ostrich feathers which is fastened on to the saddle of a pack-camel and is the visible centre of the tribe. This would at any rate lead us to the practical significance of the later mahmal, a visible sign of independence and claim to sovereignty of the various Muslim states. It is just this significance which gives the mahmuls a certain historical interest as political changes and rivalries are reflected in them in course of time. There have occasionally been rulers who by sending mahmuls gave expression to their endeavour to obtain recognition as sovereigns and protectors of the sharifs, only to be soon driven from power again by others. That the Egyptian mahmal came to obtain a place of honour, that from Syria being the only other at all comparable to it, was a result of the political influence of the Mamluk Sultan. It is noteworthy that Ottoman rule made no alteration in this respect and an attempt to send a mahmal from Constantinople met with no success. In 1867 an interruption was
caused by the conquest of Mecca by the Wahhabihs who forbade this empty pomp, so hateful to them; but this ceased when they were driven out and Muhammad A'li's rule again gave the Egyptian mahmal pride of place. After the World War the sending of a mahmal from Syria stopped. Difficulties arose between the Egyptian government and King Hussein (1915—1924) regarding the powers of the heads of a field-hospital which was to accompany the mahmal as well as regarding the ceremony of its reception, which twice resulted in the mahmal not being sent.

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

Bibliography: Borchhardt, Reise in Arabien, p. 304, 356, 407 sq.; Butler, A Pilgrimage to el-Medinah and Mecca, 1856, ill., p. 12, 267; Wavell, A Modern Pilgrimage in Mecca, 1922, p. 152, 155 sq.; Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, 1832, ill., p. 150—156, 243 sqq. (with a picture of the Egyptian mahmal); Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, l. 29, 83 sq., 152, 157 (with a photography in the Atlas, Pl. v); Juyonholt, Handbuch des islamischen Gottes, p. 114 sqq. (Pa. Bum.)

MAHMUD I., twenty fourth Ottoman Sultan, reigned 1143—1166 (1730—1754). He was born on the 3rd Maharam 1108 (Aug. 16, 1696), the son of Mustafa II. The Sultans of the 18th century give the date 7th Ramadan 1107 (April 10, 1696) — and had spent his life in seclusion up to his accession. He came to the throne through the mutiny of the Janissaries under Patronas Khalil, a mutiny which cost the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha, the Kapudan Pasha and the Kayas their lives, and forced Sultan Ahmad III to abdicate in favour of Mahmad; these events took place on the 17th Rabii' I, 1143 (Oct. 1, 1730). The mutiny, which really had the sympathy of most of the subjects and seems to have been in the nature of a social revolution (Josef), was only suppressed after some time through the efforts of the Kfilar Agas Beghri; before its suppression a certain number of appointments to important offices dictated by the rebels had to be conceded and the many palaces built in the luxurious reign of Ahmad III were allowed to be pillaged. After the Janissaries had been pacified by considerable largesse on the accession of the Sultan, Beghri Agha succeeded in plotting the death of Patronas Khalil, who was assassinated on Nov. 15, 1730. The Kfilar-aghas continued to exercise a preponderating influence on affairs of state; the Sultan, who was by nature more interested in literature and in the erection of more or less useful buildings, did nothing to throw off this influence, which on the whole was for the good of the state. One of the consequences of this system was the very frequent changes of grand viziers — there were no fewer than 16 in Mahmad's reign — but the state possessed a number of able men who worked for the good of the empire in the offices of grand vizier, reis efeendi and k'aya beg. The state finances were kept in good order, as much by the confiscation of any great fortunes amassed by high officials as by a financial system which made no distinction between state and private revenue and the personal revenues of the Sultan. The situation abroad was also favourable, especially after the peace of Belgrade in 1739, which secured to Turkey a fairly long period of peace in Europe.

At the beginning of the reign, Turkey was at war with Persia. The campaign of 1733 was favourable to the Turks, who reconquered Kirmangah and took Hamadan (battle of Koridjan, Sept. 15). Urmia and Tabriz; however, by a peace signed on Jan. 10, 1732 by the ser-asker and grand vizier Topal 'Othman Pasha, Turkey gave up Tabriz and Hamadan. This peace neither pleased the powers in Constantinople, who replaced the grand vizier by Hekim Zade 'Ali Pasha (q.v.), nor 'Othman Kuli Khan, who on his return from Herat had deethroned Shah 'Othman and was making new preparations for war. On Oct. 6, 1732, the Porte issued a formal declaration of war and in December a Persian army invaded Mesopotamia, took Kirkuk and laid siege to Bagdad; the great battles of this campaign were those of Duldjidik on the Tigris, where the Persians were defeated (July 19, 1733), and that of Kirkuk, where a week later the Turks suffered a defeat which involved the death of the ser-asker Topal 'Othman Pasha. In the same year, the Persian war produced a conflict with Russia, provoked by the Khan of the Crimean march through the Caucasus to reinforce the Turkish troops fighting against Persia. Russia declared she could not allow the passage of the Tartars through the country of the Kumak and the Kaitak, which she regarded as under her authority; the Khan's force was therefore held up and several battles were fought in Daghestan between Turks and Russians. The negotiations opened at Constantinople showed more and more that a war with Russia would be unavoidable and they were finally broken off by the siege and capture of Azof by the Russians in March 1736. Meanwhile the war with Persia, which had ceased in 1734 on an armistice being concluded by the Pasha of Bagdad, had been resumed in 1735 when Ahmd Kopefla was appointed ser-asker. The campaign was unfortunate for the Turks. They lost a number of towns in the Caucasus; however the development of affairs in Persia where Shah 'Othman Kuli, afterwards Ndir Shakh, proclaimed himself king on Dec. 1, 1735. In his camp on the Caucasian front, was favourable to the peace negotiations which were begun at this time. These negotiations ended in a peace signed at Constantinople on Oct. 17, 1736; the frontiers of the two countries remained as they had been fixed in the time of Murad IV. In the same year a Russian army invaded and laid waste the Crimes, although negotiations still went on, first at Constantinople and then in the country. Austria, posing as mediator, took an active part in these negotiations, which were finally broken off at the Congress of Nienmriow in Aug. 16, 1737, when it became evident that Austria was really Russia's ally, so that Turkey had to
deal with two adversaries. The war began badly for the Turks who lost Nish to the Austrians and Ossakow to the Russians. Nish however was won back in Oct. 1737. During the next two years fortune was rather on the side of the Turkish armies under the grand vizier Yegen Muhammad Pasha. The conclusion of the war was marked by the capture of Belgrade and the appearance of the forces of the grand vizier Hâdişî Muhammad before Belgrade in July 1739. It was during this time that the famous peace of Belgrade (Sept. 18) was negotiated with the assistance and mediation of the French Ambassador, the Marquis de Villeseuvre, by which Turkey again obtained possession of the town. Russia was included in the same treaty and had to promise to demolish the fortifications of Azof.

This ending of the war in a way very advantageous to the Porte was followed by a long period of peace with the states of Europe, which, as a result of the Seven Years' War, had no time to devote to plans for the partition of Turkey. From 1743 to 1746 there was a new Persian war. It began through the demands of Nâdir Shah to have the Persian Shah re-recognised as a fifth Mahâlik, but of all this the Porte at first gave an evasive answer and only after they had become convinced that Nâdir Shah intended to make himself lord of Mesopotamia, the Shâhi-i-Isâm gave a formal against the recognition of the Djiyârâyân. In 1743 Nâdir Shah took Kärkik and laid siege to Ïâşuj, only to be forced to raise it after a while. In the following year the scene of hostilities shifted to the Caucasus. The Porte then attempted to support a Persian pretender of the Safawid family, whom it sent off with great pomp to Kars; in 1746 the Turkish ser-asker, the former grand vizier Yegen Mahâmmad, fell in the battle of Murâd Tepe in Kurdistan. During all this time, peace negotiations were going on in Constantinople and conducted through the Turkish commender-in-chief. During these negotiations Nâdir Shah had dropped his demand for the recognition of the Djiyârâyân and finally agreement was reached on the basis of the frontiers of Murâd IV (Sept. 4, 1746). In July of the same year the full power of Bebhir Agha died at the age of 96; in spite of the efforts of the grand vizier al-Sajîyid Hasan Pasha, his successor Bebhir Agha the younger succeeded in procuring the same influence in affairs. This new regime only lasted till 1752 when there was reason to fear a new outbreak of discontent among the Janissaries and the "ulama" also; the Sultan seems therefore to have decided to sacrifice the Kîlar Agha by having him treacherously assassinated along with some other favourites (July 10, 1752). Two years later, on Friday, Dec. 13, 1754, Mahâmmad himself died suddenly on his way from the mosque; he was buried in the Yeni Dîjâmî.

The Sultan left a pleasing memory behind him; it is even said of him that he took a personal part in the affairs of state (Sîgîlî, 'Oţhmanî, etc.) although in such sources give little evidence of this. He did not continue the splendid court of his predecessor, respecting public feeling which had led to the latter's fall. Mahâmmud is especially celebrated for the large number of buildings he had erected; in Constantinople he built no less than four regiments and he began the building of the Nûr-i 'Oţhmanî mosque. This activity was equally displayed in the provinces. This Sultan also acquired considerable merit by founding four libraries in the capital, those of Aya Sofia, the Willide Dîjâmî-i mosque, the Fâti'h mosque and the Gbalâş'a Serîşî. The reign of Mahâmmud is further marked by the display of a very skilful diplomatic activity by the Porte, conducted by several very able reis esfendis, like Râghib Pasha, etc. They were profited by the lessons of European diplomats and also by the advice of the famous French renegade Bonneval, who lived in Constantinople from 1729 till his death in 1747 and introduced several useful reforms into the army. But in spite of appearances, the Ottoman empire was far from being a strong power, as the historian Djeddet Pasha (Twârîkî, Djendet, 1502 ed., i. 63) has very justly remarked; therefore, in the period of anarchy that followed in Persia the death of Nâdir Shah, the Porte consistently declined to interfere in Persian affairs. From time to time minor revolts contributed to weaken the strength of the empire; besides the always dangerous Janissaries, there were several risings in Arabia (e.g. Şâfî Beg Oghlu in Aidin in 1739). It was also in the reign of Mahâmmud I that the Wallâhîs first gave to give trouble to the government. In Egypt the Mamlûk beg succeeded in ruling the country in practical independence, in spite of the energetic steps taken by Râghib Pasha, when the latter was governor of this province. As to foreign relations, it is interesting to note that it was in this reign that France, which became very influential after the peace of Belgrade, succeeded in 1740 in obtaining the celebrated capitulation which became in time the most important document on the extra-territorial rights of foreigners in Turkey.

Bibliography: The principal Turkish sources are the imperial historiographers Twârîkî Sânî ve Şahîrî ve-Sabîlî, Constantinopole 1198 (years 1143—1156), Twârîkî ve-ısâl, Constantinopole 1199 (years 1157—1165) and the beginning of the Twârîkî ve-ısâl, Constantinopole 1219 (beginning in 1166; then there are the reports of certain embassies like the Twârîkî ve-Tenîfî of Râghib Pasha on the peace negotiations with Nâdir Shah in 1736, a manuscript which was used by von Hammer. There are also several works still in manuscript on the history of the reign of Mahâmmud I, noted by Bahinger, G.O.W., Leipzig 1927, p. 332. The same author (op. cit., p. 289) also quotes a series of monuments in Turkish which deal with the wars of Nâdir Shah. For these wars, a complementary source is the biography of Nâdir Shah by Mahdî Şânî and Hanaway, A Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia, 1755—1758. General sketches of the reign of Mahâmmud I are given in von Hammer, G.O.W., Pesth 1836, iv. 266—482; Zinkleisen, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches im Europa, v. Gorha 1857, p. 629—847; Jorge, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, v. 1911, iv. 409—462.

J. H. Kramers

MAHMUD II, THE TWENTY- NINTH SULTAN OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, REIGNED FROM 1808 UNTIL 1839. He was the son of Abd al-Hamid I and was born on the 20th July 1784 (13th Ramadân 1199, cf. Sîgîlî, 'Oţhmanî, i. 73). He succeeded to Mustafa IV on July 28, 1808, directly after the tragic events, which had led to the assassination of Salâm III (q. v.). Mahâmmud himself had a narrow escape from the fate of Salâm. Until his coming to the throne he had lived in seclusion and during the preceding year his intercourse with the
dethroned sultan had undoubtedly exercised a great influence on Mahmud's ideas, making him appear afterwards as Salim's avenger.

The grand-vizierate of Mustafa Bairakdar Pasha, the consequence of the latter's victory, lasted only until November 1808; a revolt put an end to his reformation, tyranny and to his life. The next steps were taken up by the war against the Russians, who had occupied the Danubian principalities in December 1806. Endeavouring to continue their conquests on the southern side of the Danube the Russians met with more resistance from the Turks than had been expected; it was, however, due principally to the increasing danger of a Franco-Russian war, that the Turks obtained the peace of Bucharest, signed on May 28, 1812, and negotiated, on the part of the Turks, by Ghasib Efendi. By this peace, Turkey had only to cede Bessarabia to Russia. In the meantime the new sultan had inaugurated a policy of internal consolidation of the empire, a policy which lasted until the Greek revolt in 1820 began to absorb all the strength of the state. He put an end to the almost intolerable extent of the duties in Rumelia and to that of the numerous dervishes in Anatolia, especially to the families of the Karas Oghlan, Oghlan in Şarkhan and Alikn and of the Cankaya Oghlan in the region of Kaşarlye (cf. DEBREY). The sultan's authority was equally reestablished in southern Mesopotamia after the death of Salaheddin Pasha of Baghdad in 1810. The aid of Muhammad 'Ali Pasha of Egypt had to be invoked to repress the Wahhabi power in Arabia; Mecca and Medina were reconquered in 1813 by 'Usun Pasha (cf. 1813). In Serbia it was only after years of trouble that an arrangement could be attained, which left Milosch as supreme khan of this principality. The submission of Bosnia only took place after 1821. On the contrary 'Ali Pasha of Yanina succeeded in keeping his strong position during this period; not till 1820 were the Turkish troops able to lay siege to Yanina. In Constantinople the sultan took severe measures to maintain order, especially against the dangerous element of the Janissaries.

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

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

The Turkish successes encouraged the sultan to realise his long considered project to form a new army, trained and equipped after the European fashion. These new troops were recruited from the Janissaries. Their inauguration took place on June 4, 1826 and occasioned, ten days afterwards, the revolt of the Janissaries which ended in the complete and bloody extermination of these once famous troops (June 16). The extermination of the Janissaries is an act that will always be connected with the name of Mahmud II; it made a formidable impression in the whole country and the reform party — who spoke of it as the 1826 — considered it as the beginning of a new era of prosperity. The first consequences, however, were disastrous; the strength of the empire was weakened to a degree, which made itself felt more and more in the development of the relations with Russia. Hoping to get rid of the everlasting demands of Russia, the Porte had given still more concessions by the convention of Akkerman (September 25, 1826), but soon afterwards followed an agreement between Russia, Great Britain, France and Prussia with regard to the Greek question (July 7, 1827), which prevented the Turks from the suppression of the insurrection. Though directed, since the beginning of 1827, by the fanatical Pervet Efendi as Reis Efendi, Turkish diplomacy was powerless against this new intervention. One of the consequences of the agreement of the powers was the destruction of the Tureo-Egyptian fleet in the Gulf of Navarino, on October 23, 1827, without previous declaration of war, by the English, French and Russian naval forces. Subsequently the diplomatic relations with these countries were broken off, but, when war actually broke out, it was only with Russia.

The Russian war, inaugurated by a declaration of war by Russia (May 7, 1828), was particularly disastrous for Turkey. The Russians immediately
occupied Rumania and crossed the Danube, while on the Oriental front they took Karş and Akhalteke in the Caucasus. In 1829 the debacle was completed by the occupation of Adrianople by General Diebich, on August 16. Thus, by the peace treaty of Adrianople of September 14, 1829, the Porte was obliged to make all the concessions required of her. Russia gave back nearly all her conquests, but obtained the payment of a heavy war indemnity. As to Greece, Turkey had to accept the decision of the great powers, which meant absolute independence. In the following years the new frontier and the future relations between Turkey and the new state were regulated by special conventions.

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

On the other hand Mahmud continued with tenacity the consolidation of his authority in the interior. The principal agent of this policy was the former grand vizier Rashid Pasha, appointed governor of Smyrna after his return from Egyptian captivity. He succeeded in establishing order in eastern Anatolia and in Armenia, especially by subduing the Kurdish tribes. After his death, in 1836, he was replaced as serasker by Hafiz Pasha. The latter, unlike Rashid, was in favour of the introduction of modern tactics into the Turkish army; in his successful expeditions in the north of Mesopotamia he was accompanied by the Russian lieutenant von Molike, one of the army instructors who had been sent by the King of Prussia. These military measures of Mahmud had also in view the strengthening of the frontier on the Syrian side, in order to be prepared for a new conflict with Muhammad 'Ali. This event happened only after 1838, when Khurraw Pasha [q. v.], the zealous reformer and ancient enemy of the Egypt, came again into power as president of the new Turkish cabinet. The next

year Hafiz Pasha, appointed again as serasker in Kurdistan, crossed the Euphrates and occupied 'Ainšlīb, but he was completely beaten by the Egyptians under Ibrahim Pasha, in the battle of Nîzîh, on June 24, 1839. This battle left Turkey again in a desperate condition, just a week before the death of Mahmud himself.

During the same period the sultan had to suppress dangerous and repeated revolts in Albania and Bosnia; the situation in Serbia had remained quiet after a kháftî sharîf of 1830. In August 1837, the situation in the interior had become sufficiently stabilised for Mahmud to undertake a journey in his European provinces, which journey was an unheard of breach with the traditional customs of the Ottoman rulers. It was to be one of his last public acts. Mahmud died on July 3, 1839 at Constantinople in his palace of Çâlîçû below Scutari.

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

Mahmud II lies buried in the turbe that bears his name; it was constructed in Stambool on the Divan Yolu by his son and successor 'Abd al-Majid.

Bibliography: The Turkish historical works deserve more attention than has been paid so far to them. The more accessible ones are: Djawdat Passa's Tarijeh, Constantinople 1303, vol. ix—xxi, comprising the period from 1223 to 1241, and its continuation, the Tarijeh of Aflaj. Latif, Constantinople 1309—1360, vol. i—vii, comprising the period from 1241 to 1255.

Other printed sources are: Ali, Blu, Vagif Pasha, Constantinople 1332; Tarijeh Aflaj, Constantinople n. d.; Mahmud Aflaj, Dir iz CifTER, Constantinople 1424, a monograph on the extermination of the Janissaries; Mahmud Tutreja, Nizahat al-Wahfah, Constantinople (cf. also Babinger, G. O. W., p. 387). European general treatments of this period: Zinkies, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches in Europa, vii., Gotha 1863, p. 561 sqq. (until 1812); Rosen, Geschichte der Türken, Leipzig 1866, vol. 3 (after 1826); Jorga, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, v., Gotha 1913, p. 482—487.

A valuable contemporary source is H. von Moltke, Briefe über Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei, Berlin 1883.

(T. H. Hay)

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

Bibliography: Ghulām Husain Sulim, Siraj al-Sulām, Nāṣir al-Dīn Mahmūd, Tabāshī-ı Akbarī, both in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Kāzīm Firuzbāž, Golchānih-i Irābāhī, Bombay 1832.

(T. H. Hay)

MAHMUD II, NĀṢIR AL-DĪN was the third of the Hābšūr, or African Sultans of Bengal. He succeeded his father in 1494, but was a mere puppet in the hands of one minister after another. His first minister, an African entitled Habšūr Kān, was slain by a rival, another African known as Malik Bādīr the Mālīm, who afterwards slew Mahmūd, having occupied the throne for no more than six months, and usurped the throne.

Bibliography: See Mahmūd I of Bengal.

(T. H. Hay)

MAHMUD III, GHAYYĀH AL-DĪN, was one of the eighteen sons of 'Alī al-Dīn Husain Shāh of Bengal. He remained loyal to his eldest brother, Nāṣir al-Dīn Nisārat Shāh, throughout his reign, but after his death slew his son, 'Alī al-Dīn Firdaw Shāh, in 1533, and ascended the throne. During a troubled reign of five years he never ruled the whole of Bengal. Shīr Kān Shir, who ultimately ascended the throne of Dīlī, was already powerful in Bāhā, and allied himself to Mahmūd's rebellious brother-in-law, Makhduimi-

Alim, who was governor of Ḥādjiyūpūr. Shir Kān defeated an army sent against him by Mahmūd, but Makhduimi was less fortunate, and was slain in another battle. Shir Kān then forced the Teliyāgarāhī defiles, invaded Bengal, and besieged Mahmūd in Gaur in 1537. Mahmūd appealed to Humayūn Shāh of Dīlī for aid, and Shir Kān was recalled to Bāhā by a rebellion in that province, but left his son Dīlī Kān to continue the siege of Gaur. In April, 1538, Mahmūd was forced to evacuate Gaur, and fled, leaving his capital and his son in the hands of Dīlī Kān. Shir Kān, returning from Bāhā, then pursued Mahmūd, overtook him, forced him to a battle, and defeated him. Mahmūd was wounded and fled, and nothing more is known of him.

Bibliography: See Mahmūd I of Bengal.

(T. H. Hay)

MAHMUD, SHIRR AL-DIN, the fourteenth king of the Bahman dynasty of the Daka, was raised to the throne at the age of twelve on the death of his father, Mahdī al-Dīn, on March 22, 1482, and remained under tutelage throughout his reign of thirty-six years. The ascendency of his first minister, Malik Ḥasan Bahārī, Niẓām al-Mulk, who had been responsible for the death of Mahdī Gāwān (q.v.), was distasteful to the Foreign ambār of the kingdom, at the head of whom was Vissāf 'Adil Kān of Bidjpur, and the assassination of this minister, ordered by the young king, embittered the relations between him and the Daka party, which attempted to dethrone him in 1487. The plot was discovered and frustrated, and was followed by a massacre of the Dakans, ordered by the king. But the youth could not stand alone, and was completely dominated by his next minister, Ḥāsīm Bārīd al-Māslīkī, a Turk. In 1490 Mahdī Niẓām al-Mulk, governor of Lūmā and son of Malik Ḥasan Bahārī, proposed to Vissāf 'Adil Kān and Fatḥ Allāh, 'Adil al-Mulk of Bārīz that they should proclaim their independence of the king of the Daka, and both accepted the proposal. In the numerous wars of the reign Mahmūd was no more than a figurehead, being carried into the field by his minister, who issued orders without any pretense of consulting his nominal master's wishes. Mahmūd made more than one attempt to free himself from the control of Ḥāsīm Bārīd al-Māslīkī, and of his son Amīr 'Alī, who succeeded him in 1504, but each attempt resulted only in the tightening of his bonds. In 1512 Sulṭān Kūlt Kūl al-Mulk, who had been appointed governor of Telingūna in 1494, followed the example of the other provincial governors and declared himself independent, and in 1518 Mahmūd died, worn out with debauchery. Four puppets followed him on the throne of Bāhā, and his line was finally extinguished in 1527, when Amīr 'Alī Bārīd al-Māslīkī assumed the royal title in Bāhā.


(T. H. Hay)
MAHMUD, Nisir al-Din, Sultan of Dihli, was the son of Shams al-Din Ruhman by the daughter of Kuth al-Din Aibak [q. v.]. In 1249, when the nobles of Dihli were growing weary of the sloth, incompetence, and tyranny of their uncle, Mahmud, they about 18 years of age, was governor of Bahralie, and hastened secretly to the capital when he learned that the throne was likely to become vacant. On June 10, 1249, Mahmud was deposed and thrown into prison, where he died shortly afterwards, and Mahmud, his uncle, was enthroned in the Green Palace. He was an amiable and peace-loving prince, with a taste for calligraphy, which he displayed in making copies of the Kur'an, but as a ruler he was a mere cipher. He was well served by Ghayth al-Din Balban, whose daughter he married, and who ultimately succeeded him on the throne. Balban restored the royal authority in the Pandja, the Dehli, Mewat, Multan, Nigawa, and northern Malwa, but his enemies had been busy during his absence from court, and on his return attempted to assassinate him. He frustrated this design, but was banished from court. The nobles soon grew weary of the treatment of the emir Ra'if Khan, who had supplanted him, and Balban and other nobles assembled their troops and marched on Dihli. Raif Khan and the king marched against them, but as most of the nobles in the royal camp were in sympathy with Balban, he hesitated to attack the king, serious hostilities were avoided, and the royal army retreated. The nobles at court now prevailed upon the king to dismiss Raif Khan, who was banished, first to Budan, and afterwards to Bahralie, a reconciliation between the king and Balban was effected, and they returned together to Dihli in January, 1255. Raif Khan was soon discovered to be in communication with Kutlug Khan of Bayana, who had secretly married the king's mother, and the emir was captured and put to death. In 1256 Mahmud and Balban marched against Kutlug Khan, who fled, and when he was pursued, in 1257, into Sirmur, again fled and took refuge with Khai Khai Khan, the rebellious governor of Multan and Uch. Balban marched against the rebels, but they evaded him and marched on Dihli. Finding, however, that preparations had been made to receive them, and that Balban was menacing their retreat, they fled, and in 1259 joined an army of Mughuls which was invading the Pandja. It was feared that the Mughuls would attack Dihli, but they retired without crossing the Satlaj. Order was then again restored in the Dehli, and in the following year the Meos of Mewat expiated by a terrible punishment a long series of crimes. Their country was ravaged, and 250 of their principal men were brought to Dihli and put to death with torture. In a second expedition 1,000 of them, men, women, and children were put to the sword. Meanwhile negotiations had been in progress with Hulgit Khan at Taloris, and in 1260 a Mughul envoy reached Dihli and promised, in his master's name, that raids into India should cease. At this point a hiatus of nearly six years occurs in the history of the Mamluks in India, and the next fact which is recorded is that Mahmud died on Feb. 18, 1266, and was succeeded by Balban.

Bibliography: Minhaj al-Din Sirafi, Tha'ala Dl Nair, text and translation by Major H. G. Raverty; Abd al-Karim Badatun, Minhaj al-Din Sirafi, text and translation by T. W. Haig.

MAHMUD II, Nisir al-Din, was the grandson of Fizur Shah, of the Tughluq dynasty, and was placed on the throne of Dihli on March 8, 1393, on the death of his elder brother Humayun (Sikandar Shah) and was never more than a puppet in the hands of intriguing ministers. The emir Saragar, depatured by him to quell a Hindu rebellion in Awahe, received the title of Sultan al-Shakr, and never returned to Dihli, but established his independence in Jajawan. Another amir, Sarang Khan, became virtually independent in the Pandja, and the minister Sa'dat Khan, resenting his supersession by Mukarram Khan, set up. Mahmud's cousin Nusrat as a rival king within the narrow limits of the kingdom of Dihli. In 1398 Malla, the brother of Sarang Khan, murdered Mukarram Khan and assumed complete control of Mahmud, who confounded on him the title of Ikhbal Khan. Nusrat Shah was then driven into the Dihli, but the kingdom of Dihli was in a state of utter confusion when, in October, 1398, news was received that the Amir Timur [q. v.] had crossed the Indus and taken Multan. He reached Panipat on Dec. 2, and meanwhile the capital had been filled with fugitives, fleeing before him. The resources of the kingdom were so restricted that no adequate preparations could be made to resist him, and Mahmud and Malla were filled with terror; but such troops as could be collected were assembled within the walls, and on Dec. 15, the king and his minister marched forth to meet the invader, who had crossed the Jajawan from his camp at Lum. They were utterly defeated, and fled by night, Mallu to Baran in the Dehli, and Mahmud to Gujjar, and afterwards to Malwa. Timur left Dihli on Jan. 1, 1399, when his work of plunder, devastation, and bloodshed was finished, and Mahmud's rival, Nusrat Shah, occupied the ruins of the capital, but was expelled by Mallu, and driven into Mewat, where he shortly afterwards died. Mallu returned to Dihli in 1400, and in 1401 was rejoin by Mahmud. In 1402 Mallu, carrying Mahmud with him, marched to Kansawal to attack Ithrum Shah of Jajawan, but Mahmud, weary of the domination of Mallu, fled and joined Ithrum, who, however, received him so ill that he again fled, and established himself in Kansawal. Mallu then made a fruitless attempt to recover Gujjar, and returned to Kansawal in order to capture Mahmud, but was baffled by the strength of its defences and returned to Dihli. He attempted to subdue Khair Khan of Multan, but was defeated and slain by him in November, 1405. After his death Daulat Khan Lodt became the virtual ruler of Dihli, and at his invitation Mahmud returned to his capital. The rest of his reign was spent in attempts to re-establish his authority in Samba, Sambhal, and Baran, and to punish Ithrum of Jajawan for his reception of him when he had fled from Mallu; but he was obliged to conclude an ignominious peace with Ithrum, and his success in other directions was neutralized by the insubordination of Khair Khan, who persuaded that Timur had appointed him his vicerey in India, and in 1406 stripped Mahmud of all his possessions beyond the walls of Dihli except the Dehli, Kohat, and

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
Sambhal. In 1409 and 1410 Khiār Khān captured Rohtak, Narnaul, three towns to the south of Dīhlā, and Fīrūzābād, and besieged Ṭabārī in his capital, which was only saved by a famine which compelled the invader to retire. In 1413 Mahmūd died, the last of his line, at Kītaḥbāl, after a nominal reign of twenty years.


MAHMŪD II, SHARF-AL-DIN, succeeded his father, Ismail Shah, on the throne of Dīghaṇpur in 1430. In 1443 he obtained permission from Mahommed I of Mūlla to punish Nāṣir Khān, governor of Kālpī, which was a satrapy of Mūlla for breaches of the law and customs of falsan committed by him, but Ṭabārī of Mūlla repented of his compliance, and was broke out between Mūlla and Dīghaṇpur. Hostilities, which were indecisive were terminated by a compromise. In 1452 Mahommed Sharf-al-Dīn, on the invitation of some disaffected nobles, attacked Dīhlā in the absence of Ballāḥī Lodi, but was defeated and compelled to retreat to Dīghaṇpur. The foolish act of aggression served only to enrage Ballāḥī a sense of the danger to Dīhlā of the existence of an independent kingdom in Awadh and in 1457 he marched to attack Mahommed, who, however, died before he could meet him in the field.


MAHMŪD I, SAFI AL-DIN, BAGHARIA, the greatest of the Sultāns of Gujrat, was a younger son of Muḥammad I, Khurram, and was born in 1444. In 1458 the nobles dethroned his nephew, Dāwūd, a vicious and depraved youth, and placed Mahommed on the throne. The boy immediately displayed great courage and resources in the suppression of a serious conspiracy and rebellion at the beginning of his reign, and in 1461/1462 he marched to the assistance of the youthful Nizām Shāh of the Deccan, whose dominions had been invaded by Mahommed I of Mūlla. He compelled the invaders to retire and forestalled a second attempt to invade the Deccan. In 1466/1467 he attacked and destroyed the Ādil Khān of Gīrānī, which had been independent since the capture of the fortress by Mahommed B. Tuglak, Dīhlā in 1348, and reduced him to the position of a vassal. In 1470 he again invaded Gīrānī, and on Dec. 4, captured the Rājā's strongholds and compelled him to accept Isfahān, thus putting an end to the Ādil Khān dynasty, which had reigned in Gīrānī for about 1,000 years. The Rājā became an amir of Gīrānī, and received the title of Khān-i-Dīhlā, and Mahommed founded, near Gīrānī, a new fortress, which he named Muṣafār-Shād. He then invaded Kītaḥbāl, and suppressed a rebellion in that province, carrying its leaders, who were compelled to accept Isfahān, to Muṣafār-Shād as hostages. In 1472 he crossed the Rūmān and marched into Sīmāl, to assist Līmān Nāsir (Nizām al-Dīn) who was beset by rebels. He crushed the rebellion, and after his return marched to Dīghaṇpur, to punish the Rājā. Bhīn, who had plundered a ship belonging to a Muslim merchant, Dāwārī and Bālī Shāhshahīhār, the robber-chief's stronghold, were taken, and a Muslim governor was appointed to manage the small state. Bhīn himself was captured and executed. Mahommed's next expedition was against some Malīhārī pirates who had harassed the coast near Khambhāt (Cambay), and whose depredations were checked by the capture and execution of some of their number. Rājā Pati of Čampānār had long encouraged brigandage in the kingdom of Gujrat, and Mahommed now retaliated by raiding some districts of his state. On his return to Ālmudān al-Muhānādībī discovered a plot to depose him, formed by some of his nobles, who were weary of his ceaseless activity, but the malcontents, who were well aware of the dangers which threatened the kingdom, were brought to their senses by his threat to perform the pilgrimage to Makka, leaving his young son as regent. After restoring order in various districts of his kingdom he marched, in December, 1482, to settle accounts with Čampānār. The fortress fell, after a siege of two years, at the end of 1484 and the Rājā and his Minister, having refused, after five months' imprisonment, to accept Isfahān, were put to death. In 1491 Mahommed was disturbed by acts of piracy and aggression committed against his subjects by Ballāḥī Gilān, a rebel in the Kōlān, and his protests compelled the nobles of the distracted kingdom of the Dīkhān to unite for the purpose of crushing the rebel. In 1505 Mahommed's fleet, under Malik Aḥṣāf al-Dīn, participated with that of Malik Aḥṣāf Nūsārī of Egypt, in the victory over the Portuguese fleet, in which the gallant young Lūreyrūn d'Almeida, son of the victor, was slain, and later in the same year he invaded Khānādāsh and placed on the throne of that kingdom his daughter's son, Aḥsan Khān, whose father descended from the vicing family of Khānādāsh, and who ascended the throne under the title of Adil Khān. In this campaign he was supported by Nizām Shāh of Aḥmadnagar. In 1511 a mission from Sulṭān Isābīl-Safawī of Persia arrived in Gīrānī for the purpose of inviting Mahommed to accept the Shīa faith, but he refused to see the heralds. He had now been ailing for some time, and on Nov. 23, 1511, he died, at the age of sixty-nine (Ramūr) years, after a reign of rather more than fifty-three years. He was a tall, burly man, of commanding appearance, and was, besides being an able administrator, both warlike and chivalrous. His nickname of Bagharia has been variously explained, but it undoubtedly had reference to his capture of the two great fortresses (gārāb) of Gīrānī and Čampānār. His elder brother had died of poison, and strange stories are told of his precautions against a like fate. He is said to have gradually absorbed poisons into his system until he was so impregnated with them that a fly settling on his hand instantly died. Butler refers to this strange prophylactic treatment in the lines:

"The King of Cambay's daily food
Is sap, and balsam, and toad;"

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


(T. W. HAO)

MAHMUD II. Of GUJRAT, was the sixth son of Muqaffar II, on whose death his eldest son, Sikandar, was raised to the throne, but was assassinated on July 12, 1526. The minister then placed on the throne Mahmud, who was an infant, in order that he might rule in his name, but Bahadur, the second son of Muqaffar, who had been absent at Dibbi and Jaspur, hastened back to secure his birthright, and on July 11, ascended the throne at Ahamadâbâd and marched on Chânpâner, where his infant brother was. He entered the fortress without opposition, and Mahmud was deposed and secretly murdered within the year.

[Bibliography: See MAHMUD I. OF GUJRAT.]

(T. W. HAO)

MAHMUD III. Sâ'Ud-al-Dîn, of GUJRAT, was the son of Latif Khân, third son of Muqaffar III. On the death of Bahadur Shah Muhammad Shah Fârâk of Khânchâkh was offered the crown of Gujrat, but died on his way thither. The choice of the nobles then fell on Mahmud, the heir male, but his cousin, Mahbûr Khân, who had himself expected an offer of the crown of Gujrat, refused to surrender him, until an army from Gujrat compelled him to do so. The prince was escorted back to his country, and on Aug. 8, 1537, was enthroned as Mahmud III, being then only eleven years of age. For the first three or four years of his reign he was a puppet in the hands of powerful ministers, and when he escaped from tutelage proved himself to be weak and inefficient. His attempt, in 1546, to recover Dibbi from the Portuguese, was a miserable failure, brutally avenged by him on the few Portuguese prisoners in his hands. In 1549 he retired to Mehmudâbâd, where he lived in luxurious luxury, ruining his constitution with drugs. On Feb. 15, 1554, he was stabbed, as he lay in a drunken stupor, at the instigation of an attendant named Burhân al-Dîn, who attempted to usurp the throne, but was slain by the nobles. The discovery of an heir was no easy matter, for Mahmud, dreading an heir as a possible competitor, had taken the barbarous precaution of procuring an abortion whenever a woman of his harem became pregnant. The choice of the nobles ultimately fell on a young prince entitled Râjâl al-Malik, the great-grandson of Shâhâr Khân, a younger son of Ahmed I, and he was raised to the throne under the title of Ahmed II.

[Bibliography: See MAHMUD I. OF GUJRAT.]

(T. W. HAO)
Kumbha in the field he failed to take his capital by surprise, and returned to Mândū. In 1468 he marched to Chandī, and his officers captured and destroyed the fortress of Kasahra. On his way back to Mândū he suffered severely from the heat, and on June 1, 1469, he died, at the age of sixty-eight. He was the greatest of the Muslim kings of Málwa, and under him the kingdom reached its greatest extent. The “column of victory” at Citor is said to commemorate Rān Kumbha’s victories over Māhmūd I of Gadjiṣṭ, and Māhmūd I of Málwa, but if so this is more mendacious than most laudatory inscriptions, for the successes of Mewār against Málwa were gained by Sangrama against Māhmūd II, not by Kumbha against Māhmūd I. Māhmūd’s fame had reached distant Egypt, for he received an envoy from the phantom ‘Abbāsid Khālid, who formally recognized him as Sulṭān of Málwa. He was a real Muslim, and restored the use in all public offices of the inconvenient lunar calendar of Islām, and, while he gloried in his successes against the “infidels,” was careful to excuse himself for his attacks — often unjustifiable — on sovereigns of his own faith.


(T. W. HAIN)

**MAHMŪD II.** *Allā* al-Dīn, Khabādji, of Mālwa, was raised to the throne on May 2, 1511, on the death of his father, Niẓām al-Dīn Khabādji. The early days of his reign were disturbed by rebellions on behalf of his brothers, and of other pretenders, and he was once driven from his capital, and was enabled to return and expel the rebels by the assistance of Mūsā Rāy, with a force of Rādjāpts. The king soon had reason to repent of having accepted their aid, for Mūsā Rāy assumed the place of minister, and the dominion of the Hindus alienated and disgusted all the Muslim nobles of the kingdom. Bihājī Khaṇ, governor of Chandī, openly expressed the cause of a pretender, and Māhmūd, while engaged in correspondence with him, was disturbed by news of a revolt in his capital and of the invasion of his kingdom by Mūṣaffār II of Gadjiṣṭ, but the revolt was suppressed, and the invader was recalled to Gadjiṣṭ by domestic disturbances. After protracted negotiations the pretender fled, and Bihājī Khaṇ received Māhmūd at Chandī and endeavoured, but in vain, to free him from the influence of the Hindus. Māhmūd returned to Mālwa early in 1524 and fell entirely under the control of the Rādjāpts, at whose instance he put to death many of the Muslim nobles of the kingdom. The arrogance of the Hindus at length became intolerable, and in 1527 Māhmūd fled to Gadjiṣṭ and with the aid of Mūṣaffār II, who led an army into Mālwa to restoring his authority, captured Mālwa, and massacred the Rādjāpts who had held it. The rest of the Rādjāpts in the state established themselves on its northern border and transferred their allegiance to Rān Sangrama of Citor. Mūṣaffār retired to Gadjiṣṭ leaving 10,000 horse to assist Māhmūd, and Māhmūd besieged Gāgrawān, held by Hemkaran for Mūsā Rāy. The Rānā marched to its relief, and Māhmūd, turning aside to meet him, suffered a severe defeat, and was wounded and captured. Sangrama received him courteously, but compelled him to surrender his crown jewels. He might now have annexed Mālwa, but, fearing to arouse the hostility of every Muslim ruler in India, made a virtue of necessity, and replaced Māhmūd on his throne. A few years later Māhmūd harboured and encouraged Cānd Khān, brother of Bahādur Shāh of Gadjiṣṭ, and a pretender to his throne. Bahādur invaded Mālwa and besieged Mālwa. Māhmūd’s sloth and negligence infected his army, and on March 17, 1531, Bahādur captured the city, and Māhmūd appeared before him. Mālwa was annexed to Gadjiṣṭ, and Māhmūd and his family were sent towards Cambānepur, to be imprisoned there. On April 12 the camp was attacked by a force of Bihāls and Kollā, and Māhmūd’s guards, fearing a rescue, put him to death. His seven sons were conveyed to Cambānepur, and nothing more is known of their fate.

**Bibliography:** See MĀHMŪD I of Mālwa.

(T. W. HAIN)

**MAHMŪD III. ISMĀ‘IL.** [See Ibn Khaṭīb, *Šamāl wa-Šamāl*].

**MAHMŪD III.** Muḥammad b. Maḥkāshā, a Sa’dīn ruler in the Ḥirs (517 = 1121-1131), ascended the throne as a boy of 13, being the eldest of his father’s five sons. To his misfortune, his trusted advisers only troubled about their own interests and made the young Sulṭān take various steps which were fatal to the prosperity of his reign. Anushārān in al-Birūnī mentions no fewer than ten such fatal mistakes; the result was that even in the early years of his reign several ambitious Turkish emirs were in open rebellion while his father’s Great Ḥājjī Alt Bār, who, during the latter’s illness, had had and still retained control of the vast treasures which the latter had hoarded up, dissipated them in a very short time and let the young Sulṭān lead a gay life. Especially dangerous to him were the aṭābegs of his brothers Maḥmūd and Toghārī, who found the opportunity a favourable one to dispose the sulṭānate on behalf of their infant protégés. The result was that in 513 (1119) Sandjār, the Sulṭān’s powerful uncle, was forced to interfere and marched on al-Rāyi (after an attempt to appease him had failed. Māhmūd was then forced to allow matters to come to an open fight but his troops were defeated at Sēwa [q.v.] and nothing was left for him but to go to the victor and accede to the demands made by him. Fortunately Sandjār, whose mother was Māhmūd’s grandmother, was favourably disposed to his nephew and announced himself content to add to his territory a few districts, e.g. al-Rāyi, but otherwise received Māhmūd in a friendly fashion and even gave him one of his daughters in marriage. Thereupon he retired and left Māhmūd without his help to make the best of the difficulties that faced him in the Ḥirs. There were few enough, for the Aṭtabeg of Maḥmūd, whom Ibn al-Ṭāhir calls Aḥyā al-Dīn-i Ḥabīb, in conjunction with the unruly Malik al-Ṭārīb Dhahīs [q.v.] was plotting to proclaim his protégé Sulṭān. The plan failed, however; Aḥyā’s troops were routed at Asadābād (514) and Maḥmūd’s unlucky vizier, the celebrated Arabic poet al-Taghrit [q.v.], was captured and soon afterwards put to death on the pretext
that he was an infidel. The two brothers readily made friends again as Mas'ud was still a mere child; Ayyab was escaped by Mahmud, but lost to Ahsan Khan of Multan which he had previously held. Duhais was preparing the Sultan still further trouble and soon found this opportunity, because Toghir, who, with his Atteghs being meanwhile given the province of Arran as ida could not withstand the Georgians there, who had taken Tiflis in 515 (cf. Brosset, Histoire de la Græce, i. 365; Matthais of Edessa, ch. 320–
323; Ibn al-Farràk in Ibn al-Kalâna, ed. Amer-
droz, p. 205), and came to the 'Irak to seek help from Mahmud. The latter himself took the field against the Georgians without doing much and Toghir, who had now returned to his pro-
vince, soon received a visit there from Duhais, who pretended he had set out to the 'Irak against the caliph al-Mustarshid. As they had no success in this enterprise, they turned their complaints against the Caliph and Mahmud. Sandjar thereupon went to al-Rayy and sent an invitation to Mahmud to come to answer the charges (522 = 1128). Mahmud was received with honours and instructed to restore Duhais to his territory in Hilla while Toghir and Mas'ud who was also with him, went off with Sandjar. Mahmud however did not find the caliph inclined to tolerate Duhais in his neighbourhood, and the Sultan withdrew his claims for a sum of 100,000 dinars and went to Hamadian. There had been trouble between Mahmud and the Caliph before and in 520 (1126) for example there had been open fighting in the streets of Bagdad between the Arabs and the Sultan's Turkish troops. In all these circumstances Mahmoud proved unequal to his task; while he left the business of government to his viziers, among whom al-Sumayram and al-Dargaznt (or al-Aminshadi as Ibn al-Athir always has it) were the most prominent, he spent his time with his hawks and hounds, which, according to Mirkhmir, were 400 in number and wore jewelled collars and coverings embroidered with gold. It became worse when he devoted himself to sensual pleasures and as a result of his sexual excesses fell ill and died at Hamadian at the early age of 27 (Shawwal 15, 525 = Sept. 10, 1131). Nevertheless he was: by no means an insignificant figure; he had a good acquaintance with Arabic and was celebrated in a long panegyric by Asiai-Bajis (q.v.). Ibn al-Athir lauds his gentleness and eulogizes his memory. His viziers held the government of his property. To a question by: what occurred in the article sur, 1585; cf. also Ibn Khallikan, Wafa'jir, Cairo 1899, ii. 510 et seq.

MAHMUD of Ghazna, one of the most famous of Muslim conquerors, was the elder son of Subuktigin and was born in 969 A.H. In 994 Nuh II of Bukhara appointed Sahabuddin of Khurasan, as a reward for assistance received from him, and Sahabuddin appointed as his deputy his son Mahmud, who took Nishapur from the Isma'ilis heretics and made it his capital. On his death in 997 Subuktigin left his throne to his younger son, Isma'il, but Mahmud marched to Ghazna, defeated his brother, and ascended the throne in 999. Begtuzan, an aniet of Mansur II of Bukhara, attempted to depose Mahmud of the government of Khurasan, but failed; and the S-
with much booty and large numbers of captives, to Ghazna.

In 1024 Mâhmdûd's officers subdued Gharadjistân, and he compelled the Khalifâ al-Kâtîr to cede to him those districts of Khurâsân which he had not yet occupied, but the Khalifâ returned a stern refusal to Mâhmdûd's demand for Samarkand, and Mâhmdûd was obliged to apologize for his presumption.

Amendpâl had now died and had been succeeded by his son, Trilokpâpâl, a weak monarch who committed the management of his affairs to his son, Nidar Bîm, or "Bîm the Fearless." Bîm reversed the submissive policy of his grandfather, and in 1015 Mâhmdûd was obliged to invade the Pandjâb in order to keep the road to Hindûstân open. In the spring of 1014 he defeated the Hindû prince in the Margula Pass, captured the fortress of Nandana, and pursued him into Kâshmîr, but was unable to come up with him, and was obliged to return. A second invasion of Kâshmîr was equally unsuccessful; he failed to take Lohkot, and in the spring of 1016 he retired, with heavy loss, from his only unsuccessful campaign in India, losing, on his way, many of his men in the flooded Dîskâm. In the same year he marched to Kâshmîr to avenge the death of his sister's husband, Abu 'l-'Abbâs Ma'mûn, who had been slain by rebels. He crushed the rebellion and appointed one of his own officers, Alînûr, to the government of his new conquest. In the autumn of 1015 he set out on his long meditated expedition into Hindûstân, whither Trilokpâpâl and Nidar Bîm had retired. He crossed the Jumna on December 2 and received the submission of the Râjdâ of Baran, 10,000 of whose subjects accepted Islam. He next defeated Râjdâ Kâltânâ of Mahístân, who to avoid disgrace stabbed his daughter and son, and then himself. He sacked and destroyed the splendid cities of Mathurâ and Bîndûstân and, leaving the greater part of his army there, marched with a picked force, to Kânnawât, defended by seven forts on the Ganges. Its ruler, Râjdâpûla, fled, leaving his capital undefended, the seven forts were plundered in one day, and the city was sacked. Alînûr, further down the Ganges, shared its fate, and Mîddîltân, "the Fort of the Brahmins", was plundered after its defenders had been slain to a man. Râjdâ Când of Shavâra fled, but this city was sacked, and he was overtaken and defeated on January 6, 1019. Mâhmdûd then set out on his return march to Ghazna with a large number of elephants, 3,000,000 dirhâms', much other plunder, and captives so numerous that slaves were to be had for two or three dirhâms' each. On his return he founded at Ghazna his great mosque, the "Pride of Heaven". Râjdâ Nanda of Kâllâmârâ and the Râjdâ of Gwâlâyâr had marched to Kânnawât after Mâhmdûd's retreat, and had punished Râjdâpûla for his cowardly desertion of his capital by putting him to death. They were attempting to form a new confederacy of Hindû princes when Mâhmdûd, in 1019, invaded Hindûstân to frustrate their design. He defeated Trilokpâpâl on the Rângânga and the latter fled, leaving Râjdâ Nanda who was marching to meet him with a great army, the sight of which even Mâhmdûd quailed. Nanda, however, was smitten with a sudden panic and fled in the night, leaving his camp to be plundered by Mâhmdûd, who obtained, with much other booty, 580 elephants, in addition to 270 already taken from Trilokpâpâl. Then, fearing lest his retreat through the Pandjâb should be cut off, he returned to Ghazna. In 1021 he resolved to provide himself with a base for future raids, and having invaded Swîr and Bâdjâw and compelled the inhabitants to accept Islam he attacked, but again failed to capture, the fortress of Lohkot, and, raising the siege, marched into the Pandjâb. Trilokpâpâl was dead, and Nidar Bîm fled and took refuge with the Râjdâ of Adîmar, where he died in 1026. Mâhmdûd was thus able to annex the Pandjâb, and brought it under his own sway. In 1022 he again invaded Hindûstân and attacked the forresses of Gwâlâyâr and Kâllâmârâ, but left their rulers in possession of them on their promising to pay tribute. On his return to Ghazna he mustered his army, and in 1023 invaded Transoxiana to establish his authority there. The smaller chiefs hastened to pay him homage, the ruler of Samarkand was brought before him in chains and was sent as a prisoner to Kâllâmârâ, as were also the chiefs of the Saldjâk tribe, 4,000 families of which Mâhmdûd, though he was apprehensive of their power, transported into Khurâsân. In 1025 Mâhmdûd set out on the most famous of his raids into India, the expedition to Somnâth. The insolent boats of the Brâhmans had annoyed him, but it was the reputed wealth of the temple that prompted the enterprise. He crossed the Indian desert after elaborate preparations, plundered both Adîmar and Anhîlâvâra, and reached Somnâth in the middle of January, 1026. Within two days his troops had stormed the ramparts and entered the city, but the temple was most strongly defended, and while he was attacking it he learned that the Hindû princes of Gudjarât, who had fled before his arrival, had rallied to the defence of the idol, and were before the city. Leaving a force to continue the siege of the temple, he marched against them, and, after a battle in which he narrowly escaped defeat, put them to flight. Their defeat sealed the fate of the temple, which was almost immediately captured. Mâhmdûd plundered it of its vast treasures and broke up its idol, a huge lingâm. From Somnâth he marched to punish Fârâm Dô, Râjdâ of Anhîlâvâra, for the attempt to relieve the temple, but the Râjdâ fled, leaving his stronghold and its treasures to the conqueror. It is said that Mâhmdûd was so captivated by the beauty and climate of Gu- djârât that he was with difficulty persuaded by his officers from making Anhîlâvâra his capital, and leaving Ghazna to his son, Ma'sûd. On his return march through the Sind desert his army suffered severely, and after crossing the desert was harassed by the Dâtâs, but succeeded in reaching Ghazna with its spoils. In 1027 Mâhmdûd undertook his last expedition into India, in order to punish these Dâtâs. He collected a flotilla of boats at Multân, and, owing partly to their superior construction, defeated the Dâtâs in a naval battle on the Indus, and carried off their families, which they had removed for safety to islands in the river.

The remainder of Mâhmdûd's life was devoted to the western provinces of his empire. He wrested Tus, Irrâl and Ishlân from the Buwâhîs, invested his son Ma'sûd with the government of the newly conquered territory, and employed himself in establishing order and security on the caravan routes throughout his wide dominions, and in excoriating the heretics whom the Shî'ah Buwâhîs had tolerated. In 1029 he returned from Rây to
Balkh, and marched in the spring to Ghazna, where, on April 30, 1050, he died, at the age of sixty-three, worn out with the labours of forty years. 

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


MAHMUD GAWĀN, TIMĀG AL-DIN, Khwādja, was born in A.D. 1405, of a family which had long held high offices in the small principality of Gillán, and is said to have taken the name of Gāwān, by which he was afterwards known in India, from Kawān, his birthplace. He received a good education and as a young man made a pilgrimage to Mecca. While he was there his family fell into disgrace, so that he could not safely return home. Refusing offers of employment in other parts of Persia he became a merchant, and in 1455 sailed from the Persian Gulf for India, and landed at the port of Dāhk. Thence he proceeded to Būtar, the capital of the Bahmanī kings, and was well received by ‘Alī al-Din Ahmād II, who was then reigning. He received the command of 1,000 horse and was sent to quell the rebellion of Dājal Khān in Telingān. His conspicuous success secured his position as one of the leading nobles of the kingdom, and after the death of Ahmād II in 1457 he received from his son and successor, Humayun, the title of Malāk al-Fadījīr ("Chief of the Merchants"), and was highly esteemed. During Humayun’s short reign he was employed in suppressing rebellion and restoring order in Telingān, and on the king’s death, in 1461, was associated by his widow with himself and Khwādja Dājal the Turk in a council of regency. The foreign enemies of the kingdom took advantage of the childhood of the new king, Nīṣān Shāh, and Mahmud Gāwān bore an honourable part in repelling the invasion of the Rādīj of Ura, who was forced to pay a large indemnity. Mahmud Khādji I of Mīlwa next invaded the Dākan, defeated the army of Nīṣān Shāh, and annexed the existence of the state. Mahmud Gāwān succeeded in enlisting the aid of Mahmud I, Begurānī, of Gujūrānd, and with his help defeated and expelled the invader. Nīṣān Shāh died in 1465, and the kingdom was governed for his younger brother, who succeeded him as Mūhammad III, by the same council of regency, but the arrogance and ambition of Khwādja Dājal the Turk so aroused the suspicions of the queen-mother that she ordered her young son to put him to death. She shortly afterwards retired from public life, leaving Mahmud Gāwān, now entitled Khwādja Dājal, sole regent. In 1469 he was sent to subdue the Konkan, and to suppress the pirates of that region, and, in a series of campaigns extending over three years, conquered the country and captured Goa, then one of the principal ports of Vīdayanagara. On his return to Būtar he was received with great honour and his position as first noble of the kingdom was assured. In 1472 he brought the seige of Begurānī to a successful conclusion, but the chief service which he rendered to the Bahmanī kingdom was the reform of its administration. It had originally been divided into four great provinces, Gultarga, Daulatabd, Būtar, and Telingān, to which the name of farāf was given, and the power of the farāfar, or provincial governors, was almost absolute. He collected the revenue; raised, paid and commanded the army; and appointed all officials, his responsibility to the king being limited to maintaining order, keeping the people contented, remitting to the capital the quota of revenue due, and joining the king, when summoned, with the contingent of troops which he was bound to supply. Even in the early days of the kingdom rebellions raised by provincial governors had not been unknown, but the system had worked well on the whole so long as the limits of the kingdom were comparatively narrow, and the kings were energetic. But the kingdom now stretched from sea to sea, the provinces were unwieldy and the defects and dangers of the old system were apparent to all. Mahmud Gāwān divided each of the original farāfs into two, so that their number became eight. Būtar was divided into the two farāfs of Gārī and Māhr; Daulatabd into Daulatabd and Dīnnur; Gultarga into Gultarga and Būjīpur; and Telingān into Warangal and Rādījīmahendri. The powers of the farāfūr were at the same time curtailed. These reforms were resented by all the old farāfūr, and by none more than by Malik Ḥasan Bahri, Nīṣān al-Mulk, farāfar of the great province of Telingān, who was posted to the new faraj of Rādījīmahendri, and found his power, his influence, and his emoluments reduced by more than half. He was the leader of the Dakanī party and Mahmud, though he had done all in his power to end the strife between the Dakanis and the Foreigners, was a foreigner, and was regarded by all as the leader of the Foreign party. In 1487, the royal camp being then in Telingān, Ḥasan Bahri took advantage of the absence of Mahmud’s chief supporter, Yūsuf ‘Abīl Khān the Turk, who had been sent on an expedition into the eastern provinces of the kingdom of Vīdayanagara, to compass the downfall and death of Mahmud. The minister's
confidential secretary was induced, by misrepresentation, to affix his master’s seal to a folded paper. The paper was blank, and the conspirators wrote, above the seal, a treasonable letter to the Râjid of Urta, inviting him to invade the kingdom. The letter was shown to the king when he was drunk, and he at once summoned Mahmûd, who, though warned by his friends that mischief was afoot, insisted on obeying the order. He was asked by the king what was the punishment of treason and unhesitatingly replied, “Death by the sword.” He was then confronted with the letter, and though he declared it to be a forgery the king paid no heed to him, but bade the executioner do his office, and withdrew. Mahmûd knelt down and repeated the symbol of his faith, and the executioner, Bâzawâr by name, struck off his head. An order for the plundering of his camp was then issued, and his followers were dispersed. The king was much disappointed by the examination of his late minister’s affairs. He had, throughout his official life continued his mercantile transactions, and lived frugally on his profits. His great official emoluments were expended on the troops and establishments which he maintained and on public works, and the balance was disbursed in alms, in the king’s name as well as in his own. Mahmûd III understood, too late, the value of the servant whom he had so summarily put to death, and his remorse was bitter. Mahmûd was a great statesman and public benefactor. Learned himself, he was a munificent patron of learning, and built at Bûr the magnificent college, the ruins of which are still to be seen. The only private property which he left at his death was a splendid library. He is one of the foremost figures in the political history of India, and his death was the cause of the fall of the dynasty which he had served so well, for it destroyed the confidence of the nobles in the town, and hastened the advent of the day when the provincial governors proclaimed their independence.


(T. W. Ham) MAHMûD PASHA, grand vizier in the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Muhammed II, often called Welt Muhammed Pasha. He was born in Alâqja Hijar (Kruhlevatî) in Serbia; of Christian parents; according to Chalcedonians, his father was Greek and his mother Serbian. Taken in his youth to Adrianople, he was brought up at the court of Murad II, and began his public career on the occasion of the accession of Muhammed II in 1451. Soon afterwards he became Bîlegheb of Rûm; according to the historian Râjamûz Zâde Melimûn (Kûrük Nîyânî) he had been also Sa’âdeh and qâ’î (q.v.). As Bîlegheb, he took part in the capture of Constantinople. After this event he was appointed grand vizier in 1453; the office had been empty since the execution of Cendereh Klâîs Pasha. As grand vizier, Mahmûd Pasha frequently accompanied the Sultan on his campaigns but in 1456–1458 he was appointed to conduct the operations against the Serbs, while the Sultan conquered the Moreas; in 1459 Muhammed himself advanced against Serbia which was completely subdued; during this war Mahmûd Pasha’s brother was the leader of the Tanzîphi party in Serbia. In 1460 and 1461 the grand vizier took part in the expedition against Sînope and Trebizond as commander of the fleet while Muhammed led the army by land. The capture of Trebizond was mainly due to Mahmûd Pasha; he was related to a high dignitary of the court there so that some Greek authors talk of treachery (Fellmerayer, Geschichte des Kaiserthums Trapezunt, p. 279). In 1462, Mahmûd accompanied the Sultan against the Wlovod of Wallachia, Wlad Dracul and in the following year as commander of the fleet he was sent to conquer Lesbos and forced the Duke of Lesbos to capitulate. In the same year he drove the Venetians out of the isthmus of Corinth. In the Bosnian campaign of 1464, Mahmûd prepared the way for the Sultan’s advance by taking the principal towns of the country. In the war that followed with Mathias, king of Hungary, Mahmûd Pasha stood the latter to raise the siege of Zrenjanik. In 1466 he aided the Sultan in the campaign which was to put an end to the power of the Karamanli and defeated the Karamanli Iâbâg Beg near Lâranda. The latter himself escaped and the fact combined with the too humane treatment which the governor wished to apply to the people of Konya and Lâranda and the intrigues of the second vizier Rûm Muhammed Pasha, brought the Sultan to dismiss him on the return march to Constantinople. Mahmûd Pasha then governed the sandjak of Gallipoli for some time. In 1472 he again became grand vizier. The Sultan wished in that year to send him against Uzun Hasan but was persuaded by Mahmûd to send Iâbâg Pasha to his place. In the following year he accompanied the Sultan against the Ak-Koyunlu, who were finally routed after the Ottomans themselves had suffered the defeat of Beg Bahaz. In the same year Mahmûd was again dismissed; the reason alleged was a lack of zeal in the pursuit of the fugitives. He then retired to the village of Khâs Koy near Adrianople. Next year he came to the capital on the occasion of the funeral of Prince Mustafà; this opportunity was taken to calumniate him to the Sultan on account of the intimacy which had existed between Mustafà and Mahmûd Pasha. This was sufficient to get him imprisoned in the castle of Yedi Kule and executed a few days later in Rabî’I, 879 (July–Aug. 1474).

Mahmûd Pasha was one of the most popular grand viziers. His name is still preserved in the mosque which he built at Stambul in 868 (1463–64) on a site originally occupied by a church; in the mosque is the türbe of the founder. He also erected a madrasa, a mevlevî, a mekteb, a wall and a hanimám. There is a legendary story entitled Mennâbi-ı Muhammed Pasha, in which his unjust execution is specially emphasised (printed in Fr. Dietterici, Chronomathes Ottomanae, Berlin 1854); the historian Şadr al-Din in his Tâfri al-Tarhâbî (I. 557) also devotes a chapter to the Baba-i Muhammed Pasha. Mahmûd Pasha was the patron of a number of men of letters and scholars, who dedicated their works to him. He was himself a poet but it is uncertain whether he wrote under the 'Farâhî of 'Adali or 'Adil. There is a Divan of 'Adil (printed Constantinople 1508) which is generally attributed to Sultan Bayazid II but Gibb
MAHMUD PASHA — MAHR

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


**MAHAIKER. [See Khân.]**

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

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

In the pre-Islamic period, the mahr was handed over to the war, i.e., the father, or brother or relative in whose guardianship (wa'il) the girl was. Here the original character of the marriage by purchase is more apparent. In earlier times the bride received none of the mahr. What was usually given was the dowry at the betrothal. The *qadja,* the mahr, being the purchase price of the bride, is given to the war.

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

2. Muhammad took over the old Arab patriarchal ceremony of marriage as it stood and developed it in several points. The Qur'an no longer contains the conception of the purchase of the wife and the mahr as the price, but the mahr is in a way a reward, a legitimate compensation which the woman has to claim in all cases. The Qur'an thus demands a bridal gift for a legal marriage: "And give those whom you have enjoyed their reward and a bridalgift" (lit. *farhâl* "allotment of property*"; Sûra, iv. 28) and again: "And give the women their dowries voluntarily" (Sûra, iv. 3). Cf. also Sûra, iv. 29, 38; v. 7; ix. 10.

The bridal gift is the property of the wife; it therefore remains her own if the marriage is dissolved. "And if ye wish to exchange one wife for another and have given one a talent, take nothing of it back." Even if the man divorces the wife before he has cohabited with her he must leave half the mahr with her (Sûra, ii. 239—238).

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

3. There was an ample store of traditions about the mahr and these paved the way for the theories laid down by the jurists in the fiqh-books. From all the traditions, it is clear that the mahr was an essential part of the contract of marriage. According to a tradition in Bukhârî the mahr is an essential condition for the legality of the marriage: "every marriage without mahr is null and void!"

Even if this tradition, so brief and pointed to the point, is not genuine, a number of traditions point to the fact that the mahr was necessary for the marriage, even if it only consisted of some trifling thing. Thus in Ibn Mâdhja and Bukhârî traditions are given, according to which the Prophet permitted marriage with only a pair of shoes as mahr and approved of a poor man, who did not even possess an iron ring, giving his wife instruction in the Qur'an as mahr.

A few hadiths endeavour to show that the mahr must be neither too high nor too low. From the traditions we also learn what mahr was given in particular cases in the Prophet's time: for example, the bridal gift of 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Abd Allâh was an ounce of gold, that of Abû Hurairâ an iron ring and a dish, that of Shahab b. Sa'd an iron ring.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


MAHRA, a land on the southeast coast of Arabia: on the Indian Ocean between Ha'dramût, the coast of which is inhabited by the Kâiti' (Ge'bi't), and Zafir; the Arabs however and modern geographers include Zafir itself, formerly the town only and now the country, the old frankiscene region [see %Afër], in Mahra, so that Mahra may be said to be the country between Ha'dramût and Zafir (cf. al-hâqîq. E. G. A., l. 130, 146; Hârîrî, Hârîrî, ii. 177; al-Mahâsinî, ed., iii. 57; Vâlq, Ma'dhûm, iv. 7001; al-Idrisî, ed. Jaubert, Paris 1836, i. 48; Ibn Khaddîn [in Kay, Yemen, London 1892, p. 152]). This connotation of Mahra seems to have been already known to the Greeks of the fourth century B.C.: Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. iv. 4, 2, numbers among the lands of Arabia which yield spices, along with Saba', Ha'dramût and Katabân, a fourth, Ma'dhûm (var. Mâhûm). A satisfactory identification of this land, which would also explain the name has not been made. Of the various attempts to explain it, given in the article SARA' in Pauli-Wissowa, R e a l e n c y c l. der heut. Altertumswiss., coll. 1331 sqq. (cf. the article SARA', iv. p. 64) that which suggests Ma'dhûm is a corruption of Ma'dhûm (Maranah) which Strabo, vi. 768 gives with the three South Arabian kingdoms above mentioned, following Eratothenes — these two authors represent one original source; Eratothenes and Strabo are two different sources — is certainly wrong. The identification of MÂA with Mahra p. 99, 98, 263, 266, without however any attempt at proving it and also adopted by Fr. Hommel, Ethnologie und Geographie des alt. Orientis, Munich 1926 (L. v. Müller, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Sect. iii., Pt. i., vol. 1) p. 137, is worthy of attention. It was naturally to be expected that the botanist Theophrastus, whose duty it was to give as full a list as possible of lands in Arabia producing aromatic plants, should mention the real land of frankincense, Zafir or in a wider sense Mahra, including Zafir, On the other hand, it is not to be denied that the mention in Theophrastus of a Mamali or Mall, which is quite unknown, after three well-known names, is remarkable, as it must of course be an important country, fit to be compared with Mecca or Medina; Simple for this reason E. Glaser's various attempts to identify it (Schriften der Geschichte und Geogr. Arabiens, ii., Berlin 1890, p. 3, 35 sqq., 40, 137, 153 sqq., 217), not one of which is tenable (cf. Researches, s. v. Saba', col. 1335 and here SARA', iv. p. 54), may be discarded. The passage in Theophrastus has been wrongly interpreted as mentioning Mamali only as the home of the cinnamon plant (see SARA', iv. p. 54 and the literature there given to which may be now added: Hommel, Ethnologie [= Grundzüge], p. 517, note 2). Although Mahra is not suggested without certain inherent probability, the question still arises how has it come to be called Mamali or Mall, which must remain more or less a puzzle. As the first two letters in Mahra and Mall are the same, it may be supposed that there is a corruption in the third letter of Mall. The name seems to conceal the Greek transcription of Mahra, which in the form MAPÎ (from MAPA), was corrupted to MAÂL, because it was of course unintelligible to the Greek copyists, or it might have been altered by a learned editor with geminatio of the first syllable to MÂMAÂL, especially as this form might seem to him to be superficially supported by the Sama'ân naqas in Poitiers, iv. 7, 5. A further corroborating factor is that Theophrastus' description of the hilly country, where the Athetares grows, with the is Âi'nâl and kai 'ârîw and neînâs, from which rivers pour down in the plain and which was visible to sailors from the coast, agrees very well with the description of the xa'd neigâfâwi càd iwaî and neîfâse of the land of Zafir (p. 96) in the Persicus. Merv, Babylon, § 29 (cf. the 9âr 1înâl and peîkâwâna and ') as well as § 32, very probably the Kark mountains), and also recalls Carter's statement that nowhere else in South Arabia is there so much running water as in the frankincense country. This undeniable agreement is not affected by the fact that, according to Theophrastus, the frankincense country mentioned by him was in possession of the Sabaens. The fact that he mentions this land as a fourth with Saba', Ha'dramût and Katabân and at the same time says that the Sabaens were lords (zâbî) of this frankincense country, suggests that the country which was quite a considerable distance from their original home, had passed to Saba' by direct conquest or automatically with the occupation of the
whole territory of some former independent power. This may have been either its ancient rival Ka'tabān, which, although still an independent kingdom, no longer exercised sovereign rights over the frankincense country and about two centuries later lost its independence to Saba', or the ancient kingdom of Ḥadramūt, which with the frankincense country was in the time of Jahm a part of the Sabaean kingdom, already ruled by the Himyars (according to Piby, Nat. Hist., xii. 52 sq.; see Saba') and to which, certainly in the time of Periplus, i.e. in the Himyar period of the early centuries A.D., long after the beginning of the dissolution of Sabaean rule, the frankincense country belonged, but it may however have done so before Saba' became a great power. Hommel (op. cit., p. 140 and notably p. 653) quite a close ethnic connection between the Ḥadramīt and the Minasaeans and he definitely says that the Ḥadramīt Minasaeans were those who took possession of the frankincense land, which geographically also appears most natural. No convincing argument can be brought against the evidence of Theophrastus that in his time or in that of his authority, perhaps Androsthenes (cf. Ralemenes, s.v. Saba', col. 1306), the frankincense country was not independent, but belonged to Saba', so that the latter was already a great power, which possessed the hegemony of South Arabia and numbered its weaker neighbours among its feudatories. The frankincense land only became independent early in the Christian era. That the campaigns of the Sabaean extended considerably to the east may be deduced from the Sīrab inscription (Glaser, N°. 1000) (cf. Hommel, op. cit., p. 658 sq.). On the unjustified alteration in the text (Ṣama) in Theophrastus, see Saba', 4, 6 (to the literature there quoted may now be added Hommel, op. cit., p. 516 sq. and 653 sq., in addn. to 138)). To support the assumption that the Ka'talānians occupied the frankincense land, it is not necessary to presume Gebban as a later name of Ka'talan (in allusion to the Gebbanūt in Piby, vi. 153; cf. MA'IN; on Gebbanūt, see Gebbanūt, No. 4). The eponym Yamaomūn is the longer title of the south Arabian kings of the last epoch mentioned, according to Hommel in Handbuch der arabischen Altertumskunde, ed. by D. Nielsen. Copenhagen–Paris–Leipzig 1927, p. 96, note 5, "perhaps the frankincense coast as the "south land" of Ḥadramāt?"; it might well be interpreted as a general name of the southern coastsland, at a later date still included in Yemān, in contrast to the lands of Saba', Dhī Rādīn and Ḥadramāt preceding it in the title.

Sprenger's remark, Das Leben und die Lehre des Muhammad, Berlin 1865, iii. 437: "The Mahrites were called Sachalites by the Greeks", is misleading; the land around the Sachalit Gulf is in the conception of the author of the Periplus and of Ptolemy not only Mahra, but also the land lying east of and especially the part of al-Shiby south of it. The wider sense, lying west of it, the land of the Ka'atīt (cf. the article KABIKATI in Ralemenes), the regio tartēna in Piby, xii. 52 (vi. 101) is probably to be understood as Zafīr in the narrower sense but may include Mahra to which alone Glaser refers it (Die Abhassier in Arabien and Afrika, Munich 1895, p. 125; see at the beginning). The Ḥamīl in Herofotos, ii. 73, in the story of the phoenix is practically a reference to Mahra (Hommel, op. cit., p. 138) although it is not mentioned by name. On the Ḥamīl in Stephanus, see below.

The inscriptions which, according to Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 150, are inscribed on stone pillars on an island off the South Arabian coast (cf. the article RHENNE in Ralemenes), cannot, as Ritter for example (Erklärt, Vol. viii., Sect. 1, xii., Berlin 1846, p. 290) thought, be attributed to the Mahri who settled in the neighbourhood of Cané but were probably Minasaeans (or Nabataeans). The position of the emporium of Kāšī which according to the Periplus, § 27 and Pliny, vi. 104 belonged to the frankincense country and is also mentioned by Ptolemy, vi. 7, 10 cannot be definitely ascertained. Recently several scholars, following Glaser, op. cit., p. 175; C. Landberg, Arabic, iv., Leyden 1897, p. 75 sq. and Etudes sur les dialectes de l'Arabe Méridional, i. (Hadjamūnt), Leyden 1901, p. 196 and earlier writers (see the list in Ralemenes, s.v. Saba', col. 1330), have argued in expressed the view that this port is probably to be considered as the place of Sihl al-Ghurahā (Nielsen in Handbuch, op. cit., p. 8) while Sprenger, Geographie, p. 83sq. placed it at Bāl-Hāf. Since Sprenger, nothing new has been produced in favour of the old view and against his localisation. In favour of the latter is the description in the Periplus, § 27 according to which two uninhabited islands, the "Owbar Ṣarīqe ("Bird Island") and Ṭībaṣārī were 120 stadii distant from Kane. These, according to Sprenger, are the islands of "Hilani and Gibus, also called al-Sikka" (to be written: Hillaniya and Kansāh also called Sakha; see Landberg, Arabic, iv. 66). Their mention makes certain the reference to Bāl-Hāf as the opposite point on the coast from which they are 110 and 150 stadii distant respectively, but not to Ḥiṣn al-Ghurahā which, according to Carter, is only a mile from Hillaniya. Landberg himself tells us that the island of Ḥanūs seems never to have been inhabited. The distances from the same adduced by Glaser from Ptolemy, which besides varying in the manuscripts, naturally yield nothing really convincing in favour of Ḥiṣn al-Ghurahā (particularly of Ra's al-ʿAṣīda, the equivalent of Cape Kane, west of Kane), according to Glaser, op. cit., p. 216; but this promontory of al-ʿĀṣīda is at Bāl-Hāf); these measurements can equally well be made to fit Bāl-Hāf. H. v. Maltzan, Rasse nach Schiffahreiten, Brunswick 1875, p. 225 sqq. who could not yet have known of Sprenger's view, had already called attention to the Bāl-Hāf (he transcribes it Cane) occurring in the (third) smaller inscription of Ḥiṣn al-Ghurahā (a re-production in Landberg, Arabic, iv., Pl. ix.), and connected it with "Cane Emporium"; J. H. Nordmann, Z. f. M. G., xxxix. (1885), 333 likewise explained it as Kašī, the harbour of the citadel of al-Ghurahā. Even if we readily grant that the uncertain word in the text of the inscription, most recently and probably definitively published and translated by B. Makser in W. Z. K. M., xxxiv. (1927), p. 72, really reproduces the name Kašī, this does not prove, as Sprenger, op. cit., p. 83 has pointed out, that the ancient seaport lay on the present rocky point of Ḥiṣn al-Ghurahā. It must also be remembered that the names of many Arabian harbours have in course of time been transferred to other places in the vicinity, e.g. Zaḥīr [q.v., No. 4] and Mināḥ. Landberg's
objection (Arabic, iv. 76) that the Periplus, if Kane had been Bil-Haf, would not have said (§ 29) that after Kane came another gulf running far inland, the χαλκοτρύπες, but would have mentioned the harbour of BI-Alli the coast of it, is not a cogent one. The Periplus gives a list of the most important gulf of South Arabia, and the comparatively small bay of BI-Alli might well be overlooked behind the broad Socotra gulf which runs far inland, especially as the use of the term χαλκοτρύπες is a fairly elastic one (cf. the article SOMARITANS in REA, iv., and the list of the places on the coast in the Periplus is not as a rule scientifically complete and exact but sometimes even gives wrong names (e.g. MARGA), to say nothing of the fact that in many places on the South Arabian coast, the harborage conditions have changed since ancient times. Landberg himself (op. cit., p. 65) observes that the promontory of Hār al-Ghārūn must have had a different appearance in earlier times. M. Hartmann, also, who had previously overlooked (in his article DERR AUSLÄNDER) the later statement of SOERENSEN, l., Berlin 1909, p. 175, 371 declared for the older views, and later in the very same work, p. 418, 614 that he had now adopted Sprenger's opinion. The δαρμοὶ in the inscription is still not sufficient ground for the conclusion that the identification of Kane with Bil-Haf should be rejected in opposition to Sprenger, who himself appreciated the force of this evidence. The form of the name used by Sprenger, Bil-Hafl (BIL-HAF), is incorrect however (as also in Glaser's RI al-Haf; cf. Landberg, Iṣfahān, p. 193); δαρμοὶ is equivalent to δαρμός. But Sprenger rightly recognized that in this name there is a reminiscence of a name of glory in the history of Ka'b and of Basra of the Mahra (al- Ḥikri, i. 19; Tafsir al-Arusi, iii. 531; see below).

The Arab geographers had no accurate knowledge of Mahra, not of Ḥadramawt; modern explorers have found out much more about these regions. Al-Hamdāni, Sufa Bīrūnī al-Árab (ed. D. H. Müller, Leyden 1884), p. 45 mentions al-Árāb — which Landberg Ḥadramawt, p. 125, wishes to restore to al-Asfahān from manuscript preferences — as the capital of Mahra, which, according to Glaser, Messimer, p. 87 stretches to the district lying roughly between Damhūt and Ras Duqát. All, almost, in the centre of the modern coast region of Mahra. (p. 53) he says, so Ibn al-Muqaffar and others after him, that the Mahra people also inhabited Soqotra (on the conversion to Christianity of the mixed population of Soqotra, see Yāqūt, Muḥṣīn, iii. 142; al-Muqaffar, Muqaffiy, iv. 369, etc., further particularly in the article Soqotra).

On p. 31, he talks of the Mahra tribes and their fighting and on p. 36 of the road from Ḥadramawt to Mahra and tells us about the tomb of the Prophet Iblā. This sanctuary on the frontier between Ḥadramawt and Mahra is still held in particular veneration and is much visited by the inhabitants of these two lands (a text from Ḥadramawt showing this is given in Landberg, Ḥadramawt, i. and the geographers Aḥmad Mahra in the Yemen, e.g. Yāqūt, Muḥṣīn, p. 504). On p. 76 he refers to the Mahra in Yāqūt, Muḥṣīn, iv. 700; who in this, his main reference, also repeats the view that Mahra is the name of a tribe and that the correct form is Mahra (al-Ḥadhr Mahra in Mahra is mentioned on iv. 697). It is sometimes moreover accurately defined as "in extreme (furthest) Yemen", e.g. Yāqūt, Muḥṣīn, i. 280; ii. 510 (= Muḥṣīn, p. 160); iii. 366; iv. 345, 495; Muḥṣīn, p. 415. The Arabs speak of a Najdī in the land of the Mahra (Yāqūt, Muḥṣīn, i. 220; iii. 681; iv. 345, 495; 697; Muḥṣīn, p. 394; 415; cf. al-Muqaffar, al-Ṭahārī, ed. do Goeje, l. 1908). This is also the Najdī (or Naẓīḥ) which Carter also mentions as a district in which the frankincense especially flourishes, the highland country about two days' journey north of the coast within the latitude which Carter has also defined, although too narrowly (cf. SAKR). The Mahra are also said to be inhabitants of the coastland of al-Ṣiḥr (q.v.), for example by al-Maṣ'ūdī, i. 333 and Yāqūt, Muḥṣīn, iv. 387 and we find the land of Mahra is called al-Ṣiḥr (al-Ṭasāḥhī, op. cit., p. 25 = Ibn Hawāḳal, op. cit., p. 32; cf. al-Ṭarīqī, l. 48; ibn Khālid, ed. Kay, op. cit., p. 132; cf. al-Ḥambalī, Ṣūfī, p. 51 and al-Ḫakīm on al-Ṣiḥr; the statement in Rommel, Auhulf dr Achatian, Evidenzen, Göttlingen, 1902, p. 52, op. cit., is obscure). It is the latter general use of the name is applied to the coast not only of Mahraland proper but of the land of Ṣaft also, that is of the frankincense country generally, i.e. the "frankincense coast" which is identified by many modern writers with the Mahra country but at the same time includes the part of the Ḥadramawt which adjoins on the west (cf. Ibn Khālid, op. cit., p. 132), i.e. in general the name of the shores of the Gulf of the Moon, finally in a still wider sense, the name of the whole coast between 'Aden and Ṭimān.

Al-Ṭasāḥhī, op. cit., p. 35, and almost in the same words, Ibn Hawāḳal, op. cit., p. 32, also al-Maṣ'ūdī, l. 333 op. cit., al-Ṭarīqī, l. 48, 150; Abu 'l-Fadl (see Rommel, op. cit., p. 331, 38); ibn Khālid (loc. cit.) describes Mahra as a desert in which there are no palm and no agriculture and the inhabitants therefore are not acquainted with bread. Carter, like these Arab writers, also emphasizes the contrast between the frankincense region and the dreary desert west and east of it and more recent travellers like Bent agree with him. The only possessions of the inhabitants, according to these authorities, are goats and very fine camels, particularly renowned for their swiftness, mentioned also by al-Ḥamdāni, op. cit., p. 100, 101; Ibn Ḥiṣām, Sirā, ed. Wittingfeld, p. 963 and the posts as well as the Liṣn al-Árāb, vii. 36; ζίνιμ, i. 455 and Tafsir al-Árāb (Mahra); the Liṣn quotes three plural forms: Makkariyya, Makhariyya, Makharīya; on the first see Howell, Grammar, i. 997, 1000. The camel which Muhammad chose for himself out of the booty after the battle of Badr had been purchased in Mahra; his governor in the Yemen procured Mahra camels for the Caliph Sulaymān in 'Abd al-Malik (714—717) (al-Kawawm, Adwāt, ed. Wittingfeld, ii. 41), Ibn Hawāḳal (ibid.); ibn Khālid, op. cit.; cf. al-Ṭarīqī, l. 48) adds that the Mahra live on mint, milk and its products; and fish (cf. al-Muqaddasi, op. cit., p. 100) and that they also feed their camels and goats on fish. Yāqūt, Muḥṣīn, iv. 700, records a note that the Mahra camels do not take their name from the land but from the ancestor of the Mahra's, Haidān (cf. al-Lugwārī, also ζίνιμ, Καμήλ and Tafsir, loc. cit., and Rommel, op. cit., p. 33). According to Landberg, Ḥadramawt, p. 806, and others the Mahra riding camels have for long had a bad reputation, as they are really not swift; the best of this kind are said to be those of the Banī
In 1837 he obtained some information about conditions along this coast through his intercourse in Ujida with merchants from Hadramout or Mahra (in Journ. Asiat. Sc. Paris, vol. v. 307 sqq., vol. xi. 329 sqq.; he gave an account of Ghizin, the capital of Mahra and the Sulān whose authority did not extend beyond the walls of the city. His description of the boundaries of the country was incorrect. Much more detailed and accurate were the topographical data collected by Capt. S. B. Haines, who was appointed in 1854 to make an astronomical and nautical survey of the South Arabian coast from Bir al-Mandālī westwards (as far as Rās al-Hadd). In his Memoir of the South and East Coast of Arabia (in J. R. Geog. Soc. London 1845, xvii. 104 sqq.), he describes the southern boundary of Mahra, the Wādī Massīl, which is rich in water and well tilled by the Mahra and contains many villages lying among palm groves. He then gives his short notes on the town of Sulān east of the Wādī and corroborates Fresnel's account of Ghizin about which he is the first to give fuller details. C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, Copenhagen 1772, p. 257, had already mentioned "Keschin" and the independent shākat there, who was also lord of Sulān; he also gives a plan of the harbour from a drawing executed by an Englishman, whom he had met in Bombay (PL xxvii). Haines observes, like later writers, that Ghizin is only a wretched little village of at most 200-400 inhabitants, which consists mainly of reed-huts and has only a few stone houses and that the trade there is very slight. He also gives some details of the Mahra people and its tribal divisions, its customs and dress, and in confirmation of Fresnel's observations their attitude to Islam, which only the chief, professes, while the people are indifferent to the Kāfīr and are not even able to perform the daily salāts. He ends by giving the promontories and villages on the coast east of Sulān as far as the eastern frontier of Mahra towards Sulān. The English officers cooperating in this survey of the coast visited a few points on it, which were previously confined to the Gulf of Ghizin because their duty was really confined to surveying the coast west of Mahra. Valuable information about the Mahra is given in II. J. Cattell's Notes on the Mahra Tribe of the Southern Arabs, with a Vocabulary of their Language, in J. N. A. S., Bombay Branch, July 1847, vol. ii., pp. 339 sqq. Malzahn combined ethnological research with his study of the Mahra language (in the introduction of his edition of Abdīh von Wedel's Reise in Hadramaut, Brunswick 1873 [the preface is dated 1870], p. 18 sqq., and 28 sqq., and in his article cited below) but regarding the country itself which he never entered, he knows no more than the English naval officers. The reports in Ritter, op. cit., xii. 625 sqq. and 635 sqq. he says, are sufficiently accurate according to his own information. The constellations east of Wàdī Massīl to Rās al-Hadd, i.e. Mahra, Zafār and "Oman he however calls the great "terra incognita of Oceanic Arabians". "The names Mahra and Gār (also written Gara) by which the two countries on the coast are distinguished, he described as "not clearly defined" (op. cit., p. 28). We now know that these are the Mahra and Kāfīr (the hill-people of Zafār) and the language of the latter is Karwāt (Grawat) or Shāwāt, in modern times also called Ḥakīlī or Shehrah [cf. Zafār]. Malzahn recognised...
that the two peoples are fundamentally different in language, modes of life, and religion from the people of Central Arabia.

Glauner, *Ethnol.,* p. 26, wrongly identifies *Masquna* in Sirrah, xvi, 768 (quoting Eustathius) with Mahra (Keelkentz, s.v. *Sabi*), 1334-49. On p. 20 he gives the land of *Hajramot* (after the fall of the *Abyssinian-Arab kingdom*) too great an extent (as far as Mirbat). On his note that the *Tabaskas* of Pyle are the hill-people of all Mahra cf. *Keelkentz, s.v. ISKAPITAL.* — As a result of the enquiries made by him on his travels in Arabia, he states (ibid., p. 80) that there are three distinct divisions of the Mahra tribes: the eastern is called Sheikh or Jaz and inhabitants, according to his information, the coast from *Ras Nisr* (55° 17' East Long.; from Ge.) according to another authority from the island of Majara, to *Ras Darbat* *(All)* (53° 3' East Long.), the western of which is the name Mahra is generally applied, stretches from Ras Darbat to *All* to Shi(it) while the third group inhabits *Soqotra* (cf. above on *Tbs al-Madjjar*). — L. Hirsch gives not a little new and valuable information about the people of the southwestern coast. His account of Mahra is based on his ten days' stay (1893) in Gihain (or Gaihan) surnamed Ghaban or Kishin; Hirsch writes sometimes (p. 48, 49, 51, 50) Gichin and sometimes Keschink, like W. Hein and others (p. 2 etc.), he gives "Kaschen" in the Index as the Mahri pronunciation which is also given by Jahn (see below). Of the wretched little capital of the country, he tells us, practically agreeing with Heinrich before him and Hein and Bent after him, that it consists almost entirely of isolated mud-houses in a ramshackle condition and a few ragged tents and reed-huts which, being scattered aimlessly over a wide area, leave irregular wide open spaces between them. Even the palace of the Sultan whose rule over Gihain and Shi(it) and other places on the coast is quite nominal, as he cannot do nothing without the approval of his Beduins, is a broken down mud building; there is said to be only one building in the town that is kept clean, the house of another Sultan. According to Hein, the most imposing of the mud-houses, which are not built according to any system, is that occupied by the reigning Sultan's bodyguard. There is nothing like a regular market or regulated trade there. Even the most rudimentary necessities of life are acquired by barter and money is unknown. From the government buildings a little mosque may be seen. While Meltman, corroborating Frenzel and Haines, pointed out (Wieders's *Rasism* p. 29), that the Mahra have long been distinguished as heretics from the great majority of the orthodox and indeed can hardly be called Muslims at all, Hirsch says that at least in Gihain and Shi(it), the Mahra are no less attached to Islam than any other Arabs; he saw them regularly performing their salat. This contradiction may perhaps be explained by the observation already made by Haines on the same question. According to Hirsch the ruling Sultans of Shi(it) are part Arab and part Mahra's. In any case the attitude to Islam of Bedouins living north of the coast territory is quite superficial. The Sultan of Gihain belongs to a dynasty which has also a kind of suzerainity over Soqotra. The Mahra coast, like Soqotra, is under British suzerainty. Hirsch (p. 76 sq.) and on his map gives the names of several places on the coast of Gihain. The

Bent (Southern Arabia, London 1890, p. 285) notes the striking contrast between the sandy plain of Gihain, which he did not succeed in reaching, and the fertile stretch of the coast of Zafar. Shortly before his arrival in Zafar (in the winter of 1894-1895) the sultan reigning in al-Hafa had been fighting with the Mahra tribes. The town of Rakhvütt, west of Raisat, has a little fort to defend it from the Mahra. Bent gives a more detailed account of the Mahra who live in Soqotra [s.v.]

The statement in A. Jahn (Südostafriken, *Expedition der Vierten Orientalischen Gesellschaft, ill. Rep.* Die Mehr-Sprache in Südarabien), p. 1: *"The Mahri is the language of the South Arabian coast between Hajramot and Zafar which is called *Al jedną* by the Arabs*" — is misleading. Hajramot lies roughly in the centre of the Mahra coast in 50° 39' East Long., N.E. of the capital Gihain. — W. Hein, who was sent out by the Vienna Academy to continue the work of collecting specimens of the language begun by the South Arabian expedition, arrived in Gihain with his wife in 1902. During his stay of 66 days, during which his work was much impeded as he was interned most of the time, he collected, among other information, statistical and topographical data for the adjacent parts of the coast and also for the interior (see his article, *Ein Beitrag zur Statistik Südarabien,* in the *M. Geogr. Ges.,* Vienna 1903, p. 219 sqq.). In D. H. Müller's *Prefix to vol. ix. of the South Arabian Expedition,* introductory remarks to W. Hein's record of his journey are given (p. viii. sqq.). According to him Gihain is the name of the whole stretch of country along the coast from Rds Shrin to Ras Derja for a breadth of 5 to 15 miles. About 2 miles to the north of the coast a ridge runs parallel to it. Immediately on the coast lies the *Allaria* fields of the district of Magholt, behind it, the centre Gihain, the district of Rikhît, in which the Sultan rule, east is the most important district Yemnit, west of Rikhit: Selâla, the western boundary of which is the Wadi Ghahin. Further inland lies Darth, where prominent Sultans have their homes. Hein clears up many statements by Hirsch and gives further topographical details about the surroundings of the capital. Gihain has an area of about 50 square miles. Hein estimated the permanent population at 2,386; Hirsch put that of the capital and immediate neighbourhood at about 500.

From the results of exploration so far, it appears that the country of Mahra stretches from Wadi Masalé eastwards to Rds Darbat. "Ali i.e. from 53° 12' to 53° 3' East Long., and between 16° and 17° 30' N. Lat. The Mahra rule the lower course of the main wadi which runs through Hajramot. No European has yet penetrated into the interior of the country, their presumed original home; it was however equally unknown to the Arab geographers.

In the coast district of al-Shîr (Mahra to Ombs) old South Arabian dialects are still spoken, which differ essentially from Arabic and indeed from Semitic in general. The Mahra as a rule speak very little Arabic. Al-Fihr, *cf.* p. 225: Hilî Haqal, *cf.* p. 32; al-Ibrîsî, 41, 250 who identifies it with the old Himyari language, *cf.* Shi(it) [s.v. *Soqotra*], Abû 'I-Fîdî (see Rommel, *cf.* p. 33) and others describe it as unintelligible to Arabic. Al-Handanî also (Sifs,
is called Shajrāt") Hakifī is the name given by Glaser (Śīrāz, ii, p. 95) to the inhabitants of Maḥra whose tribal name in the form Ekhkīl, Fresnel took for the name of the language spoken there and thus introduced it into European philological literature. Landberg's opinion (Arabica, v, Leyden 1898, p. 153) that the name Ekhkīl is "toute à fait juste à côté de la vraie forme Hak[ī]-li", is contradicted by Hirsch's testimony (ep. cit., p. 32; from Śēhāt) that the name Ekhkīl applied by European scholars to Meḥrī is taken there and simply means *barbaric, unintelligible*. Hommel records (ep. cit., p. 153) that Glaser had interesting specimens of the Kaṭt dialect and of Meḥrī and Sāḥqāt; but these have not been published.

Glaser (cf. Śīrāz, ii, p. 20, 96, 187, 240, 503, Aṣbaḥsīn, p. 24, and Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 12, 148, 159 sqq.) further developed these ideas of Maṭrān on the South Arabian-Ethiopic group of languages. According to the latter, the Ethiopic alphabet came from the Axum inscriptions and that of the later literature in the Ge'ez language from a variety of the alphabet of the South Arabian inscriptions, once common in the Maḥra country and the frankincense land in general was the ancestor of the Semitic, Amharic and Ambätī. Against this view, that the name of the latter is a plural of Maḥrī, is sufficient to quote the form Ambrāhī (Hommel, ep. cit., p. 152, N°. 182). There is no reason to doubt contacts between Meḥrī and Ethiopic (Hommel, p. 153). That in ancient times members of the people called Ḥabagḥat in the South Arabian inscriptions (cf. Glaser, Śīrāz, i, p. 25, 27 and Aṣbaḥsīn, p. 28) were settled in Arabia suggested by the mention of the Aḥasmat in Stephanus Byzantinus v.s. from Urmiya's Arabica (mere vēs Σαβανών Χάραμπατ, Aḥasmat) and the Aḥesma in Ptolemy, vi, 7, 11 (in Zafar, q.v.). From the first passage, Glaser, Aṣbaḥsīn, p. 88 has concluded that the Aḥasmat lived east of Ḥadramōt, while in Śīrāz, i, p. 26 he had previously supposed that by the Maḥra was understood the whole coast from Ḥadramōt to Maḥra and islands lying off it: his further identification, which however had been suggested by his predecessors, of the Aḥasmat with the Abyssinians (cf. Sahātīche Domkhdulter by J. H. Moedtmann and D. H. Müller, Vienna 1883, p. 40, where attention is called to the Abahṣhām of the inscriptions) is however worthy of attention. C. Conti Rossini in his article Saggi Habbariti (R. R. A., Vol. xvi, Ser. 5, 1906, p. 39–59) has however shown that the old home of the Ḥabagḥat in the South Arabian and Axumite inscriptions was in the southwest of Arabia and on the plains along the coast west of Sāḥbū, which however has been proved to be Ḥadramōt by Latham and Zaibī. In the Aḥasmat of Urmiya, Rossini rightly sees only a prehistoric people of this coast and military settlement. Glaser wondered (Śīrāz, i, p. 27) that at once identified the people as a people mentioned in the Monumentum Aedalimum (cf. D. H. Müller, Geographische Domkhdulter aus Abyssiniens, Definitionen, Abh. Wiener, dritte, p. 5, 7 347) with the Maḥra and the people of the islands off the coast, which cannot at all be considered proved. In any case one cannot draw any deductions from the spread of Meḥrī regarding the extent of an old Ḥabagḥat kingdom (with Glaser, Śīrāz, p. 179) nor assume that as late as 900 A.D. the kings of Ḥabagḥat.
were established, in the land of Maha (Hommel, Ethnologit, p. 151).

D. H. Müller and his collaborators were the first to collect and investigate texts in the Maha language in a systematic and comprehensive fashion. In Vol. I of the Sybarisische Expedition, Vienna 1902, Die Mehr- und Sogzor-Sprache (I) he published Biblical texts, stories, poems and proverbs, which he collected for the most part on the Syrian steamer placed at the disposal of the expedition from the months of native, who had been taken of the Steamer 'Adam' and Sozorzi. For Maha particularly, he had a single authority, the same name as Jehu had. In the third volume of the same collection appeared Die Mehr- Sprache in Sozorzi by D. H. Jahn; texts and glossary, Vienna 1902. On these two works cf. the brief review by Glaser, Zwei Wiener Publikationen über den babylonisch-persischen Dialekt in Sybaris, Berichte der Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung, 1902, No. 186 and 187 of 15th and 18th August, and the very thorough and expert criticism by Landberg, Die Mehr- und Sozorzi-Sprache in Sybaris, ... von A. Jahn und D. H. Müller, herausgegeben von Landberg, 1902, Vol. II, ed. by D. H. Müller, Sozorzi-Texte, Wien 1905; forms Vol. vii. of the collection).

The already mentioned traveller W. Hein had in 1902 in Gzagh with the assistance of various natives collected Mahri and Urartian texts. He died in 1903 before he was able to put his material into its final form; D. H. Müller edited and published it in 1904, vol. ix. of the collection (Mehr- und Urartian-Texte, Vienna 1909). Some of these texts are also included in vol. vii. of Mehr-Texte (II) by D. H. Müller, Vienna 1907 and supplied with Shoyarti and Sozorzi parallels.

M. Bittner's grammatical studies in Maha are full of matter and excellent in method (see bibl.). The modern South Arabian dialects in spite of some features in common with Sabean cannot be explained as daughter-languages and the last surviving relics of the South Arabian language which is found in the Shafeen and Musan inscriptions (Jahn, op. cit. p. 1; see also sozorzi.) In them, especially Mahri and Sozorzi, we can at most recognize with Hommel, op. cit. p. 152 a daughter language of south Arabian dialects formerly spoken there (in Mahra-land and on Sozorzi), a pronunciation to which Maltait had already come very near. On the other hand, Glaser went too far when he described Mahri and Sozorzi as remains of the oldest 'Parthian' Arabic (Die Wahlheim und Sozorzi, Berichte der Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung, 1899, No. 170 and 171 of May 27 and 29) as descendants of the old language of Hubaysh from which Ethiopic and Amhara are also said to come (see Hommel, op. cit. p. 153, note 4 and 4 in Nishan's Handbuch, p. 91). According to Volkers (Z. d. xii. 223) the South Arabian dialects go back to the time of the settlement from 'Om, the immigrant Ass, not long before the coming of Islam, had occupied Mahra and introduced their language by their dialect. So early as in 1901, D. M. and his collaborators described a mixed people, Glaser (Skizze, p. 188 and 96) also speaks of the influence of Shafeen and north-eastern peoples on the Maha language, but he wrongly applies to Parthian and Indian elements 'the notable corruption of the Arabic language in the district of Mahra Thas'.

Hypothesis is in any case sufficient to help to explain the similarity of Ománi to the neighbouring dialect of Assab. As regards Maha, the possibility of older and deeper causes for its fundamental divergence from Arabic must be taken into consideration. That the foundations for the modern South Arabian dialects were laid long before the coming of Islam is not improbable. The Mahra language, as has already been suggested, be the remains of an original population, which was driven into the inhospitable south from more habitable territory by later immigrations of Arab tribes. Even now, as Glaser, Skizze, p. 187 tells us, the whole area in which Mahri is spoken is becoming more and more Arabic because no foreign people is now predominant in these regions, but traders who are mainly Arab. The cultural level of the Mahri is very low. They have never played a part of any note in history.


AL-MÁṬÍDÁ (¼), the Table, title of the fifth Sira of the Kur'an.

along with al-Theʿalibī’s Sīr al-Adāb fī Maḏzārī ʿUṯmān al-ʿArabī, Teherān n.d.; s. Wejers, Orientalia, i. 368 nqg.; two anonymous commentaries thereon Leyden, Nq. cvii., cvii. (s. Wejers, op. cit., i. 371 nqg.); a synopsis prepared by his son Ābd Allāh b. Saʿdī (f. 539 = 1144; s. Suyūṭī, Bugyāt, p. 254) in the order of al-Djawhartī’s Ṣahābah entitled al-Azīm fī ʿal-Azīm is perhaps in Leyden, Nq. cvii. Besides a grammar Nushāt al-Tarīq fī Ihm al-Ṣarf (Brit. Mus., Or. 5904; pr. Stambul 1299), a syntax with Persian notes al-Farābī: Nqīf al-Tarīq, with anonymous commentary on the verses Leyden, clxii. (also Paris, Schœfer, Nq. 6066), and minor grammatical treatises (Leyden, Nq. clxviii., Paris, Nq. 7900), he wrote a critique of al-Djawhartī’s Ṣahābah, mainly based on al-Azhartī’s (f. 370 = 980) Takhālīf al-Lughā, entitled Kaid al-Ahind al-Min al-Īrānī, Berlin, Ahlwardt, Nq. 6942.


The first inclination (al-Mail al-ṣawwād) is an arc of the circle which goes through the two poles of the equator and one degree (point) of the ecliptic, namely the arc which lies between this point and the equator. This circle is perpendicular to the equator. The second inclination (al-Mail al-dīrās) is an arc of the circle, which goes through the two poles of the ecliptic and a point of the equator, namely the arc which lies between this point and the equator. This circle is perpendicular to the ecliptic.

In the figure let $a$ be the ecliptic, $a$ the equator, $b$ be perpendicular to $a$, $c$ be perpendicular to $a$, then $b$ is the first and $c$ the second inclination. For the calculation it is important that we should have a right angle in each of the two spherical triangles, $a$ $b$ $c$ and $a$ $b$ $d$. The first inclination is also called Mail al-falak muʿaddī al-mahār, inclination towards the equator.

Of special importance is the obliquity of the ecliptic, i.e. the inclination of the plane of the ecliptic to the equator; it is equal to the first inclination in the solstitial points. It is called Mālik falak al-dawwāb, inclination of the ecliptic, al-Mālik al-dawwāb, the greatest inclination, al-Mail al-baʿdah, or al-Mail al-kullah, the whole inclination. To distinguish it, the inclination of any degree is called al-Mail al-dīrās, the degree-inclination.

If it is a question not of points on the ecliptic but of some star, the arc corresponding to the first inclination is called $\mu \delta a$, "interval" that corresponding to the second $\alpha \delta$, "width". We speak in the first case quite generally of declination, in the second of latitude.

The obliquity of the ecliptic is man of the fundamental magnitudes of the solar system. It was therefore continually being calculated anew and almost always so as to obtain the altitudes of culmination $a_1$ and $a_2$ of the sun at the summer and winter solstices. The sin is at these times at the same distance from the equator, north or south, in the one case and south in the other. The obliquity of the ecliptic is the $a_1 - a_2 = n$. It should be mentioned that Muḥammad b. Ṣaḥḥālī (c. 875) claims to ascertain the magnitude from three different points (O. Schirmer, op. cit., p. 32).

The first method was that used by Hipparchus, Ptolemy and Eratosthenes, using the most varied instruments, the two rings, the quadrant, and the armillary spheres. In the Muslim period these observations were continued with larger and larger instruments and account taken of the fact that the sun does not always enter the solstices in question by day but may do so at night, that the heavens may be obscured at the time etc. From observations made before and after the time in question the value has to be obtained by interpolations. This is how al-Khujandī, for example, worked (on the instruments used, cf. e.g. E. Wiedemann and Th. W. Jauwoll, Astronomische Schriften über sin von ihm vorgelegten Beobachtungsinstrument, Acta orientalia, v. 1926, p. 81-167). The values ascertained have been calculated by O. Schirmer (O. Schirmer, Studien zur Astronomie der Araber, S. B. P. M. S. Erl., livi., 1926, p. 30-90). From the measurements, it was found that the obliquity of the ecliptic decreases in course of time, i.e. that the plain of the ecliptic approaches the plain of the equator. A conception of the views of Muslim scholars on this question has been given by O. Schirmer (op. cit.).

Further expressions used in this connection are al-kaff al-māli, the inclined horizontal; it means any horizontal, except that of the equator, i.e. the horizontal inclined towards the horizontal of the equator. Kaff al-māli is an expression which lies perpendicular to the equator on the globe of the earth either north or south. Falak māli is an expression which lies parallel to the equator on the globe of the earth either north or south. Falak māli is an expression which lies parallel to the equator on the globe of the earth either north or south. Falak māli is an expression which lies parallel to the equator on the globe of the earth either north or south.

MAIMANA, situated at 36° N. and 64° 45'E., was formerly known as al-Yahdīdīn, al-Yahdīdīn (Yāḥūt also calls it Yahūdān al-Kneṣa), but the name was changed to Maimana, "the auspicious town," for the sake of good omens. It is at present the capital of the little province of Almar in Afgānistan on the trade route between Herāt and Balkh. Afgānistān includes the western Khānates of Sar-i-pul, Shahrābād, Andkhūl and Maimana, sometimes classed together as the Čahār Wilayāt. Dost Muhammad took this territory from Būkhārā in the year 1855; the sovereignty remained in dispute between Kābul and Būkhārā, till it was settled in favour of Kābul by the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1873.

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


(R. E. WHITNEY)

Maimuna, the last wife that Muhammad married. She was the daughter of al-Shir't, chief of the Haxzin tribe of Shem and a sister-in-law of 'Abbas. After she had divorced her first husband, a Tashkent, and her second, the Kuriqet Aht Rukn, had died, she lived as a widow in Mecca where the Prophet weeped for her, primarily no doubt for political reasons on the 'uma' asked him in the year 7. He wish to marry her in Mecca was refused by the Meccans in order not to prolong his stay there; the marriage therefore took place in Sarif, a village north of Mecca. Her brother-in-law 'Abbas acted as her guardian at the ceremony. The question whether the Prophet on this occasion was still in the 'ibda was met with a much disputed and variegated answered question. The bridal gift is said to have been 500 dinars. Maimuna survived the other wives of the Prophet and died in 67 (681) in Sarif, where she is said to have been buried on the spot where she was married.


Maimuna. [See Ibn Maimun.]

Maimun, the name of a district in southern Iraq.

The origin and significance of this name, which fell into disuse in the late middle ages, is unknown. There is no certain trace of it in the cuneiform inscriptions; for the Babylonian Misg, which Hommel (Hethomys. and Geogr. des alt. Orientes, Munich 1926, p. 261, 263) identifies with it is as little worthy of serious consideration as the Old Testament Misuw' (NEBT, Gen. x. 30) which Biblical exegists frequently quote. Maimun first appears in the form Misuw in Strabo in the first century A.D. Ptolemy gives Maimunu as one of the names for the innermost part of the land of the Persian Gulf. The word is certainly not Greek; the meaning "middle land," the land between two rivers, may be dismissed as a fanciful etymology. The territory of Mesene is in the cuneiform inscriptions the region of the southern Khas estates, especially the most southerly Bit-Yakin; at the same time we find in them the term the sea-land (matt-tamid) as almost identical with Bit-Yakin; the part of Mesene between the Tigris and Khâzastân was in the Babylonian period the home of the nomadic Aramaic tribe of Gambul; cf. Streck, Asirumepul, Leipzig 1916, iii. 778, 783, 796-97.

In classical literature Mesene was usually absolutely synonymous with Charrakene. Mesene or Charrakene appears in the second century A.D. (after ca. 129) as a small independent kingdom founded by a certain Herus, the last of whom our knowledge of whom is practically limited to his name. After an existence of three and a half centuries Ardashîr I put an end to this kingdom shortly after his accession, between 224 and 227 A.D. for Arab sources for this event, see Noldeke, Gesh. ii. Arab. und Perser zur Zeit der Sassaniden, Leyden 1879, p. 15 (Tubari, i. 818). In the strict sense of the word, Charrakene is only the delta of the Euphrates and Tigris before the junction of the two streams, the land on the north was Mesene, we have no information about the eastern and western frontiers of Charrakene. Perhaps, as Weisbach suggests (see Bibl.), Mesene was only later conquered by the rulers of Charrakene and its name transferred to this southern district. The Talmud knows Mesene as Misuw (and Miswâ), Syriac literature as Mâyshân. Among the Persians we have Maysan and the Armenians Masian; cf. the Persian Schandar, op. cit., p. 11. The Arabs took the word over as Masfân; but we occasionally also find Masfân (e.g. Tabari, iii. 870, 8). The old name Mesene is perhaps concealed in that of the little town of Masfân, which, according to the Arab sources, was near Bâzra and was celebrated as the birthplace of the Masfân.
As in the case of Mesene-Charakene, we have no exact information about the medinaal Arab Masiun, which would enable us to define exactly the area and boundaries of the district. According to Yagut, lv. 714 and Kaswin, p. 316, Masiun is an extensive district with numerous villages and palm groves between Basra and Wasit, and was taken over by the Arabs (q.v.) and was called Sabgha-i Bahamun or "the Tigris district"; the name Furrat-Basra is also found. It was divided into four divisions (faslugu, q.v.) namely, Bahman Ardagh, Masiun, Dastimaisun and Abas-Kubah; according to Kudama (R.G.A., vi. 236, 24), these four divisions of the Tigris district later passed into the administrative district of Basra. All four faslugu are to be located on the east side of the Tigris. Bahman Ardaghi, the capital of the district of the same name, lay on the left or south bank of the Tigris, opposite Ubulla on the west or south side of the river (the latter roughly on the site of the modern Ashahih, the port of modern Basra). The second division, Masiun, in the narrow sense, must have been that in which stood the capital of the whole district of the same name. Al-Mahjar however usually figures as such in the Arabic sources; it may be supposed that this was the successor of an older town called Masiun. The locality of al-Majdar cannot be exactly fixed (see below); it lies on the east bank of the Tigris, about thirty miles (as the crow flies) north of Kurna. Dastimaisun also is to be sought east of the Tigris, in the region of al-Majdar, probably south or south-east of it. As to the fourth division, Abas-Kubah, a name, which Marquart, op. cit., p. 47 and Hersfeld, id., xi. 160 would emend to Eshana Kahuhi (Kubahd), relying on a passage of al-Idjahabani (Zi'r-i-Qashq, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 57), this also must be placed east of the Tigris not too far from al-Majdar. A reference in Kudama (p. 235, 24) agrees very well with this, according to which the four divisions of the land of Masiun lay east of the Tigris.

Even under the Abbasids there was a separate Nustorian ecclesiastical province of Massûnian which was again divided into four subdivisions, the bishoprics of Perâl de Massûnian, Karkûh de Massûnian, Bith Raima and Nehar Gâl (Gur); cf. especially Sachau, op. cit., p. 48 sqq. Marquart, op. cit., assumed it as certain that these four dioceses must correspond to the four political divisions of the district of Masiun. This view in itself probable and first found by Sachau, p. 49 as worthy of consideration is untenable, as Schaefer, op. cit., p. 29 sqq. has shown. Perâl de Massûnian is certainly identical with Bahman; but the second bishopric Karkûh de Massûnian does not correspond to the massuhi of Masiun or Massûn but it is to be located much farther south in the district of the modern Muhammadda. Bith Raima very probably lay not on the east but on the west bank of the Tigris at some distance N.E. of Basra, so that it does not even come into consideration as the equivalent of one of the four Arab divisions. Nehar Gâl (Gur) may be equated to Naheh Zobar of the Arab geographers (see Sachau, op. cit., p. 51; Schaefer, op. cit., p. 37). This is to be sought towards Khâlasian somewhere in the neighbourhood of Hwawan (see below). Whether the fourth massuhi Abas-Kubah corresponds to it cannot be settled.

If then the capitals of all four divisions of the Tigris district are to be located on the east bank of the river, the lands on the west bank, also included in the sawadd must have belonged to the same district as did the whole delta down to the Persian Gulf; for there is no district to which only the doubtful western and southern divisions might be allotted. In the Sasanian period, according to the Turfan fragments (cf. Schaefer, op. cit., p. 25), the term Masiun was usual for the whole of southern Iraq (or Mesûnian) and this remained the case under the Arabs. But according to the Muslim sources, it does not seem to have been limited to the south proper but to have extended a considerable distance northwards. The quotations above given from Yagut and Kaswin show that Masiun was considered to stretch northwards toWasit (q.v. and vol. i., p. 676, 2a, art. KASSAR); indeed it is most probable that the extreme N.E. frontier of the area known as Masiun lay in the vicinity of the modern Kât al-Amâra (q.v.); the Mahjar of the Arab geographers; cf. 969 sp.; Streck, Babyloniens, ii. 310 sqq.). The district of Kasser also stretched up to here and seems in the main to have included lands east of the Tigris (cf. KASSAR). To avoid misunderstandings it should here be expressly mentioned that for the Arab period, of the present course of the Tigris only the Shatul-ar-Arab and the stretches as far as al-Malja came into question; in those days the Tigris bed corresponded with that of the Nahar-al-Gharrât (Shatul-al-Malja) which was the western boundary of the district of Masiun. For further details of the hydrography of Masiun, see below. Masiun is occasionally used as synonymous with Kassar; cf. Schaefer, op. cit., p. 14, 17 sq. Masiun probably stretched to the east as far as the alluvial land of the sawadd, up to the frontier of Khâlasian in places beyond the present frontier of Iraq. At least Hwawan (the modern Hwawan [q.v.]) which is now on Persian soil, is expressly mentioned as a town belonging to Masiun.

The swamp region, al-Bat'ib, for the most part came within the area of Masiun. On this cf. Al-Râfînî and the articles on al-Bat'ib in al-Ma'âlûm by 'Ali Sharrî in the periodical Lâghat al-Arab, lv. (Baghdad 1927), p. 372-384, 474-477, 526-530 and vi. 277-279; also Hâshim al-Salim, Lâghat al-Arab, Baghad 1927, p. 11. More important of the swamps (khar) are given.

In modern times the practically synonymous name al-Majdar (plur. of khar) is used for al-Bat'ib (see 'Ali Sharrî, q.v. cit., lv. 376). The two specifically Iraqi words khar and khar, which are very often used indiscriminately in European works, especially on maps (usually the one form khar) (cf. Al-Râfînî where khar is wrongly given for khar), have to be carefully distinguished. For khar (older alternative khal), popularity khar = "permanent swamp, temporary lake, land liable to inundation" (cf. B.G.A., ed. de Goeje, iv. 379; O. le Strange, J.R.A.S., 1895, p. 298) and al-khar, popularity khar = "arm of a river, creek, lagoon-like gulf", cf. especially the remark of Père Anastase-Marie, the editor of the Baghdad periodical Lâghat al-Arab, in M. Lidzbarski, Das Johannesebn-Mandavels Mandäer (Gleisner 1915, p. 145).

One of the divisions of the Tigris district was called, as already mentioned, Dast-i Masiun. The
name is also vocalised Dastu- and Dasta-Maisan in our Arabic texts. Ibn Khalifīn always writes the Persian form Dastu-i Maisān; cf. Marūdī al-Itīhād, ed. Jaynhill, v. 468. Dastu, dastu can thereby only be the Persian dastū (=plain). Schaar's assumption, cp. s.v., p. 34, that dass represents an abbreviation of the Pahlavi Daskert (Arabic Dasse, q.v.) seems to me hardly tenable. Why this division in particular was distinguished as the "plain of Maisān" from Maisān proper (especially from the second division of the district), is however not apparent. Could it be that there has been a more level plain, less filled with swamps? In any case, it is not correct to equate Dastu-i Maisān without more ado to Maisān (as does G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 43). Yaḵšī (l. 574) thus defines Dastu-i Maisān:

"It is an important district between Wāṣīt, Baṣra and al-Ąwja (q.v.) (= Khūšīnān, q.v.) lying near the last-named. The capital is Baṣmārā. Dastu-i Maisān is not identical with Maisān but is connected with it; it is also said that it is a district with the capital al-Ubtūra and Baṣra belonging to it." Nothing further is known of Baṣmārā, here mentioned as the capital of Dastu-i Maisān. The form in which the name is handed down varies (see the variants in the Marūdī, ed. Jaynhill, v. 468); it is apparently identified with Baṣmārā which al-Maḳḥaddīn (E.G.A., iii. 114, 1) details among the places of the district of Wāṣīt (cp. Tābis, iii. 1558, 12; Z. D. M. G., xxix. 660; xxx. 26). From the rather general remarks in Yaḵšī the boundaries of the district of Dastu-i Maisān cannot be ascertained. We have brought a step forward by a note in Ibn Roṣṭa (E.G.A., viii. 94, 4) which expressly states that a place named "Abādağī, frequently mentioned in Arabic sources, is in Dastu-i Maisān. When Yaḵšī in another connection (l. 275, s. 3) mentions "Abādağī alongside of Dastu-i Maisān (i.e. distinguishing the two), as a division of Kaškar, this probably is an inaccuracy. From the passage of Ibn Roṣṭa quoted, it is further evident that "Abādagī must have been above al-Maḳḥaddī in the direction of Wāṣīt. In keeping with this is an itinerary given by Ṣādīn al-Ąwja (E.G.A., vi. 126, s. 5), according to which a route from Wāṣīt via Ḫūšīnān (5 farshāhs) to the E. of Wāṣīt (cp. Yaḵšī, l. 461) to Baṣra passed successively through: Abādağī ("Abā-

The distance of Budhibūn from Abādağī is put at 5 stages (rīḥān); and from Abādağī to al-Maḳḥaddī at 8; cp. also Streek, Babyl. Sus., i. 33-14. As a rīḥān on the average may be put at 4-5 miles (see Streek, cp. s.v., p. xv) the distance from Budhibūn to Abādağī may be estimated at 30-40 miles; from Budhibūn to Wāṣīt was about 15 miles. To this location of Abādağī agrees very well a note in Ibn Hawšī (E.G.A., ii. 159, s. 5), who says that the date-palm groves of the district of Barṣā are stretched without interruption for over 20 parasangs = 150 miles from Abādağī (then away to the south on the seaward side). As far as Abādağī (1), the latter must therefore mark the northern limit of the Budhibūn district of Baṣra. From the passages mentioned we have to look for Abādağī a fair distance to the north of al-Maḳḥaddī, probably rather near the bank of the eastern arm of the Tigris which was dry in the middle ages. The position given to Abādağī by G. Le Strange in his map to Ibn

Schrappen (t. R. A. S., 1895) and in The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (map ii), — south of al-Maḳḥaddī on the left bank of the Tigris (in map ii), or on the right bank opposite al-Maḳḥaddī — cannot be maintained. For further reference to Abādagī (with the variants "Abādasī, "Abādas or Abādas; according to Ḥamza al-Įsfāhānī in Yaḵšī, iii. 603, 19, a Persian word) see B. G. A., iv. (glossary), p. 94. The approximate identification of the position of Abādagī, which we have obtained, gives us a clue to that of Dastu-i Maisān. This must have been above Maisān proper (with al-Maḳḥaddī), and have comprised roughly the most northern part of the whole district of Maisān in the wider sense. It should be noted that in which the four divisions of the Tigris district are officially given (Bahman Ardasī, Maisān, Dastu-i Maisān, Abas-Kabīrī; see above) is apparently that from south to north rather north-east. To the east Dastu-i Maisān extended as far as Khūšīnān. But it should not be forgotten that the eastern frontier of Maisān during the caliphate must have undergone changes as a result of several alterations in the organisation of the provincial administration (cp. Schwarz, cp. s.v., p. 290, 291); this explains the apparent contradictions in our sources, in which one and the same place is sometimes put in the Irāq, sometimes in Abūnā (q.v.). (Khūšīnān, q.v., "Abādagī, see "Arabikāh.

When we know definitely that Dastu-i Maisān was separated by the division of Maisān from that of Bahman Ardasī which to Utūla belonged, it appears rather remarkable that in Ibn Khordhūbī, as well as in Yaḵšī (cp. Streek, cp. s.v., p. 16, 19) Dastu-i Maisān is mentioned.

If this is not simply a mistake, it might at most be explained, as Schaeffer does (cp. s.v., p. 35), by saying that under the "Abādasīs the headquarters for the collection of taxes for Dastu-i Maisān was moved to Utūla. The whole system of division into sawād, originally simply made for convenience in taxation, had lost any practical importance, at least under the later rulers of this dynasty. We are further definitely told that the Tigris district later passed under Baṣra, in which no doubt some of the officials of the old administrative district were moved to towns near Baṣra like Utūla.

A part of Dastu-i Maisān was known as Dīḵāhī. It must have lain to the west of the modern course of the Tigris roughly from al-Maḳḥaddī to Abādagī. Ibn Roṣṭa (cp. s.v., p. 953) tells us that in Dīḵāhī between the two towns just mentioned, a part of the Tigris water was directed into a small river and then into a swamp, before the river altered its bed in the direction of Wāṣīt. From the account of the campaigns of the Khārjis in the Umayyad period when the Dīḵāhī was a favourite place for these rebels to assemble (see vol. ii, p. 905); it is evident that this district must have occupied the position here sketched out for it; cp. Wellhausen, in N. G. W. Gitt, N. S., vol. v, no. 2 (1901), p. 22, Whether al-Dīḵāhī stretched as far as the Nahār al-Ġharīf (Šitt al-Ġayl) and even beyond it, we do not know. There is a Tell Dīḵāhī at some distance from the west bank of the Nahār al-Ġharīf, to be exact in 45° 52' E. Long., Greenwich, and 34° 45' N. Lat. It is possible that the medieval name of the division Dīḵāhī has survived in that of this mound, which conceals the ruins of the very ancient, not unimportant town of Umma (ideographically written Gitt-Ḡib).
For Umma, which is mentioned in inscriptions as early as 3200 B. C., and disappeared from history even before the time of Hammurabi, see Hommel, op. cit., p. 354—355, 1019, 1102 (Index) and Ungar in the Realleit. der Vorgeschichte, xx. (1928), p. 3-4. Names like Djughā, Djiwhā, Djawhān are found elsewhere in the mediaeval geographical nomenclature of Irāk and Khūruzīstān; see Yākūt, it. 669, 15-16; li. 143, 144, xi. 15; cf. on Djughā (Djiwhā) also Schaeder, op. cit., p. 23.

In Southern Irāk, to which the district of Maisān of the Arab middle ages roughly corresponds, in course of time far reaching changes have taken place in the appearance of the country. The history of the hydrography of this area is thus a very complicated problem and the solution of topographical questions especially difficult. The first thing to note in this connection is the fact that the Persian Gulf, the Khalīji al-Baṣra al-Firās, as the modern inhabitants of al-ʿIrāq call it (cf. Ḥāšim al-Sadī, op. cit., p. 41, Abū al-Raṣūd al-Ḥassān, op. cit., p. 115; Luḥāt al-ʿArāb, i. 58, and the article MARD AL-FARADD), stretched much farther north in ancient times than the middle ages with it does today. In the Babylonian period it was a lagoon almost as wide as a sea called Nāṣr Al-Murrân (see Streck, Assurkunde, Leipzig 1916, iii. 796) and stretched northwards nearly as far as 31° N. Lat. The lagoon must have stretched from Baṣra in a westerly direction indicated by the later course of the Euphrates or the modern swamps (khirb) of Abū Kālim and al-Ḥam'am, as far as the region of the mouth of rivers of Abū Shahra (c. 12 miles S.W. of al-Mukhayyir-Ur), Abū Shahrūn, the ancient Eridu, certainly lay on the shore of this lagoon as we know from inscriptions found there; cf. Langdon, Ausgrabungen in Babylonien seit 1918 = A. O., xxvii. (1928), p. 3-4; Weissbach's objections to the equation Abū Shahrūn = Eridu (in Fauly-Waissawa, op. cit., vi. 1205) now disposed of.

From Kūnr the lagoon probably sent an arm to the east as far as the Kūhrūn. The land south of Kūnr beyond Baṣra on both sides of the broad arm of the sea now marked by the bed of the Shatt al-ʿArāb was probably only partly under water in ancient times (cf. Hersfeld, in Sarre-Hersfeld, Archäolog. Reise im Euphrat und Tigrißgebiet, vol. i. Berlin 1911, p. 251), although it was probably exceedingly swampy. In any case in the Sargonid period, the Euphrates, Tigris, Kerkhā, and Kūhrūn all entered the sea or rather the lagoon running up from it by separate mouths. Cf. also AL-RĀTIQ and lii. p. 777.

If then the question of the extent of the advance of the delta since the beginning of the historical period can be approximately answered, it hardly seems possible to allow accurately the increase in land to each century, as we do not know if the sea always retired at a constant rate. In the middle ages (al-Hambān, q. v. and below) in 48° 22′ E. Long, Greenw. and 30° 12′ S. Lat., c. 45 miles in a direct line from Baṣra, was still regarded as the most southerly town of the Īrāq. According to Ibn Bāqīya's Travels (ed. Paris, ii. 18) in the first half of the sixteenth century, it was already an hour's journey from the coast. This distance has now increased to over 20 miles. In the last 50 years there has been an average increase of land of at least 2½ miles a century. For further information on the steady formation of land by alluvial deposits at the north end of the Persian Gulf cf. SHATT AL-ʿARĀB; S. Genthin, Der Pers. Murrerei, Marburg 1896, p. 54 sq.; The Persian Gulf (= Handbook of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office, 30th. 76, London 1920), p. 13; Ḥāšim al-Sadī, op. cit., p. 54-52. Since the last century Nahr al-Shatīr the most southerly settlement immediately on the sea has been the telegraph and lighthouse station of Fāq; on this cf. below.

On the hydrographical conditions in Southern Irāk, especially the course of the Euphrates and Tigris and the canal systems connected with them, as well as the swamps there (al-Baṣṭā, q. v. or al-Baṣṭīh), we have a full and lucid description of the beginning of the tenth century in the part of the Geography of Ibn Serāqa that has survived as is seen the pertinent passages in Le Strange's edition, in J. R. A. S. 1895, p. 9-10 (sect. i—iii), 28-30 (sect. xiii—xv), and translation and notes on p. 33 sq., 46 sq., 296 sq. 311.

The Tigris, probably in ancient times forked at the site of the modern Kūh al-Amāra (q. v.), the Mudhārāf of the mediaeval Arabic sources (see above) into an eastern and western arm. For four centuries the main body of the Tigris has used the eastern bed running via Amāra to Kūnr, while the western arm, a much canal-like channel only navigable at high water, has connected it with the Euphrates. This western arm is in modern European literature known as Shatt al-Hāiy. This seems to be a name coined by European travellers, apparently first found in the last decades of the xviiith century (in Beaucamp; see Ritтер, Erdkunde, xi. 1753). Shāt al-Ḥai is the "river of al-Ḥaiy" and was still the name given locally to the northern stretch of the river reaching as far as Ḥaiy, but its whole course is usually called in the ʿIrāq Nahr al-Ghārāf (cf. the quotations noted below from the works of Ḥāšim al-Sadī and Abū al-Raṣūd al-Ḥassān); Yākūt (ii. 533, 549; iii. 781-3) already knows Nahr al-Ghārāf as the name of one of the five arms of the Tigris and of a district belonging to it, The Nahr al-Ghārāf was at one time called al-Muarrad; cf. Luḥāt al-ʿArāb, i. 51. At the little town of al-Ḥaiy the Nahr al-Ghārāf divides into five channels of which only the western Abū Ḥamārī has any water, while the eastern Shatt al-ʿArāb (or Awaṣ; on the name cf. above ii. 777) is now quite dry; cf. Luḥāt al-ʿArāb, i. 51, with note and correction on p. 255 sq. Four miles above Ḥaiy the main western arm also divides into two channels: the larger Nahr al-Ẓafra in the west, which enters the Tigris at Naṣīrīyeh (Naṣīrī, see KUT AL-ʾAMĀRA), the capital of the land of Mumsīf— for some years joined by a branch line to the station of al-Mukhayyir-Ur (Ur-Junction) on the Baghādā-Baṣra railway —, and the smaller eastern Nahr Ḥaṭṭe (Bakha) said to have been originally dug out by the Mumsīf which enters the ʿIrāq al-Ḥamām somewhat east of Sīḥ al-Shiyānī (q. v).

On the Nahr al-Ghārāf (Shatt al-Ḥaiy) and the territory through which it flows, of which now as in the Turkish period, the northern part (including al-Ḥaiy) belongs for administrative purposes to the Ṣanṣ of Kūh al-Amāra and the southern to the Ṣanṣ of al-Mumsīf (cf. KUT AL-ʾAMĀRA, vol. i. 276, ii. 515 sq., and KUT AL-ʾAMĀRA and Streek, Babylonien, iii. 311 sq.; Luḥāt al-ʿArāb, i. 51 sq., 159, 217, 219).
A little below the modern Karan; cf. l. 676, 969 sq. ii. 119. Vakšt's account differs seriously from Ibn Serapion's description of the Lower Tigris. How far Yıkšt, who lived 300 years after Ibn Serapion, reflects an alteration in the river system, it is impossible to say. According to Yıkšt (ll. 553, 3 sqq.; cf. thereon Strecki, Babylonien, l. 39-40 and above l. p. 670), the Tigris after passing Wāsit divided into five arms, which reunited at a place called al-Mašāra. This Mašra (var. Mašrā and Mašrāh in B.G.A., il. 53, 35; ii. 161, 3) lay a day's journey from Bāṣra i.e. about halfway between this town and Karan.

These five arms of the Tigris were, he says, the Nahr Sāšt, Nahr Gharrāf, Nahr Dāšār, Nahr Dāšār and Nahr Mašāri. Dīnār is mentioned in another passage in Yıkšt (ll. 115, 10) as a place above Wāsit. Gharrāf has already been mentioned as the usual modern name for the western arm of the Tigris (Šāṣat-El-Haïr). The Nahr Dāşār (apparently the Aramaic form of the Arabic Dīnār) flowed, according to Yıkšt, iv. 830, 21, or v. 838, 2, near the Nahr Abī l-Asad and east of the Nahr Dīnār. The latter was (see Yıkšt, v. 838, 3) between Wāsit and Nahr Dāšār. The Nahr Mašāri, finally, seems to be identical with the Dīnār al-'Awrāf from al-Mašāra to the mouth of the Nahr Abī l-Asad (cf. also Yıkšt, l. 603, 4).

The bed of the upper Dīnār al-'Awrāf which seems to have been dammed at al-Mašāra was apparently also fed by the waters of the Nahr Abī l-Asad. The Arab geographer Khādīja (B.G.A., ii. 833, 2 sq.) says: "After leaving the Bāṣra, the Tigris divides into two arms, the one of which goes to Bāṣra and the other to al-Mašāra." On the banks of the Nahr Mašāri, "between al-Mašāra and Buṣāra," lay the village of al-Bazīr (Vıkšt, l. 603, 3).

As to the Euphrates, we are told that in the middle ages it poured its waters into the Bāṣra in two channels below Kufa and Hillah, like the main body of the Tigris in the west; cf. especially Ibn Serapion, ed. G. Le Strange, in T. R. A. S., 1895, p. 10, 18 sqq. (and p. 47, 260) G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 74, and above II., p. 514, 27, art. AL-FAKURT.

The Nahr Abī l-Asad, which runs out of the Bāṣra and is often described by the Arab geographers as the eastern section of the western Tigris (cf. above and Yıkšt, iv. 830, 22) might, with a certain amount of justice also be claimed as the last stretch of the Euphrates. It is in this sense that Yıkšt (iv. 561, 3) says that al-Mašra, mentioned above, is "on the bank of the Tigris and of the Euphrates at the junction of the two." On the alterations in the lower course of the Euphrates in the later middle ages down to the eighteenth century we have very little information (cf. al-Fakurt), but we may assume that since about the fourteenth century, at latest since the beginning of the eighteenth, the whole volume of the Euphrates no longer appeared in the swamps but a portion ran in a definite channel which roughly coincided with the course of the modern bed, and ultimately used the channel of the Nahr Abī l-Asad and thus effected a direct connexion with the Eastern Tigris. From the reports of European travellers (see G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 28 sqq.) it is evident that at the junction of the two rivers there stood since at least the middle of the eighteenth century a castle named al-Karn (now a small
town; see also below, iv. 364). Since the great scheme for regulating the Euphrates was carried out by Willocks in the first decade of this century (cf. ii., p. 518 and Maṭṭi Al-‘Arabī) only a small and insignificant arm of the Euphrates now flows out at Karma, while its main arm cuts through the swamps of al-Hummar in a new channel and enters what is now called the Shatḥ al-Arāb above Karma ‘Ali (c. 16 miles N. of Basra). On this modern Euphrates channel called after Karma ‘Ali (popularly Karma and Curma ‘Ali) cf. Hājī Muḥammad al-Sa’dī, op. cit., p. 26, q. 5, 36, it., 159, 3 sq.; Abū al-Razzāl al-Qasimī, op. cit., p. 69, 65; Lugsah al-Arāb, i. 365, 8 sq.; ibid. 427; 2: Mesopotamia (Handbook of the Foreign Office, No. 65), London 1920, p. 5, 52 sq. 55 and cf. ii., p. 515.

The Eastern Tigris from al-Maḥdīr to its mouth on the Persian Gulf bore in the middle ages the name of Dī👇lyṭ al-‘Arīṣī or the “one-eyed Tigris” (on this cf. above, ib. 777); cf. especially Ibn Rosta (B. G. A., vii.), p. 94 sq. and Ibn Serapion (J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 28, 299–303). Streck, Babylonien, i. 41–42; G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 43; Schaefer, op. cit., p. 34–35 and cf. i., p. 676, 696 sqq. ii., p. 513 sqq. Yāḏḥūr (iv. 530 sqq.) however limits the name Dī👇lyṭ al-‘Arīṣī to the stretch from al-Maḥdīr to the sea, i.e. the combined Euphrates and Tigris. At the same time we find other special names for this last section among the Arab authors of the middle ages like Dī👇lyṭ al-Baṣra (the Tigris of B.), Fāṭim al-Baṣra (cf. e.g. Yāḏḥūr, ill. 933, 30), Badhsaward (Yāḏḥūr, ill. 406, 8). A specifically Persian name is Bahmahār (the river of the district of Bahmahār) (cf. ii., p. 777; see Yāḏḥūr, ii. 779, 80).

Even in the Babylonian period the lower Tigris seems to have had a special name, Surūfqa; see Meiūser, op. cit., p. 5. For nearly two centuries the combined Euphrates and Tigris has been known as Shāṭi‘ al-‘Arāb or the “river of the Arabs”, because its banks, although since 1840 (with interruptions) they have been in parts incorporated in the Persian kingdom, are almost exclusively inhabited by Arab tribesmen. (The name Shāṭi‘ al-‘Arāb is found in the middle of the 13th century in Nasiri Khurrāw Rāfī‘un, ‘Abdu al-Sa‘īd, op. cit., p. 89) but this is only a late occurrence. In its lower half the Shāṭi‘ al-‘Arāb has since that date formed the often contested frontier between Persia and Turkey or (since the World War) the Kingdom of Iraq; about an hour’s journey above (or west of) Muhammara, the eastern bank becomes Persian. Cf. also the article Shāṭi‘ al-‘Arāb and The Persian Gulf (Foreign Office Handbook, No. 76), London 1890, p. 15, 54.

The stretch of the Dī👇lyṭ al-‘Arīṣī corresponding to the modern Shāṭi‘ al-‘Arāb in the middle ages sent out numerous canals on either side; the very complicated canal-system of the country round Basra was especially celebrated. The most important canals on the west bank were the Nahr Mu‘āl (still to-day the name of a small village 22 miles north of Basra) and the Nahr Ubullū (apparently the modern Nahr al-‘Ashārū) which united at the town of Basra and connected it with the Tigris. The mediæval Nahr Abū Khusaṭ, 15 miles south of Basra on the west side, may also be mentioned: this still exists to-day and has given its name to a district and its capital (belonging to the shāmjāk of Basra); see Curneck, op. cit., p. 23; Abū al-Razzāl al-Qasimī, op. cit., p. 118. Of the canals on the west bank the most important was the Nahr Bayān (cf. Schwarte, Iran im Mittelalter, p. 318, 390–391). The Nahr Bayān formed a artificial channel connecting the Tigris and the Karma ‘Ali. We have also medieval references to a similar communication between these two rivers. Another canal still in existence on the west side is the Nahr Bayān (Bayān; modern Riyān) north of the Nahr Bayān. The most northern canal on the east side which left the Tigris about the neighbourhood of the modern Kurna, was called Nahr al-Muḥābāt, not Nahr al-Muḏīr (cf. thereon de Goeje, in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 741; emendation to J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 59, 297, 308 and Streck, Babylonien, i. 41). Generally speaking, there are not now so many canals in the Shatḥ al-‘Arāb as there were in the middle ages. The best account of conditions in the caliphate is that of Ibn Serapion: see the text in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 29–30 (thereon p. 303–311); cf. also Streck, Babylonien, i. 42 and G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 46–48. Cf. particularly the article al-Bayān wa-al-‘Ashārū, which gives a list of old and new names of canals, in Lugsah al-Arāb, ill. (1913), p. 57–68, 128–129 and p. 673–674 (additio) and p. 700–704 (indices); al-Nababbī, al-Turjī al-Nababbīfī, Tārikh al-Dīฬār al-Arābīyya, 2nd ed. Cairo 1342 (1923), ii. 45–53.

After the hydrography of the district of Māsān, we may now deal briefly with the more important places in It. The mediæval Arab geographers give as its capital the already frequently mentioned al-Maḥdīr on the eastern bank of the Tigris, 4 days' journey from Basra. The Shāfī‘i inhabitants according to Yāḏḥūr (vi. 408) had a splendid mosque here with the tomb of ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah who fell at Karbalā in the year 680; on this see the references in Winterfeld, Géographie des Tableaux de la région de la Babylonie, Register (1853), p. 8 and Yāḏḥūr, vi. 506; cf. also Bahmahār. This sanctuary still survives and it enables us — which has not been noticed before (for example, the inaccurate locations by G. Le Strange in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 300 and in The Lands etc., p. 42) — to define quite exactly the site of al-Maḥdīr. The name al-Maḥdīr is no longer known on the spot; on the old town the highly revered ‘Alīid sanctuary is all that remains, the place is now called simply ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah, who passed here on his way up the river in 1824, speaks erroneously of “the residence of Sheikh Abdullāh bin Ali, an Arab chief”; cf. his Personal Narrative of a Journey from India to England (London 1827), i. 91. According to Chemery’s map (see: Expedition for the Survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris, London 1856, Atlas, ii., p. 2) Usair and ‘Abd Allah are only 10 miles apart in a direct line, a figure which has however to be doubled when allowing for the many windings of the river if one goes by boat. The traveller Schafft, who in 1862 went down the Tigris on a steamer, took two hours to go from ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Ali to Usair; cf. his Reisen im Orient (Winterthur 1864), p. 137; Rich took six hours to ascend (Kitter, xi. 945). On my own journey in March 1927 I visited ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Ali; the steamer covered the distance from here to Usair with the river in favourable condition in not quite three hours. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Ali lies on a slight eminence ten minutes from the left bank of the Tigris, which describes a curve here. The mosque of the tomb with its dome
visible from a long distance off stands within the south side of an ahlong court, to which entrance is given by a door in the slightly built north wall. The Mahfâmo-pas de al-Hajri, born in Mashân (near Bayr) is said by Yâkût (iv. 468) to have died in al-Madâhir. As Itm. Rossâ (G. G. A., vii.), p. 95 tells us, the tide came up as far as al-Madâhir; this agrees with Schâfфи's observation (cf. cit.). The tide indeed is sometimes-perceptible as far up as the town of Kâ'fî al-Sûlî, farther north; cf. Hâshîm al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 29, 2; cf. also The Peruvian Gulf Pilot, London 1836, p. 295.

Opposite al-Madâhir, on the west bank was the little town of al-Hâdi (Yaqtû, iv. 947, 26). With it as a border in one passage (iv. 714) it is stated that the capital of Mashân was also called Mâsin, he can only be referring to al-Madâhir, the centre of the district of Mâsin in the narrower sense, not perhaps, Futû' Mâsin, for which we also find an abbreviated form Mâsin. The name al-Madâhir probably first came into existence in the Muslim period, perhaps for a new foundation on the site of the old town of Mâsin.

As to Kâ'fî al-Sûlî already mentioned on the left bank of the Tigris which like 'Abîd Allâh b. 'Abî Alig belongs to the lea of 'Amira, see Hâshîm al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 151, 'Abî al-Razzâk al-Hâshibî, op. cit., p. 125-126, and Lâzúqî al-Arâbî, iv. 277, 278, 279. The town of modern origin is a couple of hours' journey below 'Abî Alig b. 'Abî Alig has now about 3,000 inhabitants (including many Mâsinânis). The site of al-Madâhir cannot be marked by Kâ'fî al-Sûlî for al-Madâhir was certainly of moderate extent and the 'Abîd mosque is to be sought within it and not in its vicinity.

As to 'Usâir already mentioned (now usually pronounced 'A'sir), south of 'Abîd Allâh b. 'Abî Alig. The town on the west bank of the Tigris, it is especially mentioned that it belonged to the district of Mâsin, see Yaqtû, iv. 319, 714; Kazanî, 'Abî Alig, n.d. Wettenfelder, ii. 310. The proper name of this place with the alleged tomb of Ezra (Mássî) in the middle ages was, according to Arabic and Jewish sources, Nahr Samura (popularly Sîmûra); cf. e.g. Yâkût, iv. 840, as on 'Usâir especially D. S. Sassoon, op. cit. (see Bib.) J. R. Gaussma, op. cit. (see Bib.), p. 189 sq. and the article 'A'sir.

The town of 'Abâst (Abâst or Abas) to the north of al-Madâhir has already been discussed. On the town of Huwâza (now Hawâzîa) also belonging to Mâsin see above 1, p. 676 and art. Wâzî; the Mâsin Bibliography may now be added: Layard in J. R. S. Asia 1880, p. 34-35; J. de Morgan, Mission scientifique à Perse, Étude géographique, iii. Paris 1895, p. 278 and Schwartss, Ein Mann Mittelalter, p. 352 sqq.; Lâzúqî al-Arâbî, vi. 277 sq. An extensive swamp (fata) (cf. p. 876) takes its name from this town: the water from which flows into the Tigris a little south of Kâ'fî; cf. Hâshîm al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 21, 21.

The modern towns of importance on the Nahr al-Qâshâr (Shat al-Hâiy) are of recent origin and are still developing. They are from north to south: Haiy (Kâ'fî), a town with 9,000-10,000 inhabitants (cf. above and 1, p. 876; Lâzúqî al-Arâbî, i. 152, 224) Kâ'fî al-Sûlî with 1,500 and Shat al-Hâiy with 7,000 inhabitants; on these three places cf. Cuinet, op. cit., iii. 290, 210 sq. 312-313 (where Kâ'fî al-Sûlî is wrongly given for Kâ'fî al-Sûlî); Sachan, Am Ephrata et Tigris, Leipzig 1900, p. 69 sqq.; 'Abî al-Razzâk al-Hâshibî, op. cit., p. 111-112, 130 sqq.; Hâshîm al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 147, 162-163.

At the spot which up till some two centuries ago was regarded as the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris stands the little town of Kâ'fî (Korna, Gurnâ) with 2,000 inhabitants. It is not known to have existed in the middle ages; on it cf. above and Mignan, Travaux in Chaldée, London 1829, p. 284 sqq.; Ritter, xl. 1018-1023; Cuinet, op. cit., iii. 211 sqq.; 'Abî al-Razzâk al-Hâshibî, op. cit., p. 113; Hâshîm al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 156; Lâzúqî al-Arâbî, ill. 57. Halfway between Kâ'fî and Shat al-Hâiy must have stood al-Mâsin where, according to Yaqtû, the two arms of the Tigris, or the Euphrates and Tigris met in the middle ages; cf. above. About 3 hours' journey above Shat al-Hâiy on the right bank of the river is the little village of Kâ'fîn. All, where as already mentioned, the main stream of the Euphrates flows into the Tigris or the Shatt al-Arab.

In the Muslim period, Bayr was the largest and most important town in the old district of Mâsin and in its practice its capital, although under the 'Abâsids, al-Madâhir may have for a considerable period been regarded as the official capital. On Bayr, mediæval Basra, modern Basra and al-'Ashshâr, cf. the article BASRA.

Al-'Ashshâr stands approximately on the site of Ubulûla which as a suburb and port on the Tigris for the mediæval Basra was of some importance. In our sources we are expressly told that Ubulûla lay north of the canal which bore its name, partly on an island, which was formed by the Tigris and the two canals of Nahr al-Mâskî and Nahr al-'Ubulûla which joined one another at Bayr. The modern Nahr el-Mâskî which leaves the Shatt al-Arab about one hour south of al-'Ashshâr, cannot be the Nahr al-'Ubulûla (in spite of Lâzúqî al-Arâbî, ill. 63). The modern al-'Ashshâr, the principal commercial centre of southern Iraq, is only a little inferior to Basra as regards numbers of population. The two (or three) together now have a population of 50-60,000. On Ubulûla, the ancient Arbûkâr kaurus (see B.H. Wissowa, Reallex. der kl. Altertumswissenschaft. Suppl. Bd. i. 111), cf. G. Le Strange, F. A. S. 1895, p. 306 and The Land at the Feast of the Feast, p. 47; Drouin, in O. C. Litt., p. 93; Sachan, Arch. Pr. At. W., 1919, iv. 20. 51 sq.; ibid., xi. 151; Lâzúqû al-Arâbî, v. 477, vi. 200, v. and the art. Ubulûla.

Opposite al-'Ashshâr, on the east bank of the Shatt al-Arab stands the little town of al-Tauâni (cf. Lâzúqî al-Arâbî, ill. 129, p. 230, 2; 'Abî al-Razzâk al-Hâshibî, op. cit., p. 115; Hâshîm al-Sâdî, op. cit., p. 156, etc.). On its site or at least somewhere in the neighbourhood, there was already in ancient and mediæval times an important harbour, known to Pliny as Phai (cf. also Drouin, op. cit., p. 8). In the Tailmâ (see Berliner, op. cit., p. 44) and in Syriac sources it is called Perat de Mâsinâ in the mediæval Arab authors Perat Mâsinâ or Phai at al-Mâsin. In Syriac and Arabic texts we also find Perot or Furtû, without the addition of Mâsinâ; with Furtû = Euphrates the name has no connection. When the first Sādatîn king Ardshîr I. founded the city it received from him the new name of Bahman-Ardshîr, shortened to Bahmanshîr; see Haman el-Yâshînt, Tûriḳ, ed. Gottwald, p. 37 sqq. 46 and 64, xi. 149. Cf. the above mentioned.
specifically Persian name of the Dūljat al-'Awrār and Banīšah (Bāhānshīr) as a name of an arm of the Karīm (cf. v., p. 777). That so-called Persean Ma'ān was restricted to the left bank is quite clear from the Arabic references: cf. Wellhausen, Abh. G. W. Goit., N. F., v., No. 2, 1901, p. 34 and Schaefer, op. cit., p. 31. The identification of Furtat Ma'ān with the modern Başra or with old Başra (Berлина, op. cit.) has been championed by different scholars (Nöldeke in S. B. Ak. Wien, 1893, Abh. 3, p. 18; Marquart, op. cit., p. 41; Sachau, Abh. Fr. Ak. W., 1919, No. 1, p. 49; only modestly as a possibility by Harnack in Sarre-Herfeld in Achet. Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet, i, 251) is therefore untenable. Persepolis Ma'ān was the scene of the Nestorian metropolitan which was later moved to Başra (first certain reference in 893) (cf. Sachau, op. cit., p. 49 and Schaefer, op. cit., p. 31). The old name of the diocese Persepolis Ma'ān was still frequently used in place of Başra even after the transfer of the episcopal see. If we have on one occasion, c. 900 A.D., a mention of a bishop of Ma'ān simply, we should refer it to Persepolis Ma'ān rather than to Karkh Ma'ān (as Sachau, op. cit., p. 30) because the abbreviation Ma'ān for Persepolis Ma'ān is found elsewhere in Syrian literature (cf. Schaefer, op. cit., p. 32-33). As to the coinage of the Omayyad period of the mint of Ma'ān, this is probably to be explained also as al-Furtat Ma'ān and not as Karkh Ma'ān (cf. Mordtmann, Z.D.M.G., xxxiiii. 126) or Ma'ān (al-Mahdī) as Schaefer, op. cit., p. 34 thinks. Abn. 1-Bida, Taqwa al-Bulūnd (ed. Reinhard, p. 296), also is obviously identifying Furtat Ma'ān not Ma'ān (al-Mahdī) when he says "Ma'ān is a little town in the lower part of the land of Başra".

On the west bank of the Shatt al-Arab about where the Eunuch or Dūjdū (the modern Karīn [q.v.]) joins it, Alexander the Great built a new town on the site of an older settlement, which he called Alexandria after himself. After its restoration by one of the Sasanians, it was known as Antioch China. When Spahines (Hyphasis) created a kingdom of his own in Mesopotamia-Charrake, Antioch-Cina=Antioch was his capital and was known as Karkh Asiya; under this name (Arabic Karkh Asiya or simply Karkh) it is mentioned in the Palmyrene inscriptions. Another refoundation of the town is ascribed to Ardashīr I, hence its official designation in the Sasanian period as Arslān (also abbreviated to Arslān); cf. Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Arab. und Pers. aus Zeit der Sāzānids (Leiden 1879), p. 14; Marquart, op. cit., p. 41; Herzfeld, ibid., xx. 150; Hama al-Jamāli, op. cit., p. 47. It is the (correct?) form of the name Ingh Ardashīr. The older name Karkh more exactly defined by the addition of "al-Mahdī" remained in existence. The Syriac texts always write Karkh al-Mahdī. There was a Nestorian bishopric here, which seems soon to have disappeared under Islam; see Sachau, op. cit., p. 49-50 and Schaefer, op. cit., p. 33. The Syriac took over the Syriac name as Karkh [q.v.]. Ma'ān; cf. e.g. Yākūt, iv. 207, 1. The Persian traveller Nāṣiri Khusrav who visited the Irāk about 443 (1051) (cf. his Šefaremla, ed. Schefer, p. 56) mentions, besides Başra, in the district of Ma'ān a place called Akt Ma'ān, probably an inaccurate reproduction of Karkh Ma'ān. The site of Karkh Ma'ān is usually sought on that of the Persian port of Mu'hammads, which has only arisen since about 1812, or at least in its immediate neighbourhood; cf. Andreas in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenzykl., i, 1394 sqq.; Drouin, op. cit., p. 7; Herzfeld in Sarre-Herfeld in Archäologische Reise, i, 251; Sachau, op. cit., p. 50; Schaefer, op. cit., p. 33. This identification does not have the old, generally certain Karkh Ma'ān is perhaps to be located farther to the north; cf. e.g. the objections of Mordtmann in S. B. Ak. Ak., 1875, vol. ii., Suppl. Heft, iii., p. 14. Cf. also on Alexandria-Charrake Spasni: Karkh Ma'ān the important article "Alexandria" by Andreas in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenzykl., i. 1390 sqq. and the article Charak Spasni by Weilschad, ibid., iii. 2122; Drouin, op. cit., p. 7; A. W., 15; Schaefer, op. cit., p. 31 sq. On coins struck in Karkh Ma'ān of the Ašrakī and Sasanian periods cf. Mordtmann, Z. D. M. G., xxxiii. 126 sqq. and C. F. Hill, Catalogue of Greek Coins of Arabia and Persia in the British Museum (London 1923); cf. also Mardiana and also Bull. ii. p. 777.

In the middle ages the most southerly towns in the Irāk were ʿAbbādīn, which then lay on the coast—under the later ʿAbbādī it was already some distance from it—and was an important harbour. Cf. above and the article ʿAbbādīn.

At the beginning of the twentieth century it was still an insignificant little village. It is only since the last twenty years that it has undergone an unexpected development, because of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company making it the terminus of their pipes from Meshet and Mādnī in Bahān (cf. ii., p. 777). The oil is now pumped into tankers at ʿAbbādīn; important factories, warehouses etc. have been built there. On the Thames five minutes west of ʿAbbādīn proper, has developed into a flourishing town which bears the name Khūrān ʿAbbādīn or ʿAbbādīn al-Hadīlī = New ʿAbbādīn. On the meaning of the word ʿAbbādīn (a particular kind of date) cf. Lūgḥat al-ʿArab, i. 125; sqq.; 443; s; iii. 594, 1 from below. In Brīm are the ruins of a palace or castle said to date from the time of the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd; cf. Lūgḥat al-ʿArab, i. 126 sqq. ʿAbbādīn is now next to Başra-Ashūr and Muḥammar the largest and most important town in the whole of the Shatt al-Arab. On the other place on the islands of ʿAbbādīn cf. Lūgḥat al-ʿArab, i. 128 sqq. The island, which before the war belonged to the Shāhī of Muḥammar who was under Persian suzerainty, was leased about 1931 by England for 99 years. On māna ʿAbbādīn cf. Lūgḥat al-ʿArab, i. 121-129; on modern ʿAbbādīn and the works of the Persian Oil Company, ibid., i. 175-184; W. Schweer, Die türkisch-persische Erde, Hamburg 1919, p. 112-115.

ʿAbbādīn close to the sea coast there stood in the middle ages the lighthouses known as al-Tarākāk (q.v.).

As has already been pointed out, ʿAbbādīn is now over 20 miles from the sea. The most southerly town in the Irāk, for about a century was the important lighthouse and telegraph station at Fūs (q.v.), built on the shore of the Persian Gulf; on it and the district, cf. Gueder, op. cit., ii. 606-707; Ābed al-Razzāq al-Ḥāṣib, op. cit., p. 118; Ḥāşim al-Sulṭān, op. cit., p. 21, 155, 1 from below; cf. above and art. Shāt al-ʿArab. The Turks fortified this important strategic point (see Persian Gulf [Handbooks etc.], p. 54: Med
The remarkable sect of the Mandeans (the Sinha’ of the Kūrān, q.v.), now called Subhī, had from their early times their headquarters in southern Irāq, in Ma’isān, especially in the swamp country. On their geographical distribution in the sixth century cf. Chwolson, Die Subhī er der Sabirin (St. Petersburg 1859, l. 124–145) and Euting, in Das Auland (1876), p. 204–205. According to enquiries which I made in 1927 of Mandeans, the number of Mandeans in the larger towns of the Irāq may be approximately estimated as follows: in ‘Amāra and Hawza 1,000 each; in Kafāt Shīlī and Majmūma 500 each, in Baṣra 300 and in Kūrma 100. The language of the Mandeans, who represent a remnant of the original native Aramaic population of Babylonia, is probably identical in the main with the Aramaic idiom which was once predominant in southern Irāq, the dialect of the old kingdom of Mesene-Charakenn, the Mešīt dialect as it is called in the Targum; cf. Noldeke, Mandalkche Grammatik (Halle 1875), xxvi and Pognon, Inschriften. manîdiche des vouges de Khosrab (Paris 1868–1899), p. 13–14, 274.

The Indians people of the Dīl (Arab. Dīl) and the Zindī from East Africa, who were settled on the soil of Ma’isān at the end of the first (seventh) or in the third (ninth) century a.d. above i., p. 676 and the articles Dīl and Zindī.

As to the industries of the people of Ma’isān in the middle ages we need only mention the mats made here, which are praised as the best of their kind; cf. S. Frankel, Die aram. Fremdwörter in Arabisch. (Leiden 1886), p. 92. The red-beds of the marbes supplied excellent material for them in enormous quantities. Even at the present day the manufacture of red-mats continues to give employment to many hands; for the people of the flat lands in southern Irāq like to use long two-shaped mats called cappār, the walls of which are made of red-matting.

The history of Ma’isān since the introduction of Islam practically coincides with that of the Irāq, especially that of the northern part (the province of Baṣra and the Battāla); the reader may therefore be referred to the articles Irāq, Baṣra and At-Battāla. Here we will only point out that the administrative district of the Tigris belonging to Ma’isān was conquered by Dāmt-i Māsān in the year 14 (635) on this conquest cf. Baldhūrī, op. cit., p. 340–342 and Caesanti, Annali dell’ Ist. din., iii. 252, 301–304 (§ 6 and 81–86); ci. 108 (Indux x. v. Mayān).

Al-Mahār, the capital of Ma’isān, was the scene of important military happenings at the time of the Arab invasion and frequently later also. In the year 12 (633) al-Khīlīlī and al-Muhannā fought a great battle with the Persians at this town, the first in their invasion of the Irāq. This battle is sometimes called after an adjacent canal, called al-Thīr (Yākūt, l. 937 sqq.). The defeated Persians are said to have lost 30,000 men in this encounter; cf. Baldhūrī, op. cit., p. 242, 272, 291; Caesanti, op. cit., v. 2026–2029; al-Ma’ābūnu, op. cit., iv. 209; Mulīr, Der Ist. din., i. 228; Caesanti, op. cit., ii. 959–962 (§ 196–200). In the fighting with the Khurāsānī for whom the district of Dāmt-i Māsān frequently served as a hidingplace, there was a desperate battle in 47 (664) in and around the town of al-Mahār. These rebels were forced to retreat by the Khurāsān under the leadership of Ma’īl b. Kais; cf. Wellhausen, Abb.
MISARA, a Berber chief of the Maghrib, who rebelled against Arab authority in 122 (739-40). He belonged to the tribe of the Maghātra and the historians give him the surname of al-Hādirī the "low-born" because he was of humble origin and before his rebellion had been a water-seller in the market of al-Kairānān.

After the recall of Mūsā b. Nūṣār at the end of the first century a.h., rebellion began to smoulder in North Africa. 'Umar b. Abd Allāh al-Murāt, governor of Tangier, and a grandson of 'Ubayd b. Nāfi', Ḥālib b. 'Abī 'Ubaida, governor of Sīsā, were inflicting grievous wrongs on the Berbers by treating them, as regards taxation, as a conquered people not converted to Islam, and by taking the freedom of their women to send as slaves to Damascus.

The governor of Sīsā was sent from Sīsā with his troops to the conquest of Sicily, his departure was the signal for insurrection. A movement on a large scale broke out: at its head the Berbers put Misarā al-Magharī. With the related tribes of the Mālikūn and Barāghwātī [q.v.] Misarā advanced on Tangier and seized it. The Arabs tried in vain to withstand him: the governor of Spain, 'Ubayd b. al-Hadīghī, even crossed the Strait to help Tangier but his efforts were in vain. It was not long before Misarā was disarmed and killed by his own followers but his successors al-Khālid b. Hamdūn al-Zanjītī was more fortunate at the beginning of 123 (740) he inflected on the Arabs on the banks of the Waḥil Shāfī (Cheffī) the disastrous defeat known as the "battle of the nobles" (ghawrāt al-ḥārīf). It required a great expeditionary force to be organised in the cast in order to overcome finally this general rebellion, which was not done without considerable losses.


MAISIR, cutting lots by arrows, a method by which a herd of cattle was divided. This was the custom of the Arabs before Islam. The word has survived almost to mean lucky chancy, easy success, from ja'iz, to be easy, ja'izat, to succeed; cf. maiṣīra, comfort, riches. A group of ten Arabs used to buy a young camel, which was cut into ten portions and the yariz presiding distributed the portion among his companions by means of arrows on which he had written their names and which he threw at random out of a bag. In another system 28 portions were made of the animal; there was one past for the first arrow, 2 for the second and 3 for the third and so on up to 7; the last just got nothing. These arrows were deposited with the guardians of the temple in Mecca.

The game was considered a pagan practice and the Kanīn (ii. 210 and v. 92) forbade it along with wine and idols as a major sin.

The word maiṣīr has acquired a wider sense among the commentators and in certain traditions.
Zamakshari gives it the same sense as bānir [q.v.], according to a tradition of the Prophet, which is applied also to dice: "these accursed dice are the cause of Rewards (ma’sūr al-salāmah)", according to a tradition of transmission and chaos (presumably in so far as dice were used in these games) and according to Ibn Sīrīn to every practice in which there is an element of chance.

Cf. the Dictionaries, the Kanzul, Lawhart, Zamakshari, Kanzul, ed. Nasar, Leen, i. 380; al-Yaqūbī, ed. Hootman, i. 360 sqq.; Huber, über das Ma’sūr genannte Spiel, Freytag, Einleitung, p. 179 sqq.

(6. CARA 290. VAUX)

MAISUN, daughter of the Caliph Yazid b. Umair [q.v.], mother of the Caliph Yazid I. We do not know if after her marriage with Mu‘awiyah she retained the Christian religion which had been that of her family and of her tribe. A few verses are attributed to her in which she sighs for the desert and shows very slight attachment for her husband, but the attribution to Maisun of this fragment of poetry, which is in any case odd, has been rightly disputed. She took a great interest in the education of her son Yazid and accompanied him to the desert of Kāthir where the prince passed a part of his youth; this temporary separation from her husband gave rise to the later legend of her repudiation by Mu‘awiyah. She must have died before Yazid became Caliph. Bibliography: This is given in Lammens, Récr. sur le régime du califat omeyyade, iii. 380—387, 395, 312—314. (M. LAMMENS)

MAISUR (MYSORE) (Skt. mahīgha-Caṇṭha "buffalo town"), the premier Hindu State in India, is a principality in Southern India under the British protection, having an area of 29,433 square miles, between 10° 36' and 15° 28' N. and 76° 38' and 78° 36' E. Its Hindu rulers preserved their independence until the middle of the sixteenth century, when Haidar Ali [q.v.] took possession of the country. It remained in his and his successors, Tipu Sultan’s [q.v.], possession until the capture of Seringapatam by the British in 1799. Maisur was then restored by Lord Wellesley to the old Hindu dynasty. The majority of the Musalmans are Sinhais, very few being Shāfs. Of Muhammadan buildings the most noteworthy are the Gumbaz of Mausoleum of Haidar Ali and Tipu at Gandikot, and the Darya Dowlat, a palace at Seringapatam. The population at the census of 1911 was 5,869,193, of whom 314,494 are Musalmans, mostly Sinhais. The capital of the principality bears the same name, Maisur. The languages spoken are Kannada, Hindustani, Tavare and Telugu.

Bibliography: Imperial Gazetteer of India, Mysore and Coorg, Calcutta 1908; Census of India, 1911, vol. xxx, Bengalure 1912.

(M. HINDERT HOWARD)

MAITA (M.), femimine of ma’at, dead (used of senseless things); as a substantive: it means an animal that has died in any way other than by slaughter. In later terminology the word means firstly an animal that has not been slain in the usually prescribed fashion, the flesh of which therefore cannot be eaten, and secondly all parts of animals whose flesh cannot be eaten, neither because not properly slaughtered nor as a result of a general prohibition against eating them.

In addition to Sūra xxxvi. 33, where ma’at appears as an adjective, the word occurs in the following passages in the Kūrān in the first of these meanings: xvi. 116: "He has forbidden you ma’at blood, pork, and that over which another than Allah has been invoked; if however anyone is forced (to eat these) without wishing to transgress or sin, Allah is merciful and indulgent" (of the third Meccan period, since vi. 119 may refer to this context and the appearance of the same exception for cases of coercion in vi. 146 [cf. below] is then only easily explained in view of the whole trend of the passage, if there were an earlier passage, namely xvi. 115, given full justification; cf. Nöldeke-Schwearl, Geschichte des Koran, i. 146 sq.); Grimm, Mohammad, ii. 26 transfers the whole Sūra to the later Meccan period); vi. 140, 149: "They have said: 'What is in the womb of this cattle belongs to the males, and is forbidden to our females'; but if it is ma’at (still born), all have a share in it.... Say: I find in what is revealed to me nothing forbidden, which must not be eaten, except it be ma’at or congealed blood or pork — for this is filth — or a slaughter at which another than Allah is invoked, but if anyone is forced (to eat it) without wishing to commit a transgression or sin, thy heart is merciful and indulgent" (of the third Meccan period); cf. Nöldeke-Schwearl, i. 161; Grimm, ii. 26); ii. 168: "He has forbidden you ma’at blood, pork, and that at which another than Allah is invoked but if anyone is forced (to eat it) without wishing to commit a sin or transgression, it is not reckoned as a sin against him; Allah is merciful and indulgent" (of the year 2 of the Hijra, before the battle of Badr; cf. Nöldeke-Schwearl, i. 178; Grimm, ii. 27): v. 4, 5: "Forbidden to you is ma’at, blood, pork, at which another than Allah is invoked, and which has been strangled, killed by a blow or a fall, or by the horns (of another beast), that which has been eaten with wild beasts — with the exception of that which is made pure — and that which hath been sacrificed to idols.... But if anyone in this hunger is forced to eat of them without wishing to commit a sin, Allah is merciful and indulgent" (in all probability revealed after the victorious pilgrimage of the year 10; cf. Nöldeke-Schwearl, i. 227 ff.; Grimm, ii. 38 dates the Sūra to the year 97).

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

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

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

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

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

Bibliography: Lane, Ar-Engr. Lexikon, R. V.; the books of Hadith and Fikhip; Wenasik, Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition, s. v.; Juynib, Hümeyth 1: 45, s. v. Mehmudanise, Werke, p. 169 sq. (J. Schalch): MAIYAFAŘIKIN, a town in the north-east of Diyarbakr (q.v.). The other Muhammadan forms of the name are Mafarín, Mafārīn, Mafārīn (whence the name of origin al-Farīk) etc. The town is called in Greek Martyropolis, in Syrian Mphetepē, in Armenian Nhpkrēt (later Mhakhn, Mphargn). According to Yâkūt, iv, 703, the old name of the town was Mafarārīn (read *maita nh ālakā in Armenian, "town of the martyrs"). On the identification of Tigranocerta with Māyāfaṛikīn see below.
Geography. The town lies to the south of the little range of the Harez which rises like the first tier of the amphitheatre of the mountains, the higher parts of which consist of the summits (Darkkash, Antok) rising to the south of Mshgh and separating the course of the eastern Euphrates (Muridz-cai) from those of the Tigris and its left bank tributaries.

Maiyafarikin lies 25 miles north of the Tigris and 12 west of the Batman-ku. It is watered by a little river (now called the Farkin-su) which flows into the Batman-ku 12 miles to the southeast, an important left bank tributary of the Tigris which drains the wild and mountainous country south of Mshgh (the cantons of Kulp and Shaghn). The old names of the Batman-ku are Nicephorius (Roman period), Nymphios (Byzantine period), Syriac Kallath, Arabic Sattadam (a word of Aramaic origin transcribed Shithithma in Armenian and explained as “drinker of blood”); Roman. Geog. of the seventh century, Marquart, Erzahlung, p. 161), Armenian Khallir and perhaps Manuqht (Faustus of Byzantium). Some of these identifications, as we shall see, are still uncertain.

Maiyafarikin is the meeting-place of a number of roads from the north following the different streams which go to form the Batman-ku: 1. Cabakhdiq (on the Murudz-cai-Dhul-I-Karram-Lidje-Boishat-Maiyafarikin, 2. Mshgh-Kulp-Peir'in-Maiyafarikin, 3. Mshgh-Koht-Tingirt (Shaghn) Maiyafarikin. Routes 3 and 4 passing Shaghn are still little known. The distance between Deyrakask and Maiyafarikin is about 45 miles. The old road Deyrakask-Bittis, which used to run through Maiyafarikin, now runs farther south and crosses the Batman-ku south of Almasdin (Deyrakask-Sinad-Zek-Weisicharni-Bittis).

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

Ancient History. The mountains to the northeast of Maiyafarikin have long sheltered the remnants of ancient aboriginal peoples. About 600 A.D. Georgius Cyprius (ed. Geiser, p. 48), mentions the Khoshtalai and Sanansoontai there who gave their names to the districts of Koht and Shaghn. Marquart (1916) supposes there are elements of the aboriginal language in names like M-pher-ku and „M-mshgh-ku which are, he says, formed with Caucasion (“Zid-kaukaisch”) prefixes. According to tradition (Yukti, iv, 703), the founder of Martopoly, Martush b. Laytish, was the son of a woman of the mountains, and Marquart sees in Laytish a mutilated form of the name of the people Urug (Hansel Amerogo, 1915, p. 96; 1916, p. 123). The Marzndk Abul Nasr was married to the daughter of Sangerab, lord of the Khoshtalai, cf. Amudrez, on J.R.A.S., 1913; Lehmann-Haupt thinks he can recognize at Maiyafarikin traces of an ancient Assyrian settlement, “eins von Haus aus assyrische Anlage” (Armenien, i, 360, 398).

Tigranocerta = Maiyafarikin (1). As early as 1258 von Moltke had suggested that Maiyafarikin was the ancient Tigranocerta i.e. the new capital founded by Tigranes II about 80 B.C., which was taken by Lucullus after the victory won on the banks of the Nicephorius (Oct. 6, 69 B.C.) and again in the reign of Nero by the legate Corbulus (63 A.D.); it is regularly mentioned down to the middle of the fourth century A.D. Other scholars had sought Tigranocerta at Sirt (d'Anville), Arzun (H. Kiepert, 1873), near Keft-Djiha (Kiepert 1875), at Tell-Armen west of Nisibin (E. Saebus; cf. Dunasier) etc. Late Armenian tradition gives the name Tigranocerta to Deyrakask. Moltke's idea was taken up vigorously by Lehmann-Haupt and W. Belck, after their expedition to Armenia in 1898-99.

On the north wall of Maiyafarikin is a mutilated Greek inscription. It was deciphered and published by Lehmann-Haupt, who attributes it to the Armenian King Pap (369-374), which is quite in keeping with the known facts of the reign of this monarch. In spite of his criticism of the details of Lehmann-Haupt's hypothesis, Marquart (1916) has rather corroborated him by bringing forward new considerations.

In view of the many contradictions found in the classical sources regarding Tigranocerta the question comes to be, if Maiyafarikin is not Tigranocerta, what other unknown town existed here in the time of Pap, unless the stones on which the inscription is engraved and which are now hopelessly disarranged (“in hellosor Verwirrung”) were brought from another place when Martyropolis was being built?

The main objection to the identification of Tigranocerta with Maiyafarikin is that, according to Eutropius, vi. 9, and Faustus, v. 24, Tigranocerta was in Arzunene (Ardzunikh); on the other hand, the river Manuqht seems to have formed in the fourth century the western frontier of this latter province. From this fact (Halbschmied, Die allarmen. Ortsnamen, Indogerman. Forsch., 1904, p. 475-475), it seems that Tigranocerta ought to be placed east of the Batman-ku if this river is identical with the Manuqht. This last name was connected by Marquart with the name al-Musiliya, which Maqaddast, p. 144, gives to one of the tributaries of the Tigris (on the left bank) and apparently corresponding to the Batman-ku. [A district of Musiliya (?) still exists farther east on the upper course of the Birti-cai, in the area of the ancient possessions of the Barik Musili (for: Ksawri, in Yekud, ii. 551-552].

To reconcile the statements of Faustus, iv. 24 and 27, with the position of Maiyafarikin (12 miles W. of the Batman-ku), Marquart proposes to identify the Manuqht = Nicephorius with the Farkin-su while the Musiliya would be applied to the whole system of the Batman-ku (Nymphios, Sattadam etc.). The insignificance of the Farkin-su, which rises in the hills about 3 miles north of Maiyafarikin (Dhul al-Azraq, calls its source Ra'a al-Ain; the Lakiin-nam, p. 437: 'Ain al-Hawj) does not suit the description of the hermitage of Mambri, which, according to Faustus, must have been on the right bank, makes Marquart's hypothesis less attractive. If finally we consider the position of Maiyafarikin from the point of view of the interests of Tigranes, one is forced to admit that against an enemy coming from the west (Lucullus') Tigranocerta = Maiyafarikin was devoid of natural defences, while in the event of an enemy coming from the east it ran the risk of being easily cut off from Armenia on the main road from Birti (the ancient Kastabz Birit'elzw, cf. Tomaschek,
The site is said to have been founded on the site of a "large village" (şarva 'eine) by the bishop Mariṭši, who had obtained the authority of Vardank I of Persia to do so. This ecclesial flourished between c. 583 and 420 (see C. Marquet, op. cit., p. 91-92, 125). The town of Martyropolis to which Mariṭši brought the remains of the Christian martyrs of Persia is mentioned for the first time in 410. The etymology of the Syrian name Mifberk is uncertain (cf. above). In Armenian the town is mentioned for the first time in the Geography of the viith century as Nphr kert (once Nphrèt).

By the peace of 397 with Diodetian, the province of Sophene, within which Martyropolis lay, had become part of the Roman empire. Even after the disastrous peace made by Jovian of 363, Sophene remained to the Emperor, and under theodosius II (401-450), the new town sustained quite near the frontier, acquired considerable importance and became the capital of Sophene (as Great Tsopkh). The town was still insufficiently fortified and it was the Sasanian Kawağh b. Përōz seized it and carried the inhabitants off to Khusistān where they were gathered for the town of Abar-Kobağh (Yakūt, iv, 707) (cf. Amīch-Kawād = Arraqūn; cf. Marquet, Erāšarak, p. 41, 307). Anastasius began the fortification of Martyropolis but Justinian, after his accession (527), was the first to reorganise completely the eastern frontier between Dērzā and Trebîzond. Martyropolis, the headquarters of a commander under the strategos of Theodosiopolis (Erzerum), became one of the most important military centres. From the beginning of the 6th century, the urban development of the town continued, and it became a centre of trade and commerce. In 589 the town fell into the hands of the Sasanians but in 591 came back to the Byzantines in return for the support given by the Emperor Maurice to Khusraw II. Heraclius held it till the year 18 (59) (Yakūt, l.c.). [The date is not given in Muqāt, Chronogr. bar., l.c.]

The vicasituation of Martyropolis probably explain the fact that in the Armenian Geography of the seventh century (ed. Patkanow, trans., p. 45; Marquet, Erāšarak, p. 18 and 161) the Persian province of Abznikār (Arranēnē) is separated from Tsopkh (Sophene) by the line of the Khatišt (Baştān-ç, while in the description of parts of Armenia Nphret (= Npherkert) figures as one of the 10 cantons of Arranēnē.

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

Under Islam. In 13 (640) in the reign of the caliph Umar, Mayfârîkîn was taken by 'Abd al-Ghānim without a blow being struck (Balâqār, p. 175-6) and henceforth shared the lot of Diyarbakr.

The intermediate character of the position occupied by Mayfârîkîn puzzled Arab geographers. Ibn Rusta, p. 106, puts the town in Djêydar and the others (Ibn Hawqal, p. 246) regard it as belonging to Armenia. According to these authors, Mayfârîkîn was a little fortified town having an unhealthy climate on account of the stagnant water but not without its amenities (Isqārāt, p. 76); Ibn Hawqal, p. 131, 131, 132; Muṣnaṣṣat, p. 54). The region (gyqāʾ as-bālā) of Mayfârîkîn and Aras in the time of Ibn Hawqal was however entirely depopulated.

The Hamdānids and the Buīyids. Mayfârîkîn formed part of the territory of the Hamdânids (q.v., 317-394). They built a castle (bāṣ) there near the gate Bāb al-Farâbawī, the gate (Yalūk); its ruins are apparently mentioned by Ewīya (1655), iv, 71-4 under the name Saif al-Dawla Sarayāt. The Bāb al-Mulân gate also dates from Saif al-Dawla (333-356). This prince was buried at Mayfârîkîn; cf. al-Qāmīs, p. 437. In 352, Naṣr, a client of the Hamdānids, rebelled in Mayfârîkîn. In 362 (July 4, 973) Hībat Allāh b. Naṣr al-Dawla defeated the Byzantines in the vicinity of the town.

In 367 (978) the Buīyids Aẓūd al-Dawla disposed the Hamdânids who had supported his cousin Bakhtyâr and in 368 Abu l-Wâfi, a general of Aẓūd al-Dawla, took Mayfârîkîn (Ibn Miskawich, ed. Amorosi, ii, 199, 266, 314, 384).

The Marvânids dynasty. After the death of Aẓūd al-Dawla (374), Mayfârîkîn and the rest of Diyarbakr fell into the power of the Kurf Bādī (cf. KURDISCH and MAWĀNID) who had the Dailami garrison of Mayfârîkîn massacred and was able to defend what he held against the Buīyīd Şamshān al-Dawla, who had meanwhile returned to Mawāl. After the death of Bādī, his nephew, Abu Allā Ḥasan b. Marwān, established himself in Mayfârîkîn and for a century this town remained the capital of the Marvânids (350-479 and again in 586). In 384 the governor Mammûz, appointed by Abu Allā, succeeded in checking the turbulence of the inhabitants who had been incited by Hamdânī lullabies. There is an inscription of Mumahhid
al-Dawla dated 391 (1000) on the wall of the town. In 520 an 'Alid pretender again stirred up trouble in Maysafirin. In 401 after the assassination of Mumahid al-Dawla, his murdered Sharwa, son of Mammil, with the help of his Georgian guards seized Maysafirin but Saliq Abi 'Nasr came from Aran and began his long and brilliant reign (401-453).

A fine castle decorated with gilding was built in 403 on the little hill on which stood the convent and sanctuary of the Virgin. This Christian sanctuary (the connection of which with the al-'Aqṣā mosque is not quite clear, cf. above) was transferred to the Melkite church. Later they built a hospital, a mosque with a clock (houalla < Pers. ʿānqā) and baths. Water was led to all the town from the spring of Raʾs al-Ain. A palace was built on the banks of the Sīrādah (Baṣāma-ūn) and the water was raised to it from the river by a noria. A bridge spanned the river Hawr (Hasā). A well frequented by Saliq Abi 'Nasr al-Munṣi endowed the mosque (mouk) at Maysafirin with a library. A fort was built to protect the town against the Sasanian (people of al-Sāʿūn).

This list from Ibn 'Abd al-Aziz is supplemented by the statements of Nāṣir-i Khwāzūm, who visited the town under Abi 'Nasr on the 6th Djamād 2 (438). The Persian traveller speaks of walls, built of huge blocks of white stone (Ibn Miskawī, ii. 354: “strong walls of black stone”; Lehmann-Haupt: “gelbhüttener Kalkstein”), the western gate all of iron, the Friday mosque, the water-channels passing before each house (one uncovered with drinking water and the other covered serving as a sewer). Outside the town were the caravanserais, the hot baths, and a second covered mosque. To the north of the town was the suburb of Muhāsah, also with a Friday mosque and baths. A distance of a farsāk from the town (on the bank of the Sīrādah) was a new little town called Naṣīfīn built by the emir then reigning.

After the death of Abi 'Nasr, who was buried in the town, the Sālijūq began to interfere in the affairs of Maysafirin. In 438 Sallās Khurāsānī sent by Tughrīh arrived before the town with 5,000 horsemen. In 463 it was visited by the celebrated Nāṣir al-Mulk. In 478 by orders of Malik Shāh the former vizier of the Mawāsids, Ibn Ḫūshir, besieged the capital of his masters, which surrendered in Djamād 2 (478). The treasures of the Mawāsids valued at 4,000,000 dinars were carried off by Ibn Ḫūshir. In 482, 'Aḍī al-Dawla, son of Ibn Ḫūshir, was appointed governor of Maysafirin. After the death of Malik-shāh (485), the Mawāsids Naṣir al-Dawla succeeded in re-entering Maysafirin, but the Sālijūq Tugāt of Syria took the town in Rabīʿ I 486; cf. Ibn Arāj in Amurād, J. E.A.S., 1903. In 534 (Ibn al-Albhī, ii. 435) the last representatives of the Mawāsids family disappeared from the neighbourhood of Maysafirin.

The Ţūrijīs and the Ayyūbīs. In 575 (1181) the Sālijūq Sultan Mahmūd added to the possessions of II-Ghāzī, founder of the line of Ţūrijīs of Mosul, the lord of Maysafirin, to which II-Ghāzī appointed his son Salmān (516-518); cf. Abu'l Faradj, ed. Pocock, p. 249 and Kāmil Fardī, Mawāsids Mūsāt-ī Ţūrijīs [Arabic] (Istanbul, 1913) (written in 942-4357), ed. Al-'Amīr ʿEmīrī, Constantinople 1331, p. 20. Six successive Ţūrijīs ruled Maysafirin till 589 (1184). In 587 (1191) the last Ortukīd Yūmān Arādnī again seized the town and held it for a time.

In 581 the Ayyūbīs had become masters of Maysafirin and held it till 638 (1240). Sālijūq al-Dīn built a mosque there for which the columns of the Byzantine basilica were used (Gertrude L. Bell, op. cit., Pl. xl.). Maysafirin had a mint under the Ayyūbīs: the coins which they struck (dated 591, 599, 600, 614, 618) bear curious human figures which are portraits of symbolical personages (Ghilâb Bāhmūn, Catalogue de monnaies turcomanes, tl. vii. n.s., Constantinople, 1894, p. 439-467; S. Lane-Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. iv., p. 355; see vol. iii., p. 24 for a Marāwīd coin of this mint). On the walls of the town are inscriptions of the following Ayyūbīs: Aḥmad Naṣīm al-Ayyūbī (of 600 a.d.), Malik Aḥmad Mīsīr (607-617), Malik Mūṣṭafā Ghāzī (623), Malik Kāmil Maḥmūd (654). A complete list of rulers at Maysafirin from 315 to 658 prepared by van Berchem is given in the appendix to Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien, p. 134.

The Mongols. In 659 (1261) the Ayyūbī Shāhī al-Dīn Ghāzī had received the summons from the Mongol Khātān to submit and raise the tribute of the town but gave an evasive answer. In 660 (1262) the Mongols occupied the country round Maysafirin. During Hūlagū's expedition to Syria in 668 (1270) the army of the prince Vaghnāt besieged Maysafirin which was defended with great bravery by Malik al-Kāmil. The blockade produced a terrible famine in the town which was forced to surrender. Only 70 of the defenders survived. Kāmil put to death in cruel fashion and his head carried on the point of a lance through the streets of Damascus (Rashīd al-Dīn ed. Quatremère, p. 330-331, 350-375; d'Ohsnow, Histoire des Mongols, iii. 354). Before his death, in 662 (1264), Hūlagū gave the district of Dīyarbakr to his general Tuḥān (cf. above), three years later, Aḥṣā al-Tawfīq al-Maysafīrī to his father's widow, Kūsāy-Khatun. Maysafirin later lost its independence and henceforth shared the lot of Dīyarbakr [q.v.]

In 706 during Timūr's stay at Mārḍīn, a number of Maliks including those of Aram (Ar'i) and Baṭmīn came to pay him homage but the Zafār-nīmā (I. 665) does not mention the lord of Maysafirin. After the conquest of Dīyarbakr, Timūr on his way to Māt in took the road via Maysafirin (ibid., I. 685) and Śewān (the name of a summit in al-Sūrī east of al-Antak). This march is the only example of a considerable force following the direct road Maysafirīn-Mughān.

The Saławīds and the Ottomans. Our information about the rule of the Turkish dynasty ( Kara-Koyunlu and Al-Koyunlu) in the region of Dīyarbakr is still very deficient. In pursuit of his campaign against the last Al-Koyunlu Murād, Shāh Ismāʿīl I Saławī in 915 occupied all the region of Dīyarbakr, the government of which was entrusted to Khān Maḥmūd Ustālūj (Shahrnūb, I. 408; 'Alamü-arūṣ, p. 23-25). The defeat at Cālīfān produced risings against the Persians throughout Kurdistan. The Kurd chief Saliy Ahmad Beg Rāzākī seized Maysafirīn and at Aṭāk (Hārnāh, cf. the Karšūr Arzāxī of Georgios Cyprus), Maysafirīn passed definitely under Ottoman rule after the battle (941) of Koc-Ḥūr (south of Mārḍīn) in which the Persian general Kara-Khān was defeated (von Hammer, G.O.B.S., i. 731-741).
Köpr. 1344, fol. 212v—315v, upon which Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi in Ḥid al-Farādī (Cairo 1305), I. 380 sqq. and al-Ṭarīqī, Siyar al-Mulūb (Buitrago 1289), p. 32 sqq. have again drawn. The word 'Dhikra' came to have the more general meaning of lecture, e.g. in Mas'dī, Marājī al-Dhahab (ed. Paris), v. 431, and perhaps also Dhibis, K. al-Bukhārī, p. 212, 17, where it appears along with poetry, proverbs and tales of battles as an essential element in Arab education. In the third century A.D., however, the word began to sink from this higher sphere; it became the name for a beggar's appeal, which had to be framed in carefully chosen language, more the literary training of the adhā, once a privilege of court circles, became disseminated among the people; an example of these appeals is preserved by Dhibis in Bahāʾī, K. al-Makāmān wa l-Maṣāḥiḥ (ed. Schwally), p. 513 sqq. The appeals of beggars seem to have paved the way for the literary genre proper (cf. A. Masʿūd, ʿAlī al-Kāẓim, p. xxii/xxiv). This owes its existence to Hamadhānī [q. v.]. He created a typical representative of this literary Bohemianism to which he himself belonged, which entered upon the inheritance of the adhā poets of the early days of Islam, like al-Ḥujjat. The very witty execution of the constantly changing part of his hero Abū l-Fath al-Iṣkandārī and from the point of view of form the adoption for his tales of rhymed prose, which was already beginning to dominate the finer style of letter-writing, are the two special characteristics of Hamadhānī's work. To the hero himself, too, he gave the person of a narrator, ʿIṣa b. Ḥājīm, who sometimes appears instead in the role of a trickster, as in makāmā 12. In the 7th also — one of the poorest of the way — in which a certain Ḥusayn b. Badr al-Faṣ Finite records a, i.e. have found in Dhuʾl-Rawāni, the principal hero takes no part. Six of these stories are only intended to glorify his patron, Kahlāf b. Abal-Rahem ruler of Sudjātan, to whom as Marguoiloth supposes (cf. fumajūlī) the whole collection was dedicated. Sometimes he only uses the makāmā form to give expression to his own views on literary questions, e.g. for example, in the first on ancient and modern poets, in the fourteenth on the masters of prose, al-Dhibis and Ibn al-Muṣṭafā in the 25th makāmā, another in which al-Iṣkandārī does not appear, he puts his polemic against the Muʿāṭīla in the mouth of a madman. He does not always make al-Iṣkandārī appear as a rogue but in the 45th makāmā he displays a knowledge of the world which is quite innocent of guilt. No. 26 (Syrian, lacking in the Baritt edition) and 31 (the Rusafī, incomplete in the Hāriri edition) contain specimens of erotic language and cant-language; of purely lexicographical interest is makāmā 30, edited and elucidated by Alward in Chahif al-Alonga, I. 555 sqq., which also with a competition instituted by Saif al-Dawla for the best description of a horse. The last (No. 52 in the Hāriri edition) is of quite another character and has only the rhymed prose in common with the makāmā proper; it is on this account classed with nine other anecdotes as makāmā in the Stambuł edition and put in an appendix.

How far al-Ḥāfiz's statement quoted above, a.v. Hamadhānī, that al-Hamadhānī got the idea from Ibn Daniūl's Ārābātī is true cannot be ascertained as this work has not survived. In any case he is entitled to the credit of having created a new literary form, which might have proved very fertile in Arabic literature which is not exactly rich in forms. It is perhaps impossible to appreciate his talent fully if we may believe the tradition that the 53 specimens that have survived to us and which were apparently all that were known to al-Ḥariri represent only about an eighth of his whole output. His contemporaries and immediate successors were however not able to follow him on the path he had indicated. One only of his contemporaries, the court poet of Saif al-Dawla, Abū Naṣr, Abū ʿAbd al-Aʿīs b. ʿUmar al-Saʿdī († 405—939), has left us a makāmā (Alward, Vers. der ar, Händschr. Berlin, in No. 8536). Not till a century later do Ibn ʿAbd al-Ghaffār and al-Ḥarīrī again take up the form created by him. The former (Abu ʿĪsā al-Ḥāfiz Abī Aḥūf, Abhū al-Bāhlā Alī Muhammad b. Ḥusayn b. 15th Dhu ʿl-Ḥaḍa[1] (March 12, 1020) in Baghāh, d. 4 Muḥarram 485 (Febr. 15, 1021), of whose other poetical and philological work nothing has come down to us, does not keep strictly to the model created by al-Hamadhānī in the nine makāmās preserved in a Stambul MS. (Fātāl 4097; M.O., vii. 112) as much as he does not have one hero all through and also introduces various persons as narrators, but the main point is the polished form, in which he tells his story otherwise remarkable stories (cf. Ch. Huard, Les dōars d'ʿAlī Nūyī, T. A., ser. 10, vol. xi., 1908, p. 453—454, and the edition by O. Rescher, in Beiträge zur Magusus-Literatur, Heft 4, Stambul 1914, 125—153). It is not till al-Ḥarīrī [q. v.] that the makāmā revives as such. In the latter at the same time considerably limited its subject matter in such a way as to make the anecdotes recorded by al-Ḥarīrī b. Ḥammān centre round a hero, Abū Zeid of Sārinj, and relates the adventures of this Bohemian, whose wit is never at a loss and who is able to meet all difficulties, in a style sparkling with wit and full of all the tricks of language. That he owed the stimulus to his work to an encounter with a real tramp may be legend; al-Subkī, Taḥāṣī al-Shaykhī (1926, in Ibn Tarnūgbīrī, iii. 23), says he was a Bashār al-Maguerī (Ibn Tarnūgbīrī says al-Manṣurī) b. Sallār (cf. D. Damās, Le hēros des maganīn de Harīrī, Abū Zeid de Senūjī, Algiers 1917). The story at least may be quite true that the Makāmā al-Harāmīya said to be inspired by this meeting was the first of its kind. In any case Ḥarīrī's tricks of rhetoric (cf. the analysis in Crussard, Études sur les dōars de H., Paris 1923) so overshadowed his subject matter in the eyes of later generations that henceforth the form became the essential characteristic of the literary genre, and it could be used to cover the crudest variety of material, as in later generations it became the characteristic literary genre, and it could be used to cover the crudest variety of matter. Al-Qanārī (d. 505 = 1111) and Abū ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Samʿānī (d. 505 = 1117) in their Makāmāh al-ʿUṣnān bāna yadda al-Kaḥfī (Alward, Vers. der Hafs, Berlin 4537, 1) and Makāmāh al-ʿUṣnān bāna yadda al-Kaḥfī (Balādī Khafifa, N. 147a) attempt to go back to the original form. But the Spanish Almār al-Tāhir Muhammad b. Yūsuf al-Anjūkāna (d. 535 = 1143) in Cordovero's version gives us a makāmā to have come nearer to Harīrī in his Makāmāh al-Qaṣrānīyya (in Stambul, Lalliet, N. 1928, 1923). He also set himself the classical number of 50. Al-Zamakhi (d. 538 = 1143) on the other hand disregards
such affinity; his makāmās are simply moral admonitions and like their counterparts the Nusḥātā al-ˤAlamī and the Aḥqāq al-Dhakhīr, are intended to be appreciated mainly as tours-de-force of rhetoric (cf., for ed. Berlin, 1345). But the translation by Lechler, in Beltrana sur Maqāmāt-Litteratur, Heft 6, Greifswald 1891, whether the Maqāmāt al-ʕāliyā of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardi (d. 587 = 1191), which deal with mystic terminology (cf. Cat. of MSS. Brit. Mus., No. 1349, 23), belong to this class at all is doubtful. On the other hand, the Maqāmāt al-Dīwānīyāh fi ˤal-Mašrīq al-ʕāliyā (Leyden, No. 426, Cambridge, No. 1098, Escurial, Dérenburg, No. 542), which the author Ibn al-Dajwīzī (d. 597 = 1200) himself provided with a lexicographical commentary, are certainly modelled on those of Ḥarīrī. The al-Maṣḥūmāt al-Maḥfūzāt of the Christian physician Abu ʿl-:selected text here, def., p. 551) definitely prefers to be a single imitation of the latter; they have a hero and a narrator but the subject matter is varied, usually of a learned and technical nature (cf. Flügel, Verz. der Hist. Wtsch, No. 384). To the end of the sixth century A.H. it seems to belong to Abu ʿl-ʾAlāʾ Ahmad b. Abī Bakr b. Abī al-ʾAlawi al-Ḥasanī who dedicated 30 makāmās to the chief ʿṣīlī Muhīl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Muhammad b. Muhammad b. al-ʾAlawi al-Shāhrazūrī (not the same as mentioned in Ibn Khallīkān, Rūyāt 1399, l. 597). The only indication of his date is the mention of the Ḥājīr of Shirwān (51:1); this title was first borne by Maḥmūd II, about 550 A.H. (cf. iv., p. 384). His aim is to imitate Hamshābī and Ḥarīrī but to use simpler language. Like them he introduces his hero and a narrator and is fond of elaborate descriptions, frequently dropping into the obscene; a number of the makāmās go together in pairs, the one being complementary to the other (cf. the edition in O. Rescher, Der Tưibī sur Maqāmāt-Litteratur, Heft 4, p. 1—115). Of the eighth century A.H. we only need mention an imitation of Ḥarīrī's makāmās, 50 in number, dedicated to the family of Dīwānī (cf. its Tārīkh al-Ẓāḥib, ed. Mīrā Mūḥammad G. M. S. xvi, l. iii., note 2) by Shams al-Dīn Maʿādhī (Maḥmūdī) b. Naṣr al-Ḥamīd b. al-ʾAlawi in 672 (1275) (Ḥājījī al-Khālīfī, No. 12709) entitled al-Maṣḥūmāt al-Zainīyāt (s. Brit. Mus., No. 669, 1403; Stambul, Nīr-i ʿOghmānīa, No. 4273). The Syrian Egyptian poet Mūḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Dīn al-Tashkisi al-Ẓāḥib al-Zarīl (d. 688 = 1289) applied the form in the field of love-poetry, sometimes with lascivious subject (Maṣḥūmāt al-ʿAlīyā, No. 3847). Fāṭḥū al-Maḥīṣī Makāḥāt al-Maḥīṣī and al-Maṣḥūmāt al-Hitiyā wa l-ʕāliyā, Ahlward, Ver. Hist. Berlin, No. 8594, 4: 5). These imitations become more numerous in the ninth century. In 730 (1339) ʿAbd al-Muṭṭāf al-ʾAlawi composed al-Maṣḥīmāt al-ʿAlīyā wa l-Qāḍīyā (tr. Tunis 1303, Les douze chants de Chérīz A. H. M. al-Maḥīṣir, publ. by M. Sullivan al-Harain, Paris 1828 [1853]). The form was occasionally used for religious subjects, e.g. by Abu ʿl-Fath Mūḥammad b. Sāyid al-Miṣr (d. 734 = 1334) in praise of the Prophet and his companions in al-Maṣḥīmāt al-ʿAlīyā fi l-Kāramāt al-ʕāliyā (s. Rosen, Neues sammlung al-Maṣḥūmāt ..., No. 225, 4: 4; St Petersburg, No. 126, No. 146, 42), for mysticism by Shams al-Dīn Mūḥammad b. ʿAlīm al-Dīnābādī (d. 747 = 1347) in al-Maṣḥīmāt al-ṣāḥīfāyā wa l-Tarbiyāt al-ʕāliyā, in number 50 (Cambridge 1102), and again for the panegyric in 749 (1349) by Zān al-Dīn ʿOmar b. al-Ẓāfīr in the makāmā on the plague of which he died in the same year entitled al-Naḥāj wa ʿl-Wahī (Ahlward, Berlin, No. 8550, probably identical with the maḳāmā which Shūrī put in his work on the plague). The maḳāmā was adopted for the panegyric by the Meccaḥī Abī ʿl-Nāṣr al-Ḥājīr in his al-Maṣḥīmāt al-ʿAlīyā wa l-Tarbiyāt al-ʿAlīyā in honour of the Manṣūrī Ṣāḥīb al-Ḥākīm (906-922 = 1500—1516; s. Persch, Verz. der Hist. Gotha, No. 4773). The great encyclopedist of the ninth century, al-Ṣūrī, naturally did not omit this form of composition, which he used with complete confidence for its traditional use to treat of subjects from the most varied branches of knowledge, religious as well as profane, e.g. the question of the fate of Muhāmmād's parents in the other world, the merits of different perfumes, flowers and fruits; nor did he hesitate to use it for obscene subjects (cf. the article ʿālīyā where the printed editions are given). His contemporary, the South Arabian Ẓāhid ʿIsābām b. Mūḥammad al-Ḥādīwī b. al-Warīr (d. 914 = 1508), used the maḳāmā for theological instruction in al-Maṣḥūmāt al-ṣāḥīfāyā wa l-ʕāliyā wa al-Ṣīqāh al-ḥādīwī (Leyden, No. 438; Brill-Ital., No. 67), as did Shūrī's rival Abī ʿl-Muṭṭāf b. Mūḥammad in laṣīāt al-Ṣādātī (d. 923 = 1517). The maḳāmā of the al-ʿArīsīyya (Stambul, Kūsūlī, No. 784). Even in the centuries when literature was at a low level, the ʿAlīyā and ʿAlīyā, the maḳāmā was still used for the most varied purposes. In 1078 (1667) Dājwīzī al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Fath b. Alawīn al-Kābrī composed a maḳāmā on the war then being waged by the lords of Bāṣṭ al-Husain, Pāsha and ʿAlī Pāsha, when he elucidates in the commentary Zāw ad-Maṣḥīmārī (Brīt. Mus., No. 1045—6, Bāghdād 1924), used by R. Mīnqūn in his History of Modern Bengal, p. 269—286; s. St. H. Longroiy, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq, Oxford 1925, p. 328). His compatriot Abī ʿl-Khāīr Abī ʿl-Raḥmān (d. 1300 = 1786) used the form to string together a series of old and new proverbs in a witty context (Maṣḥūmāt al-ʿAlīyā al-Siṣīrīa, Cairo, 1340, No. 1215) and the same in al-Maṣḥūmāt al-ʿAlīyā wa l-ʿAlīyā, Berlin, No. 8582—83). An imitation of the maḳāmā in 50 anecdotes, the scene of which is laid in India, of an Abu ʿl-Zafar al-Hindī al-Sīyāṣī, which al-Nāṣir b. Fāṭūb narrates was finished in 1228 (1715) by ʿAlī b. Abī Bakr b. Mūḥammad Bābdī al-ʿAlawī (lit. at the Māfī al-Ulm Press 1264 entitled al-Maṣḥūmāt al-Ḥasnāwī, 9. M. Hidayat al-Husnān, Catalogue raisonnable of the Süleimān Library, l. 459). Ḥarīrī himself had already allowed his art to degenerate to mere juggling with words, when he used in the Rūyāt al-Sīnāyā wa l-ʕāliyā, not included among the maḳāmās, in the columns of the words with ṣīn and in the other only those with ṣīn (just as a contemporary of Simonides had written a Greek hymn without a sigma in it, cf. Wilhelm, Kultur d. Gegenwart, i., lll. 49); also al-Ḥanāfī's maḳāmās contain such juggling with words; Abī ʿl-ʾAlāʾ b. ʿAbd al-Ḥārīm (d. 1184 = 1770) wrote al-Maṣḥūmāt al-Ṭahurātīyā wa l-ʕāliyā in which the words are arranged in pairs only distinguishable by their diacritical points.
Finally the metropolitan of Nisibī 'Abdihū (Ebodēghū) who died in 1318, composed in 1290–91 on Harṭī’s model 50 Syriac poems, religious and edifying in their subject matter in two parts, called after Etoch and Eblis, the artificial language of which he himself elucidated in a commentary in 1316 (the first half: Parādixūnā Edīnən sar Parādixūn Edīnin ₃ərəmən, ed. Gabriel Cardahl, Basle 1880).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(C. Brockelmann)
and asked Washam, the brother and successor of Māzdāwīd, to surrender the province to him which he did. Henceforth very friendly relations were established between them on the strength of which Māzin threw off the yoke of Bugāā. When Amir Naṣr b. Ahmad learnt this, he despatched Ahmad, the commander of the army of Khurān, against Māzin who was defeated after a desperate struggle of 7 months and forced to flee to Washam at Ra'y. Ahmad followed him thither, and defeated the combined forces of Māzin and Washam at Injīshkāh (near Ra'y) on 21st Rabī' 1, 329 (December 25, 949 a.d.). Māzin was shot in the head by an arrow and fell dead. His head was cut off and sent to Bukhārā.


**MAKARI. [See MAHARI.]

**MAKDISHŪ, a town in East Africa, on the shores of the Indian Ocean, capital of Italian Somaliland. Population 21,000. Setting aside the question of some ruins perhaps South-Arabian, Makdishū arose in the 5th century a.d. as an Arabian colony. The immigrations of the Arabs reached Makdishū in different times successively, and from different regions of the Arabian peninsula, the most remarkable one coming from al-Akhār on the Persian Gulf, probably during the struggles of the Caliphate with the Romans. Papyrus, at the same time also Persian groups emigrated to Makdishū; and even to-day some inscriptions which have been found in the town demonstrate that Persians from Sīrvān and Nakaḥlrā were dwelling there during the Middle Ages. These foreign merchants were, however, obliged to unite themselves politically against the nomadic (Somali) tribes that surrounded Makdishū on every side; and eventually against other invaders from the sea. Therefore a federation was concluded in the same 6th century a.d. and composed of thirty-nine clans: 12 from the Māziī tribe; 13 from the Ḍilāfī tribe; six from the 'Akbārī tribe; six from the 'Issālī and three from the 'Affī tribe. The trade was even more developed under such conditions of internal peace; then in the town the Māziī clans acquired a religious supremacy and, having adopted the Māziī, the 'Abbāsī 'Aqīfī, formed a kind of dynasty of 'Abūlāmī and obtained from the other tribes the privilege that the 'Abūlāmī of the federation should be elected only from among themselves.

But, in the second half of the 6th century, 'Abū Bakr b. Fakhr al-Dīn established in Makdishū a hereditary Sultānate with the aid of the Māziī clans whom the new Sultān recognized again the privilege of giving the Sultān to the town. During the reign of Shāhīk 'Abī Bakr b. 'Umar, in the year 1332 a.d., Makdishū was visited by Ibn Battīṭa, who described very carefully its conditions in his Rihla. Shāhīk 'Abī Bakr b. 'Umar was probably a Sultān from the family of 'Abū Bakr b. Fakhr al-Dīn; and under this dynasty Makdishū reached in the 15th century the highest degree of prosperity. Its name is quoted even in the *Maqṣūf ilā Mīrāf*, a book by the king of Abyssinia Zara' Ya'qūb, with reference to the battle fought by the same king against the Mussul- men at Gomut, December 23rd 1445 a.d. In the 16th century a.d. the dynasty of the Muzzafar succeeded to the dynasty of Fakhr al-Dīn. However, in the region of the Wēh Shābelī, viz. the true commercial hinterland of Makdishū, the Adhārān (Somali), who had constituted there another Sultānate friendly and allied with Makdishū, were defeated by the nomadic Ḥaẃī (Somali) who conquered that territory. Thus Makdishū was cut off by the Bedouins from the interior of the land and began to decline from its prosperity. The colonial enterprises of the Portuguese and the British in the Indian Ocean hastened even more this decadence. Vasco da Gama, when he came back from India in 1499 a.d., assailed unsuccessfully Makdishū with his squadron; and even Da Cunha in 1507 a.d. did not succeed in occupying the town. In 1532 a.d. Makdishū was visited by Dom Estevam da Gama, son of Vasco, who came there to build a ship. In December 5, 1700 a.d. a British squadron of men-of-war stopped threateningly before Makdishū but they did not land any force and after some days went away probably to India. During the wars between the Portuguese and the Ilam of 'Omn, Makdishū and other towns on the Somali coast were occupied by the soldiers of 'Ilam of Sultān 'Abūlāmī (died 1704); but after a little while the 'Ilam ordered his troops to come back to 'Omn.

In the meantime the Sultanate of Makdishū was practically finished; and the town divided in two quarters (Jama'a-Wes and Shangiī), each of them being inhabited by civil wars. The Somali had so penetrated, little by little, into the ancient Arabian town that the clans of Makdishū changed their Arabic names with new Somali appellatives; the 'Akhārī clan became the 'Abī Shāhī; the 'Ilāfī clan were called 'Sān-dīshī', the 'Affī took the name of 'Gūm-māna' and even the Māziī ('Aqīfī) changed their name for the Somali 'Abī Fakhrī'. But in the 17th century a.d., the Bedouins (Somali) Dān-dālla, excited by exaggerated traditions of the wealth of Makdishū, assailed and conquered the town. The chief of the Dān-dālla, who had the title of 'Ilam, established himself in the Shangiī quarter; and the privilege of the Khājālī about the election of the Shāhīk was again recognised by the new masters of the town. In the first half of the 18th century the Sultān of 'Abūlāmī occupied Makdishū and ruled the town by means of a Shāhīk. In 1889 the Sultan of Zanjījar leased the town to Italy, who afterwards in 1906 bought all the settlements of Zanjījar on the Somali coast.

Makhzin (ጉን), from ከሃግዑር, "to shut up, to preserve, to board". The word is believed to have been first used in North Africa as an official term in the second century AD. It is applied to an iron chest in which the French b. Al-Aghlab, emir of Ifrikiya, kept the sums of money raised by taxation and intended for the Abbassid caliph of Baghdad. At this time, which in Morocco is now synonymous with the government, was applied more particularly to the financial department, the Treasury.

It may be said that the term makhzen meaning the Moroccan government and everything more or less connected with it at first meant simply the place where the sums raised by taxation were kept, intended to be paid into the treasury of the Muslim community, the al-māl. Later, when the sums thus raised were kept for use in the countries in which they were collected and were no longer paid into the treasury of the Muslim community, and they became as it were, the private treasuries of the communities in which they were collected, the word makhzen was used to mean the separate local treasuries and a certain amount of confusion arose between the makhzen and the ḍālī al-māl.

We do find in Spain the expression 'abd al-makhzen but it still means slave, of the treasury.
rather than slave of the government, and it seems that it was only later in Morocco that in proportion as the state became separated from the whole Muslim community after being successively under the Omeyyads of Damascus, the 'Abdulids of Bagdad, the Omeyyads of Spain and the Fatimids of Egypt that the word mahzen came to be used for the government itself.

To sum up, the word mahzen, after being used for the place where the sums intended for the bit al-nil of the Muslim community were kept was used for the local treasury of the Muslim community of Morocco, when it became separate under the great Berber dynasties: later with the Sharifite dynasties the word was applied not only to the treasury, but to the whole organisation or less administrative which lived on the treasury, that it is to say the whole government of Morocco. In tracing through history the changes in the meaning of the word mahzen, one comes to the conclusion that not only is the institution to which it is applied not religious in character but on the contrary it represents the combined usurpations of powers, originally religious, by laymen, at the expense of which it has grown up through several centuries. The result of these successive usurpations is that the mahzen which originally was only a chest in the treasury came to mean first the treasury itself, and the government and to represent to the Moroccan the sole principle of authority.

We know that the fundamental principle of Muslim society is that of the community: the head of this community is simply an administrator who has to exercise his functions, say the caliph ‘Omar, like an honest teacher, solely concerned with the interests of his pupils. Of this ideal the one part remaining in practice is that the members of the community are effectively in tutelage. In rapidly surveying the history of the Mahzen, we can see how this arbitrary government became gradually established while using the prescriptions of Islam, and how it succeeded in forming in face of the native Berber element which surrounded it a kind of Arab facade, behind which the Berbers in spite of the slowness of their gradual Islamisation, have preserved their institutions, superstitions and their independence. In this connection it cannot be too strongly emphasised that, in spite of their perhaps disputable orthodoxy, the Berbers are Muslims and consider that they belong to the Muslim community. No doubt they do not practice it very often but they have the pride of Islam and its intolerance; they have taken Muslim elements into the service of their native savagery and it would be a dangerous error to think that they could be open to anti-Muslim sentiments and particularly to imagine that their religious belligerence ought to make them favourable to us.

No organisation was made at the first conquest by 'Ojba b. Nafi in 63 (652 A.D.). All the representatives of Arab culture had to do was to levy heavy tribute in money and slaves to satisfy their own greed: and to enable them to send valuable gifts to the caliph of Damascus.

It was the same in 90 (705) with Musul b. Nusair but the conquest of Spain brought over to Ibadin a large number of Berber tribes by promising them a share in plundering the wealth of the Visigoths. On the other hand the exactions of the Arabs and the desire to escape the demands of the caliph facilitated the spread of Khartjiji doctrines, the many schools of which made any unity of power impossible and on the contrary increased decentralisation.

The Idrisid dynasty, which its Sharifite origin gives a claim to be the first Muslim dynasty of Morocco and which completed the conversion of the country to Islam only exercised its power over a small part of Morocco. Alongside of it the Barmawati [A.D. 975-1227] heretics and numerous Khartjiji emirs continued to exist. The Zentia, Mleka, Maghrawa and Banat Irin at a later period were no more able to effect a centralisation of power. It was not till the sixth century A.D. (11th A.D.) under the Sanjaridi dynasty of the Almohads that in the reign of Ya‘qub b. Tashfin we can see the beginning of a mahzen which only becomes clearly recognised under the Almohad dynasty.

It was under the latter that religious unity was first attained in Morocco. The heresy of the Barghawati and all other schisms were destroyed and a single Muslim community, that of the Almohads, replaced the numerous more or less heterodox sects which had been sharing the country and its revenues. It may be said that the organisation of the mahzen which we found in Morocco is fundamentally based on this unification and the measures which resulted from it. The Almohads regarded theirs as the only true Muslim community. All who did not belong to it were infidels whom it was lawful to fight, to kill, to reduce their women and children to slavery and to seize their goods and lands for the benefit of the Almohads, the only orthodox community. The Almohads were thus able to apply to all the territory of their empire the ideal Muslim principle of dealing with land, i.e. that all the lands conquered by them from non-Almohads and even from Almohads whose faith was regarded as suspect were classed as lands taken from infidels and became qubbas of the Muslim i.e. Almohad community. These qubbas districts were those whose occupants have to pay the tax called kharad. In order to levy this the Sultan ‘Abd al-Mu‘min had all his African empire surveyed from Gubes to the Wadi Nain.

A few years later Ya‘qub al-Mansur brought to Morocco the Almoravids and Banat Hilal Arabs and settled them on lands belonging to the Muslim community, which had been unoccupied since the destruction of the Barghawati, the wars of the Almohads with the last Almoravids and large despatches of troops to Spain. These Arab tribes who formed the qalsh (pronounced giel in Morocco) of the Almohads did not pay the kharad for the lands of the Muslim community which they occupied. They were Mahzen tribes who rendered military service in place of kharad. We shall find later the remains of this organisation with the giel tribes and the tribes of mawd. The efforts of the Mawatu to reconstitute a giel with their own tribes did not succeed and they had to return to the mahzen of Arab tribes brought to Morocco by Ya‘qub al-Mansur and even added to it contingents of the Mall Arab tribes of Sīḥs.

Under the Banat Wajīla this movement became more marked and Spanish influences became more and more felt in the more complicated organisation of the central Mahzen and by the creation of new offices at the court and in the palace.
The conquests by the Christians caused the development of the sâdâs and the fall of the Banû Watîân brought about the rise of the Sa'dâns [q.v.], of Wadî Darâ. The latter with their primitive manners as Saharan tribes and under the religious influence of the shâkîn of the brotherhoods began to try to bring back the exercise of power to the patriarchal simplicity with which it was wielded in the early days of Islam. The necessities of the government, the intrigues of the tribes and the wars of members of the ruling family against one another soon made necessary the constitution of a proper makhzen with its military tribes, ministers, its crown officials of high and low degree, its governors to whom were soon added the innumerable groups of palace officials which will be mentioned below.

The frequent intercourse between the Sa'dâns and the Turks, who had come to settle in Algeria at the beginning of the eighteenth century brought to the court of Morocco a certain amount of eastern ceremonial, a certain amount of luxury and even a certain degree of pomp in the life of the sovereign and in that of his entourage and of all the individuals employed in the Makhzen.

It is from this time that really dates the existence of this entity, which is really foreign to the country itself, which lived by exploiting rather than governing it and is known as the Makhzen.

The increasing official relations of Morocco with European powers, the exchange of ambassadors, the commercial agreements, the ransom of Christian slaves, largely contributed to give this Makhzen more and more the appearance of a regular government. The jealousies of the powers, their desire to maintain the status quo in Morocco and the need to have a regular government to deal with them further strengthened the Makhzen both at home and abroad and enabled the Sultan Mâwîyâ al-Hassân to conduct for nearly twenty years this policy of equilibrium between the powers on one side, and the tribes on the other, who kept till his death the empire of Morocco in existence, built up of very diverse elements, of which the Makhzen formed the façade.

The very humble, almost humiliating, attitude imposed on the European ambassadors at official receptions increased the prestige of the Sultan and the Makhzen in the eyes of the tribes. The envoy of the Christian power, surrounded by the presents which he brought, appeared on foot in a court of the palace and seemed to have come to pay tribute to the emir of the Muslims, who was on horseback. All the theatrical side was developed to strike the imagination of the Makhzen with much care and succeeded in creating an illusion of the real efficiency of this organisation in the eyes of both tribes and powers.

Under the Berber dynasties, the Aâmulids, the Marinids and the Banû Watîân, the military tribes, the ghâsh, were almost all Arab; under the Sa'dâns they were entirely Arab; to the Dûghâm and Banû Hîlîl Arabe were added the Ma'âlî Arab of Sûna. On the other hand, the Sa'dâns had removed from the registers of the ghâsh a certain number of the Arab tribes who then paid in money the khârîj for the hârûn lands of the Muslim community which they occupied. These tribes, in contrast to the ghâsh, were called tribes of the nûri, that is to say, according to the etymology proposed for the word, they were under the tutelage of the makhzen (from nûrî "tutor" or "substitute" for a father) or perhaps that they paid the tribes of the ghâsh a sum for replacing them (from nînâ, to substitute).

From this time on, Morocco assumed the appearance which it had when France established her protectorate there. The frontier, settled with the Turks in the east, had hardly been altered by the occupation of Algeria by France and the territory of Morocco was, as it still is today, divided into two parts: 1. bilad al-makhzen or conquered territory; 2. bilad al-rîd or land of schism; the latter was almost exclusively occupied by the Berbers.

The bilad al-makhzen, which represents official Morocco, was formed of territories belonging to the hâbîs of the Muslim community and liable to the khârîj. This land was occupied by Arab tribes, some ghâsh others nûri. Morocco consisted of an Arab government (makhzen) which administered the regions liable to khârîj, and occupied by Arab tribes, the status of which varied according as they were ghâsh or nûri.

The Berber tribes of the bilad al-rîd not only refused to allow the authority of the makhzen to penetrate among them, but even had a tendency to go back to the plains from which they had gradually been pushed into the mountains. One of the main endeavours of the present dynasty, the 'Alawi Sharif of Tafisilt, which succeeded the Sa'dâns in the seventeenth century has been to oppose this movement of expansion of the Berber tribes. This is why Mawlay Isâmîl, the most illustrious Sultan of this dynasty, built 70 hâshâs on the frontier of the bilad al-makhzen to keep down the Berbers. Hence we have this policy of equilibrium and intrigues which has just been mentioned and which up till quite recent years was the work of the Makhzen.

As we have already said, it was not a question of organising the country nor even of governing it, but simply of holding their own by keeping rebellion within bounds with the help of the tribes of the ghâsh by extracting from the ports and from the tribes of the nûri the all that could be extorted by every means. From time to time expeditions led by the Sultan himself against the unsolicited tribes asserted his power and increased his prestige.

The Makhzen, gradually formed in course of centuries by the possibilities and exigencies of domestic policy, as well as by the demands of foreign policy seems to have attained its most complete development in the reign of Mawlay al-Hassân, the last great independent Sultan of Morocco (1873—1894). The government of Mawlay al-Hassân consisted in the first place of the Sultan himself, at once hereditary and also, if not exactly elected, at least nominated by the nîsâb and notables of each town and tribes from among the sons, brothers, nephews and even the consorts of the late ruler. This proclamation is called hâshâ. It is in general he who takes control of the Treasury and of the troops when the moment comes to assume the right of succession. It sometimes happens that the late sovereign has nominated his successors, but this does not constitute an obligation on the electors to obey it. There is then no rule of succession to the throne.

Formerly there was only one viceroy, the grand vizier: the grand vizier, a kind of Home
Ministry, was divided into three sections, each managed by a secretary (kālīd):
1. From the Strait of Gibraltar to the Wād Bī-Regreg.
2. From Bī-Regreg to the Sahara.
3. The Maghrib.

In the reign of Sidi Muḥammad (1859—1873), the more frequent and intimate relations with Europe and more particularly the working of the protectorate made it necessary to found a special office for foreign relations, and a wakīr al-bahr, literally Minister of the Sea, was appointed. This does not mean minister for the Navy, but for all that came by sea, i.e. Europeans. This minister had a representative in Tangier, the wālī al-mulūk, who was the intermediary between European representatives and the Central Māhkān. His task was to deal with European complaints and claims from perpetual settlements and to play off against another one the protégés of the European powers, who were certainly increasing in numbers and frequently formed an obstacle to the traditional arbitral role of the Māhkān. The régime of the consular protectorate, settled and regulated in 1880 by the Convention of Madrid, had also resulted in discouraging the Māhkān from extending its authority over new territory.

The exercise of this authority was in fact automatically followed by the exercise of the right of protection and from the point of view of resistance to European penetration, the Māhkān had everything to gain by keeping in an apparent political independence the greater part of the territory which thus escaped the influence which threatened in time to turn Morocco into a regular international protectorate.

By a conciliatory native policy and cautious dealing with the local chiefs, the sheikhs of the ṣūqyān and the Sharīfī families, the Māhkān was able to exert even in the remotest districts a real influence and never ceased to carry on perpetual intrigues in order to divide the tribes against one another.

It maintained its religious prestige by the hope of preparation for the holy war which was one day to drive out the infidels and sought to penetrate by spreading the Arabic language and the teaching of the Kurān and gradually substituting the principles of Muḥammadan law of the 'ābādī for Berber customs. In a word, it continued the conquest of the country by trying to complete its Islamisation and making Islam permeate its customs.

In the reign of Mawlay al-Ḥasan, the Māhkān consisted of the grand vizier, the wālī al-bahr; minister of foreign affairs, the 'ālīfī — afterwards called minister of war, the sālih al-wānāmī, —afterwards minister of finance —, the ḥālib al-'aqqāṣī, secretary for complaints, who became minister of justice by combining his duties with that of the ḥālib al-baqāt, Kādī of Kafr. These high officials had the offices (banītīl, pl. banītēn) in the mausāwar at the Palace.

The offices were under the galleries which were built round a large courtyard. At the top of the mausāwar was the office of the grand vizier, beside which was that of the ḥālib al-maṣṣūr, a kind of captain of the guard, who also made presentations to the sultan. The ḥālib al-maṣṣūr was in command of the police of the mausāwar and he had under his command the troops of the ḥālib, maṣṣūrīn, maṣṣūtīn (banītīl — as : ḥālta) etc., as well as all the bodies of servants outside the palace; the muwāli al-rūmi, grand-master of the stables, the ḥāqṣīs, who had charge of the sultan's encampments.

In addition to these banītīn of the maṣṣūr, mention must be made of an individual, who as was shown in recent times could play a more considerable part in the government than his actual office would lead one to expect. This is the ṭāfīfī [q.v.], literally the "curtain", i.e. an official placed between the Sultan and his subjects like a curtain. His banītīn was situated between the maṣṣūr and the palace proper and he had charge of the interior arrangements of the Sultan's household. Under his orders were the various groups of domestic servants (banāt al-dakhkhilīn), maṣṣūltīn al-rūmī, who looked after the washing arrangements, muwāli al-frīsh who attended to the beds, etc., etc.; he also commanded the eunuchs and even was responsible for the discipline of the women of the Sultan, through the "artsī or mistresses of the palace. The ṭāfīfī is often called grand chamberlain, although he does not exactly correspond to this office.

Around these officers gravitated a world of secretaries of different ranks, of officers of the gādir, then the ḥālib al-rāqī, who was in theory in command of 300 horsemen, the ḥālib al-maṣṣūtī, who commanded 100 down to a simple muğūddām. All this horde of officials, badly paid when paid at all, lived on the country as it could, trafficking shamelessly in the influence which it had or was thought to have and in the prestige it gained from belonging to the court, whether closely or remotely. The influence of these court officials spread throughout the regions controlled by the organisation of Māhkān officials, which contributed to the centralisation of authority and its profits.

In this organisation it may be noticed that the authority of the Māhkān properly so-called, i.e. of a lay power, continually increased at the expense of the religious power by a series of changes. No doubt the basis continued to be religious, but the application of power became less and less mo and the civil jurisdiction of the ḥālib and of the Māhkān more and more took the place of the administration of the gādir by the ḥādir, which finally became restricted to questions of personal law and landed property.

The authority of the sultan was represented in the towns and in the tribes by the ḥādir, appointed by the grand vizier and by the muwaṣṣūlīn, whose office owed its origin to the religious law of the 'ābādī. The muwaṣṣūlīn supervised and controlled the gādir, fixed the price of articles of food and inspected weights and measures and coins.

The tax of the ṭāfīfī, which represented the old ḥādir, wa levied on the non-hādir tribes by the ḥādir of these tribes. It was one of the principal causes of abuses; the amount of this tax was never fixed and the sum which came from it were in reality divided among the ḥādir, the secretaries of the Māhkān and the vizier without the sultan or the public treasury getting any benefit from them.

The grand vizier also appointed the muṣṣār officials, who from the reign of Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahmān, had been attached to the local nūrūs of the banūs of the mosques and sanctuaries. The ḥādir were appointed by the ḥādir al-baqāt; at the present day they are appointed by the minister of justice.
They propose the 'udul but do not actually appoint them. The financial staff, 'umani, who control the customs, the possessions of the Makzen (al-amir), the mansif (market-places and tolls etc. called makra), the controller of the 'ilm al-mad (popularly aln-l-masnul) i.e. the official who intervened to collect the share of the Muslim community from a state of deceased persons and who also acted as curator of intestate estates (wali al-gainty). All these officials were appointed by the amir al-umani who was later known as the minister of finance.

This organisation was completely centralised i.e. its only object was to bring all the resources of the country into the coffers of the State and of its agents, but there was no provision for utilising these resources in the public interest. No budget was drawn up, no public works, no railways, no navy, no commerce, no port, nothing at all was provided for. Military expenses were confined to the maintenance of a regiment commanded by an English officer, of a French mission of military importance, and a body of armed garrisons directed by Italian officers and of the building of Rabat of a fort by a German engineer. These were really rather diplomatic concessions to the powers interested than a regular military organisation. In the spirit of the Makzen the defence of the territory was to be the task of the Berber tribes, carefully maintained out of all contact with European behind the elaborate display maintained by the court.

In the event of war, the Makzen, faithful to its system of equal favour, purchased arms and munitions from the different powers and kept them in the maktin of Fas to be able when necessary to distribute them to the tribes when proclaiming a holy war.

The expenses of the education service were limited to the very modest allowances granted to the 'ulama of al-Asrayyan at Fas. These allowances were levied from the habal and augmented by gifts made by the Sultan on the occasion of feasts (jub).

Nothing was done for public health and one could not give the name of hospitals to the few hospitals to be found in certain towns, where a few desirable creatures lived in filth, receiving from the habal and the charity of the public barely enough to prevent them dying of hunger and of disease without receiving any medical assistance.

On the repeated representations of the Powers the Makzen had ultimately delegated its powers to the members of the diplomatic corps in Tangier, which had been able to form a public health committee in order to be able to refuse admission to infected vessels if necessary. In spite of its defects, the Makzen constituted a real force; it formed a solid bloc in the centre of surrounding anarchy which it was interested in maintaining, to be able to exploit it more easily on the one hand and on the other to prevent the preservation in the country of any united order which might become a danger to it.

In brief we may say that the Makzen in Morocco was an instrument of arbitrary government, which worked quite well in the social disorder of the country and thanks to this disorder, we may add, it worked for its own profit and was in a way like a foreign element in a conquered country. It was and still is a regular cause with its own traditions, way of living, of dressing, of furnishing, of feeding, with its own language, al-lughat al-maghribiya, which is a correct Arabic intermediate between the literary and the spoken Arabic, composed of official formulae, regular clichés, courteous, concise and binding to nothing.

This Makzen which was sufficient in the old order of things which it had itself contributed to create and maintain, was forced, if it was not to disappear at once, to undergo fundamental modifications from the moment this state of things had rendered necessary the establishment of a protectorate.

Various changes have always been made in the old regime, which has been a matter of regret to many as reducing sources of profit. The vizierate of foreign affairs and that of war have been handed over to the Resident-General, that of finance to the Director-General of finance who administers the revenue of the empire alike to those of a regularly organised state.

The director-generalships of agriculture and education, which are regular ministries are held by French officials as are the management of the postal service, telegraph and telephone and the board of health.

Two new vizierates had been created, that of the regal domains (al-amali) and that of the habal. The vizierate al-amali has just been suppressed and the domains are administered by a branch of the finance department. The vizierate of the habal is under that of the Shari'ia affairs. This organisation represents the principle of protectorate in the Moroccan government itself and in order to realise "the organisation of a reformed Sultan Makzen" in keeping with the treaty. (Ed. Michaux-Beliarc)
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(M. Burret)

MAKHZUM (RANK) along with the Omanis,
the aristocratic clan of Mecca. This
assertion is contrary to the theory popularised by the
Sira in virtue of which the ancestor of the
aristocratic families was Kusayy [q. v.]. About the
middle of the 21st century A. D. we find that among
the clans of Kuraish [q. v.] that held in most
consideration was the band Makham, which traced
its descent through Ya'qub b. Mirra to the legendary
Fih (Kuraish) without going through Kusayy. At
this period the Makham controlled everything at
Mecca, except the sanctuary. They alone were able
to counterbalance the growing influence of the
Omanis. It is at this time that their name becomes
occasionally synonymous with Kuraish.
(Im Durâid, Kitâb al-Lughât, ed. Wissmefeld,
p. 94, 1a.)

The Makham seem to have owed their primacy to Mughira b. Abd Allah, a contemporary of Abd
al-Majdrib and grandson of the eponymous
ancestor of the clan. The adjective Maghîth thus
comes to be used for Makham. His son, Hujjâm
b. al-Mughira, is even said to have had the title
*Ibaru (rab) of Mecca'* (Im Durâid, Kithâb, p. 93, 4b). The Kuraish are said to have dated one
of their emirs from the death of this individual, if
the reference is not to Wâlid b. al-Mughira.
Tradition hesitates between these two Makhamites.
The influence of the Makham was preponderant in
the sula, or council of notables which decided
affairs at Mecca. It is frequently a Makhamite who
speaks in name of the sula, as for example in the
discussion with Muhammad, at the beginning of
the preaching of Islam. They are believed to
have opened up to Meccan commerce the principal
routes to foreign markets. For their intelligence,
their activity they were said to be *ardent as
Makhzum — Al-Makin

fire" (Alqam, Hilal, xv. 8; infra) — their patrician pride and particularly their wealth they were envied by the other Meccan clans. In a word they threw into the shade the descendants of Kuraish like the Banu Hashim, for whose benefit the traditional theory seems to have been put into circulation. They lost a large number of members at the battle of Badr; after this disaster from which they never recovered, they had to yield the first place to the Omayyads.

What injured their reputation in Muslim tradition was their opposition to the rise of Islam. Tradition has chosen from them in the person of Abu Dujhdh [q. v.] the type of the irrefrangible opponent of Islam. In Mecca the Maghzm clamor of al-Maghrb was numbered among the "mockers" of the Prophet. Several verses of the Meccan suras are said to be directed against him (Ibn Duraid, Lailak, p. 60—61). Before becoming the "sword of Allah" Khald b. al-Walid [q. v.] fought with the majority of his people against Muhammad and Bishr, Othub, Khudak, etc. This persistent opposition explains why they and the Omayyads are called al-Aljfarin min Kuraish, "the two wicked classes of Kuraish" (Tabari, Tafsir al-Kuran, xiii. 130).

After the Fatih (conquest of Mecca) they adopted the new religion without enthusiasm; many went and settled in Madina, which now became the capital of Islam, so as to get in touch with the governing circles. The Prophet was able to use the military talents of Khald b. Badr to his advantage, as they refused to come to terms with the Omayyads and submitted themselves to the advance of the Muslims (Ibn Al-Hashim, Sira, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 202, 275—57). When the father of Abd Bakr heard that his son had been elected Caliph, the old man's first question is said to have been: "Did the `Abd Manuf and Makhzum give their consent?" (Ibn al-Athir, Usul al-Ghada, iii. 222). The author of the Tafsir Darni 'I-Arak (ed. Mann, p. 170, 26) expresses surprise at his discovering in the pre-Halra genealogies of the Makhzumians, names like `Ubed and al-Walid, showing pre-occupation with religion.

Abd Bakr's father had promised with Khald b. Badr to send his men to wage war in remote lands and giving him vast tracts of land. With the second caliph there was open conflict. `Umar, although he is said to have been the son of a Makhzum mother, had to suppress the turbulent general, more used to conquer than to obey. The Makhzumians came into conflict with `Omar over 'Ammar b. Vasit [q. v.], a client of their family (Mash'ari, Marvd d al-Ashab, ed. Paris, iv. 121, 260, 279, 360). They declared against `Ali in the body. Abd al-Rahman b. Khald b. al-Walid [q. v.] who at first supported Mu'awiya in the end by his independence aroused the misgivings of the Omayyad caliph. The Makhzumians accused Mu'awiya of having had their relative poisoned and assuming the right to wreak vengeance, they gave a new proof of their independent spirit. From this time they were on bad terms with the Omayyad caliphs, as they had been with the earlier rulers, being naturally inclined to resist authority and to offer a useless opposition. When `Abd Allah b. al-Zubair [q. v.] rebelled against Yazid I, they adhered almost without exception to his cause. In return the Meccan anti-caliph appointed one of them as his representative in Basra.

The Mawrids, after their triumph agreed to bear no grudge against the Makhzumians. They even chose members of the clan for the office of governor of Madina, hitherto reserved for an Omayyad. After, as before, the Mawrids, the Makhzumians continued to be reckoned among the richest capitalists in Mecca. They had about 5,000 mithqal of gold laid out in the caravan, which was the cause of the battle of Badr. It was to them that Muhammad applied on the eve of Humaia for a loan of 40,000 dirhams. Their systematic opposition to authority put them completely out of the running for any of the great administrative offices in which the members of the Kuraish clans enriched themselves. Their aristocratic pride did not prevent them however from seeking profit in commerce and even in industry. We know this from the story of 'Omar b. 'Ali Rabi'a [q. v.], the most famous of the Kuraish poets. 'Omar kept 70 of his slaves employed in the weaving-mills established in Mecca (Alqam, 1. 37, 3). Another Makhzum, a contemporary of 'Omar's, was known as "the monk (rahid) of Kuraish" on account of his merit and his asceticism of prayer (Ibn Sa'd, Tabakhat, ed. Sachau, v. 153, 16). Much better known than this ascetic and continually quoted on questions of Fikr and Hadith is the Makhzum b. al-Musiyib [q. v.], one of the most famous rabis of the first century a. h. With the coming of the 'Abbaids, influence passed over to the Irans, gradually the Makkhid, like other Kuraish clans, fell into obscurity. At the present day there are still families bearing the name Makhzum. It remains to be seen to what extent they are justified in claiming descent from the Makhzum, if it is not in the female line in the case of Siraj al-Din al-Makhzum al-Humdi (cf. Beckelmann, C. A. L., ii. 98). Kalkaendar (Sahih al-Abi, Cairo, i. 213) justly remarks that the tribe of the Basal Khald which led a nomadic life around Hijaz has only the same in common with the great Makhzum captain. The male line from Khald b. al-Walid is said to have become extinct very early (cf. Ibn al-Asw, Usul al-Ghada, v. 249, infra), a statement disputed by the Siraj al-Din mentioned above.


(H. LAMMEN)

AL-MAKIN b. AL-AMID, DIRJIS (AND AL-AMIN)
b. ABI 'IBRAHIM, the Christian author of a World-chronicle in Arabic. His life has been several times treated by western authors in encyclopedia and other works of reference; but nothing can be learned of their sources from their articles. Even Beckelmann (i. 248) has to content with giving the traditional biography and relying upon his European predecessors. To avoid repetition...
here, we only give the dates of his birth and death, 602 (1202) and 672 (1273). The latter date is given by Ḥadžīlī ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn ʿAṣim. His grandfather, according to J. H. Hottinger, *Pamphlet* in *Pamphlet*, vol. 75, 1877, died in 606 and his father in 630.

Al-Makki's world-chronicle consists of two parts, the first of which deals with the pre-Islamic world from the Creation onwards and the second with Muslim history down to 658 (1260). The work is so planned that the whole history of the world is given in the form of successive numbered biographies of its most important men. Near the beginning of the discussion of some of the questions and the several times is inserted. Describing the reign to 586 B.C., it is based on Biblical history; the numeration of the biographies begins with Adam as No. 1. For the period after the destruction of Solomon's temple there comes upon the usual scheme of the dynasties of the Eastern Asia, which in turn are succeeded by Alexander, the Romans and the Byzantines. In this and in the second part, as the author himself tells us, he is following the model of the Sibylla's chronicle.

The work which is entitled al-Makki's *al-Makki* al-Makki exists in various manuscripts. The first part is regularly quoted with a Latin translation by Hottinger, *Smejke Orientale* (1858) in the chapter De non lingua Sarmatian in theologia historia on various facts of history. The chapter on Alexander the Great has been edited in English by E. A. W. Budge, *The Life and Explorations of Alexander the Great* (1896). The second part was edited and translated by Th. Leblanc under the title *Historia Sarmatia* by G. T. Wilkins, 1625; English and French translations appeared soon after. Many emendations were given by Rücker in *Die sarmatische Erforschungen*, viii–ix, xi, xiv, xvii. A critical edition of the whole work is an urgent desideratum. How important it is for Christian church history has been shown by A. v. Oesterley, *Verzeichnisse der Patriarchen von Alexandria* et al. (1899, p. 395–525). This is sufficient to show how necessary would be a comprehensive investigation of Al-Makki's place in historical tradition, which could only be undertaken on the basis of a certain text. Besides it is evident that Al-Makki used old sources independently which are not known to his immediate predecessors like Eutychius (q.v.) and his contemporary, much quoted by him, Ibn al-Rabīʿ (Brockelmann, *G. A. L.* 349), where of course it should be 660 = 1270 with whom he agrees in the numeration of the biographies which are also used by Al-Makki. In the chapter on Alexander the Great, the English translation of which edited by Budge, agrees very closely with the Arabic original. Budge's work is an urgent desideratum. The author himself tells us, he is following the model of the Sibylla's chronicle.

Al-Makki's work is, therefore, of great importance for the study of the history of the Middle East. It contains a wealth of information about the early Islamic period, which is not found in any other source. The work is particularly important for the study of the history of the Byzantine Empire, as it contains a number of biographies of important Byzantine figures. The work is also important for the study of the history of the Jewish community in the early Islamic period, as it contains a number of biographies of important Jewish figures.
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In addition to the works mentioned above, Al-Makki's work is also important for the study of the history of the Christian church in the Middle East. It contains a number of biographies of important Christian figures, which are not found in any other source. The work is also important for the study of the history of the Islamic period, as it contains a number of biographies of important Islamic figures. The work is also important for the study of the history of the Jewish community in the early Islamic period, as it contains a number of biographies of important Jewish figures.
he taught: hadith in a way that attracted much attention. He again made stays at Jerusalem and Damascus where he was received at the Madrasa Djamé in Damascus by the learned Ahmad b. Shihin. In this city also his lectures on Muslim Tradition were largely attended. He then returned to Cairo and while he was preparing to return to Damascus to settle there permanently, he fell ill and died.

In spite of his long stay in the East, it was in Morocco that al-Maqqari collected the essential materials for his work as the historian and biographer of Muslim Spain, especially at Marrakesh in the library of the Sa'diyyan Sultans (now in part in the Escorial); this is how al-Maqqari consulted among other works the unique copy of the Manuss of Ibn Marzuki: cf. Historia, v. 8, p. 23). Indeed his masterpiece, written in the East at the suggestion of Ibn Shihin from materials collected by him in the Maghrib, is a long monograph on Muslim Spain and on the famous encyclopaedic of Granada, Lisan al-Din Ibn al-Khatib, Nafah al-Thib min Vagham al-Andalus wa-Dhikr Waziriin Lisan al-Din Ibn al-Khatib, an immense compilation of historical and literary information, poems, letters and quotations very often taken from works now lost. It is this that gives the Nafah al-Thib an inestimable value and puts it in the first rank for our sources of Muslim Spain from the conquest to the last days of the "Reconquista". Even for the later period it is the only Arabic source that we still possess.

The Nafah al-Thib consists of two quite distinct parts, a monograph on the history and literature of Muslim Spain and the monograph on Ibn al-Khatib. The first part is divided as follows: 1. physical geography of al-Andalus. 2. Conquest of al-Andalus by the Arabs, period of the governors. 3. History of the Omeyyad Caliphs and of the petty dynasts (Muwallid-dawlati'iyin). 4. Description of Cordova, its history and its monuments. 5. Spanish Arabs who have made the journey to the East. 6. Scholars who have made the journey to Spain. 7. Sketches of literary history, the intellectual and moral qualities of the Spanish Arabs. 8. The "reconquista" of Spain and the expulsion of the Muslims. The second part contains 1. Original biography of the ancestors of Ibn al-Khatib, 2. biography of Ibn al-Khatib, 3. biographies of his teachers, 4. letters in thumim prose of the chancellors of Granada and of Fûs, sent or received by Ibn al-Khatib (mukhabarat). 5. a selection of his works in prose and verse. 6. analytical list of his works.

The Nafah al-Thib was printed in full at Basra in 1291 and at Cairo, in 1302 and 1304 (2 vols). The first part was published at Leyden from 1855 to 1861 under the title of Almanates sur l'histoire et la litterature des Arabes d'Espagne, by R. Dusy, G. Duquet, L. Kehr and W. Wright. In 1862, D. Pascale de Gayangos had published in English, at London, under the title The History of the Muhammadan Dynasties in Spain, a version adapted from the part of the first half which deals with the history of Muslim Spain. A critical translation of this monumental work in its entirety remains to be done.

Al-Maqqari also wrote other important works, among which special mention must be made of a lengthy monograph on the famous khidr, the Song of Ahmad al-Khatib, published at Tlem in 1322 in 2 vols. A list with reference to known MSS. will be found in Brockelmann and Ben Chenin.
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**AL-MAKKAR, ABU TÂBÈ MUHAMMAD BEN ALI AL-HIRIMI, d. in Baghdad in 380 (996), an Arab mu'madin and mystic, head of the theological madrasah of the Sâlihiya [q.v.] of Basra. His principal work is the Kâr al-Kutub (Cairo 1310, 2 vols.) whole pages of which have been copied by al-Ghazâlî into his Ilyâ'hu 'llah-Din.

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, G. A. E., i., 200; Sâlih Qarmut, Kârîb al-Din, i. 67, 68 sq.; Sâlih Qarmut, Kârîb al-Din, ed. Cairo, ii. 28; Ibn 'Abd Rundi, Kârîb al-Din, lith. Fès 1320, p. 149, 200-201.

**MAKRAN,** the coastal region of Balûsht, extending from about 35° to 65° 35' E. and inland from the coast to the Styhân Range, a little beyond 25' north. This tract was known to the Greeks as Gedrosia, and was inhabited by the febbyphragi, or fish-eaters, the Persian translation (Mâh-Khurân) of whose name supplies a fanciful derivation for its present name, which is traced, with more probability, to a Dravidian source.

In Persian legend Kalkisrasaw of Iran captured the country from Ahrasiybu of Turan, and both Cyrus and Semiramis marched through it. In 325 B.C., it was traversed by Alexander in his retreat from India, and fell, later, under the dominion of the Sâlihiya, but was occasionally assailed into the Hindu kingdom of Sind. It was annexed by the Arabs in the course of the rapid expansion of the empire of Islam in the early days of the caliphate, and it was through Makran that the Umayyad b. Kûsim invaded Sind in 711 A.D. and established the first Muslim settlement to the east of the Indus. Marco Polo mentions it in 1290 as the most westerly part of India, under an independent chief, probably a Muslim, who found it unnecessary to make any pretense of submission either to Persia or to India. Indigenous tribes ruled the country until they were ousted by the Gikhis from India, but the Persian monarchs reckoned Makran as part of Bâlûsht, which was included in the great province of Kîrman. In the middle of the eighteenth century the Aymâhas of Kûst, established their suzerainty over the country, and in 1879 Colonel Geldard demarcated the frontier between Persian Makran and eastern Makran, which remains subject to
the Khān of Kalāt, though British intervention has frequently been necessary to compose the disputes between him and the dominant tribes of the province, Gīlān, Neīrūz, Buzurdān, and Mirāzwān. Cultivators of the soil are Bālūčis, and tribes of inferior social status and the fishermen form a class apart.

The climate of the country varies with the altitude. Near the coast it is uniformly hot, but not unpleasant; in Keč or Kej, from which eastern Makrān is known as Keč Makrān, the winter is dry and cool, the summer intolerably hot; and higher still Pandjīq is bitterly cold in winter and moderately hot in summer.


(T. W. Hig.)

AL-MAḴRĪZĪ Abū 'l-Qādir Abū Ḥabīb Abū Ḥabīb Al-Maḵrīzī. A descendant of the Umayyad dynasty, he was a regent of the Abbasid Caliphate and a prominent figure in the intellectual and cultural life of his time. He is known for his contributions to various fields, including literature, astronomy, and mathematics. His interest in astronomy led him to translate and comment on the works of Ptolemy, and his astronomical works were influential in the medieval Islamic world.

Abū Ḥabīb Al-Maḵrīzī was born in the city of al-Maḵrīzī, a part of the larger region of Makrān, in present-day Iran. He was educated in the sciences and was known for his mathematical and astronomical achievements. His work in astronomy was so influential that it helped to establish the Umayyad dynasty as a leader in the Islamic world.

Abū Ḥabīb Al-Maḵrīzī is also known for his work in philosophy and theology, and his contributions to these fields were significant. He was a follower of the philosophy of the Persian philosopher al-Kindī, and his works in this area were influential in the Islamic world.

Abū Ḥabīb Al-Maḵrīzī's scientific works were highly regarded in his time, and his contributions to astronomy, mathematics, philosophy, and theology were highly influential in the Islamic world. His works were studied and copied by many later scholars, and his legacy continues to be felt in the fields of science and mathematics.

Abū Ḥabīb Al-Maḵrīzī's work was highly regarded in his time, and his contributions to astronomy, mathematics, philosophy, and theology were highly influential in the Islamic world. His works were studied and copied by many later scholars, and his legacy continues to be felt in the fields of science and mathematics.
measures (Nabihat al-'Ushd ft Umur al-Naḥd, Cairo 1298, ed. O. G. Tychsen, Rostock 1797; Traité des monnaies musulmanes, transl. by S. de Sacy in Mag. eml. by Millin, tiv., 1797, p. 472; m/i, p. 38 sqq., revised reprint, Paris 1797, an edition revised by the author Shabūr al-'Uṣūd ft Dhikr al-Naḥd, printed under the title al- 
Naḥd al-'aṣāma wa 'l-Iṣām, Stambul 1298 
in a collected volume; Rishāl al-Makah wa 'l-
Mawṣūl al-Shārī'iyā, ed. O. G. Tychsen, Rostock 
1806). He also wrote a general geography under 
the title Zāni al-Asār min al-Waf al-nuṣfār 
(Berlin, N. 6049, Cairo, v. 40) what he 
dedicated; for this is still uncertain; in Paris, 
N. 591 the Istirāj al-Maḥāfīz fi 'l-ṣerār al-
Fāh is said to be the basis; Lavi-Provençal, 
Les Historiens des Croі, p. 361 identifies it 
with the al-Waf al-nuṣfār ft Kaḥar al-Aṣrī 
mentioned by Ḥaḍidh al-Khalfa, iii, N. 6598 
of Abū ʿAmmār al-Ḥumaydī; (Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. 
'Abd al-Mu'min al-Ḥumaydī, which is said still to exist in the 
Karamayn mosque of Fez. In some of these shorter 
theses he touches on theology, a subject he does 
not otherwise deal with, dogmatics in the essay 
composed in 813 (1410) entitled al-Dūāh al-
hafidh ft 'l-Farāk bain al-Tawḥīd wa 'l-Tālād, the autograph 
of which is in Leyden, Amin, N. 188 
(cf. also Cairo, vii, 565), Tājīrīn al-Tawḥīd (in 
Paris) and tradition in lectures on the family and 
domestic arrangements of the Prophet, which he 
delivered at Mecca (Tājīrī 'l-faṣl fī 'l-
Nabi min al-Hadidhā wa 'l-Mahbūba, 6 vol., Gotha 
1830, Stambul, Köprülü, N. 1004). To supplement 
this work, towards the end of his life, he planned 
a work which beginning with the Creation, was 
to be also a general geography to give the genealogies 
of the Arab tribes and the history of the Persians 
down to the Shāhānshah under the title al-Khabar 
āmī 'l-Baḥr, at which he was still working in 
844 (1441) (parts in the autograph Stambul: Aya 
Sophia, N. 3362, and Falūq, N. 4328-4344, 
other in the copy, Aya Sophia, N. 3365-3366, 
T. Tauer in Islamica, i, 357-364). Even 
with this work which he quotes in his works, in the essays 
Dīnak al-Sāri' ft Muḥāṣib Tawḥīd al-Dīrāt 
in the Leyden collected volume and also in 

**Bibliography:** Sayyid, Hussain al-Muhāfiz, 
L. 321; de Sacy, Christ., vol., i, 112; Hamaker, 
Sph. enc., p. 207; Wientzen, Geschichtebilder, 
p. 482; Goldziher, Zāhirītān, p. 196-202; G. 
A. L., ii, 38. (C. Brockmann)

**Makrūh.** [See Shari'a.]

**Maks, tolk. customs duty.** Is a loanword 
in Arabic and goes back to the Arabica 
makās, cf. Hebrew mašeq and Assy. maqās; from it is a 
verb mašequ in the 2nd pers. pl. makkat, the 
collector of customs. According to the Arabic 
tradition preserved in Ibn Sīdā even in the Dāhilīya 
there were market-dues called maks so that the 
word must have entered Arabic very early. It is 
found in Arabic papiri towards the end of the 
first century A. H.

Becker has dealt with the history of the maks, 
especially in Egypt, and we follow him here. The 
old law books use maks in the sense of 'mār, 
the tenth levied by the merchants, more properly 
the equivalent of an excise duty than of a custom. 
They still show some opposition to the maks, 
then give it due legal force, but the word con-
tinued to have unpleasant associations, cf. the 
ḥadd: 'insa makkat 'l-makās fī 'l-nār: "the tax-
collector will go to hell": Goldziher has suggested 
that the Jewish view of the publican may have 
had some influence here.

The institution of the customs duty was adopted 
by Islam about the beginning of the Omaiyad 
period or shortly before it. While theological 
tendency demanded a single customs area in Islam, 
the old frontiers remained in existence by land 
and water, and Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia 
were separate customs areas. The amount of the 
duty in the canon law was settled not so much by 
the value of the goods as by the person, i.e. the 
religion of the individual paying it; but in practice, 
attention was paid to the article and there were 
preferential duties and no attention was paid to 
the position of the owner in regard to Islam. 
The laws of taxation were very complicated and 
graduated; the duties rose in course of time from 
of the tenth ('mār) to the fifth ('Shamī).

The Egyptian maks was levied on the frontier 
at al-Arish and in the ports (tawziq) 'Ālīdāh, 
al-Kaṣīr, al-Ṭur and al-Suways but there was also 
an octroi to be paid in al-Fuṣṭāt at a place called 
Maks. This name is said to have replaced an old 
Unum Dunain and then became identified with the 
Maks = custom-house of Cairo. All grain had to 
pass through here before it could be sold and 
two dirhams per arteba and a few minor 
charges had to be paid on it. Further details of 
the administration of the maks in the earliest period 
are not known but there are references towards 
the end of the first century A. H. to a maks maks 
Mafṣūr in papiri and in literature also.

The conception of the maks was extended in the 
Fatimid period when all kinds of small dues 
and taxes became known as makās, especially 
emphasizing the already mentioned unpleasant 
associations of the word — the unpopular ones which 
the people regarded as unjust. Such occasional 
taxes had been levied from time to time in the 
early centuries of Islam. The first to make them 
systematic was the dreaded financial secretary 
and noted opponent of Ahmad b. Ṭṭīn, Ahmad b. 
A. Madabbīr. The latter introduced not only an 
increase in the ground-tax and the three great 
monopolies of oilers, fisheries and soda (in 
connection with which it is interesting to note 
a revolution was made to old Roman taxes), but also 
a large number of smaller taxes which were called 
makāsān and marjūb and included among the 
hilālī, the taxes to be paid according to lunar 
years. Such artifices (known as makās from the 
Fatimid period and later as mukāṣim, ḥimṣātān, 
rīyalāt or mūṣāt) (karaq) were destined to develop 
in time into the main form of oppressing the 
people and to become one of the principal 
causes of the economic decline of Egypt, until under 
the Fatimāt a limit was reached where hardly any 
thing was left untaxed and mukāṣim were even granted 
feats and "misfortune became general" (wa-'amān 
maṣlāhā nāμāt). These small taxes however (but not 
the monopolies) were repeatedly abolished by 
reforming rulers, indeed ʿlāl al-makās (other terms 
are raqā, munāṣib, ḥabba, waqf, rafʿ al-makās) 
even formed part of the style and title of such 
rulers. Thus it is recorded of Ahmad b. Ṭṭīn that 
he abolished some duties, and later of Salahādīn, 
Bābars, Ṣāḥīb al-Dawla and his sons Khağı and 
Nāṣīr Muhammad, of Aḥmad Shābān, ʿAṣrāf 
Dājā
MAKS. Makrit gives a long list of makuk abolished by Salahin and Kalkashandi gives copies of the texts of musimmah, which are decrees of Mamlik Sultan abolishing taxes or granting exemptions from dues which were sent to the governors and read from the minbars and sometimes contain very full details, while shorter decrees were probably carved on stone and are given among the fragments published by van Berchem. It would of course be wrong to deduce from such abolutions of taxes that the government was a particularly good one, while on the other hand the continually recurring extortion of the same taxes shows that the abuses had been restored in the interval. Makrit, i. 111 concludes with the well known jibe at the Copts: *“even now there are makuk, which are in the control of the viceroy, but bring nothing to the state but only to the Copts, who do exactly as they like with them to their great advantage”.*

Among the great variety of dues which were of course not all levied at the same place and at the same time were the following: ahldi—taxes on ovens, baths, ovens, walls and gardens; harbour-dues in Gizch, in Cairo at the corn-guayy (jahl al-ghalaa) and at the arsenal (jidda), also levied separately on each passenger; market-dues for goods and caravans (bahdi, awa-bahdi) especially for horses, camels, mules, cattle, sheep, poultry and slaves; meat, fish, salt, sugar, pepper, oil, vinegar, turnips, wool, silk, linen and cotton; wood, earthenware, coal, halfa, straw and henna; wine and oil-presses, tanned goods; brokerage (samura) charged on the sale of sheep, dates and linen. Taxes on markets, drinking-houses and brothels which were euphemistically called munayy, al-milaya. Warders deprive prisoners of everything they have; indeed this right is sold to the highest bidder; officers consume the fees of their soldiers; peasants pay their lords forced labour and give them presents (bahdi, hadiy) and many officials (shadd, muckatsh, mukhabiran and waru) also accept them; when a campaign is begun the merchants pay a special war-tax and a third of inheritances falls to the state; when news of victories is received and when the Nile rises, levies are made; the dhimmis, in addition to paying the poll-tax, have to contribute to the maintenance of the army; pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre pay a tax in Jerusalem; separate special taxes are levied to maintain the embankments, the Nilometer etc.

Outside of Egypt we occasionally hear of the makuk as toll or market-duty, e.g. in Dijida, in North Africa (cf. Dory, Suppl., ii. 606). Ibn al-Hajj, iii. 87 mentions a wusimmah mahal, but does not use the word makuk in this sense.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Mannāmat, Kanunin al-Dawwārin, p. 10—26; Makriti, i. 88 sqq., 104—111; ii. 267; Kalkashandi, iii. 468 sqq. (== Wüstenfeld, p. 169 sqq.); xiiii. 30 sqq., 117; Becker, Papyri Schott-Reimann, p. 51 sqq.; do., Beiträge zur Geschichte Ägyptens, p. 140—148; do., E. i., ii. 15; do., Islamstudien, l. 177, 267, 273 sqq.; van Berchem, Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, ii. 59, 560; ii. 297, 331 sqq., 374, 377.; 284; Mor. Renais- sance, p. 111 sqq., 117; Heffening, fremde Rechtsformen, p. 53; Bowern, Alt. b. Islam, p. 124; Wenzlach, Handboek, p. 228; Pagan, Additions, p. 165; Yahāl, Makājīm al-Bulūl, iv. 606 on Maks. (W. Björkman)
Sébèl; at Tlemcen, we find the word derradí which again crops up in the Algerian towns.

The master in the Kur'ánic school has as his only intellectual equipment a rule a perfect knowledge of the text of the Kur'án. He cannot understand or expound it; he hardly knows any grammar or any of the branches of religious knowledge. The most learned masters are those who have devoted themselves to learning a certain number of the seven ways of reciting the Kur'ánic text according to the principles laid down by the seven šaykh al-ّarabiyá.

In some towns there are Kur'ánic schools for girls but this is exceptional. The mistress is known as fàsíka or fàsíra (Morocco).

The pupils are called ilmán in the towns, gendís in the country districts and mulájí in the towns of Morocco. Their ages run from six to eighteen. Where there are schools for girls, little boys are sent there also up to the age of six.

In Kur'ánic schools nothing is studied but the Kur'án and without any explanation. The task of the master is to learn the sacred text by heart. Ibn Khaldún in his Muqaddamah says that in his time the schools of Spain and Tunisia taught children reading and writing and the Arabic language before putting them to study the Kur'án, which they then learned without much difficulty while in the rest of the Maghrib they were only taught to recite the Kur'án and from the beginning of their studies. It is this latter that is still the usual fashion in North Africa of our day.

The Kur'án is not studied to know and understand it. It is learned by heart for the reward promised in the next world to those who know it and to benefit by the virtue of al-kuráh of the divine verses. The latter point of view is very much in keeping with the mentality of Musulmán peoples with a strong belief in magic.

When the boy begins his studies he is taught to smear a wooden slate with a fine white clay called qamal; sleeped in water. When the slate is made dry, either by being exposed to the sun or held to a fire, the master traces on it the letters of the alphabet, with the point of a bâlâm (reed sharpened for writing) without any ink. He cuts into the clay by forming the letters on the slate and the pupil then asks to go over them with the bâlâm dipped in ink (which is made from burned wood). At the same time the child learns by heart the names of the letters and their descriptions without the master, however, thinking it worth while to point out to him on the slate that a certain character corresponds to a certain name of a letter. It is therefore not surprising that with such a method a pupil has to devote two or three years to learning to read and to write.

When the child can write to dictation, the master dictates verses from the Kur'án. The child writes them one by one. As soon as he has finished writing one he says azma mîn al-sabâ on reaching the last word he has to write. The master then dictates the next verse and so on till the slate is completely covered with writing. Then the pupil goes to the bottom of the class and begins to learn by heart what has been dictated to him aloud. When he knows the text by heart, he recites it to the master. If the latter is satisfied he orders the child to clean his slate. For this purpose the boy washes it in the mistâ, the vessel of water in the corner of the school; then he covers his slate with clay again and begins all over again.

If we reflect that the master has 30 or 40 pupils in front of him all of whom is at a different place in the Kur'án and that his method of instruction is individual, we can see that to learn the whole of the Kur'án, even the most intelligent pupil requires several years if he is not discouraged before reaching the last sâra.

The study of the Kur'án begins with the first chapter, the fâtiha. After this sâra the last and then the second last, then the ante-penultimate is learned and so on back to the second sâra, that of the Cow. The Kur'án is thus learned in reversed order. This method is explained by the fact that the sâras have been classed, except for the fâtiha, in order of length, the shortest being at the end. Since at the time of prayer, the believer repeats a sâra, usually one of the last, there is some point in the study of the Kur'án beginning with the sâras at the end of the book. When the pupil has learned the sacred text in the reverse order, he repeats it in the proper order.

The Kur'án is divided into sixty parts called khâis; each khâa is divided in its turn into four rûb' of quarters, each quarter into two dhâhâs or eighths, and each eighth into two kharîitta or sixteenths.

The time-table of the Kur'ánic school is as follows: the master and pupils arrive at dawn, at least in theory. They study without a stop till lunch-time. Some go home to eat and return as soon as possible; others are given their lunch in school and eat either in the class, which is not encouraged, or outside near at hand. If the master goes out, his place is taken by an older pupil. They continue reciting the Kur'án till sunset when everyone goes home to dinner; they frequently return to the school till the hour of the palât al-ّalâ. No recreation is provided for. The only relaxation is the recreation by the pupils in a body of panegyrics of the Prophet. In the Maghrib there is no school from Wednesday at midday till Friday after the noon palât. Tradition has it that the Caliph 'Umar (who founded the first Kur'ánic schools) prescribed the Thursday rest. It is said in explanation that the triumphal return of the Muslim troops after the conquest of Palestine took place on a Thursday; the pupils having had a holiday to take part in the festivities, the Caliph 'Umar decided that henceforth Thursday should be a holiday in the schools. In the Hûl Jûl the holiday is Tuesday (cf. W. Martini, Textes Arabes de Touger, p. 184, note 2).

The schools are also closed on the occasion of the religious feasts and the fast of Ramadân for one week or two, each country having its own special habit in this respect (cf. especially Michaux-Belair in Archives Marocaines, xvii, p. 77).
with different colours. It is to be noted that this mixture it not always includes eggs. Some verses are written on the slate. A procession is formed to go to the house of the child, who is the hero of the occasion; part of the Qur'an is recited and a copious repast eaten. A collection made after the feast and also at the houses of the relatives and friends of the family procures the teacher a supplement to his salary which he much appreciates.

Discipline is maintained in the Qur'anic school by corporal punishment. The master keeps in his hand a long stick with which he strikes more or less cruelly inattentive children on the head. To punish serious faults he inflicts a certain number of blows on the soles of the delinquent's feet. The boy is laid on his back, with his legs in the air and laid together; one of the older pupils holds his feet up to the master who beats them rhythmically with a rod of the wild quince tree. If the pupil is too strong for his comrades to be easily able to keep him in the desired position, his feet are fastened to a wooden bench (jala'a) which two of his comrades hold up. These corporal punishments have been frequently condemned (cf. especially Mu'addii'ah) but they continue to be applied with the unanimous consent of the parents. Indeed the parents very often commission the master to punish children for faults committed out of school.

The master's duty is to give the children a good education; that is to say an education that is entirely religious. He generally does his duty very badly, at least from the European point of view.

The results obtained in the traditional Qur'anic teaching are generally bad. After long and monotonous years spent in school, the child only knows a few sections of the Qur'an and like his master is unable to write a letter correctly or read a book. Wherever general education has made some progress we find the Qur'anic schools losing their importance in spite of the piety of the people. The child is often taken there to learn a few suras after which he is taken away and put at the primary school. Very often the child goes to the Qur'anic school outside of the hours of the primary school and only for a year or two. On the other hand in cases where the people are at all backward but ardent in their faith, the Qur'anic schools are numerous and largely attended.

The children at the Qur'anic schools play a certain part in social ceremonies on account of the doubly magic character which their youth and knowledge of the divine word gives them. On Thursdays the go in a master under the conduct of the master to recite the Qur'an over the graves of pious recently buried; when a woman's accouchement is difficult and threatens to be dangerous, the children from the neighbouring school go round the town chanting litanies behind a piece of cloth held by four of them; in the centre of the cloth is an egg; the passers-by throw coppers into the cloth and utter good wishes for the sick woman. The school-children, slaves in hand are also sent to seek mercy from a conqueror for a conquered town or tribe; to appeal for rain in time of drought, the Qur'anic schools are also called upon to take part in processions.

The organisation of Qur'anic teaching is rudimentary. In the towns, it is the khatib who in theory supervises the schools; in reality he only interferes in cases where complaints are made against the teacher. In the tribes it is the 'adil who takes the place of the khatib in this connection.

The teacher is very often a stranger to the country, more often from the country than the town, which is to some extent explained by the magic character common to the state of being a foreigner and to Qur'anic study.

In the towns he receives a very small sum monthly from the parents of his pupils; on the Wednesday, the children pay him a few coins on leaving school; on the occasion of school-feasts and holidays he receives a few more gifts. He also makes amulets which he sells. In the country the falsch is paid in kind. The relatives of his pupils feed him in turn, giving him, eggs, butter, cereals and lambs; sometimes the village or donor shares the labour of working a plot of ground and gathering its yield for him. Payment in kind of the services of the teacher is the subject of a regular contract between the representative of the village or of the donar and the falsch. The latter is then called falsch mukarrir. The teacher is also the imam of the village; he washes the dead and prepares them for burial; he is also occasionally tailor and public letter writer. In brief although he enjoys the respect of those around him he lives very poorly.

The choice of a teacher is often decided by the reputation which he enjoys. The consent of the parents in the town's, of the qaima in the country gives him the right to exercise his functions. Tunisia however has endeavoured since the French occupation to regulate more carefully Qur'anic instruction and to demand a certain standard of knowledge and morality in the teacher. Qur'anic instruction by its very nature seems to have remained unchanged from the early days of Islam.
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MĂKŬ, a kăнате in the Persian province of Āḏarbāḏūm.
Măkū occupies the N.W. extremity of Persia and forms
an enclave between Turkey (the old sandjāq
of Būyażid) and Transcaucasia. In the west of this
frontier with Turkey follows the heights which
continue the line of Zagros in the direction of
Ararat. The frontier then crosses a plain stretching
to the south of this mountain (valley of the Šar-šu)
and runs over the saddle between Great and Little
Ararat. Down to 1920 Great Ararat formed the
frontier between Russia and Turkey while Little
Ararat was divided between Russia and Persia.
Since 1920 Great Ararat has been completely
surrounded by Turkish territory, while Little Ararat
is divided between Turkey and Persia. The Turco-
Persian frontier at the present day comes down
to the Araxes. The Lower Kāra-su and the Araxes
(to its confluence with its right bank tributary
Kūṭur-šāl) form the frontier between Măkū and
the Turkish territory of Nakhšivan which forms
part of the Armenian Soviet Republic. The left
side of the triangle i.e. the inner boundary between
the kānate and the Persian province of Kōhi is
somewhat vague. When the prestige of its khan
was at its greatest, their lands stretched to the
districts of Āḏar-pāră, Ėlīštān (Kāńăn-Aimet) and
Alând. The little kănate of Avadāḏ (30 villages
belonging to the Airunlu Kāńăn) on the Būyażid-
Čaldērūn-Kōhi road forms a little enclave close
to the Turco-Persian frontier.

The kănate consists of a series of heights and
fertile valleys. In the centre between the valley of
the Zāngiṁar and that of the Aḵh-šāl rises the
isolated mass of Šoḵūr. At the foot of the Little
Ararat along the frontier chain and on the slopes
of Šoḵūr there are excellent pastures.

The lands of Măkū are very well watered. The
streams that flow into the Araxes on the right bank
are as follows: i. in the northwest the lower Kāra-su
which runs almost parallel to the Araxes and receives
on the right bank the waters from Dambat (a high plateau to the S.E. of Little Ararat where in
1905 Minorsky discovered the ruins of the ancient
town which local Armenian tradition identifies
with Arshakan, cf. Moses of Chorene, ii. 27
and ibid., i. 30); 2. the mountain-torrents Yllandārāş and Šar-šu; 3. the river Zāngiṁar (Zāngiṁar, Măkū-šāl) which consists of three main branches,
one coming from the kănate of Avadāḏ, the other,
the Tīghūl, from the S.E. corner of the plain of
Čaldērūn from the vicinity of the village of Tīghūl
(Armenian: Ėmān = muddy); the third from
the central canton of Bahāḏūk. The combined
waters run through the defile in which lies the
town of Măkū and water the rich district of Zangi-
başar ("watered by the Zāngiṁar"). Here the Zāngiṁar receives on its right bank the waters
from the central massif of Šoḵūr (this tributary
seems to have been once known as the Kāhan),
and on the left bank the Šar-šu (different from the
above mentioned Šar-šu) which rises on Turk-
Asiac territory in the north of Būyażid and flows
a considerable distance parallel to the central course
of the Zāngiṁar. 4. The Aḵh-šāl, the sources of
which are on the eastern face of the chain which
separates Turkey from Persia and on the southern
face of the transverse chain (Āḏar-pāră) which separates
Aḵh-šāl from Tīghūl. The waters of the Aḵh-šāl
and its tributary irrigate the canton of Sŏgmač-
āwā, flow into the fertile plain of Ėlīštān and flow
into the Kūṭur-šāl which waters the plain of Kōhi.
Below this confluence the Aḵh-šāl receives on its
right bank the waters of the district of Āḏar which
rise near the Turco-Persian frontier to the south
of the sources of the Aḵh-šāl and the north
of those of the Kūṭur-šāl.

The town. The site of the town of Măkū is
very striking. It lies in the short gorge through
which the Zāngiṁar here runs. The cliffs rise
perpendicularly on the right bank. The cliffs on
the left bank rise to a height of 600 feet above
the river. The little town lies in an amphitheatre
on the slope. Above the town at the foot of the rocks
are the ruins of ancient fortifications and a spring.
Then the mountain wall rises almost perpendicularly
and at a height of 180 to 200 feet leems forward.
There is therefore an incredible mass of rock
suspended over the town. (According to Monteith's
estimate the dimensions of the cavern thus formed are:
height 600 feet, depth of the cavern 800 feet (7),
breadth 1,200, thickness at the top of the arch
800 feet). It is only for a brief period daily that the
sun penetrates into this gigantic cave. Just above
is a cave which used to be entered by a perilous
scaffolding. At a later date when the cave was used
as a prison, the prisoners were hoisted up by
a rope. (The only European who has been inside
it is A. Iwanowski).

The population. The population of Măkū consists
of Turks and Kurds. The former, who are in the
majority, occupy villages along the rivers of the
kănate. They are the remnants of the Turkoman tribes of Bayat, Pornāk etc. The canton at the foot of the Šoḵūr is called Kāńăn-Koçułu.
The people (about 900 houses grouped into 26
villages) belong to the Aḥ-šāık faith (R. M. M.,
XL, p. 66) which is indirect but interesting evidence
of the character of the heresy of which the Turkom-
0

an dynasty of the Kāńăn-Koçułu was accused
(MūneĎdji-mbaşlı, illi., p. 153). The old enmity
between the Turkoman tribes survives in the general
name applied by the Kāńăn-koçułu to their Shīa
"Twelve" neighbours: they call them Ağı-Koçułu
(Gordievsky, p. 9).

The Kurds of the kănate are semi-nomads.
The Džallāt (cf. on their supposed ancestors, "Alam-
āz, p. 339 under the years 1017—1018) occupy
the slopes of Ararat and in summer betake them-
selves to the pasturages along the Turco-Persian
frontier. Many sections of them lead a troglodyte
life in the caves of the Dambat region.
The Mītān live between the Araxes and the
massif of Šoḵūr where they pass the summer.
At Kāńăn-Aimet (in Kūrdis Kaledi) there are
Haidārānu.

Before the war there were only 1,200 Armenians
left in Măkū. It is remarkable that the confidential
servants in the houses of the kănate are an
Armenian nationality. The celebrated and imposing monastery of St. Thadden (Thadevos-Arakel = Kāńăn-Kišia among
the Muslims) rebuilt in 1247 (St. Martin, Misoiées
sur l’Arménie, ii. 463) is in the central canton
of Bahāḏūk. It is regarded with a certain respect
even by Muslims who kiss the Gospels on entering
it. A long inscription recording the foundation,
given it by Shâh Ağaş adorns the doorway. At one time the villages at Măkū and
at Khoi belonged to the monastery and paid their rents to it. Another Armenian monastery (Sam Stepanos, Dastpil-Peuch) was located below the mouth of the Kotur-cai on the borders of Mäkti. The little village of Daghbärü is inhabited by Yazidis.

Ancient history. The oldest monuments of Mäkti go back to the period of the Khatl (Vanitic) kingdom. The chamber carved in the rock near Sangar (on the Mäkti-Bāşirān-Bāyazid road) is one of a number of similar constructions in Bāyazid and in the country west of Urmi (Minorisk, Kelo-Siah, Zogh., xxiv, p. 171). A Khaldi inscription known as that of "Mäkti" seems to come from Bastin on the Akh-cái (district of Cai-pān). It is of King Rusi II, son of Arghisht (c. 680-695 n. c.; cf. Sayce, A new Vanitic Inscription, J. R. A. S., 1912, p. 107-115; N. Y. Marr, Nadv. Rus. I is Mäkti, Zogh., xxv, 1921, p. 1-54). The inscription is important as showing that the power of the kings of Mäkti was extended to the region of Khoi.

Mäkti later formed part of Armenia. It corresponds to the canton of Artas of the province of Vaspurakan (Armenian seventeenth century Geography). According to Moses of Chorene, the district was at first known as Shutwarsh but was given the name of Artas in memory of the old home of the Alán whom Aratahs̄ transplanted hither (cf. Ardaz in Ossetia). The name Shutwarsh may be explained from the rule of the Artrasun kings among whom the name Shwarak (Šwarak = Šawrak = Mod. Pers. Shurshyr) was frequent (cf. Marquart, Erzrabihr, p. 4, 177). The suggestion of this scholar that Artas is connected with the older Arzana etc., Strabo, xii, 14, 3, is untenable because Artas is above Artaz which again is above the last of Artaz = Mäkti. The Aradni kings who later established themselves north of the Araxes must also have ruled in Artas for the diocese of Mäkti is called Amatunez̄-tan (Adonta).

The names Mäkti and Hæcium (= Hasm) north of Mäkti are mentioned in the History of Thomas Artaruni written in the tenth century, in the passage (ii. 3) describing the frontier of the lands ceded by the Sasanian Khuršar to the emperor Maurice in 591 (Brosset, Coll. d'Hist. Arm., St. Petersburg 1874, i., p. 75). On the many Armenian monuments in the land of Mäkti cf. the work of Minorisk on the antiquities of the khatene; cf. also Hübschmann, Die altarm. Ortsnamen, 1904, p. 344 and Adonta, Arménia v epliu̇ T'uttiniana, St. Petersburg 1908, index.

According to a legend recorded by Moses of Chorene (iv. 2, ii. 40) Tigiranes, having defeated the Medes (in Arm. Mard) Abdalshak settled his descendants all around Maas (Ararat). Neither the Arab historians (Tabari, Ibn al-Athir) nor geographers know this corner of Armenia although the name looks very old. It would be tempting to explain Mäkti as Mān + Kūh = Mountain of the Medes (P ers. måk and Arm. wär go back to the old Iranian Māda). The form Mākti (*Māktia) which is found in Hamdullah Mustafavi however presupposes a different final element.

History under Islam. Hamdullah Mustafavi (Nnebát al-Kulib, ed. Le Strange, p. 89) is the first writer (740 = 1340) to mention Mäkti among the cantons of the kingdom of Nakhčivan. It is a cleft in the neck of a rock and at the foot lies a village which stands in the shade till midday. In this place lives the Christian chief priest (ṣaqlik) whom they call Mass-Häšar (this reading is preferable to Margusha of Le Strange; cf. Aram. Margushat = the Lord Bishop).

The Spanish Ambassador Clavijo who visited Mäkti on June 1, 1404 still found it inhabited by Armenian Catholics ruled by their prince Noradin, who enjoyed practical independence. Timur did not succeed in taking Mäkti but by a treaty Noradin agreed to supply him with 20 horsesmen when required. The oldest son of Noradin was taken to the court of Omar Mirza and converted to Islam when he was given the name of Sargatunx (Seyr-g charismatic); as to another son, Noradin intended to send him to Europe to be consecrated a bishop. Clavijo mentions a monastery of Dominicans at Mäkti, "en el dicho lugar" (Frayles de Sancto Domingo, Viage a las anteladas, ed. Sennenschwi, St. Petersburg 1881, p. 158-162 and 376) trans. Le Strange, London 1928, p. 144-145). Clavijo gives an accurate description of the town (a castle in the valley; on the slope, the town surrounded by walls; higher, a second wall, which was reached by steps cut in the rock).

On the death of Timur, Kara-Vüstüf the Kara-Koyuni disappeared on the scene and Mäkti was one of the first places he conquered in 806 (1406) (Sharaf-nimaa, i. 376). Henceforth the country must have become rapidly Turkised. According to the Sharaf-nimaa (i. 295, 298), in 892 (1574) the Ottoman government ordered the Kurds to look after the Mähmûdî tribe (cf. above ii., p. 1145) to take Mäkti (one of the cantons of Nakhčivan) from the Persians and to restore the fortresses. I twas given to Mäkti as vajhsar. After his death in 1002, Sultân Muhammad II gave the fortresses to Mustafa Beg, son of I twal.

When in the summer of 1014 (1605) Shâh Abbas was in the vicinity of Khoi the Mähmûdî Kurds of the district of Mäkti and Pasak (a village on the Alân-cai to the west of Khoi) did not come to pay homage to the Shâh. Abbas I transferred the clan of Manšur-beg to the Trâk (Persian) and took the field in person against Mâhtaf, beg of Mäkti. The historian Iškandar-munghi mentions two forts at Mäkti, one at the foot of the mountain (fuy-i väk) and the other on its side (moiyan-i vádi). The former was taken by the Shâh's troops but the capture of the other was "not so easy". Orders were given to plunder the Mähmûdî tribe which was done. The women and children were carried off and the Mähmûdî men executed. The booty was so great that cows were sold at 2 dirhams = 200 (Persian) dînârs a head. The royal camp remained for 10 days at Mäkti but the upper fortress "in spite of the constretness of the place and the lack of water" held out and the Shâh left for Nakhčivan without having obtained its surrender (Ālam-i-nahr, p. 479).

The Turks and Persians attached great importance to the position of Mäkti. Murad IV in the campaign of 1045 himself realised the importance of Kotur and Mäkti and in the instructions given in 1046 to Kâna Mustafa Pašā ordered him to demand that the Persians should destroy the two fortresses. Indeed by the treaty of 1049 (1639) the Persians decided to raise Kotur Mäkti, (read Mäkti) and Mazhabār (Zarikh-i Nâ'immü, i. 686). However Murād IV died and in the reign of Selim I, the Persians reoccupied Kotur and Mäkti (Ewliya Celebi, iv., p. 279).
The next stage is recorded in the Persian inscription engraved on the rock above the fortress (Minorsky, Dramaotsi, p. 23). It tells us that Şah 'Abbas II ordered the destruction of the fortress because it sheltered the embattled (mufsadat). The fortress is compared to a Kaţa‘-y′a Khabib; the ex
cutor of the Şah′s order was a certain Akbar and the date is 1052 = 1641-1642 (Chronogram ḡ-n-f). The history of 'Abbas II (Kıpšl-Ab-khānī, Bibl. Nat. Paris, Sapph. Per., N° 227) throws no light on the incident but as (fol. 74v) an Ottoman embassy to the court of the young Şah in 1052 is mentioned, it is probable that it was not without influence on the destruction of the fortress, on the preservation of which Persia had formerly laid stress.

Contrary to the tenor of the inscription, Ewliyyā Celebi, II, 337-339 claims that it was the Ottomans who, after the peace of 1049, destroyed Mākū and at the same time recalled the Maimudī Beg who was their representative there. In 1057 (1647) the Kurd Beg of Shāhkī (a stronghold on the borders of Persia) rebelled against the Turks. The Persians, while protesting against his raids, seized the occasion to introduce to Mākū 2,000 riflemen from Māranderd. The Ottomans sent an army of 32,000 men against Shāhkī. Muṣṭafā Beg of Shāhkī was defeated and sought refuge in Mākū. Ewliyyā accompanied the Pasha and the detachment that went to Mākū to demand the extradition of the rebel. Satisfaction was given them and the wali of Erzerum Mudīm from Fatih the Persian envoys in a very friendly fashion. He told them however that if the Persians did not withdraw their troops from Mākū and destroy the fortress he would attack Erivan and Nakhchivan. The result is not known but Persia′s possession of Mākū recognised in 1639 does not seem to have again been seriously disputed by Turkey.

The family which ruled Mākū from 1747 to 1923 belonged to the Bāyāt tribe, the clan settled around the Sūkhar (on the Bayat cf. Koprulizade Memed Pīşkū, Oğlanı Bustaniye, David Türk, İstanbul, 1925, p. 16-23). According to oral tradition Ağman Salām Bāyāt was in Khorāṣān in the service of Nūr-Şah. After the latter′s assassination, he seized one of his wives and a part of their treasure and returned to Mākū. Very little is known about him or his son Hamān Khatūn (Monteith′s host) who died in 1835. It is possible that under the Zand dynasty and at the beginning of the 19th century the real authority in the region N.W. of Aharbābdājān belonged to the family of Dumbull Khatūn [cf. Kurde], whose headquarters was at Khol (cf. Tārīkh, the special history of the Dumbull is not accessible in Europe). The disappearance of the Dumbull must have opened the way to the Bāyāt. 'Ali Khatūn (1775-1865), son of Hamān Khatūn, is often mentioned by travellers (Fraser, Abich, Flandin, Ćirko, Likhtin) as an influential chief jealous of his prerogatives. We know that the Bāb was entrusted to the guardianship of 'Ali Khatūn from June to December 1847 and that the latter treated him very kindly. The Bāb in his esoteric language calls Mākū ḡakāh-ḵī, īstif in contrast to ḡakāh-ḵī (i.e. ġahrī, cf. salmās) where his imprisonment was more rigorous (cf. Brown, A Traveler′s Narrative, 1891, li, p. 16, 271-277; Jān-Khāḥānī, Nuqat ul-qīf, G. M. S., vol. XV, 1910, p. 131-132). During the war of 1853-1856 'Ali Khatūn derived great material advantage from the neutrality of his territory which lay between Russia and Turkey. His son Timūr Pasha Khatūn (1820-1859?) profi
ted by a similar situation during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878. In 1881, his appearance at the head of the Mākū horsemen in the district of Salmās accelerated the collapse of the invasion of Kurds under Şahīkh 'Ubaidallah [q.v.]. Timūr Pasha Khatūn was hailed as the saviour of Ahihrbābdājān and the people even called him Mākū Pādkhatūn.

His son and successor Murtaḍā Kulli Khatūn Igbal al-Salāma (1863-1933) at first continued the policy of isolation and aggrandisement of the khatūnate but his activity aroused suspicion on all sides. At the beginning of the war of 1914 Russian distrust earned him a forced stay in Tiflis. In time Mākū became part of the theatre of war. The Russian troops built a light railway from Shāh-čaft (on the Araxes) to Bāyāzīd and the station of Mākū became a busy centre. In 1917 the Sanīder returned home and held his position till the coming of Rūdān Sīnī Pahlawī, when, accused of intrigues, he was arrested on 25th Mihr 1912 (Oct. 17, 1923) and transported to the prison of Tābriz where he died suddenly. A Persian officer was appointed governor of Mākū (Nawbahkt, Shāhīngūsh Khatūn, Thānī 1834, p. 112).


MĀL (a.), means in the old language possession, property, referring among the Beduins particularly to camels, but also to estates and money, in any case to concrete things. The word is formed from māl and means properly anything that belongs to any one. As a noun it is of course treated as a med. stem from which a
verb is then formed. In the meaning "money" the word is used in the expression māl qašāt "dumb property" in contrast to māl waṣṣāt "speaking property", applied to slaves and cattle. There is a full definition of the conception in the introduction to the Jihrā' illā Mafāsiṣ al-Tulā' al-Abū 'l-Fadl Dja'far b. Abī al-Dimashqī (Cairo 1318, p. 2 sqq.) studied and for the most part translated by H. Ritter, Isi., vit. (1916), 1-91. There and in the Mafāṣṣil al-Ulūm (see Bibli.) p. 59, the different classes of property are enumerated. As māl includes property in its different aspects the word can also mean " storia.

The attitude of the Muslim religion to money and property and its acquisition was of course a subject of discussion from the beginning of the literature. The authoritative religious and ethical point of view is that of al-Ghazālī (so to be written, cf. Moh. ben Cheneb, R.A.A., vii., 1927, p. 224 sqq.) in the second decade of the 15th, especially book 13 (Ritter, op. cit., gives an analysis) and 14 (transl. by H. Bauer, Berlauern und verworbene Güt = Islamische Ethik, ill., 1922; cf. R. Hartmann in Isti., xiv.).

The acquisition, guarding and disposal of property is one of the four main sections of economics (Tadhīr al-Munāfīq), the second part of practical philosophy, which is divided into ethics, economics, politics and justice, just as it entered Islam with the rest of Hellenistic sciences. As the Politics of Aristotle, the first book of which deals with ethics, the Muslims had to be content with the only translated work on economics, composed by the Neo-Platonian Ps.-Bryson which has had a decisive influence on the whole economic literature of Islam. The text, the Greek original of which is lost, was first edited by L. Chichko in Moschr. xix. (1921) and has been recently published with the Hebrew and Latin versions and a German translation by M. Piessner (cf. Bibli.). The interesting chapter on māl in it was further expanded by Muslim authors of the school of Ps.-Bryson, particularly from religious literature. A standard work is the Abūl Ishaq b. al-Tūlī (q.v.) of which the economic section has been analysed and translated by Piessner. The view of the origin of money which Aristotle holds in the Nic. Ethik. reached Islam direct, besides coming through Ps.-Bryson; it is first found in the Tuhfāt al-tūlī (Miskawakh (this is his correct name and not Ibn Miskawakh (q.v.) e.g. Cairo 1322, p. 38 (cf. also KAMUS AND DHAHAB).

The word māl very early became a technical term in arithmetic. It is first found in exercises in dividing inheritances applied to the property of the testator which is to be divided. We later find the word used regularly for the unknown quantity in an equation; in this meaning it was afterwards replaced by kifāh (q.v.). Used for the unknown in quadratic equations it became the word for the square of a number. The fourth power is called māl al-māl, the fifth māl ka'bah, the square of the cube. The history of this change of meaning has been elucidated by J. Ruska, Arch. oriental. Geschw. und Rchronik (S.B. Ab. Heid., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1917, No. 2, esp. chap. vii., cf. also Index, s.v. Māl).


MĀL AMĪR, more accurately Māl-ʾAmīr, a ruined site in Lūristān. It lies in the centre of a flat plain about 3,100 feet above sea-level, in 46° 45′ East Long. and 31° 50′ South Lat., 3-4 days journey east of Shīzar (q.v.) and marks the site of a mediaeval town for which during the caliphate the name Iḥṣādī (sometimes vocalised Alḥṣādī) was exclusively used. The modern name Māl-ʾAmīr seems to be first used in the Mongol period; at least the first known occurrence is in the first half of the sixteenth century in Ibn Batṭūta (ii. 29) in the Arabic form Māl-ʾAmīr. Iḥṣādī under the 'Abbāsid was the capital of a district of the province, and was also described more precisely as Iḥṣādī al-Ahwāz (Khuṭustainā), sometimes called after Rāʾiṣ (a)burnur to distinguish it from a place of the same or similar name in the region of Sarmāzand (cf. Yūḥān, i. 416, 417: Iḥṣādī, ii. 496).

Even under the Šāfiʿīs and the somewhat inaccessible district of Iḥṣādī seems to have enjoyed a certain independence. When the Arabs for the first time invaded Khuṭustainā in 17 (635) they came to a friendly arrangement with the lord of Iḥṣādī by which the latter was guaranteed the possession of his power (Tabarits, i. 2553). Eleven years later (29 = 649) however, the governor of Banū, 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭāmr (q.v.), was forced by a rising in the newly won province to undertake a military expedition which took him incidentally to Iḥṣādī; see Baladī (ed. de Goeje), p. 384 and above, ii. 4.

Under the caliphate Iḥṣādī played no prominent part. During the troubles in the last decade of the Omayyad rule Abū Dja'far al-Manṣūr afterwards Caliph (cf. v. Vloten, in Z. D. M. G., iii. 314) administered the district of Iḥṣādī for the 'Abbāsid pretender `Abd Allāh b. Maʿṣūma (q.v.). A son, afterwards the caliph al-Mahdi, was born to him here, apparently by a woman of Iḥṣādī (see Tabarits, ill. 527). The family of the latter apparently kept up its connection with Iḥṣādī for Yūḥān (i. 416) speaks of descendants of al-Mahdi who bore the family name of Iḥṣādī. The name Māl-ʾAmīr, "prince's estate", might date from the time of al-Mahdi when the 'Abbāsids seem to have had lands in Iḥṣādī. But this name of Iḥṣādī, as already mentioned, does not occur in an Arabic source till 500 years later, so it may be assumed with greater probability that it arose in the time of the Atabegs of Lūrān Buzurg (q.v. = Great Lūr) under whom Iḥṣādī attained its greatest prosperity. This ruling family, which traced its origin to a Kurd chieftain of Syria, is also called the Fāṭimids dynasty after an ancestor of the Ḥazāraspid after the proper founder of their power, Malik Ḥazārasp. Their rule over East and South Lūr-
rihatia dated from about 530 (1135). The capital was Iddhajj. At times the power of these princes stretched eastwards as far as the vicinity of Iyahan and southwards to Byasar and to the Persian Gulf. They owned the suzerainty of the caliphs or of the Mongol Khanas who replaced the Abbásids; in practice they were fairly independent. Among the Uthbees of this dynasty mention may be made of Almahud Nuṣrat al-Din (596–730 or 733 = 1226–1329 or 1332). According to Ibn Battūta, he built 160 madrasas in his kingdom, of which 44 were in Iddhajj. He also improved caravan traffic by hewing roads through the rocks. Under his successor Abū Bakr ibn al-Cast, Ibn Battūta spent some time in Iddhajj and gives an interesting description of this city in the course of this journey. The Timurids in 827 (1424) put an end to the rule of the Fatālī dynasty. On this dynasty cf. above ii. p. 48 sg., and the genealogical tables in Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, Marburg 1895, p. 460 and E. von Zambait, *Manuel de Géographie et de Chronologie pour L'Histoire de l'Islam*, Hanover 1927, p. 334.

On the later history of Iddhajj nothing is known. The town probably became gradually deserted after the fall of the Fatālīs. Its ruins are now represented by a large mound of earth, about 35 feet high, of irregular shape with smaller mounds of rubble around it. Cf. Layard in *J. G. R. S.*, xi. 1846, p. 74 and Layard, *Early Adventures in Persia*, Sarisar and Bokhala, London 1887, l. 403, and Jequier, *op. cit.* (s. Bibl.), p. 134.

It may be mentioned that the Bohīd Sultanān struck coins in Iddhajj in the name of Shemimit. In the neighborhood of these border ranges, as is the S. E. and is linked up to the Mungabat hills farther south (cf. Rawlinson in *J. G. R. S.*, x. 80–81; de Bode, *op. cit.*, xii. 100; Layard, *op. cit.*, xiv. 74 and de Bode, *Travels*, ii. 39) within which stood the fortress of the same name, which played an important part in the middle ages (Mungabat, Mankhlih, Mandjaj; cf. also above iii., p. 466 sq.).

The ridge which shews in the plain of Māl-Amūr in the east or N.E. is called Kūh Gheghūt. According to Jequier, there is a large artificial lake in the north (northeastern) part of the plain, which finally disappears in the swamp. According to de Bode (*J. G. R. S.*, xii. 104), there was in his time two small lakes there, the so-called Shatt-bend's, which dried up in summer like the marshes and the small streams which run through the plain. The water of the latter came in the main from the lake of Deridjelī Bandān, south of the plain of Māl-Amūr, behind which Hotun-Schindler (see Bibl.) ascended the steep wall of the Tanawat range. The lake called Fam al-Bawwāb described by Yāqūt may be identical with this stretch of water; cf. La Strange, *op. cit.*, p. 245; Schwarz, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

Among the numerous ravines which are to be found among the hills that border the Māl-Amūr plain on the N. E. the most interesting from the archaeological point of view is that of Kūh-l Fārūk (see the plan in Jequier, *op. cit.*, p. 135). Kūh-l Fārūk, according to O. Mann in Lütr "little ravine"; cf. above iii., p. 41 b,Dieulafoy and Schindler have erroneously reproduced this to them unintelligible word by Kal'a or Kūt = fortress: see Weissbach, *op. cit.*, p. 743, note, whose suggestion about the meaning of Kal'a is now ruled out. For Fārūk, H. Schindler gives the form Ferra and Ferendi (Franks, Europeans), the latter apparently based on a Lūtr interpretation of the male costume in the reliefs there. Earlier travellers (Layard, de Bode) write Kūl-Fārūn, apparently because their Lūtr authorities identified the same Fārūk with Fārūn (Pharaoh) whom they saw from the Kūrān.

The majority of the sculptures of pre-Irānian (Elamite) origin in the region of Māl-Amūr are to be found in Kūh-l Fārūk. Quite close to the entrance to the ravine is a large stele with very small human figure in high relief, a row of smaller figures with a well preserved 24 line cuneiform inscription and 10 smaller inscriptions (the latter giving the names of the individuals represented). According to the large inscription it is a monument erected by a certain Ḥánī, son of Ṭabẖiḫān. Opposite, on the other side of the ravine at intervals on blocks of stone and on the wall are five tablets with other reliefs of rude execution. Special mention must be made of a great procession with 67 figures. The total number of figures in Kūh-l Fārūk is according to Layard 341.

Opposite the ravine of Kūh-l Fārūk, in the hills which bound the S. W. side of the plain of Māl-Amūr is the cave with many corridors of Shīkefte-i Salmān, "the cave of Salmān." According to the Bahktiyārs who hold this place in great honour, the name is derived from that of Salmān al-Fārist [q.v.], the first Persian to adopt Islam, who is buried there, contrary to the modern Sunnite and Shi'i tradition which locates the tomb of this companion of the Prophet in al-Madīna (`Salmān Fāris; cf. above iii., p. 79). In Shīkefte-i Salmān have survived four primitive bas-reliefs of the Elamite period of which two are outside and two inside the cave. Among them is a figure, over life size with a 36 line cuneiform inscription which also dates from the Ḥāńī above mentioned. On a little explanaede to the south of the cave are the ruins of a little Muslim sanctuary, probably erected on the site of an older sanctuary. In the corner of the spring is a spring which rises one of the little streams that water Māl-Amūr.

Apart from the monuments of Kūh-l Fārūk and Shīkefte-i Salmān there are a series of other monuments and remains of the ancient and mediaeval periods in the plains of Shīkefte-i Salmān. For example, in the southwest part of the plain near a ruined inamandī (saint's tomb) which the Lārs call Shāh-Suward (the king on horseback) on a slope of the hill is a small stele, obviously also of the Elamite period, with 6 figures and an inscription which has been destroyed. According to Layard, there are many popular traditions about this place. A little north of Shāh-Suward at a place called Kūh Wādī are the ruins of a palace. In the opposite direction in the N. E. section of the plain rises a round palace on the summit of a rock, called Ķal'a Gāshdoun (Scorpion Hill) by the natives. A ravine near by is called Hōng; in it
may be seen a much weathered Sassanian rock-sculpture of great dimensions; probably of the earlier period (c. 5th). That the plain of Mä’l-Amir enjoyed comparative prosperity in the Sassanian period is evident from the remains of canals of this date.

In the S.W. of the plain a narrow road runs to the village of Hallâd (de Bode: Halegem). Near it are old ruins of the period of the Atâbeg dynasty. There is an Atâbeg citadel, an Atâbeg bridge and well. The numerous traces of buildings probably date from a medieval town. Of recent date is the ruin (mentioned by de Bode) of a palace of Hasan Khan, a chief of the Bakhtîyâr tribe of Čahâr-Lâng who lived here about 1821. Here is another little river called Hallâd-jân or Shîth-Rüben which is probably connected with the lake at Bâshidj-i Bândân already mentioned (cf. Layard, J. R. G. S., xvi. 74 and Early Adventurers, i. 403.; de Bode, J. R. G. S., xii. 100 and Travels etc., i. 404.

In the N.E. of Mâl-Amir runs an old road paved with huge blocks of stone, which is now called Râk-i Sulân (the Sulân’s path) or Diâtet-i Atâbeg (= Atâbeg road) to the Sar-i Râk (Rädjî) some 3,500 feet high, the highest point, and thence to Işfâhân after several days’ journey. It has already been mentioned above that the Atâbegs did a great deal for road-making in their lands. But the original planning of the road probably goes back to a great antiquity; cf. thereon de Bode, J. R. G. S., xiii. 102–104, and Travels etc., ii. 6–8, 35–46. Perhaps, he suggests, the ‘ladder-steps’ (ṣâhûnencias σκάλας) over which Eumenes passed, as mentioned by Diodoros xix. 21, may be identical with the Atâbeg road. Remains of old roads paved or hewn out of the rock are also found in other places in the neighbourhood of Mâl-Amir; cf. iii. 516. The natives ascribe them at once to the Atâbegs, as they do the ruined caravanserais found everywhere. Near the Sar-i Râk pass about 12 miles east of Mâl-Amir is a place called Kâsl-i Medrese, where chiefs of the Bakhtîyârs meet every year. There are the ruins of two Sassanian buildings; cf. Unvala, in Revue d’Asiologie, xxv. 1924, p. 86–88, who gives a detailed description of them. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 340, thinks that this Kâsl-i Medrese — in spite of the discrepancy in the distances given corresponds with the place Hallâd-jân mentioned by Ibn Bâji (ii. 41). A ruined site of the same name, also with two Sassanian buildings is according to Unvala 24 miles S.E. of Masdîd-i Sulâmân (cf. assan); 4–5 hours N.E. of Mâl-Amir are the ruins of Sûsân [q.v.].

The Arab geographers of the middle ages reckoned the celebrated stone bridge (bantara) of Išdâdi crossing the Djudjâl (Kajfez) among the wonders of the world. It was also called Kântara Khurrâsân from the alleged (otherwise unknown) name of the mother of Ardashir I, who is said to have built this bridge and another in the town of Ašwâs (see Schwarz, op. cit., p. 321). Otherwise we only know the masculine form of the Persian name Khursâd (cf. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 338 note 4 and Jastrow, Iranisches Wörterbuch, Marburg 1895, p. 180). In the 16th (5th) century this bridge of Išdâdi was restored by the vizier of the Bâshid Rûkân al-Dawla after two years of work. De Bode identifies it with the “Atâbeg” bridge at Hallâd-jân; probably he should, with Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 53 and Schwarz, op. cit., p. 339, identify it with the “Old Bridge” crossing a small tributary of the Kârlûn N.E. of Kâl’a-i Medrese. For further information on the Bridge of Išdâdi cf. Yâkût, i. 416, iv. 189 and Schwarz, op. cit., p. 338–339.

The rulers who had the sculptures and rock inscriptions of Kâl-i Zârâ and Siâjkfeh-i Salâmân made, belong to the period of the latter E. Elamite kingdom, to the period between Neo-Babylonian 1 (1146–1123) and the rise of Assyria in the first half of the 16th century i.e. about 1000 B.C. It cannot be decided whether king Hanni, son of Shîth-Rüben, from whom the monuments and inscriptions date, and the Shûtar Nakhkhûnî, son of Indada mentioned by him, ruled the whole of Elam or whether they are to be regarded as members of a local dynasty ruling perhaps the district of Mâl-Amir. The inscriptions are in the Elamite language but contracts written in the Babylonian language have also been found in Mâl-Amir; cf. the Bibliography.

Here it may be mentioned that following de Bode the town of the Uxians which Alexander the Great passed on his way from Susa to Persepolis after passing the “Süsan Gates” has often been sought in the region of Mâl-Amir; de Bode, Travels etc., ii. 47 sq.; Spiegel, Ermanische Altertumskunde, i. Leipzig 1876, p. 409 and Kaezst in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl. d. class. Altertums-wiss., i. 1424.

Since the late middle ages (beginning of the vi/viiith century) the Bakhtîyâr Lürs have settled in the district of Mâl-Amir (cf. above iii., p. 428, 435). They spend the winter there on account of the fine green pastures. On the Bakhtîyârs see Sakhtûyârs and iii., p. 426, 435, 436, 506.

Bibliography: B.G.A., passim (s. Indica); Yâkût, Muṣīyân, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 416; Hând Allah Mustâwî, Nuzhat al-Kelâb (G. M. S., xxii.), p. 70; Ibn Bâji, ed. Paris, ii. 39–427; G. L. Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 245; P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter nach den arabischen Geographien, iv. Leipzig 1921, p. 293, 335–340; 441, note 5; 421, note 6; 439–440; Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 152–157, 218. — It is only since the xixth century that we have more exact accounts of the plain of Mâl-Amir and its monuments from European travellers. On those for the period 1841–1889, see Weisbach, op. cit. (see below), p. 745. Rawlinson was not himself in Mâl-Amir but heard of the ruins there when in the neighbourhood in 1836; cf. his article in J. R. G. S., ix. 82–84. — For the archaeological monuments of Mâl-Amir the most valuable records are those of Layard and C. A. de Bode who both visited it in 1841 and that of Jâquier at the beginning of the xixe century. C. A. de Bode in J. R. G. S., xiii., 1843, p. 100–104 and in Travels in Kurdistan and Arabia, London 1845, i. 400–404; ii. 1, 6–8, 25–50, 102–100; Jâquier, Description du site de Mâl-Amir, in Délégation en Perse, Mémoires, vol. iii., Paris 1901, p. 133–143 (with 2 plates). Cf. also the description by A. Houtum Schindler (Reise 1877), in Zeitschr. d. Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde zu Berlin, xiv., 1879, p. 45 sq. Cf. also the descriptions of the monuments of Mâl-Amir in Weisbach,
For the Elamite bas-reliefs in Mal-Amir and the cuneiform inscriptions with them the reader is referred to Weisbach, op. cit., p. 745-747 for illustrations, squatters, editions, decipherment, and commentary as regards the Bibliography down to 1893. The inscriptions were first edited by Layard in his Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character, London 1851, Pl. 31-32, 36-37. Mention should also be made of: A. H. Sayce, The Inscriptions of Mal Amur, in Acta du six Congres International des Orientalistes, 3. Leyde, vol. ii., Leyden 1885, Weisbach gave a new edition in the publication above mentioned; a new transcription and translation of the Mal-Amur texts with commentary; cf. op. cit., p. 748-754, 759-777 (and plates i-iv.). A transcription, differing in many points from Weisbach, of the two great inscriptions of KUL-FAR and Shikkeb-Salman (with notes) was given by G. Husing in Zeitschrift für Assyriologie (M. V. G., ill., Heft 7), Berlin 1898, p. 21-34; cf. also Husing's short articles in O. L. Z., ix., 1906, vol. 605-606; xi., 1908, col. 337 sq. The latest edition of all the Mal-Amur inscriptions — including the fragmentary one of Shikkeb-Salman quoted by Weisbach — is that of Scheil, Délégation en Perse, Mémoires, vol. iii., Paris 1901, pl. 27-36; transcription and translation under: N. X. I., and tav., p. 102-112. Scheil (ibid.) also published autotype fascimiles of the bas-relief and a 'picture of the cave of Shikkeb-Salman': cf. pl. 27-33. In his travels in Pakistan O. M. Mann also visited Mal-Amir and took squatters of the inscriptions there (cf. O. L. Z., xi., 605); but so far as I am aware he has published no more about them. — On the particular form of cuneiform used in the Mal-Amur inscriptions see Weisbach, op. cit., p. 752-759 (syllabary) and the epigraphic tables on pp. 762-780; cf. on the question of transmigration Husing, Beiträge zur K. G., p. 15-21 with table of characters and data. In O. L. Z., vil., 1904, vol. 437-440.

In Mal-Amir have also been found cuneiform tablets of a legal nature (contracts) written in the Babylonian language; 16 of these contracts have been edited, transliterated and translated by V. Scheil in Délégation en Perse, Mémoires, vol. iv., Paris 1902, pl. 19-20 and p. 169-194. (M. Streck)

MALABAR, a district of the Madras Presidency in British India, situated on the west coast of the peninsula, between 10° 15' and 13° 48' N. latitude and 73° 14' and 76° 15' E. longitude, and extending for 450 miles along the shores of the Arabian Sea; on the E. the district is bounded by the Western Ghats, the hills of which attain an average elevation of 5,000 feet, but occasionally rise to 8,000 feet. Out of a total population of 2,093,333 (according to the Census of 1921) there are 1,008,327 Muslims, of whom 93.60 per cent are Sambas; the greater part of them are Mappilas [q. v.]; the Labbais [q. v.] form the next largest group.

The Arabs, who, in the latter part of the 17th century, established themselves on the Arabian coast, and who gradually increased their power, were not, however, driven from the coast by the Portuguese, but established themselves on the adjoining territory, and were thus enabled to trade with both the east and west.

Trade with Arabia appears to have led to the introduction of Islam into the Malabar coast at an early period, and the exact date of which is uncertain. Hindu rajahs encouraged the Arab traders and the commerce of the western coast had passed almost entirely into their hands by the end of the 18th century when the Portuguese arrived to dispute it with them. The Arabs did not give way without a struggle, but by the middle of the 19th century the petty coasting trade was left in Arab hands, and when the power of the Portuguese declined in the 19th century their place was taken by English and Dutch traders. In 1766 Haidar Ali [q. v.] added Malabar to his dominions, but found it a turbulent possession, and his son Tipu Sultan [q. v.] in 1792 had to abandon this territory to the British.
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317th century. After the middle of the 16th century, Malacca territory was increased by the conquest of Pahang (on the East coast of the Peninsula); and for a time the kingdom included all the coasts of the central and South of the Peninsula to about 4° N., together with a sovereignty over the parts of Smatra lying opposite to it. Siam made several unsuccessful attacks on Malacca during this period.

The growth of this incipient empire, which however already showed signs of decay in the form of internal divisions and bad administration, was cut short by the Portuguese conquest in 1511, whereby the town and its immediately adjoining territory, together with the command of the sea, fell into European hands. Though often challenged by the attacks of their Muslim neighbours (especially the new state of Aceh [Achim] in Northern Smatra), the Portuguese maintained their hold on Malacca till 1641, when after a prolonged siege it was taken by the Dutch. In 1795 it was occupied by the British, in the name of the Prince of Orang, and held until 1808, when it was returned to the Dutch under the provisions of the treaty of Vienna. In 1824 it finally became British and in 1826 it was incorporated in one government with Penang and Singapore and made subject to the East India Company.

During the Dutch period the importance of Malacca as a trading centre declined; it was never allowed to compete seriously with Batavia, and in the end it was quite overshadowed by Penang (founded in 1786) and Singapore (founded in 1819).

In recent times it has shared in the general economic development of the Peninsula; but it only ranks as the fifth town in British Malaya, with a population (In 1931) of 36,071 (of whom about one-fifth were Muslims) in an area of 3.5 English square miles. In the whole settlement or territory of Malacca, including the town itself, the population was 153,522, of whom 53,658 were Malays proper (including a considerable number of Minagakban descent), 2,777 other Muslims (such as Javanese, Banjarans, etc.) of Indonesian stock, 1,146 Muslim Indians, 2,575 Chinese, and 56 Arabs, making an approximate total Muslim population of 57,571; almost all of whom were Sons of the school of Shafi'i. Of the rest of the Asiatic population about four-fifths were Chinese and one-fifth Hindus.


(C. O. BLACNON)

MALAGA, Arabic Malakt (ethnic: Malakj), a large town in Spain on the Mediterranean and capital of the same name, has at the present day 133,600 inhabitants. It is built at the centre of a bay commanded by the hill of Gibralfaro (the Llano Fino de Tari). The town is traversed from north to south by a narrow dry (Arabim arid) of the Guadalmedina (called 'Samalbin') which, while very often dried up, sometimes overflows in the rainy season. To the west of the town lies the Vega or Hoja of Malaga where the vegetation is exotic and extremely luxuriant.

Malaga, the ancient Malaca, was founded by the Phoenicians and retained for long under Roman rule. A trace of deep Phoenician influence; its port under the Empire was one of the most important in the Iberian peninsula. At a later date it was the see of a bishop. It was taken from the Byzantines in 571 by the Visigothic king Leovigild. In 711 it was taken by a Muslim force sent from Reja by Tarik. It soon became an important Muslim town and in time supplanted Arabidhona (Archidona, q.v.) as capital of the province of Reja (Latin: regio) where in the time of the governor Abu 'l-Khatta' Abu al-Haitham b. Diri al-Kalbi the Arab Tone (Jordan [al-Urdum]) was settled in 125 (744). Malaga welcomed the founder of the Osmayud dynasty of Spain, 'Abd al-Rahman 1 al-Daghili, after his landing at Almuñecar and his triumphal progress through the districts of Elvira. But, in the second half of the third (nineteenth) century, the province of Reja including Malaga became closely involved in the troubles stirred up by the nationalist 'Umar b. Hafsan. In the reign of the Emir Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. b. Hikam, according to the historian Ibn Hafsan, the province supplied for a summer expedition (2000) against Geralia an imposing number of horsemen: 2,600. Later, when the rebel was causing anxiety to the Emir 'Abd Allah an expedition on a large scale had to be undertaken against the province of Reja. An army under the command of prince Abu son of 'Abd Allah took the field in 993 (694) and inflicted a severe defeat on the troops of Ibn Hafsan. Three years later, the same general had to besiege Malaga which was held by the rebel Musaddir b. 'Abd al-Rahman. Another expedition was again led against Malaga in the reign of 'Abd Allah in 997 (699).

The great caliph 'Abd al-Rahman III, on ascending the throne, had no peace until he succeeded in putting down the rebellion of Ibn Hafsan. In the early years of his reign several expeditions were again sent against the rebels in the province of Reja of which Malaga was the port but not yet the capital. Once order was completely restored by the sovereign, Malaga entered on a long period of prosperity which continued till the end of the Umayyad caliphate.

From being capital of a province, Malaga became the capital of an independent kingdom in the period of the maslak al-mu'tamid. The Hamudids after having had to renounce their claims to the caliphate of all Muslim Spain were able to hold out in a little principality in the S.E. of Spain with Malaga as capital. At the same time another branch of the same family founded a little kingdom around the town of Algeciras. The Hamudid dynasty of Malaga survived till 449 (1057) [on it cf. the article HAMUDID]. The king of G-ana, the Zirid Badi b. Habbas, had hitherto been nominally their vassal. He decided to clear off their sovereignty and seize their principality. He did this with ease and called the last Hamudids to Africa; his son al-Mu'ta' was appointed ruler of Malaga. On the death of Badi in 466 (1073) his kingdom was divided between his two grandsons 'Abd Allah and Tabuin and Malaga
felled to the latter. The town very soon passed to the Almoravids and then to the Almohads. When, in 629 (1232) Muḥammad I Ibn al-Abjar founded the Nasrid kingdom of Granada, Malaga and its province formed part of his lands and remained in the power of the dynasty till the period of the Catholic Kings. Fentinland and Isabella took Malaga from the Moors on Aug. 18, 1487; after a close blockade.

The Arab geographers of Muslim Spain almost all give enthusiastic descriptions of Malaga. Idrisī (xith century) mentions two of its suburbs, praises the sweetness of its waters and the flavour of its fruits. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in the second half of the xith century says much the same and adds that a fine gilt porcelain was made at Malaga which was exported to the whole Muslim world. Finally Ibn al-Khathīb frequently speaks of Malaga in his description of the kingdom of Granada; one of his minor works is devoted to a comparison of Malaga with Salé, the Musulmano Málaga de Salé (the Arabic text has been published from two MSS. of the Escorial by M. J. Müller, Wettstreit zwischen Málaga und Salé, in Beiträge zur Geschichte der westlichen Araber, p. 1-13).

Very few monuments of the Muslim period survive in Malaga, which have not been very much altered. The old chief mosque has become the cathedral. According to the author of al-Rawī al-maṣfūr, this qāya had five naves and five doors, two on the side facing the sea, one on the east front (Bib al-Wāṣl) and one on the north side (Bib al-Khanīkh). Another mosque of Malaga built in the grafa is said to have been founded by the traditionist Muḥammad b. Sīrīb of Emsa (d. 158 = 775). The old Muslim citadel is still called Aḥzarrāya. There are very few relics of Jālim in it, a vaulted gateway (Arco de Cristo) and a tower (Torre de la Vela). This citadel was joined to another fortress by a double rampart built on the hill of Gibralitar; it was restored at the end of the xiii century by the Nasrid rulers of Granada.

Malaga in the Muslim period remained an important sea-port and an active centre of shipbuilding, less important however than its neighbour Almeria. This Dar al-GeVīna, the name of which has survived in the form Atravanna, occupied the actual site of a market and one of the gates with the motto of the Nasrids (al ḥālaḥa illa Allāh, "There is no victor but Allāh") is still standing.


MALĀḤIM (h., sing. malāḥa) came, after a long and obscure development, to mean "destinies", either simply al-malāḥim, or kutub al-malāḥim or in the singular. The word was already quite adequately explained by De Sacy in his Christi

nominative arab., ii. 298-303, on the basis of several passages in Ibn Khaldūn’s Muhaditha. There Ibn Khaldūn defines al-malāḥim as "numerous bones on dynastic changes and events (hīsidjūn al-durai), written in verse and prose and ražīs, many of which are spread abroad amongst the people, some dealing with the changes in the Muslim people (al-milīla) as a whole, and others with particular dynasties, but all ascribed to well known indivi
duals", although, in Ibn Khaldūn’s opinion, it would be difficult to prove the correctness of any of these ascriptions (Quatremer’s text, il. 192 foot; De Slane’s transl., il. 226). The most famous case of this is the book called al-Dānaf (q. v. and the references there). Such predictions as to public affairs have close connection with, and were probably developed from the Jewish and Christian apocalypses. As there are many stories, both in sober historians and in popular tales, describing these books as secretly preserved and consulted by dynastic leaders for their own guidance, they have also contacts with the Roman Sibylline books. The popular doctrine of the Mahdī (q. v.) and of the Last Day (al-Kiyāma [q. v.]) became inextricably confused with this branch of Muslim literature.

The derivation of malāḥama and the development of its meanings are obscure. The word does not occur in the Kur’ān which has the root only in lāḥū and lāḥūn with the concrete meaning, "flesh". Yet the root lā/m,n, like the cognate Hebrew root, had apparently very two separate but old meanings, "food" and "fighting". Further, the fact that the Hebrew food-word, leḥem, means "bread", while its exact equivalent in Arabic means "flesh" would suggest a separation very far back rather than a borrowing (cf. the comparative treatment and references in Browne-Driver’s Handbooks, Hebrew Lexicon, p. 535 sqq.). In old Arabic the meaning of decisive fighting, leading to defeat, pursuit and slaughter, seems to be certain (cf. the treatment in the Līḥā, xxii. 9-11, and add to the quotations there Hamshā, ed. Freytag, p. 124, 726; Duwān of Taftūn b. ‘Awf, ed. Krenkow, p. 7, l. 29, with translation and note on p. 15).

The Līḥā mañana to connect the meanings (flesh; warp and woof in weaving; close, entangled fighting) under the general idea "being intricate, mixed" (lāṭāṭā, lāṭāṭā) or with the picture of the flesh of the slain on the battle-field. But, in view of the Hebrew usage, it is better to be satisfied with the meaning of malāḥama as "a stricken field"; the Līḥā (p. 10) reiterates the idea of war and fighting with much slaughter and especially in the Fītā (bāṭīnā), its only allusion to the prophetic and eschatological usage. An epithet of Muhammad is "the prophet of the malāḥama", indicating that the Līḥā gives two explanations: (i) "the prophet who was sent with the sword" (as in another tradition, būṭītān bāṭīnā); (ii) "the prophet of union and good order" (bāṭīnā, bāṭīnā).

There is very little general prophecy in the Kur’ān to future historical events in this world; but in Tradition there is a great deal. Even the two Sāfi’s have sections on such future fiṭām—
apparently the oldest word for them and frequent in the Qur'an — especially those leading up to the Last Day. In Bukhari (Bullaq 1315, i. 46-61; Book 92 in Wensinck, Handbook) the Prophet is quite explicit in foretelling such woes and tries to come in and in warning how they must be set.

In Muslim (Constantinople 1320-1333, viii. 165-210; Book 52 in Wensinck, Handbook) there is a similar series of hadith or prophetic sayings, but, also, an explicit statement (p. 172 sqq.) that the Prophet foretold everything which would happen to his People until the Last Day. By Ibn Khaldun (Muhammadan, ed. Quatremere, i. 182 sqq.; transal. De Slane, ii. 212 sqq.) this tradition is cited and others, by later and less weighty authorities, which make the Prophet give a dynastic history for future Islam, with the names, fathers' names and tribes of all leaders of revolts until the end.

The use of the term malākīm in connection with such prophecies appears first among the 'Alids in their doctrine of the Dajir. The Futūh gives two occurrences: Ali b. Ya'qūb (D. A. B. 182; p. 224, l. 22) had a Kitāb min umūr al-Malākīm and Isma'il b. Mihrān (p. 225, l. 20) had a Kitāb al-Malākīm. But the name must have spread very rapidly. In the Maqāalah of al-Baghawi (Cairo 1318, ii. 126 sqq.) those traditions are classified and one section is Kitāb al-Malākīm (p. 130-33). All the traditions bear on the wars of the Last Days but the word malākīm itself occurs only in the early part of the Kitāb section (p. 132 middle) in such phrases as "the Malākīm," "the great Malākīm," connected with the capture of Constantinople and the appearance of al-Da'dūl. In the Mukhātkh al-Malākīm (Dhibi 1327, p. 396 sqq.) the text is practically the same, only adding the names of the collections from which the traditions are taken, Abū Daws and al-Tirmidhî. Abū Daws has a separate section on malākīm (No. 36 in Wensinck).

In such a book of edification as the Taḥdhib of al-Qurtubî (l. 671 = 1272), in the Mukhtasar of al-Shahrâbi (Cairo 1334) the sections on the Malākīm have swallowed up the whole doctrine and history of the Mahdî (p. 115-21), to the aid of whom there is sent an angel called Dâmkîr (f), qâkîr al-malākīm.

Ibn Khaldun has recorded the final form which these prophecies took. Traditions put in the mouth of the Prophet were supplemented and largely displace by calculations of astrologers and by the speculations of pantheistic Sufis using the science of Simyâr [q. v.] in the interests of the 'Aliids. We have thus to distinguish sharply between (i) the malākīm-predictions registered in the canonical books of traditions and in the literature of edification based upon these and (ii) the malākīm-books based upon secret tradition and on astrology which went back to the 'Aliids and are represented best by the Dajir. For, besides the Dajir ascribed to Dâ'âr al-Sâlihî, there was also an astrological Dajir, ascribed to Ibn Ishaq al-Kindi, dealing with the dynastic desinies of the 'Abbasids. An asserted fragment of this, called the Little Dajir, was in circulation in the Maghrib in Ibn Khaldun's time, but had apparently been composed in the interests of the Musawwids. Further Ibn Khaldun had known as in circulation in the Maghrib several poems of this class in the interests of different western dynasties. In the Orient he had heard of several such malākīm ascribed to Ibn Sind and he had actually had knowledge of one such ascribed to Ibn al-'Arabî.

In Cairo he had found another, also ascribed to Ibn al-'Arabî, giving a horoscope for that town. In the Orient, too, he had seen a malākîm-poem by a certain Sâlih, Muḥammad al-Bâqîrî, of the Karândî Fraternity of darwishes, who left behind him a heretical sect, al-Bâqîrîkhâya, and who died 724 (1324). Ibn Khaldun gives a mass of details on this malākîm and on its author, who called it a Dajir. It dealt with the dynasties of the Mamûlîks and Ibn Khaldun knew it in two recensions from which he quotes. For still more details on this genre of literature, based on Ibn Khaldun's personal knowledge, see Quatremere, text, ii. 193-201 (the Bullaq texts are not complete) and De Slane's translation, ii. 226-237.

In stories, there are frequent references to the science of malākîm as one of the esoteric sciences along with astrology and qârîb al-rumâl. Thus, in Habîch's text of The roots of night (ed. Breslau, ill. 218) in the Story of Kamar al-Zamân and Badrî, a form closely akin to the version of Galland and different from that in the second Calcutta and the Bullaq editions, Marzâwan, the foster-brother of Badrî, is described as learned in the sciences of astronomy and the sphere and reckoning and algebra and rumâl and malākîm.

Bibliography: is given in the course of the article.

(D. B. MACDONALD)

MAL'ÂK. [See MAL'ÂKA.]

MAL'ÂKA, angels, is the Arabic broken plural of an early Semitic (Canaanite?) word malāk, meaning "messenger". The evidence would suggest that it is a loan-word, coming into Arabic from Hebrew; there is no trace of a verb in Hebrew (nor in Phoenician, where the noun occurs in later inscriptions), and in Arabic the root, even, is in the greatest uncertainty, being referred to a dubious 'lāk (Lane, p. 81, s.; Lîân, xii. 273 sqq.; Tabari, Tafsir, i. 150) and to a still more dubious 'lāk (Lîân, xii. 370). The singular in Arabic is normally malâk without harša, and so always in the Qur'â'n; although the Lîân in two places (xii. 274, 4, 371, 3) quotes the same verse as a proof that malāk does occur, but as an exceptional form (shâdlâk). Both singular and plural in Arabic are used only in the sense "angels".

In the Qur'â'n it occurs twice in the dual (malākāt, ii. 96; vii. 19), of the two angels Hâdît and Mârîf (q. v. and under shâdlâk), and of Adam and Eve being tempted in the Garden to believe that they may become angels. The plural occurs very often in the Qur'â'n (in Flügel's Concordance under 'lāk, p. 171) but the singular only 12 times (Flügel under malâk, p. 183). These are of the people demanding revelation by an angel rather than a human being (bâshar, vi. 8, 9, 50; xi. 15, 33; xvii. 97; xxx. 8); women think Joseph an angel for his beauty rather than a human being (bâshar, xii. 31); an angel's interchange (gâfûrâ', liii. 26) does not avail; twice as collective for angels, beside the arâb (lxx. 17), and in rows and rows (lxix. 43).
"the Faithful Spirit" (al-rāh al-āmin); he brings down the revelation to the ḍhīl of Muhammad in a clear Arabic tongue. There are other descriptions of him, still unnamed, in Kurān iii. 5—18 and lixxi. 19—25, as appearing plainly to Muhammad in revelation. He, as "our Spirit" (rūhānī), was sent to Maryam (t. xii. 17). He is called the "Holy Spirit" (rūh al-hūdā) in xxiv. 118 and Allah addressed ʿIšā'ī with the same (li. 84, 254; v. 169). ʿIšā'ī (variant Mikāli) is named (li. 92) as an angel of the same rank as ʿIšā-query; see a long and apparently true story of how his naming came about in Baidāwī (Feisčicher's ed., l. 74, 163 sqq.); in traditions he, with ʿIšā-query, appears to Muhammad and instructs him; he does not laugh (Wenslock, p. 152b); Muhammad called the two his wazīr of the angels. To Isrāfīl (p. 128, the angel with the trumpet of resurrection, there is no reference either in the Kurān or in canonical traditions but very much in exegiastic legend. In Kurān xliii. 47, the trumpet heralded to call to the keeper of hell, "O Malik!" (l. 15) and xxvi. 18, the guards of hell are called al-Zabānīya, an otherwise unused word, meaning apparently, "violent thunders." (Līlāt, viii. 55): the number of these, Kurān lxxiv. 39, is nineteen and they are asserted specifically to be angels, apparently, to guard against the idea that they are devils; they are called "rough, violent" (zāhirīh, ahdāf). Another class of angels are those "Bewitched Near" (to Allah), al-musānārīya (iv. 170); these praise Allah day and night without ceasing (xxi. 20); Baidāwī calls them also al-muṣāmūn (on Kurān li. 28, Feisčicher's ed., l. 47, 57; and al-musāhirīya on Kurān iv. 170 (Feisčicher's ed., l. 243, 48) as those that we answered, the word. The same term, musāhir, is used of the Kurān (li. 40) as he is in the company of the angels nearest Allah; of article 168, above, for his semi-angelic character. At the beginning of the Surah of the Angels (Kurān xxxvii) there is a significant description: "making the angels messengers (rasūlim), with wings two and three and four; He increases in the creation what He wills"; this has had much effect on later descriptions and pictures. They are guardians (ḥāṣifūn) over mankind, cognizant of what man does and writing it down (ḥāṣifūn; Kurān lixxi. 10—12). In xxvi. 94 the writing down is referred to Allah himself. In lxx. 4; lxixvii. 56; xxvi. 4, there occurs the very puzzling phrase "the angels and al-rāh". Baidāwī on the first two passages shows how perplexing the distinction was found (Feisčicher's ed., li. 350, 8: p. 352, 1): the rāh is an angel over the spirits (al-sālihāt); or he is the whole genus of spirits; or ʿIšā-query; or a creation (ḥāshi) mightier than the angels; al-ī, too, of Al-Wāzin's ḍhīl, ed. Waterfield, p. 36. For spirits and the conception "spirit" in ḍhīl see article al-ḥāshi. In the Kurān there is no reference to the two angels, Munkar and Nakir, who visit the dead man in his grave, on the night after his burial, and catechize him as to his Faith. Thereafter, if he is an unbeliever, his grave becomes a preliminary hell and if he is a believer, it becomes a preliminary paradise from which he may pass at the Last Day into paradise; it may even, if he is a saint, be a preliminary paradise. This is called technically the Questioning (al-ṣaḥīf) of Munkar and Nakir and also, the Punishment of the grave (ḥāishi al-ḥāshi). This doctrine, similar to the Lesser Judgment of Christian theology, is one of the ṣaḥīfīya (to be believed on oral testimony) and is based on the implicit meaning of Kurānic passages (xiv. 341; xl. 11; liii. 25) and upon explicit traditions (Tafsīr al-ʿĀbī's commentary on Nusairī's Aḥādīth, ed. Cairo 3521, p. 199; Mawṣīf of al-ʿĀbī with commentary of al-Djurjānī, ed. Bulbul, 1266, p. 590 sqq.). There is a still fuller account and discussion by the Ḥanbalite theologian Ibn ʿAṣim al-Jawziyya (Broekelmann, G. A. L., ed. 106, No. 23) in his Alīth al-ʿĀbī, ed. Haidarābād 1374, p. 62—144, viii. 81—114. The angels are also called the heavenly host, or multitude (al-malakūt al-aṣlād, xxxvii. 68; xxviii. 69) and guard the walls of heaven against the "listening" of the āfān and shurān. See further on this under ʿIšā-query, lii. p. 410.
to above. These two angels are supposed to have yielded to sexual temptation, to be confined in a pit near Babil and there to teach magic to men. But: it is answered, the Kurān says nothing of their fall; (ii.) teaching magic is not practising magic; (iii.) they always first warn those who come to them. "We are only a temptation (fīzā); so do not disbelieve" (Kurān ii. 96); and, further, Taftāzān on the Āniyād of Naṣṣāf, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 153.

In Bāṣawī on Kurān ii. 32, there is a long discussion of the angels' nature (ed. Fleischer, i. 544, to p. 552, 8) which, however, runs out in the despairing statement that knowledge on the point is with Allāh alone (al-Allāh la huwa yahūd). Perhaps Ibīs was of the gīrūl as to his actions (fī zaman), but of the angels as to species (fīnaw). Also, Ibn 'Abbās has a tradition that there was a variety (jātrah) of the angels who propagated their kind (this has always been regarded as an essential characteristic of the gīrūl and of the šālihat's as opposed to the angels) and who were called al-gīrūl; and Ibīs was of these. Or, though he was a gīrūl brought up among the angels and identified with them; Or, that the gīrūl were among those commanded to prostrate themselves to Adam. Or, that some of the angels were not impeccable, although that was their characteristic in general, just as some men, e.g. the prophets, are guarded against sin but most are not. Further, perhaps a variety of the angels are not essentially different from the šālihat's but differ only in accidents and qualities; as men are virtuous or evil, while the gīrūl unite both, and Ibīs was of this variety. The tradition from 'Abbās is no answer to this explanation; for light and fire in it are not to be taken too precisely; they are used as in a proverb, and light is of the nature of fire and fire of light, they pass into another; fire can be purified into light and light obscured to fire. So al-Balādāwī.

With this should be compared the scholastic discussion in the Mašīfī on al-Allāh, with the commentary of al-Khujāridjī (ed. Mīrās 1366, p. 576). In it the objector to the šāniha of the angels over the angels has two grounds: (i) their urging upon Allāh that he should not create Adam showed defects (slander, pride, malice, finding fault with Allāh) in their moral character; (ii) that Ibīs was rebellious, as above. These grounds are then answered scholastically. Then various Kurānic texts, as above, on the submission and obedience of the angels are quoted. But it is pointed out that these texts cannot prove that all of them, at all times, are kept free from all sins. The point, therefore, cannot be absolutely decided. Individual exceptions under varying circumstances may have occurred, just as, while the šālihat's as a class were created for evil (šālihat al-nahrā), there is a definite tradition (Shāb by al-Muhtar) on al-rāfī by Allāh ascribed to Ahmad, ed. Haḍaradźh (p. 545) of one Muslim šālihat, a great-grandson of Ibīs, who appeared to Muḥammad and was taught by him certain sûras of the Kurān.

The story of Ḥārūn and Mūsā suggests that the angels possess sex, although they may not propagate their kind. But they are not to be described with either masculinity or femininity (Cāzīd of Naṣṣāf, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 153). Taftāzān and the other commentators in this edition explain that there is no authority (maṣūf) on this point and no proof by reason (nābīst) it should, therefore, be left unconsidered and that, apparently, was the course followed by al-Isī and al-Kurānjī. They may have sex and not use it. In that respect man who has in him the possibility of sin and must himself rule his appetites of lust (žawāra) and of anger (ṣādqa) has a higher potentiality of excellency than the angels (Bāṣawī on Kurān ii. 28, ed. Fleischer, i. 48, et seq.).

This leads to the second question as to the angels, which scholastic theology has considered, the relative excellency of angels and men, and, especially, of angels and prophets. This is stated shortly by Naṣṣāf (p. 147 of ed. cited above): (i.) "The Messengers (ruṣūm) of mankind (al-baṣar) are more excellent than the Messengers of the angels and (ii.) the Messengers of the angels are more excellent than the generality of mankind and (iii.) the generality of the angels." Taftāzān develops that there is general and indeed necessary agreement on the excellency of the messengers of the angels over mankind in general, but that the other two statements (i. and iii.) will bear argument. He urges (i.) the prostrating of the angels to Adam; (ii.) that Adam was taught all the names of things (Kurān ii. 29); (iii.) that Allāh "chose" (lā fārī) Adam and Nuh and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Ibrāhīm over all created things (al-šāri'ātam; Kurān iii. 50); (iv.) that mankind achieves excellences and perfection of knowledge and action in spite of the blindness of lust and anger. But the Maṭīlīwī and the "philosophers" (al-halālu'I) and some Agārīwīs held the superior excellency of the angels. They urged (i.) that they were spirits, stripped of materiality (farār madājarwad), complete actually, some of even the beginnings of evils and defects, like lust and anger, and from the obscurities of form and matter (gūnūd al-hayā taw wa l-jār), capable of doing wonderful things, knowing events (bašā'īn), past and to come, without error. The answer is that this description is based on philosophical and not Muslim principles. (ii.) That the prophets learn from the angels, as in Kurān xxvi. 193; (iii.) The answer is that the prophets learn from Allāh and that the angels are only intermediaries. (iii.) That there are multiplicity of names both in Kurān and in tradition where mention of the angels precedes that of the prophets. The answer is that precedence is because of their precedence in existence or because their existence is more conceded (al-šāri') and, therefore, faith in them must be emphasised. (iv.) In Kurān iv. 173 "aš-šāniha does not disdain to be an "aš-šāniha" to Allāh nor do the angels' must mean, because of linguistic usage, that the angels are more excellent than Šāri'. The answer is that the point is not simple excellency but to combat the Christian position that 'Iṣā is not an "aš-šāniha" a son to Allāh. In the Mašīfī (p. 572–578) there is a similar but much fuller discussion which involves a philosophical consideration of the endowment, mental, physical, spiritual — of all living creatures from immaterial spirits to the lower animals (al-baṣar). In the "Aṣwāf al-Mažābirāt of al-Kawāmī (ed. Wittemfeld, p. 55–63) there is an objective description of the angels in all their classes, in which the statements of Kurān and Summa are adjusted to the Aristotelian-Neoplatonic universe.
with its spheres (al-aṣṣīf), in accordance with al-Kaswirī’s general aim to give a piction of the created universe in its details and wonders. Yet, apparently, while the angels possess the quality “life” (ṣayyāf), and are the inhabitants of the heavens and of the heavenly spheres (ūnhīmūn al-thayyāmūl), they are not to be reckoned among the animals (al-thayyāmūl). Al-Damiri includes mankind and the djinn, even the diabolic (mutanāḥṣantūn) djinn, such as the ẓayın, in his Ḥaṣāl al-Thayyāmūl but not the angels. Equally acute and scholastic with the discussion in the Munawwīfī, and more spiritual than that by Kaswirī, is al-Ghazzālī’s treatment of the mystery of the angelic nature in some of his specialistic smaller treatises. For him it is part of the general question of the nature of spirit to which his smaller Maqāmūn is devoted. See, too, the larger Maqāmūn (ed. Cairo 1305) in Rukn, ii., p. 43 sqq. and the translation by W. H. T. Gairdner of his Miṣkīf al-Anwar (London, Royal Asiatic Society, 1924), parrin.

The above is a statement of Muslim ideas as to the angels. But Muslim literature also takes account of non-Muslim ideas on them, as those of “philosophers”, Christians, dualists, idolaters. These will be found given shortly by Badāwī on Kurʾān ii. 28 (ed. Fischer, i. 47, 48 sqq.) and in more detail in Dict. of tebub. terms, p. 1327 sqq.

Bibliography: Besides the references above, Walter Eickmann, Angelologie u. Dämonologie des Korans, New York and Leipzig 1908; a number of books and articles by Josef Horovitz, Konvische Untersuchungen, Berlin 1926; Jewish proper names in the Koran, in Hebrew Union College Annual, vol. 2; Muhammadi Himmat-u-farîd, etc. i. 42 sqq.; E. W. Lane, Thamūm and Oma Nahiyya, 1901 ed., and to Introduction, note 15 to chap. 1.

MALĀṬYA, an old city, not far from the upper Euphrates. It lies at the junction of important roads (in antiquity; the Persian royal road and the Euphrates route; in modern times Samad—Sûwa—Malatya—Diyarbakir and Kars-Sivas—Malatya—Kharput) in a plain, the fertility and richness of which in all kinds of vegetables and fruits was celebrated by the Arabs geographers, as in modern times by von Moltke and others. It is the northern foot of the Taurus not very far south of Tokhmas (Arab. Naḥṣ al-Kubāk) which is there crossed by the old bridge of Kargöl. The town was supplied with drinking-water by the springs of Uṣūn Dâwīya and by the Euphrates. Weaving used to be a flourishing industry there; according to Ibn al-Shāhla there were once 12,000 looms for spinning wool in Malatya but they no longer existed in his time.

The town appears as Melitade in Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions and two “Hittite” steles have been found there (to be more accurate: Ar-sin Tepe, a little south of Malatya: Meuseræschmit, Corpus Ins. Hittít. in M. V. A. G., 1900, part iv., p. 13; 1906, part v., p. 7). It is probably also to be identified with the district called Mele (last letter un保留) in the inscription of king ZABA of Hamat, (c. 600 B.C.) which Poggio found in “Afla near Aleppo. Pliny (Nat. Hist. viii., 3) calls the town Melita: a Semitic root; the name of the legendary founders has perhaps survived in that of the fortress of Shimrit which Michael Symus (Chronicon, transl. Chobert ii., 272) mentions in the sixth century in the land of Sawaad in the region of Malatya. To its position on the Oriental itineraries Malatya owed its great prosperity in the Roman period. From the time of Titus it was the headquarters of the Legio XIV (Felimina); it was much extended by Trajan and under Justinian raised to be the capital of the province of Armenia III. Anarapis and Justinian reformatted and beautified it. After his severe defeat at Malatya in the autumn of 575, Phoebus I burned the town (John of Ephesus, vi., 9; E. Stein, Studien zur Gesch. d. Byzantin. Reiches, Stuttgart 1915, p. 56—57 sqq.; note 97: 200 Ḥābiḥ b. Maslama al-Fihri sent by Ṣaḥāb b. Ghiyām from Armenia VI (Shamshā) against Malatya and took the town; but it was later retaken by the Muslims. When Mu’tawiyah became wāli of Syria and al-Dajjār, he again sent Ḥābiḥ b. Maslama against the town. He stormed it in 36, left a troop of cavalry in it to guard the frontier and placed a governor in it. Mu’tawiyah himself visited Malatya on his campaign against Asia Minor and left a large garrison in the town which henceforth became one of the headquarters for the summer campaigns into Bilâd al-Rūm. When the people abandoned the town in the time of the caliphs Abū al-Malik and Abū Allāh b. al-Zubair, it was taken and sacked by the Byzantines; on their withdrawal, it and the whole of Armenia IV was settled by the Armenians and Malatians, that is Aramaic speaking peasants, driven out of his kingdom by the emperor Philippicus. (Nöldeke, Z. D. M. G., xxx. 125; al-Baladhurī, ed. de Goeje, p. 185; Michael Syrus, trans. Chobert ii., 192 sqq.; according to Theophanes the Armenians were settled in Malatya by Philippicus in 712 A. H.) They increased very much and were valuable allies of the Arabs in the wars against the Byzantines (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.). The caliph Omar settled the fugitive inhabitants of Turanda (now Derenda) in Malatya and made al-Dajjār b. al-Harthī of the tribe of the Bani Ḥarith of the confederation of the Bani Sa’d the governor. In 133 (740—741) a Greek army of 20,000 men under Aḥkāvīq, the general of the Theme Armeiniakon, advanced against Malatya and plundered the country round it. The inhabitants closed the gates and sent a messenger to Ḥājjām in al-Rūm; but the latter soon heard that the Greeks had withdrawn and sent the messenger back with a body of cavalry. Later, when he himself took the field against the Byzantines, he camped before Malatya until the rebuilding of the town which the enemy had destroyed was completed (Baladhurī, loc. cit.; Michael Syrus, ii., 306; Theophanes, ed. de Bovor, p. 743; P. Diomys, ed. Chobert, year 1051). The Emperor Constantine V (Copronymos) in 133 (750) advanced on Kamath and Malatya, whose inhabitants looked in vain for help to Mesopotamia, as a civil war was raging there. As the emperor knew this he demanded that the inhabitants should abandon the town. After at first refusing they finally agreed, being exhausted by the siege, left the town with all their goods and chattels and went to al-Qādīzār whereupon Constantine levied Malatya to the Crown; nothing but a half ruined granary remained standing. Henī Kallawīyā was also destroyed and its inhabitants, like those of the other villages in Armenia IV, carried off into captivity (Baladhurī, loc. cit.; Michael Syrus, ii., 518; Baethgen, Abh. d. K. d. Morgenl., viii. 3, p. 34, 127; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifs, ii., 15). Six years afterwards (139 A. H.) the Mal❣wī wrote to Sābīl, b. ‘Abd Allāh who had in the
previous year defeated an army of 100,000 men under Constantine and retaken Malatya (G. W. Freytag, Selecta ex histor. Hafci, Paris 1819, p. 62, note 58) ordering him to rebuild and fortify the town. He then appointed his nephew, the Imam 'Abd al-Wahhab b. Ibrahim, governor of al-Djazira and its marches (al-Tabari). He arrived there in 140 with al-Husain b. Khaṭaba and Khaṭaba's troops, who were reinforced by Syrian and Moslem

was also rebuilt (Baladhitur, loc. cit.; Michael Syrus, ii. 522; P. Dioni, ed. Chabot, p. 67; Vidi, Muqarnas, iv. 653; Well, Grec. d. Chalifat, i. 55); a frontier fort was built 50 m. from the town and another on the Nahr Khabūlī (Tehrāna-šī). Al-Mansūr sent 4,000 Mos科普otamian soldiers to Malatya to whom he gave increased pay and allotted lands as fiefs.

In the next year (141) Muḥammad b. Ibrahim was sent to Malatya with a Khurāṣi army to protect the town from the enemy. The former inhabitants, at least those who were still alive, thereupon returned to Malatya. An expedition sent by

the Byzantines against Malatya was defeated by Ḥārūn al-Rashīd (Baladhitur, loc. cit.). In the reign of al-Ma'mūn, his son, al-ʿAbbas, who was governor of al-Djazira conducted a campaign against the Byzantines (Well, op. cit., i. 259) from Malatya. In the summer of 222 (837) the emperor Theophilus went into Armenia with Zilāṭa, which he sacked and burned, and on his way back passed through the country of Malatya which was also laid waste and its inhabitants carried off prisoners by Byzantium (Michael Syrus, iii. 89; Maḥfūl, Muḥāfīl, viii. 133 sqq. Tabari, Yaʿqūbī and other Arabs wrongly date this campaign in 223 [838]; cf. for the contrary view Well, op. cit., iii. 310, note 1 and Bury, Hist. of the East Roman Empire, 1912, p. 260, § 1; Marqwarī, Hamīd-e Amāryā, xxviii., 1914, p. 42). The town itself, which was handed over to him by the Roman prisoners there, he spared out of fear of an approaching army of the enemy. Towards the end of the following year al-Maʾṣūm sent the Syrian amir Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Muḥammad b. Ṭūlūn against the Byzantines but he only met with moderate success; the people of Malatya under Ḥāfiz and the amir ʿOmar b. Ṭūlūn b. Marāwīn al-Aṭīa of Malatya in alliance with the Armenians and 10,000 Turks then defeated the emperor. Theophilos near the fortress of Duzman (al-Maʾṣūm, E.G.A., viii. 169; Marqwarī, Chronogr. Byz., p. 418, 729; Well, op. cit., i. 312). In 841, however, the Byzantines conquered al-Hadīlah, Marāb and the land of Malatya. When in the middle of the 11th century the Palaiolecos (Arab: al-Baṣṣārī, al-Baṣṣārī) some of whom lived in the country west and north of Malatya (Karapet Ter Marĉenī, Die Palaiolecosen., Leipzig 1853, p. 116 sqq.) rebelled against the Byzantines, the amir of Malatya, ʿOmar b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Aṭīa, protected them from their persecutors; their leader Kurkaši built in this region the fortress of ʿAṣūna (Argwāta), Tephrike (Dıwright) and Amara (Emeril, near Varpuz). Fighting went on for some years with varying results (Well, op. cit., ii. 363–365); finally ʿOmar al-Aṭīa was completely defeated on a campaign in Asia Minor in Radijb 249 (863) by the valiant Petronas (al-Bayānī), Michael III's general, with his whole army on the Mardj al-Uṣaf (Well, op. cit., iii. 380; Tomaschek, Sasan u. d. Quellenquellen des Tirgir, S. H. Ak. Wien, xxviii., vol. iv., 1893, p. 23; on the site of the 'Bishop's Meadow': Le Strange, Eastern Caliph., p. 138). The Emperor Basil I in 871 went against Tephrike and Taranton (Derece), he plundered Zilāṭa and Sumnaš and then encamped at ʿAṣūna (Nahr al-Zarnūṣ; now: Cirmikl-šāl, hūsra ʿAṣūna in der Theophanis continuator, ed. Bonn, p. 465; Kastor Kurbans, Hahsebruch, Charta, x., 1920, ed. Abbeleho-Lamy, 1921, now: Cirmikli, cf. Tomaschek, Beitr. z. alien Gesch. u. Geogr., Friedrichs, f. H. Klopstock, Berlin 1898, p. 141). But he was not able to take Malatya which was fortified (Heremōtōr, Phoemenus, ii. 442; Well, op. cit., ii. 471). His army suffered heavy losses during the siege and the emperor himself was nearly captured. Whether he undertook a second campaign against Malatya was doubtful (Well, op. cit., ii. 475).

The Arab general Mūsīn in 304 (916–917) devastated Cappadocia from Malatya. (Well, op. cit., iii. 653); similar invasions took place in 310 and the following years. It was not till 314 (920–927) that the Byzantines were able to avenge their revenge. Under the brave Domestikos Joannes Kurbans (Ibn al-ʿĀthir, ed. Tornberg, vii. 211: Abūnāmīzīr, Kurbāk; Michael Syrus, iii. 122 sqq.; 158: Kyriakos), they entered the district and advanced up to the suburbs of Malatya, laying waste the country and going as far as Shimākht (Arsamanta) (in 315 according to Hūnāz al-Iṣfahānī, Taršīh, ed. Gottwald, p. 205; trans. p. 158, wrongly "in fœde Samometanis inverso"). Kurbans forced the amir of the town to send his son, Abū Ḥafṣ (ʿAṣūja), and the general Abu l-ʿAwšār (Aramaxē) to him and to acknowledge the suzerainty of the emperor (Symeon Magister, Bonn, p. 741 sqq.; Georg Monach., ed. Muralt, p. 854), while the Bonn edition p. 908 and Theophanes continuator, ed. Bonn, p. 416 and Georg Kedrī, ed. iii. 310 sqq. wrongly write "Arnaxos"). Kurbans, himself an Armenian by birth, seems to have granted the lands of Malatya and Sumnaš to the Armenian prince Michel (Arab. Malīḵ, Greek Μάλαχ), who was again driven out of Malatya and Sumnaš in 320 by Saʿīd al-Dawla, uncle of the Hamadān Nāṣr al-Dawla of Mawsīl (Well, op. cit., ii. 659; Zappakh Imp., Akad. Nauk, xlv. 102 sqq., following Dāmīl al-Din b. Zāba). But in 934, after the death of the two friends of the Byzantines, Abū Ḥafṣ and Abu l-ʿAwšār, Kurbans and Michel again appeared before the town, which at that time was protected by a double wall and a ditch full of water. The inhabitants found themselves forced by starvation to negotiate about the surrender of the town. During the negotiations the Greeks succeeded by a stratagem in forcing an entrance through the north gate of the town and taking it on May 19, 934. The inhabitants, in keeping with the promise that had been given them, were allowed to leave the town. The walls were razed so that the town was henceforth open to all attacks (Michael Syrus, iii. 122 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿĀthir, viii. 221; Ramraš, L'Empire Grec au Xeme siècle, Paris 1870, p. 433 sqq.; Rosen, op. cit., ii. 89 sqq., 105, 108). In the next decade Saff al-Dawla repeatedly invaded the territory of Malatya.
His mamliq Nadji, in his campaign to Hanit in 1550 (961–962) encountered Abd Allah of Malatya and put him and his friends to flight (Freystag, Z. D. M. G., sq. 1917; Rosen, sp. cit., p. 383). Two years later he again ravaged the land of Malatya for 18 days with fire and sword (Freystag, p. 264, 265).

When the emperor Nicephorus enquired Syria, he wished to repopulate Malatya, which was deforested and deserted. But the Greeks refused to leave there for fear of Arab raids. His advisers therefore recommended him to invite Syriac Jacobites to the country. He did this and promised the Patriarch Makl Vahanan Saragas, that he would repopulate Malatya, Hanit and the pessaga (skrapa), he would no longer persecute the Jacobites (Michael Syrus, iii. 132 sq.; Barhebræus, Chron. eccl., ed. Abello, Lamy, i. 411 sq.; Markwardt, HANDL. AMORASCH., xxx., 1915, p. 212, note 1). People now flocked to Malatya from all parts (La 969 A. D.). Monasteries were built. About 1100 there were said to be in Malatya and district 53 churches and 60,000 Christians capable of bearing arms, including many Melkites (Michael of Tinina in Renand, Hist. Patr. Alexandr., Paris, 1713, p. 405; Barhebræus, sp. cit., i. 424, note 1). The emperor did not, however, keep his promise; persecutions again became of everyday occurrence and drove the Jacobites more and more into the arms of the Arabs (Michael Syrus, iii. 131, 132, 147).

According to Ibn al-Athir (al-Kamil, ii. 565), Malatya at this time was placed in the beira of Armenvan (Armenvan) which he says stretched to the Bosporus (Khalif al-Kutbâniyye) which he says stretched to the Bosporus (Khalif al-Kutbâniyye).

The Emperor John Tzimiscas (Shimbski) in 1071 on his campaign to Nisibis crossed the Euphrates at Malatya (Yabûl al-Antakhi in Rosen, sp. cit., p. 183 note; Schlembarger, L'Epopee byzantine, i., Paris, 1896, p. 255.).

The rebel Dardas Schlevra in 1168 (976–977) seized the town of Malatya, imprisoned the strategos who was governing it for the Emperor and had himself proclaimed basileus. When Schlevra was fighting against the imperial general Michael Barqes (al-Barqi) there was with him a Shukh who had been converted to Christianity, the priestic Ubâdi Allah al-Majnûyûs of Malatya, who is perhaps identical with the ’Abd Allah mentioned in 350. Schlevra made him suggitres and sent him with one of his slaves, the smith, Kantidh (’Abd al-‘Ali, Sallalha) whom he raised to the rank of khudás (*“Count”), to Antikliya against the basileus Kutalb, the imperial governor of this town. Kutalb surrendered to them Antikliya, the Thoughts and the whole of the Orient; he and the most prominent citizens of Antikli were then sent as prisoners to al-Kutbâniyye (Cappadocia) (Rosen, sp. cit., p. 3 sq., and note, p. 81–90 sq.; Schlembarger, L'Epopee byzantine, i. 359, 362, 376 sq.). Schlevra however at once sent the Antikli inhabitants back to their homes and made Kutalb basileus of Malatya (Rosen, sp. cit.; Schlembarger, i. 386) while on the other hand Ubâdi Allah soon went over to the emperor Basil (977–978). When after a seven-years' interment on the Tigris island of Madida near Baghdad, Dardas Schlevra succeeded in gaining his freedom, he escaped to Malatya with the help of Beduins, where he was at once (in Shawwal 376 = March 987) seized the basileus Kutalb who had gone over to the emperor, and himself again proclaimed basileus (Yabûl, transl. Rosén, p. 22; Schlembarger, i. 678). Bardas Phocas, who took Bardas Schlevra prisoners by treachery and then claimed the imperial title for himself, passed through Malatya on Sept. 14, 987 on his way westwards straight through Asia Minor (Schlembarger, i. 695).

In 1009 (1008) the Hamdaniyân Abû l-Haithâm fled to Malatya before the Minâshd Mâshûr b. Lîlîn, where the emperor appointed him suggitres (Rosen, sp. cit., p. 51; Schlembarger, ii. 442).

The most important event during the Byzantine occupation of Malatya was the invasion of the Turks. Their first inroad into the area of the town was in 1058; the inhabitants fled before them mainly into the adjoining mountains where they perished of hunger and cold. The Turkish force 3,000 strong under the amir Abû Dinâr remained to days pillaging Malatya and laid the country waste for a day's journey round. On their retreat the Turks were surprised by the people of the Armenian district of Sasamun (Arab. al-Sânâmû, now: Sânûn) and all slain, with the assistance of the prisoners and fugitives from Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 158 sq.), according to whose erroneous chronology these incidents took place in the 9th or in the last year of Constantine IX (i.e. 1050–1051 or 1054–1055); Matthis of Edeess, transl. Dulamieri, p. 107–109; Arslânâ Kastavi, in Tomasea, Siyatt u. das Qenilgöolheit des Tigris, S. B. Ab. Wüten, xxivii, vol. iv., 1805, p. 29 sq.).

One of the prisoners who survived, the Syrian monk Joseph, wrote three memoirs on these events; the patriarch Vahanan X bar Ghobin also composed 4 memoirs on the devastation of Malatya (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. P., ii. 291 sq.). By the time of the Emperor Isab II. (1057–1059) we again find the Turks raiding the country of Malatya and carrying off prisoners from it. His successor Constantine X Ducas (1059–1067) restored the two walls and the ditch at Malatya (probably in 1060–1061). When the imperial decree regarding this was published, a number of citizens of Malatya, who were in Constantinople returned home and arranged for a large number of workmen and builders to be brought from Asia Minor and Antikliya; in a very short time owing to the continual threat to the town, the fortifications were rebuilt on the old foundations (Michael Syrus, iii. 165 sq.). The Byzantine saggitaris Kînootes was afterwards killed with his wife and children and the town “henceforth knew no peace” (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.).

These constant invasions of the Turks, which specially affected the region of Malatya (Skyllitzes in the ed. of Kedros, Bonn, ii. 660 sq.) met with very little opposition. Then the legions quartered around Malatya, whose pay and provisions had been withheld, refused to cross the Euphrates to meet the enemy along with the local volunteers. The Turks did not besiege the town but went on to attack Kamariya, which they stormed (Skyllitzes, loc. cit.). When Romanus IV Diogenes attacked the Turks in 1068 he sent a general from Göksüt, perhaps as Gfyorix suggests (Histo, Gesch., iii. 720), the Bulgar Alshinasa, to Malatya to guard the frontier against the raids of the Turk Afîthin (Alyvâskin). The general however did not leave Malatya so that Afîthin was able to advance against the emperor undisturbed (Skyllitzes in Kedrosos, ed. Bonn, ii. 674; Weil, sp. cit., iii. 112, note 2).

In the same year the emperor appointed the
succeeded in conquering Abulustain, the district on the Djiailan and the whole country round Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 195). The Atibeg of the Sultan of Malatya (probably Bālāk), in 1111 again deprived him of his lands on the Djiailan. Khūlid Arab’s widow left Malatya to marry the doughty Amir Bālāk (Michael Syrus, ii. 200). A Turkish cavalry leader offered to sell Taghiril Araskan the fortress of Ziyād; when the young Amir of Malatya wanted to take possession of it, however, it was taken from him by the son of the Amir of Kharṣa without a blow being struck. On the 11th March 1118 the Amir Mangāngi of Kamashi pillaged the country round Malatya; the Khāṭīn of Malatya thereupon turned to Joscelin of Edessa for help (Michael Syrus, iii. 204). In the following year the Sultan of Malatya conquered Abulustain and the lands on the Djiailan; the region of Kūf was passed as a gift to Malatya (Michael Syrus, ii. 205). Taghiril Araskan owed his success to the Governor Bālāk, who advanced as far as Kamak, defeated the Greeks with the help of al-‘Abī Bālāk; Dānishmand, again took Ḫūṣa Ziyād and defeated the Armenians of Garag on the Ephrates (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.). When, after further considerable successes, Bālāk fell fighting the Franks before Manbijj, his kingdom was divided; the Sultan of Malatya received Massad and Garag with the result that there was soon fighting with Sulaiman of Ḫūṣa Ziyād. On this occasion al-Qādis of Siwa and his son-in-law Mas‘ūd attacked Malatya and besieged it from June 13 to Dec. 10, 1224. The town suffered exceedingly from famine and the Khāṭīn’s reign of terror and the inhabitants breathed more freely when the ruler left the town with her son and all her followers and al-Qādis entered it (Michael Syrus, iii. 219 seq.; Matthias of Edessa, p. 215). Under him Malatya enjoyed continued peace. His son Malik Muhammad, who succeeded him in 1135 left Malatya soon afterwards when the news of the approach of the Byzantine Emperor reached him (Michael Syrus, iii. 257). When John II Comnenus invaded Syria, Mas‘ūd invaded Cilicia from Konya and carried the inhabitants of Adham prisons to Malatya (Michael Syrus, ii. 245). Malik Muhammad in 1139 also invaded Cilicia and took from the Greeks the fortresses of Bahgā and Galnāpur (Bāg, Karsner, Armen. Vaghe, Gabor; Michael Syrus, ii. 248; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Kyr. Jenen, p. 211, note 2). Two years later he was fighting with the Franks who had advanced as far as Zilaatj, Azāk and Abulustain and came at Nīkār opposite the emperor John, who had again taken the field against the Turks, for six months without fighting (Michael Syrus, iii. 249). After his death (Dec. 6, 1143) Dhu ‘l-Nūn succeeded him in Malatya (Syr. Dānūn in Michael Syrus, iii. 253 and Suppl., p. 116; Byz. Ḫwās). When however his brother ‘Al ‘Alal-Dawla (Michael Syrus, only Dawlā) advanced against him, the Turkish garrison of Malatya broke through the Basālījūt gate and surrendered the town to him (Michael Syrus, iii. 255). Sulṭān Mas‘ūd of Konya besieged Malatya when ‘Al ‘Alal-Dawla went not to submit to him of his own accord, first from June 17 to Sept. 14, 1143 and again in 1144 without success (Michael Syrus, ii. 254, 258, 257.; Röhrich, p. cit., p. 246, note 5). After ‘Al ‘Alal-Dawla’s death (June 12, 1152) his minor son Dhu ‘l-Karmān succeeded him, for whose mother first acted as regent but she was soon banished as she
plotted against his life (Michael Syraxis, iii. 305 sq.).
Mas'ud again (July 24, 1154) tried without success to take the town. Dhu 'l-Ka'bah was succeeded in October, 1162 by his minor son Nasir al-Din Muhammad (Mahnud) who made himself so detested by his excesses that he had to leave Malatya (1170).

His place was taken by his brother Abu 'l-Kasim (Taqar al-Din Kasis; Michael Syraxis, iii. 336 sq.). In May, 1172, when 15, he married the daughter of the lord of Hün Ziyâd. During the wedding festivities he fell from his horse while jouthing and died of his injuries (Michael Syraxis, iii. 343). He was succeeded by his younger brother Ferîdûn (Afânânî) who had to marry the princess intended for the brother. On the news of these happenings, Kîlîdja Arslân II attacked Malatya, where however preparations were rapidly made for the defence under the direction of the emir Sa'd al-Din. Kîlîdja Arslân had to withdraw but carried off with him 30,000 prisoners from the country round (Michael Syraxis, iii. 346). On Feb. 15, 1175, Ferîdûn was murdered by his brother Muhammad, who after many adventures had returned in disguise to Malatya by a secret agreement with the princess of Ziyâd who had left her husband (Michael Syraxis, iii. 362—364). When Kîlîdja Arslân II thereupon again besieged Malatya, the discontent with Muhammad was so great that he no longer felt safe in the town but withdrew to Hün Ziyâd. Kîlîdja Arslân after a four months' siege entered Malatya on Oct. 29, 1178 (Michael Syraxis, iii. 372). He repaired the walls of the town (Michael Syraxis, iii. 383).

The Turtukmâns, who since 1185 had been ravaging wide tracts of Asia Minor also invaded and plundered the district of Malatya (Michael Syraxis, iii. 402). In 1189 (Michael Syraxis, 1191 according to Arabic sources) Kîlîdja Arslân gave the town of Malatya to his son Ma'izz al-Din Kâmil Shâh (Michael Syraxis, iii. 407; Rec. Hist. Ori. Croeina, ii. 56; iii. 265). Kîlîdja Arslân later found himself forced to hand the town over to his other son Kûbî al-Din Malik Shâh; but Ma'izz al-Din went to Shalâh al-Din (580 = 1191—1192) and regained his position with his help (Rec. Hist. Ori. Croeina, i. 406; Rec. Hist. Ori. Croeina, ii. 56; iii. 265; v. 44).

To strengthen the alliance he married the daughter of Malik al-Azîd and accompanied Shalâh al-Din's army to Taxhûn (Rec. Hist. Ori. Croeina, ii. 117). In June 1200 Rukn al-Din Sulaimân of Dükân (Taşküt) deprived his brother Ma'izz al-Din of Malatya; the latter fled to his father-in-law Malik al-Azîd (Barhebræus, Chron. Syraxis, ed. Redjan, p. 406; Rec. Hist. Ori. Croeina, ii. 71). Sa'dîn's son, al-Muhammed al-Zâhir, who had only Sumâriz left of his inheritance, submitted in 1207 to Rukn al-Din of Malatya and Konya (Barhebræus, Chron. Syraxis, p. 408). In the next year Rukn al-Din took Anqor, a few days later he died (Barhebræus, p. 418 sq.). He was succeeded by his young son Kîlîdja Arslân III, who was however soon thrown into prison by Ghiyâspâl al-Dîn Kâmil-Shâh (Barhebræus, p. 419). After the latter (d. 1208) came his son 'Isa al-Dîn Kâmil-Khusraw, who while on a campaign against Malik al-Ashraf in Malatya developed consumption from which he died on his return (Barhebræus, p. 437; Rec. Hist. Ori. Croeina, ii. 550 sq.). In the reign of his successor 'Abî al-Dîn Kâmil-Khusraw, the Tartars in 1231 penetrated to Hün Ziyâd and to the Euphrates near Malatya (Barhebræus, p. 463). 'Abî al-Dîn took Kâtîb from Malik al-Ashraf in 1232. When in the next year the latter along with his brother Malik al-Kamîl of Egypt occupied Hün Mânazir, 'Abbî al-Dîn collected an army of over 100,000 men, took Hün Ziyâd (Barhebræus, p. 467) and besieged al-Rukn al-Dîn the following year; the inhabitants of Jarras fearing an attack on Malatya sent him the keys of their town (Barhebræus, p. 468; Kamâl al-Dîn, transl. Illoche, 'A. C. J., v. 89). His successor Kâmil Khusraw II (1237—1245) at the beginning of his reign drove the Khwarizmians out of his kingdom; on their retreat they defeated the commander (Sîhâs) of Malatya Saîf al-Dawla and crossed the Euphrates at Masîrû (var. Munzir) (Barhebræus, p. 471). In 1241, the emir of Malatya again suffered an annihilating defeat from fanatical Turkoman horsemen under the prophet Pâpît (Bâbû) (Barhebræus, p. 474). When the news of the victory of the Tatars at Kozâ-Dagh (1243; Barhebræus, p. 475) reached Malatya, the Sihâs Rashid al-Din and the other court officials broke into the royal treasury, shared the treasure among themselves, and fled to Halab. Many prominent citizens followed them; but they were surprised by the Tatars on the hill of Bîr hârî, a day's journey from Malatya and some taken, some taken prisoners. The inhabitants of the town, Muslîms and Christians, asked the Metropolitan Mîr Dâmasî who Angûr to direct the defence of the town. After two months during which Malatya was watchfully defended, the Tatars withdrew. In 1244 the Tatar chief Iusuf (var. Naçîwit) Nuyun besieged Malatya and ravaged the country round until Rashid al-Din caused him to retreat by rich presents (Barhebræus, p. 477—479). After the division of the Saltûk empire by Hüthîq, there ruled at first 'Isa al-Dîn at Malatya; then, after his deethronement, his brother Rukn al-Dîn (Barhebræus, p. 482). At the end of 646 (1251—1252) and in July 650 (1252—1253), the Tatars again besieged the town under Jâwûr and wasted its surroundings (Barhebræus, p. 491). When in 1257 'Izâ al-Dîn sent an Araptâr (Bâgîr) to the district of Malatya to seek recruits and the latter allotted the town to the Kurd chief Shahrâl al-Dîn Almûn. Bîsû, the inhabitants did not have him as they had sworn fealty to Rukn al-Dîn and feared his Tatar patron Bahlîji. It was not till 'Izâ al-Dîn had sent a second envoy, Bîsdûr, that they admitted him into the town; but the latter soon fled again before Bahlîji and only returned when he had gone, but again found the gates closed against him and was only admitted after famine had broken out in Malatya as a result of his siege (Barhebræus, p. 498—500).

In 1260 'Abîlîcî built bridges over the Euphrates for his vast host at Malatya, Kâlî'âl al-Rûm al-Dîn and Karîsîyâ (Barhebræus, p. 509). The Egyptian governor of al-Dîn Hâdar (Bâhûrî) in 1282 laid waste the country round Malatya (Barhebræus, p. 546).

The Mongol Khân Abâka (1265—1282) again divided the kingdom of Rûm between two Saljûq cousins of whom Mas'ûd received Arrîjân, Siyûl and Malatya.

In the xiv and xilîh century lived the two great Syriac historians, both born in Malatya, to whose chronicles we mainly owe our knowledge of the history of the town: the patriarch Michæl I (1056—99), son of the priest Elyûth, who belonged to the family of Kindap in Malatya and the Malatyan Gregor Abu Tûrâjî called Barhebræus (1236—86; q.v.), whose father, the baptised
Jewish physician Abü Fudur had restrained his fellow citizens in Malaya from stupidly flying before the Tatars (Bunsmark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 308—310, 312—20). Michael’s principal authority, Ignatius (d. 1104), was also metropolitan of Malaya (Bunsmark, sp. cit., p. 201).

The increasing weakness of the Seldjucks about 1300 favoured the formation of local Turkoman and Armenian petty states, especially in the east of Asia Minor. According to Abu ‘l-Fida’, Christians and Muslims in Malaya in those days lived on the best of terms with one another; the town took the side of the Tatars and informed them of everything that went on in the country. During his war against the Tatars, Sultan d-Malik al-Nasir in 715 (1315) decided to send a large army under the nābī of Damascus, Saif d-Ilgin Tuncu who was joined by his vassal Abu ‘l-Fida’ of Hamah, against Malaya. The army went by Halab, Ani, Hiss Manşir and Ziziha to Malaya and encamped before the town on April 28. The inhabitants sent their bakīm Djamal d-Ilgin al-Khiyri, whose father and grandfather had filled the same office in their time, through the south gate; Bahl al-Kadi, to Tungs, who was willing to afford them protection and security, if they surrendered the town. But he was unable to fulfill his pledge for the soldiers could not be restrained from plundering and ravaging in the town. Among the prisoners was the bakīm Ibn Kerkaghâ and the sāhib of Hiss Arkam, Shishq Minjâd. The greater part of the town was finally burned down (Abu ‘l-Fida’, Annates Musam, ed. Reiske, v. 68—92, ed. Stambul 1286, iv. 77 sq.; trans. also in Rec. hist. syr., 1801; Welh, Gesch. d. Chalifs, v. 310 sq.). The Sultan made the territory of Malaya a separate frontier province, which included seven districts (Khišt d-Zahir, Zunba, ed. Rassale, p. 52). There were seven citadels around the town: Mûsâr or Minishr, Kum, Karâhidzat, Kâari, Kâfri, Kâfri Nawamand (?) and Kâfri al-Khri (Khalil, sp. cit.; Gaudet-Marinu, Le Syrie à l’époque des Maoméciens, p. 97, s. 105).

Malaya for the next few decades belonged to the Manālik Sultanate, as their remotest province, its capital with Halab in 917 (1317) the scene of a great rebellion led by the governors Minšâr and Yellbâgh against Barqûk [n. v.]. About this time the Turkish family of the Dhu ‘l-Khadroghlu [n. v.] began to rise to power in the region of Malaya and Albitan where they ruled till 1515 under Egyptian suzerainty. About 974 (1317/18) Bayrâd I conquered the town and in 1400 (Tmrt). By the battle of Kéif Hisâr (1346) it fell into the hands of Selim I [n. v.] who destroyed the Dhu ‘l-Khadroghlu. This was the cause of his war against Egypt, which was rapidly decided on the field of Mârâš and was finally decided on the field of Mârir (Kesabu). The town in 1278 was the headquarters of the Ser-xâker Háfi Pâsha, with whom Mâlik was attached. It is said to have suffered much at the hands of the troops quartered there for months before the battle of Nîzrb. After the earthquake of 1893 Malaya was rebuilt on the site of the suburb of Asmûn S.W. of the older site now called Eski Shehr, but the old town continued to be inhabited. It has now about 30,000 inhabitants, including many Armenians, Kurds and Kashmiri.


b. History: al-Balâbaki, ed. de Goeje, S. 184—88, 190, 195; Abu ‘l-Fida’, Annates Musam, ed. Reiske, v. 286—92, ed. Stambul 1286, iv. 77 sq.; transl. also in Rec. hist. syr., 1801; Welh, Gesch. d. Chalifs, v. 310 sq.). The Sultan made the territory of Malaya a separate frontier province, which included seven districts (Khišt al-Zahir, Zunba, ed. Rassale, p. 52). There were seven citadels around the town: Mûsâr or Minishr, Kum, Karâhidzat, Kâari, Kâfri, Kâfri Nawamand (?) and Kâfri al-Khri (Khalil, sp. cit.; Gaudet-Marinu, Le Syrie à l’époque des Maoméciens, p. 97, s. 105).

MALAY PENINSULA is a name sometimes rather loosely applied to the whole tract of land south of the Isthmus of Kra (Lat. 10° N.) but so far as the Northern part of this tract is concerned the name is a misnomer, the bulk of the population there being Siamese and Chinese, not Malay. Excluding from the total Malay population of Siam [n. v.] as a whole some 50,000 Malays scattered in Ayuthia, Bangkok, Chantaburi and the rest of the Eastern shore of the Gulf of Siam, the remaining 350,000 are in Southern Siam and mainly in the parts South of Kra. But it is not till about Lat. 7° N. that one meets with districts where the majority of the inhabitants are Malay, viz. on the West coast of Palms and Satun and on the East coast the province of Pahani formerly an important Malay state, finally conquered by Siam in 1854. Of the approximate total population of 370,000 in these three districts the greater part consists of Malays. The Southern boundary of Siam, running irregularly between 6° 43' and 7° 45' N., separates them from the rest of the Peninsula, which is attached to the British Empire and with which we are here concerned. The area of this latter portion is about 52,600 English square miles.

The geological structure of the Peninsula includes calcareous rocks and limestones, chert, shales, quartzite, volcanic rocks, granite, alluvial deposits, and the ferruginous substance known as laterite. The most important minerals are tin and tungsten. The former has been exploited for more
than a thousand years and is still a very important product.

Until about fifty years ago the rivers, though mostly small and only navigable for small craft, were the chief and almost the sole means of access to the interior, which was then an almost trackless forest of luxuriant vegetation, traversed by a number of mountain ranges, some running roughly north and south, others transversely or irregularly. A few of the highest points exceed 7,000 feet (roughly 2,100 metres). At sea-level the average temperature is about 82°F. (about 27°C.) with a daily and annual variation of not more than about 10°F. (about 4.5°C.) in each direction; the annual rainfall varies locally from about 60 inches (about 150 cm.) to four times that amount. The N.E. and S.W. monsoons prevail, but are subject to periods of slight or variable wind. The climatic conditions are therefore very favourable to the main staples of native agriculture, viz.: rice, coconuts and miscellaneous local fruits; to these, foreigners have added the cultivation of other products, such as tapioca and coffee (now almost abandoned) and especially Para rubber, in the cultivation of which the Peninsula has led the way. The economic development of the Peninsula may be said to date from the institution of the Residental system in three of the Western states in 1874, which led progressively to the making of a network of excellent roads and a State railway system now comprising a trunk line from Singapore to the western part of the boundary with Siam, where it links with the Siamese system, and a number of branches, one of which turning northward through the centre of the Peninsula is destined to join the Siamese railway at a point near the eastern end of the frontier.

From the administrative point of view, the British portion of the Peninsula falls into: 1. the British colony styled the Straits Settlements (which is an abbreviation of “British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca”), comprising the three “settlements” or divisions of Singapore, Penang and Malacca; 2. the Federated Malay States, viz. Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, on the West coast and Pahang on the East coast, which are united in an administrative union under a Chief Secretary to Government at Kuala Lumpur (in Selangor) and 3. the Unfederated Malay States, viz. in the extreme North and on the West coast, Pérlis and Kedah, and on the East coast, Kelantan and Terengganu, and in the extreme South, Johor. Administratively the Island of Labuan off the coast of North Borneo, and the Cocos Keeling Islands and Christmas Island to the South-West of Java form part of the “settlement” of Singapore; and the State of Brunei (Brunei) in Borneo is an unfederated Malay State ranking with those of the Peninsula.

The Colony has the usual administrative machinery, consisting of a Governor (who is also the High Commissioner for the Malay States), together with executive and legislative councils, and a Supreme Court. Each of the Malay States has a Malay ruler, who usually bears the title of Sultan, and also a British official, styled in the Federated Malay States the British Resident and in the unfederated ones British Adviser or General Adviser, and a State Council. For the Federated States there is in addition a Federal Council and a Judicial Commission. In these States the chief administrative departments are federalized under federal heads, and in one or two cases (such as Education) are linked up with the corresponding department in the Colony. Both the Colony and the States are divided into administrative districts, and the officials in charge of such districts in the Colony and Federated States are mainly Europeans. The same applies to the heads of the principal departments of Government. Many of their assistants are also Europeans. In the unfederated States the administrative machinery is not so elaborately organized and the proportion of Europeans is smaller. Government schools have been established in the principal villages and give elementary instruction exclusively through the medium of Malay. In towns there are also higher schools, supported but not founded or managed, by Government, which give instruction through the medium of English. The college at Kuala Kangsar, which is bilingual, is mainly for the sons of Malay rajas and chiefs though others are admitted. Female education has developed more slowly but is gaining ground.

The ancient history of the Peninsula is obscure. Palaeoliths and neolithic implements have been found in various places. The so-called aborigines, amounting in 1921 to about one per cent. of the total population, comprise in the extreme North a few thousand woolly-haired Negritos, generally termed Siam, in the centre a much larger number of wavy-haired light brown people known as Sakai, and in the South mostly straight-haired people of the Indonesian type, often referred to as Jakun. The first two groups and a portion of the third speak languages containing a strong Mon-Khmer element, the remaining Jakun speak Malay dialects with some alien admixture. From about the 5th century a.d. Sanskrit inscriptions on stone found in Kedah and Province Wellesley (opposite Penang) attest the presence of Buddhists using a South Indian script. An inscription of 775 originally set up at Ligor (Nakhon Sri Dammarat) about Lat. 8° N. indicates that before that date certain points on the isthmus were held by the Saflendra kings of Sri Vijaya (Palembang in Southern Sumatra), who controlled the trade route through the Straits and across the isthmus probably till near the end of the 6th century. It would appear from a notice in the History of the Liang dynasty of China (502-556 A.D.), Book 54, that this isthmus had formerly been controlled by the state of Fanau, which centred round the mouths and lower course of the Mekong river. An inscription found at Chiiya (Juli, near Lat. 10° N.) and probably dated 1183 refers to the king who presumably set it up a princely title which points to the Malay region of Southern Sumatra, adjoining Sri Vijaya to the North-West. Another inscription of Chiiya dated 1230 was set up by the local king Candrabhuana who according to the Mahavamsa and other sources raided Ceylon on two occasions (probably about 1250 and 1256) with his "Javaka" (i.e. Malay) force.

It is plain, therefore, that between the 7th and the 12th centuries the settlement of the Peninsula by Malaya from Sumatra had been going on. A few years later, but before 1280, the Siamese from Sukhothai (Sukhothai) put an end to Malay rule in Ligor, thus beginning the extension of Siamese influence to the southward. In the Javanese poem Ngarakrtanagama (1365) a
number of places on both coasts, from Kedah and Sai (in the old Patani state) in the North to Singapore [q. v.] in the South are claimed as vassals of the Javanese empire of Majapahit. In the same century, but at a date which cannot be precisely fixed owing to the fragmentary condition of the record, the earliest Malay inscription in the Arabic character as yet discovered makes it plain that Islam had recently become the state religion of Trangganu. In the 15th century Islam was being spread in the Peninsula under the influence of the then most important state, Malacca [q. v.] and after its fall in 1511 at the hands of the Portuguese its dynasty continued to rule in the internal (Johor) and neighboring islands, while another branch held Pahang, and Perak eventually came into the hands of a family claiming to descend from the senior line of the same stock. In or before the 16th century, an immigration of Minangkabau settlers from Sumatra founded a number of small states inland of Malacca, which all eventually admitted the suzerainty of Johor, save the southermost, Nanging, which in theory at any rate a subordinate ally of the Portuguese. In the early part of the 17th century the Achinese raided Kedah, Perak, Johor, etc., and for a number of years exercised some sort of suzerainty over Perak. Meanwhile the Northern states came intermittently under Siamese influence, which varied with the strength of that power but retained the character of an external suzerainty till Kedah in 1821 and Patani in 1832 (this last finally) were conquered by Siam.

The Dutch tenure of Malacca (1641-1795), while it controlled to some extent the external trade of the Malay states, did not interfere with their internal affairs. In the eighteenth century Bugis adventurers settled in the Riau-Lingga Archipelago and made their influence felt on the mainland, ultimately establishing the new state of Selangor under a still ruling Bugis dynasty. British influence dates from the founding of Penang (1786), which was followed by a temporary occupation of Malacca (1795-1818), its final cession in 1824, the founding of Singapore (1819), and the incorporation of all these settlements in one government (1826), which in 1857 was transferred from the control of India to that of the Colonial Office. The policy of non-interference with the Malay states was maintained until long-continued disturbances in Perak, Selangor, and Sungai Ujong (part of Negri Sembilan), due to Malay dynastic quarrels and civil war between unruly gangs of Chinese tin-miners, coupled with an increase of piracy in the Straits, led in 1874 to the inauguration of the Residential system. This ultimately developed into the present system whereby since 1895 Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang form a federation administered under the direction of British officials. Perak, Kedah, Kelantan and Trangganu were ceded by Siam in 1909 in return for certain concessions, one of which was the abolition of the extra-territorial privileges of British subjects.

The population in 1921 of the part of the Peninsula and adjacent islands under British administration or protection was about 3,525,000, nearly half being immigrants, mainly Chinese, and to a less extent Indians, among whom males predominated very considerably. The great bulk of the native-born population consisted of Malays, and the total number of Malays, properly so-called (including, however, something like 100,000 persons of Minangkabau descent in Negri Sembilan and Malacca) numbered 1,418,195. The other Muslims Indonesians amounted to 171,315 (including 112,775 Javanese, 37,848 Banjarese, 9,772 Banyans, 8,588 Bugis, 727 Achinese, 859 Kedari, and 946 Mendeling). The 47,465 non-Indonesian Muslims comprised 41,537 Indians, 4,315 Arabs, 1,500 Chinese, and a few Persians and Turks; the total Muslim population was 1,636,978, the great majority being Sunnis of the school of Shafi'i. Of the non-Muslim population roughly three-quarters were Chinese and about one-quarter Indians but there were also 32,448 so-called aborigines of the Peninsula (a few of whom may, however, have been converts to Islam), 18,178 Siamese, 14,833 Europeans (mostly British, but including Continental Europeans and Americans of European descent), 12,629 Eurasians, 6,989 Japanese, and 2,215 Sinhalese, besides several smaller communities.


MALAYS. People. In this article only the Islamic features of the Malay nation will be dealt with, so neither ethnographical nor anthropological questions will be discussed. It may be sufficient to say that the Malays originally—we do not venture to say: as autochthons—were established in the middle part of Sumatra, especially in Palembang, and spread over the eastern and northern parts of that huge island, and settled in the Straits, mainly in Malacca [see MALAY PENINSULA], and founded colonies in Borneo, along the great rivers, and elsewhere eastward. They belong to the widely dispersed Polynesian (or Indonesian) race, whose languages extend from Madagascar to the Philippines and from the peninsula of the utmost S.E. point of Asia to the remoter islands of Micronesia and Melanesia in the Pacific. The Malay chronicles, for the greater part mythical, and a few epigraphical data, make it clear that there was a highly cultivated Hinduised Malay kingdom in Palembang, the seafaring people of which went over to several adjacent and more distant countries; it was along the ways of commerce that they carried the Malay language to sundry ports and lands. It is not exactly known in what century Islam swept away Hinduism, but it is a fact that the new religion on its arrival in the Straits found Malay people settled in the Peninsula and the Malay language introduced there as the generally adopted speech of commerce and political intercourse.
Language. It is due to Islam that Malay, being already a language enriched with many Sanskrit words, became an idiom of very mixed lexigraphical character. The Islamic current brought words of Tamil origin, innumerable Arabic words, some of them in Dekhanised or Persian-like garb, many Persian words, some of them with Indian characteristics, and a small quantity of Hindustani vocables. In that heterogeneous form Malay became the vehicular language of the new religion. Undoubtedly it had found its way already to the most visited ports in the Archipelago in a simplified form fit for intercourse with all kinds of natives and foreign merchants, later also with European, namely Portuguese and Dutch captains and ambassadors. It was Islam that gave Malay a literary character, and when it had established itself as a medium into which innumerable Arabic books were translated, its form became crystallised and its orthography was fixed systematically. That uniformity made it the appropriate language for literary and liturgical purposes and also a medium for dogmatics and mysticism, as well as for romantic and historical literature. It has to be borne in mind that there is a great difference between the patois or lingua franca heard in most of the sea-ports, and the cultivated literary language, which became highly developed in Malacca, once the seat of a Muhammedan court and a royal library. When Arabic and Indian learned men came to Aceh, they discussed theological questions in Malay and even wrote books in that language. The literary form is sustained uniformly to the present day, literary products being written in archaistic formulas, and the colloquial style being used in different parts of the Archipelago, the purest in Johore and Malaya in general and the East-coast-districts of Sumatra; the least pure in Java and more eastern islands. In the Moluccas, especially in Amboyna (Ambon), the preaching of Christianity availed itself of Malay and in those islands this language has therefore assumed an individual character. As to its linguistic character, it may suffice to notice that Malay, like all Polynesian languages, belongs to the agglutinative type, declension not existing, conjugation being limited within narrow bounds, and amplification of the mainly disyllabic stems with a quantity of prefixes, infixes and suffixes giving opportunity of forming words for almost all grammatical and logical relations. There are some traces of the influence of Arabic grammar on Malay syntax, but on the whole the Malayanic current has not essentially altered the character of the language; it has only enriched it with an enormous number of words, and given to its written literature an individual Islamic character.

Literature. Of pre-Islamic literature nothing is known. As far as may be concluded from a few old inscriptions in Hindu script, it seems that Malay was written in Kawi-like characters, but literature, in its earliest known form, is written in Arabic letters only. The oldest manuscripts are preserved in the Cambridge and Oxford libraries; they date from the last years of the xvth and the first decade of the xviith century. The only literary-historical evidence of the existence of written literature in the xviith century is the mention, in a xviith century chronicle, of the use made of a royal library at Malacca at the time when the Portuguese endeavoured to capture that town (1511).

Malay literature, as it presents itself now, is only for a very small part original. Hardy any of the chronicles, tales and poems are derived from Arabic sources directly, most of the religious and semi-historical romances having been translated from Persian, but all these literary products are imbued with the Muslim atmosphere, being full of Arabic words and phrases, and laden with Islamic theory. There are, it is true, some indigenous farcical tales, and some fables, especially the bedtime highly appreciated mouse-deer-tales, moreover some original romances with Hinduistic influences, and several adapted old Javanese tales, that do not betray real Islamic influence but the very fact that all these books are written in Arabic characters makes them overflow with Arabic words, and in that way shows that they belong to Islamic mentality. In this short account there will be no mention of literary products going back to the great Sanskrit epic poems, nor of the tales that do not show traces of Muslim influence; only in so far as Malay literature has Islamic features, will it be treated here. The originally genuine Indonesian deer-fable has undergone an Islamic corretion. The historical writings, more or less mythical and semi-romantic, are almost absolutely Islamicised. To that class of works the chronicle Siyarak Melawi, and other ones, as the chronicles of Kutawaringin, Kuta, Aceh and Pasai are to be reckoned. A partly historical, but for the greater part fictitious, romance is the Hikayat Hong Tuak. A host of romances, dealing with foreign princes and princesses and their endless adventures, has been spread over a great part of the Malay-reading East-Indian World; the titles of all those popular, but for European readers less attractive, books, may be found in the catalogues of Malay manuscripts at Leyden, Batavia and London. Some books of fiction have been translated from Persian, Arabic or Hindustani. A group of them is to be traced to the Hitopadesa-collection, another one to the Tuti-nama-series, a third one to the Bahkhtiyar-cyle. By way of exception foreign authors have written in Malay; e.g. the Radjput Nair Al-Din al-Ranti [q.v.], who wrote a great encyclopaedic chronicle at the instigation of an Achehese queen. A very great number of texts deals with the old prophets, the Prophet Muhammad, his family and friends. Those works, like e.g. the romances of Amir Hamza and Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya, have Persian originals. The purely religious books cannot be regarded as Malay literature.

Poetical literature has a different character. The real Malay kind of poetry, though not devoid of Persian influences, is the pantun, i.e. popular quatrains, whose first two lines deal with a natural scene, or a well known event, and are intended to prelude, phonetically, the 3rd and 4th lines, that contain the real meaning of the usually erotic poem. The other "genre" is the ghoirs. Its form is the stanza of four rhyming lines. Some of these very extensive overlauing poems are from the Javanese, some others are versified versions of prose romances; moreover historical events, scenes, religious matters, mystical speculations etc. are dealt with in innumerable ghoirs, the titles of which may be seen in the following catalogues: Leyden University Library, by H. H. Juyboll; Supplement thereto by Ph. S. van Ronkel; Batavia, the Hague and Brussels by the same; London (R. A. S.) and ibidem E. I. H. (India Office Library) by H. N. van der Tuuk.
MALAZGERD, district (Köf), and town in Armenia, to the North of the lake of Van. Of the name, there occur, in old-Armenian, the forms Manavazkert, Manavaskert, and Manazkert resp. as well as the Arabic form Manaksd, from which, by old-Armenian Manavazkert, the original form, Manavazak represents a popular etymological formation, from the name of the noble family of the Manavazans, which, in olden times, resided in the district. For it is phonetically impossible, that an old-Armenian form Manavazak should regularly become Manazkert. This is the theory of Hübschmann, who admits however the possibility, that an earlier Manavazak may have been arbitrarily shortened in pronunciation, so as to become Manazkert, the word being otherwise too long. W. Belks has conjectured, that in the first part of the word, there may be hidden the name of the Urartian (pre-Armenian) king Menus of Van. This conjecture is based on the fact, that from an inscription of Menus it appears, that the city Menus was supposed to be the capital of a kingdom, which was called Menus (Menazkert-town), thus it would, according to Belks, be very probable, that Malazgerd, in whose environs there have been found many inscriptions of Menus, was this very town, named after him. If such be the case, then the old-Armenian form Manavak must have originated from a later, popular etymology. From the fact, that names of towns formed with -kert (= -karat) seem to have originated not before the Parthian epoch, as Häubschmann observes, it would follow, that the memory of the old king Menas was still alive in the relatively late Parthian time. This difficulty, however, is not insoluble, for it seems, that the name of another Urartian king of Van also may survive in classical Armenian quasi-historical tradition as Aram. The oldest and best Arabic spelling of the name of the town is Manavazqird, with n; the form with l are later, and on them is based the modern name (Malazgerd). The spelling with n we find e.g. in al-Iṣṭakhrī; Yākūt, the author edited by Houtsma in Rec. des textes rel. à l'hist. des Sélençéites, ii; al-Nasawi (ed. Houdas); in a varia lectio of the text of the Rūbat al-Sadūr (G. M. S., New Series, ii, 119); and in the text quoted J. R. A. S., 1902, p. 797. The spelling with l, common in later texts, occurs, among older authors, in al-Mukaddasi; Ibn al-Athir; the Rūbat al-Sadūr (the reading adopted by the editor); Ljuwaini, and the Nasbat al-Kušk. The terminations -gird and -bird also alternate in the apokope, this variation is already noted by Yākūt (Malāṣgif, iv, 648). As regards the form Manazav, cited by Marquardt (Erönahr. p. 162) from Thomas Ariuni, cf. Häubschmann, Die altarmen. Ortsnamen (in dgl. Forschungen, xvi.), p. 450. For the year 1198 the number of inhabitants of the district Malazgerd is given as 21,000, viz. 12,000 Kurds, and the rest Armenians. The district belonged to the vilâyet Biltu, massjıf Mūṣh. In this hilly country, the highest elevation is the Sipān-Daghi (3,000 m.); perhaps the same mount as the Song-i Sefīl, which is, according to Yākūt (Malāṣgif, iii, 165), a mountain in these regions. The soil of the district is fertile; its main products are wheat, barley, millet, lentils and peas, which are also exported, as are also sheep and buffaloes, e.g. to Dīyarbekr. The region of Malazgerd produces also salt and mineral stone, which becomes hard when brought to the day light. Its wild animals are the wolf, the fox and the stone-marten, which is hunted for its fur. Textiles are manufactured in, and exported from the district. The town of Malazgerd is situated on a tributary of the Murād Sū, called the Tula Sū; Hājījī Khānīsa (Qīshān-nunār, p. 426) reckons 2 marbālā between Malazgerd and Erzrum. The town lies, moreover, on the way from Sivas to Artaq, and also at the crossing of the two different ways, which connect Mūṣh and Bāṣayd. The city it surrounded by a high wall and towers; at the East of the town there is the citadel, built from black volcanic stone. In the 12th century, Malazgerd had a triple wall, and it was well furnished with drinking water from within (Cedrenus, ed. Bonn, ii, 590). More than one fruitless siege of this place is recorded in its history.

Belks supposed, that the well-known battle between the Assyrian king Tīghlath-pīleser I against the allied Nātri-kings took place in the plain of Malazgerd (Z. d. M. G., ii, 560). If, at that remote time, the town of Malazgerd existed already, it is not certain. That it existed in the time of the Urartian king Menas, who, as Belks thinks, gave his name to the town, is made probable by an inscription of that prince, from which it would appear, that he rebuilt an older citadel and an older palace on that place. The environs of the modern city of Malazgerd are remarkably rich in cuneiform inscriptions, which were discovered by Lehmann and Belks during their stay there. They found an Assyrian inscription of Tīghlath-pīleser I and several Urartian inscriptions, belonging others, of Menas (± 800 a. c.) and Argisht (± 714—ca. 690 b. c.). It appears from these documents, that Menas devoted great attention to the irrigation of the land, by constructing several canals.

In the early Middle-ages, the town of Malazgerd (Manazkert), lying on the confines of the cantons Harkh and Apanahkh, was sometimes assigned to the former, sometimes to the latter. That in old-Armenian times here resided the family of the Manavarans, has already been remarked. For these matters, and also for the quotations from Byzantine and Armenian authorities regarding them, cf. Häubschmann, Die altarmen. Ortsnamen, p. 325, 330, 449 ff.

Malazgerd belonged, since the beginning of their dynasty, to the realm of the Bagratides of Armenia, who allowed it to be ruled, as well as Alahā, Artaq and "Perki" (= Ergir), by a family of their vassals. This family, whose members bear Arabic names, became in course of time independent of the Armenian kings, but, on the other hand, was obliged to pay tribute to the emperors of Byzantium (Constantius Porphyrogenetus, De admin. imp., ed. Bonn, p. 192 ff.).

Yākūt says, that the inhabitants of Malazgerd are Armenians and Byzantines (Nāṣī); a native of this town was Abū Naṣr al-Manṣūr (this, therefore, is the niha of the name), who was wazir to one of the Marwānī princes of Dīyarbekr. This Abū
Nasr died 437 (1045—1046) and, according to our authority, was a good poet: Ya'qub cites two fragments from his poetry (Ma'djam, iv. 648 sq.). Regarding another al-Mahri, cf. Y. R. A. S., 1902, p. 788, note 1.

A topic of political events connected with the town of Malazgerd, it may be noted that, on the occasion of the campaign, which the great Hamdanid Saif al-Dawla undertook into Armenia (325—940), there is mentioned one 'Abd al-Hamid, prince ('abd al-Hamid) of Malazgerd and Sibalwarq (Sewerw) (Y. R. A. S., 1902, p. 797): the name, 'Abd al-Hamid, occurs among the names of the dynasty of Malazgerd, recorded by Constantine Porphyrogensous, and this contemporary of Saif al-Dawla doubtless belonged to that family. But he cannot be the 'Abd al-Hamid of the Greek text, who, from a chronological point of view, must have lived some two generations earlier (cf. the genealogical table of these dynasts of Malazgerd in Baudouin Animalier, Le Catalogue des Comtes de Constantinople, iii. 372). In 353 (964) a certain Naquil, a ghulān of Saif al-Dawla, received against his master, after taking possession of that part of Armenia, which was ruled by one Abū ʿI-Ward. The latter was slain, and, among the places conquered by Naquil, Malazgerd also is cited (Ibn al-Shihab, ed. Tornberg, viii. 408); in the year 359 (971—972) Malazgerd was taken by the Byzantines (ibid., viii. 445); they must have lost it again before 382 (992—993), for in that year they besieged not only Aḥkāt and Ardashīr, but also Malazgerd, but this time they could not take it, but returned home after concluding a treaty for ten years with Abū ʿAlī al-Husayn b. Maḥmūd (ibid., ix. 67). In 440 (1049—1050) it must have belonged to the Byzantines, for the same Naquil, whom 'Abd al-Hamid, Toghril Beg's brother, undertook into the Byzantine empire, attacked also the territory of Malazgerd (ibid., ix. 372). And it is explicitly stated by Ibn al-Shihab (ibid. iv. 411), under the year 446 (1054—1055), that Malazgerd was in possession of the Byzantines, for there he relates, that this strong city resisted a siege by Toghril Beg himself (cf. also Cadmus, ed. Bonn, ii. 596 et al.). The most important historical event, with which the name of the town is connected, is the battle of Malazgerd (463—1071) between Alp Arslan and the Byzantine emperor Romanus Diogenes, in consequence of which the eastern part of Asia Minor, viz. Armenia and Cappadocia, was lost for ever to the Greek empire (Ibn al-Shihab, x. 44; Rec. des textes relatifs à l'histoire des Soumouch, ed. Toutain, ii. 38 et al.; Richter und Seefeld [G. 32, New Series, ii.], p. 119; Zenara, ed. Dindorf, iv. 313, et al.; cf. also IL Gelber in K. Krennreich's Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, v. 1010). After this event, therefore, Malazgerd passed into the possession of the Seljuks. In 531 (1137) it was given by King Malikshah, along with Erzerum and part of the territory of Aḥkāt, to his brother Sahlshah, as a gift (Rec. des textes relatifs à l'histoire des Soumouch, ed. Toutain, ii. 185). In course of time, the city was besieged in 942 (5897—1191) by Toghril ibn al-Shihab (Ibn al-Shihab, xiv. 141). During the disturbances, of which Armenia was the scene in the beginning of the sixteenth century, mention is found several times made of Malazgerd. In 603 (1206—1207), a former manāhīd of the Shih Arman took possession of Malazgerd; and, after that, also of Aḥkāt. He had, in addition, control of Ardashīr and other places. This man, whose name was Ballān (the vocalisation of the first syllable is uncertain), was assisted by the prince of Erzerum, Mughul, ʿAlī ibn Toghril. Shah b. Kühli, Arslan, against al-Malik al-ʿAwād, son of al-Malik al-ʿAḍī of Egypt. Later on, Ballān was murdered by his ally of Erzerum, who tried to enter Aḥkāt and Malazgerd, but in vain, so that he was obliged to return to his own state (Ibn al-Shihab, xii. 168, 180 sq.). In 623 (1226), Toghril ibn al-Shihab of Khwarazmshāh ʿAlī ibn Mūhammad occupied Malazgerd, as he intended to attack Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī al-Shihab, in Aḥkāt. But, since his attempt on this town did not succeed, and as the winter also set in (he had entered Malazgerd on Dūn 2-Ka'ba 13, November 4, 623), and the Turkomans invaded his own realm, he was obliged to retire (Ibn al-Shihab, xii. 301). In 626 (1229) however he succeeded in taking Aḥkāt, after which he besieged Malazgerd, first in person, afterwards leaving one of his generals in charge of the siege, but on this occasion without success (al-Nasawi, ed. O. Houda, ii. 116, 205; translation, p. 345, 344, 347).


MALDA (properly, Māldah or Māldah), a District in Eastern Bengal and in the Rajshāhī Division of the Presidency of Bengal. Area, 1,899 sq. m. Pop. in 1911, 1,004,159, of whom 465,521 were Hindus, and 539,506 Muslims. In old times it was famous for its two capitals of Gaur (q.v.) or Lakhānawī, and Pandua, where there were many ruins of the mosque and other buildings of the Muhammadan kings of Bengal.

Bibliography: Munshi-I̲ Sarāfī, Tahāshī-Nāṣirī, Raverty's translation (Riv. Ind., 1881); Ghulam Ḥusayn Salim, Riayd al-Sulṭānī (Riv. Ind., text and translation); Mohun C. Mozam-ī, Brāhmānīs of Gaur (in Bengali, Calcutta 1886); Hedgell's Diary, ed. Yule (Hakluyt Society); H. C. Oldridge, Ruins of Gaur, London 1877; Ravenshaw, Gaur, London 1878; W. Franklin, Notes on old Gaur 1870 (J. A. S. B., for 1894); Archaeological Reports, xx.; Blochmann, Gaur, Bengal (J. A. S. B., for 1899); Bahlol Bakhsh, Khwarizmshāh Aṣ-Ṣamōjī (J. A. S. B., for 1895); Imperial Gazetteer of India, and Statistical Account of Bengal, vol. viii., s. v.; Census Report for 1911, vol. xi., parts i. and ii. (H. Beveringe)

MALDIVE ISLANDS, a group of coral-islands and islets in the Indian Ocean, lying between 7° 6' N. and 0° 42' S. lat., and 72° and 74° E. long., and consisting of seventeen atolls with a great number of islands, of which about 300 are inhabited, the population being estimated at 70,000. The Mowrish traveller, Ibn Battūta, lived for more
than a year (1543–1544) in the islands, but the first Europeans to visit them were the Portuguese, who established a factory in them in 1518. The Maldives were much harassed by Māpipī (Mōpiāk) pirates from the Malabar Coast and in 1645 the king, who is entitled " spécialisé de the Twelve Thousand Isles", placed himself under the protection of the Dutch in Ceylon, with which island the Maldives have, since that time, been politically connected. The natives are Muslims and fall into three ethnographic divisions, (1) the northmen, with a strong admixture of Dravidian blood from India; (2) the central, under the immediate rule of the Sultan, who resides in Male, which has acquired from Arab traders and settlers a strain of Semitic blood; and (3) the natives of the southern clusters, who have had little communication with the central group, and preserve more of the primitive type, resembling the Sinhalese villagers of Ceylon. All are peaceful, intelligent and industrious, growing their own crops and weaving their own cloth and mats. The chief exports are copra, oil, and dried fish products. The language is a dialect of the Sinhalese, somewhat Islamised, but many read Arabic more or less fluently.


MALHAMA. [See Malāwī.]

MALL, a town, which no longer exists, the old capital of the Mandingo empire, in the western Sudan, also called Māli, Māli, Māli, Mōla, Muni or Mané. All these names are dialectic or local variants of the same word which is the name of the country of origin of a people whom the French call Mallinck, following the Paul and Tocqueville, and the American "Mannah"; following the form used by one section of this people on the Lower Gambia.

The name used by the Arab authors for this town was not the one used by the inhabitants themselves and the latter is not given us by the geographer Idris, nor the historian Ibn Khalids, nor the traveller Iun Bārūtta, nor Leo Africanus. It was only in 1913 that the translation of an Arabic manuscript not long before discovered in the Sudan, the Tārīkh al-Fatḥah, enabled us to learn that in reality there were two successions capitals of the Mandingo empire or of Māli: the older was called Diarība or Diarība and there was later another called Nani.

Recent researches in the valley of the Niger have enabled the sites of these two towns to be discovered. The first was situated at the junction of the Niger and the Senegal, and at the place called Māni or Māli-Tombo, i.e. ruins of Māli. There are still traces of a very ancient and important town, which the natives regard, according to their traditions, as the ancient residence of their former sovereigns and the place where the latter are buried.

As to the second town, a copyist's error in the text of Ibn Khalids concealed the true name till the publication of the Tārīkh al-Fatḥah in 1915. It was recently recognised that the capital in question should be located on the left bank of the Sankaran, and at the level of Siguini, not far from the place where there is still a town of the same name, Nani.

Djerba was no doubt the cradle of the Mandingo dynasty of the Keita of the 18th–19th century. We have no information about it. We are more accurately informed of Nani. It is supposed to have been founded in 1238 after Sundjata Keita, ruler of the Mandingo, had defeated in 1235 at Kōrima the emperors of Sānha, Samanurak-Kante, his rival and enemy. Gongo Mūsā, often wrongly called Kankun Mūsā, was ruling there a century later, when on his return from a pilgrimage to Mecca, he attracted to his court an Arab poet named al-Sāhili, who belonged to a Granada family. By orders of Gongo Mūsā, this foreigner built in Gao a mosque with battlemented terrace and pyramidal minaret. According to tradition, this was the first building of the type, now so widely spread in the western Sudan, the origin of which is North African.

In 1522–1533 in the reign of Sulaiman Keita, brother of Gongo Mūsā, the Arab traveller Iun Bārūtta visited the town. It was then a completely Africanise and Moroccan legal authorities, students of Islam, readers of the Koran, the mosques, and merchants. No description of the different quarters of the town has come down to us but we have a fairly detailed account of the sovereign's palace. The ruler gave his audiences in a room looking out on a courtyard, with six windows of wood, three of which were covered with plates of silver and above these three covered with plates of gold. These windows were hidden by curtains, which were lifted to show that the hour of audience had come.

The empire of Māli retained its power down to the beginning of the xvth century when its decline began. According to Leo Africanus, who visited the Sudan in the first half of the xvth century, the capital Māli or better Nani was inhabited by about 6,000 families who included many artisans and traders. Islam was flourishing, the town had still a number of mosques and prosperous schools but it had lost its former glory.

In 1545, Dā'īdī, brother of the akhīya of Gao, marched to Nani; the ruler of the Mandingo having succeeded in escaping, Dā'īdī occupied the town which he plundered for a week before withdrawing, ordering his soldiers to despoil the palace of the king with orders.

In the xvth century the growth of the fourhn kingdom of Songa and Kaarta contributed to overthrow what was left of the old Mandingo power, the last chiefs of which, learning Nani, took refuge in Kangaba.

There is no doubt that Nani was visited on several occasions by the Portuguese. We know nothing of the expeditions which set out from their factories in Lower Gambia to the interior; on the other hand, we have notes about the Mandingo capital on the journey made in 1483 of an embassy from Elmina (now the Gold Coast Colony). João de Barros describes it in his Book III of his Aflar: *By the route of the fortress of Minas (Elmina) he (John II) also sent an embassy to Mahamid b. Marnagui, grandson of Mūsā, king of Songa. This city is one of the most populous of this great country which we usually call the
land of the Mandingoees". Another author, Barth, claims to identify the Songo of the Portuguese historian with the land of the Songoh on the Niger. This is clearly wrong. But is Songo a name applicable to the Mandingo capital? M. Delafosse does not think so; he calls attention to the fact that the country of the Mandingoes is still known among the coast peoples of the Gulf of Guinea and in all the Fanti and Ashanti country under the name of Songo, so that among those with whom the Portuguese of Elmina mixed, the word was simply a synonym of Mandingo or Mali.


(Henri Labouret)

**MALIK (L), King.** In the Kurân the word, in addition to being used of the kings of this world, is also applied to Allâh, e. g. xxi. 113: "So is Allâh exalted, the King, the Truth". In iii. 25, Allâh is the mâlik al-mulk, the possessor of royal power, which he gives to and takes from whom He will: in the Fâtiha many Kurân readers read mâlik (for mâlik) yawan al-mulâ; God's kingdom is also described as mâlik and mulâkah (cf. Allâh).

Muslim rulers do not generally call themselves kings; as in the Kurân, the use of the word was confined to the rulers of foreign peoples in so far as it had an earthly significance. The application of the word to Muslim potentates was regarded not so much as blasphemy but rather as implying a form of rule which was contradictory to Muslim political theory. It was considered very much to Mu'tawiya's discredit that he described himself as the first king in Islam; and as a kingdom, which is contrasted with the imamate, the dignity alone worthy of the Muslim rulers, the rule of the Omayyads was attacked and despised by the pious old-fashioned party.

While religious constitutional literature does not recognise the word mâlik as a term for Muslim conditions, it plays a very much greater part in the literature of mirrors for princes which is indifferent to religion, but only when it is a question of a ruler in general and not of specifically Muslim rulers. Al-Dhâbic gives his K, al-Tabî, the subtitle Fi Ahlak al-Mâlik and al-Fârâ'î deals very fully with the duties of a king, in the ethical encyclopaedias which deal with all three moral sciences, ethics, economics and politics (cf. Mal.), like the Sullûk al-Mâlik fi Tadhîr al-Imamîh of Ibn Abî 'l-Ra'îîi, the king appears as the subject of special chapters in the scheme of division of the kind of literature.

With the spread of Islam and the Arabic language into Asia, mâlik became used as the equivalent of the Persian shah and as a royal title was particularly favoured by mediaeval dynasties of Turkish origin. We find the title mâlik as early as the Sâmidîs and in the next century the Bitîid Bâhî al-Dawla calls himself Malik al-Mâlik, a title modelled on the ancient Iranian title of "King of Kings". Among the Sâdûqîs, Atâbib and Urtûqûs, it is the regular title of sovereignty, usually combined with an honorific epithet. It is not so generally used by the Ayyûbids and Mâmilûs. In the feminine it is the royal title of the Ayyûbîs Shâhjâr al-Durî, who calls herself "queen of the Muslims" (Malika al-Musulûmûn). One of the rare occurrences in India of the title is also in the feminine Malika, which queen Raşaîn of Delhi uses in place of the Sultân of the other members of the dynasty. After being practically extinct for several centuries in the Muslim world mâlik has quite recently been adopted as the royal title in the new kingdoms of Egypt, 'Irâq, the Hijârz and Afghanistan so that it has suddenly, if somewhat artificially under the influence of the western conception of kings, come to be the royal title par excellence in the Muslim world.


(M. Plessner)

**MALIK 'AMBAR HABASHI, an Abyssinian slave, who rose to great power and influence in the Deccan.** When Ahmadnagar was conquered by prince Dânîyûl in 1609 (1600), Malik 'Ambar and Râkî Mî ('Ambar, a Deccan chief, divided the remaining territories between them. About this period owing to the rebellion of Sulân Salîm, the death of Akbar, and the revolt of Sultan Khurshî, 'Ambar found time to regulate his country and raised large armies, and even dared to seize several of the imperial districts. He introduced a new revenue system into the Deccan, perhaps in imitation of Tûdâr Mill. When the authority of the emperor Dâjûngar was established, he sent several expeditions to the Deccan, but 'Ambar could not be subdued. At last he restored the places taken from the Mughals to Shah Dâjûn, to whom he became attached and remained loyal to him until his death, which occurred in 1655 (1642), in the 8th year of his age. He was buried in Dâwanatîyad (q.v.).


(H. Hidayyat Hosain)

**MALIK AL-KÂMIL I, NEṢRÊN DÎN ABU 'L-MÂLÎ MAḤMAD B. AL-MÂLÎ AL-ṢÂDIQ B. AYYÛBĪD, was born in Râbi'î 576 (Aug. 1180) and knighted with full ceremony on Palm Sunday (May 29) 1192 in Akkâ by Richard Coeur-de-Lion who was on friendly terms with his father. A few years later his name begins to appear in the history of the Ayyûbids wars. When his father, who was besieging Mârîdûn (q. v.), with his army, left it after the death of al-Âzîz, Saîdîn's brother, on 27th Muharram 595 (Nov. 29, 1198) to seize the capital, Damascus, for himself, he entrusted the conduct of the siege of Mârîdûn to his son Kâmîl. The governor of the town had begun to negotiate with him for surrender, when reinforcements arrived and after a fight which went badly for al-Kâmîl, the latter was forced to withdraw and join his father in Damascus. Al-Kâmîl's death (7th Dhîqânûd, 1145—Aug. 31, 1248) left the difficult task of clearing Egypt of the Crusaders, who had landed near Damietta in the beginning of summer and had begun to besiege the town.
On the news of their landing, al-ʿĀdil [q.v.], who was then in Syria, sent troops to Egypt and al-Ẓāmit endeavoured to defend the land as best he could. The Christians gained the upper hand at first and by the end of Shaban 616 (July 1219), Damietta had fallen into their hands. It took nearly two years for al-Ẓāmit, who had had homage paid to himself as suzerain of Egypt and Syria after the death of his father, to retake the town with the help of the other Ayyūbīs, particularly his brother al-Malik al-Muʿāṣraṯam the Christians by this time were tired of fighting and in Raijib 618 (the end of August 1221) they offered to abandon the town if given a free passage. Al-Ẓāmit, who feared not without reason that they would soon receive reinforcements from Europe, gladly accepted their terms whereupon the Franks left Egypt. But then troubles broke out within the Ayyūbī ranks. When al-Muʿāṣraṯ died (end of Dhū ʿl-Ḥejja 624 = Nov. 1227) al-Ẓāmit and his brother al-Malik al-ʾAṣghaf attacked his son and successor al-Malik al-Ḥāṣir Dāwūd and finally took Damascus from him (Shaban 626 = June/July 1229); al-Ẓāmit next occupied southern Syria and Palestine and al-ʾAṣghaf was recognized as ruler of Damascus under the suzerainty of al-Ẓāmit, while their nephew Dāwūd received al-Karnak, al-Shawbak and other remote fortresses as compensation. Al-Ẓāmit had previously entered into negotiations with the Emperor Frederick II and concluded a treaty with him by which he ceded Jerusalem to him with a corridor to Jaffa and the Emperor in return promised to help him against all his enemies. After some time the Ayyūbīs came into conflict with the Saljuqs. Kal-Ẓāmis I [q.v.] had previously quarrelled with al-ʾAṣghaf and sought to bring against him a confederation of petty Mesopotamian dynasties and under his brother and successor Kal-ʿAlī b. [q.v.] it came to open fighting. The successes won by al-Ẓāmit in this war, however, aroused the jealousy of his relatives and they formed a coalition against him (cf. ʿAdilīn). Al-Ẓāmit then left for Egypt and advanced victorious as far as Damascus. He succeeded in taking this city also but died very soon afterwards (in Raijib 635 = March 1238). As a ruler he was undoubtedly one of the most distinguished of the Ayyūbīs. He was a brave soldier and a skilful diplomat and rendered lasting services to the development of his country. He devoted special attention to irrigation and in his reign the defences of the citadel of Cairo were completed. He also took a lively interest in the cause of learning.

Bibliography: Ibn Khalilikin, Wafayāt al-Aṣ'īm (ed. Wüstenfeld), Ns. 705 (transl. de Slane, ii. 240); Ibn al-ʿĀṣim, al-Ṭāmil (ed. Tornberg), xii, see Index; Abu ʿl-Ḥadīd, Anwār al-Tawāreb (ed. Reise), iv, passim; Ibn Khalilikin, al-ʾAṣghaf, v. 345 sqq.; Ibn ʿAbd al-Mabīn (Butkī 1311), l. 77 sqq.; Ricciutti, Le Storia del Cretese, ii, see, in, passim; Well, Gesch. der Chasidim, ii. 433 sqq., 441 sqq.; Stanley Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt, p. 221 sqq.; Röhrich, Gesch. des Konigreiches Jerusalem, see Index. (K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

AL-MALIK AL-KĀMIL II. [See Shawkan]

MALIK SARWAR, KHALWĀD-ī DIJKHAN was a sūnuq given by Salāḥ al-Dīn to his grandson Muḥammad, son of ʿAlī Ẓāhir Tughlak, in whose service he rose to be chief suunq and controller of the elephant stables. He was faithful to his master in all his troubles, and in 1530 received the title of Khwāja Shāh Di̇jk汗 and was made muqarr. Muḥammad's son, Muṣṭafā Shāh, sent him in March, 1394, to govern the eastern provinces, with his headquarters at Dījkhanpūr, and conferred on him the title of Malik al-Shārqi, or lord of the east. He took thither with him Karanfūl, a slave and water-bearer of ʿAbū Tughlak, whom he had adopted, and his brothers. His administration was most successful and his adopted son Karanfūl served him loyally. On the disruption of the kingdom of the Tughlak dynasty after Timur's invasion, Malik Sarwar assumed the title of Sultan al-Shārqi and established his independence in Dījkhanpūr. Karanfūl received the title of Malik al-Shārqi, and his brother Ibrāhīm was made commander of the fort and city.

Malik Sarwar died in 1400 and was succeeded by Karanfūl, who ascended the throne of Dījkhanpūr under the title of Muḥarrak Shāh.


(T. W. HARC)

MALIK b. ANAS, a Muslim jurist, the inām of the maqāṣid of the Malikīs, which is named after him, and frequently called briefly the inām of Medīna.

I. The sources for Malik's biography

The oldest authority of any length for Malik, Ibn Sa'd's account (d. 250) based on al-Waqidi (d. 207) in the sixth class of the Medīna "successors", is lost as there is a hiatus in the manuscript of the work, but it is possible to reconstruct the bulk of it from the quotations preserved, mainly in Tabari (ii. 2519 sqq.), in the Kitāb al-ʿAṣāīn (Frazen, hist. arab., 1. 297 sqq.), in Ibn Kathīr and al-Suyūṭī (p. 7 sqq., pp. 39 sqq., 44, 45). From this it is evident that the brief biological notices in Ibn Kathīr (p. 275) and the somewhat more full ones in the Fihrist (compiled in 377) are based on Ibn Sa'd. The article on Malik in Tabari's (d. 310) Dālī al-Mudḥayyal is essentially dependent on the same source, while a few other short references there and in his history are based on other authorities. Al-Samʿání (c. 550) with the minimum of bare facts gives only the legendary version of an otherwise quite well established incident, while in Ibn Kathīr (d. 672) and particularly in al-Nawawī (d. 676) the references are more pronounced although the isolated facts of importance are also preserved by them. Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911) gives a detailed compilation from Ibn Sa'd and other works, most of which are not, however, accessible but are for the most part of later date and unreliable, like the Musnad ʿAbdu ʿl-Mawṣūfa'ī of al-Ṭāhirī, the Hilya of Abū Naṣīr, the Kitāb al-Maṭṭūṣah wa ʿl-Muṭṭalaf of al-Khatib al-Baghdādi, the Kitāb Tarikh al-Muṭarrīk of al-Kāfī Ḥaṣṣ, the Fihrist Malik of Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Fīrāz. The bulk of the later Maṭarrīk, for example that of al-Zawādī, is of no independent value.

II. Malik's Life

Malik's full name was Abū ʿAbd Allāh Malik b. Anas b. Malik b. Abū ʿAmir b. ʿAmar b. al-

The date of his birth is not known; the dates given, varying between 90 and 97, are hypotheses, which are presumably approximately correct. As early as Ibn Sa'd we find the statement that he spent three years in his mother's womb (over two according to Ibn Kazakhs, p. 290, a legend, the origin of which in a wrong interpretation of an allowed statement by Malik on the possible duration of pregnancy is still evident in the text of Ibn Sa'd). According to a tradition preserved by al-Tirmidhi, Muhammad himself is said to have foretold his coming as well as that of Abul Hanifa and al-Shafi'i. His grandfather and his uncle on the father's side are mentioned by al-Sam'ani as traditionists, so that there is nothing remarkable in his also being a student. According to the Kitab al-Azghani, he is said to have first wanted to become a singer, and only exchanged his career for the study of Fiqh on his mother's advice on account of his ugliness (cf. Goldscheider, Minh. Studien, ii, 79, note 2); but such anecdotes are little more than evidence that some one did not particularly admire him. Very little reliable is known about his studies, but the story that he studied Fiqh with the celebrated Rabia b. Farihik (d. 132 or 133 or 143) who cultivated roqay in Medina, whence he is called Rabah al-Roy, can hardly be an invention, although it is only found in somewhat late sources (cf. Goldscheider, op. cit., p. 60). Later legends increase the number of his teachers to incredible figures; 900, including 300 tashfin are mentioned. It is said he has learned kirah from Nan b. Abu Nula'am. He transmitted traditions from al-Zuhri, al-Naih, the Mawlid of Ibn 'Umar, Abu Ja'far al-Ash'ami, Abu Ja'far al-Rawah, Hisham b. 'Urwa, Yahya b. Sa'd, Abul 'A'ib b. Dinar, Muhammad b. al-Munkad, Abu 'Zoheir and others, but the insors of course data insufficient evidence that he studied with the authorities in question; a list of 95 shuyukh is given by al-Suyuti, p. 48 seq.

A fixed chronological point in his life, most of which he spent in Medina, is his being involved in the rising of the 'Aliid pretender Muhammad b. Abul 'A'ib in 145 (on the other hand the story of Malik's alleged dealings with Ibn Hurrax in the same year gives the impression of being quite apocryphal). As early as 144 the caliph al-Manasir sent to the Hassanids of Mecca through him a demand that the two brothers Muhammad and Tahir b. Abul 'A'ib suspected of being pretenders should be handed over to him; this shows that he must have already attained a position of general esteem and one at least not openly hostile to the government; he was even rewarded out of the proceeds of the confiscated property of the captured 'Abul 'A'ib, father of the two brothers above named. This mission met with no success. When Muhammad in 145 by a coup made himself master of Medina, Malik declared in a fatwah that the homage paid to al-Manasir was not binding, because it was given under compulsion, whereas many who would otherwise have held back joined Muhammad. Malik took no active part in the rising but stayed at home. On the failure of the rebellion (147) he was punished by flogging by Djasar b. Sulaiman, the governor of Medina, when he suffered a dislocation of the shoulder, but this is said to have still further increased his prestige and there is no reason to doubt that the stories of Abu Hanifa's ill-treatment in prison are based on this episode in the life of Malik. He must have later made his peace with the government; in 160 the caliph al-Mahdi consulted him on structural alterations in the Meccan sanctuary, and in the year of his death 179 the caliph al-Rashid visited him on the occasion of his pilgrimage. While this fact may be considered certain, the details in the Kitab al-Uyoun are already somewhat legendary and in Suyuti, following Abu Nu'aim, quite fantastic. The story of al-Mansur found as early as Ibn Sa'd, in a parallel ra'awiy in al-Yabari of al-Mahdi, is quite fictitious and is given again with fantastic detail in al-Suyuti (from Abu Nu'aim) of al-Rashid, though the caliph wanted to make the Musawwa canonical and only abandoned his intention on the representations of Malik.

Malik died, at the age of about 85, perhaps in the year 179 in Medina and was buried in al-Baq'iy. 'Abul 'A'ib b. Zainab, the governor there, conducted his funeral service. An elegy on him by Djasar b. Ahmad al-Sarrad is given in Ibn Khallikani. Pictures of the sahaba over his grave are given in al-Batamani, al-Rihla al-Hadhjiyya, opposite p. 256 and in Ibrhim Rifat al-Pasha, Mir'at al-Murarani, vol. i, opposite p. 426. As early as Ibn Sa'd (certainly going back to al-Waki'i) we have a fairly full description of Malik's personal appearance, his habits and manner of life, which however cannot claim to be authentic, nor can the sayings attributed to him which became more and more numerous as time went on. The few certain facts about him have been buried under a mass of legends; the most important facts have already been noted, and the others will be found in al-Suyuti and al-Zawawi.

On the transmitters of his Musawwa and the earliest members of his madhab see Sect. III, iv; here we will only mention the most important scholars who belonged on traditions from him. These were 'Abul 'A'ib b. al-Mubarak, al-Awaq, Ibn Dinar, Hammadi b. Zaid, al-Layth b. Sa'd, Ibn Salama, al-Shafi'i, Abu 'Ubaida, Ibn 'Uyaina, Yazid b. 'Abul 'A'ib and his shaykh al-Zuhry and Yahya b. Sa'd; al-Suyuti, p. 18 seq., gives a long list of transmitters but most of them are not corroborated. We may just mention the apocryphal story of Malik's meeting with the young al-Shafi'i (Progen. hist. ar., i, 359; Wustenfeld, Gatt. Aeg., 1890, p. 34 and 1891, p. 1 seq.), which is simply an expression of the view that was held of the relation between the two Imams.

III. Malik's Writings

Further sources for his teachings

1. Malik's great work is the Kitab al-Mumawwa, which, if we except the Corpus Juris of Zaid b. 'Ali, is the earliest surviving Muslim law-book. Its object is to give a survey of law and justice, ritual and practice of religion according to the ijma' of Islam in Medina, according to the sunna usual in Medina and to create a theoretical standard for matters which were not settled from the point of view of ijma' and sunna. In a period of recognition and appreciation of the canon law under the early 'Abbasids, there was a practical interest in pointing out a "smoothed path" (this
is practically what al-muwattāʾ means) through the far-reaching differences of opinion even on the most elementary questions, Malik wished to help this interest on the basis of the practice in the Ḥadīth and to codify and systematise the customary law of Medina. Tradition, which he interprets from the point of view of practice, is with him not an end but a means; the older jurists are therefore hardly ever quoted except as authorities for Malik himself. As he was only concerned with the documentation of the sunna and not with criticism of its form, he is exceedingly careless as far as order is concerned in his treatment of traditions. The Muwattāʾ thus represents the transition from the simplicity of the earlier period to the pure science of Ḥadīth of the later period.

Malik was not alone among his contemporaries in the composition of the Muwattāʾ; al-Muqaddasi (d. 164) is said to have dealt with the consensus of the scholars of Medina without quoting the pertinent traditions, and works quite in the style of the Muwattāʾ are recorded by several Medina scholars of the same time (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 219 sq.) but nothing of them has survived to us. The success of the Muwattāʾ is due to the fact that it always takes an average view on disputed points.

In transmitting the Muwattāʾ, Malik did not make a definitive text, either oral or by munawala, to be disseminated; on the contrary, the different riwaṭs (recensions) of his work in places differ very much (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 223). The reason for this, besides the fact that in those days very little stress was laid on accurate literal repetition of such texts and great liberty was taken by the transmitters (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 221), lies probably in the fact that Malik did not always give exactly the same form to the same lectures in different "classes". But the name Muwattāʾ, which certainly goes back to Malik himself, and is found in all recensions is a guarantee that Malik wanted to create a "work" in the later sense of the term, although of course the stories which make Malik talk of his writings reflect the conditions of a later period. In later times the Muwattāʾ was regarded by many as canonical (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 213, 265 sq.; al-Suyūṭī, p. 47) and numerous legends deal with its origin (al-Suyūṭī, p. 42 sq.).

Fifteen recensions in all of the Muwattāʾ are known, only two of which still survive in their entirety, while some five were studied in the sixteenth centuries A. D. in Spain (Goldziher, op. cit., p. 222, note 2 and 4) and twelve were still available to al-Raḍānī (d. 1094) (Heffening, fremdenrecht, p. 144, note 1):

a. the vulgar of the work transmitted by Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Maḥmūdī (d. 234), often printed, e.g. Delhi 1216, 1296 (without ināda, with Hindustānī translation and commentary), 1307, 1308, Cairo 1279-1280 (with the commentary of Muḥammad b. Abī al-Bākī al-Zarqānī, d. 1122), Lahore 1889, Tunis 1250; numerous commentaries, editions and synopses; cf. Brockelmann, G.A.L., l. 156; Ahlwardt, Katang Berlin, 1145; Muḥammad Abī al-Hayy al-Halakhwī (Introduction to the edition of the recension 4); Lucknow 1297, p. 21 sq.; al-Suyūṭī, p. 3 and passim (work of al-Fakhūrī), p. 57 (cf. Abī al-Barr) and p. 58 (chief passage); Goldziher, op. cit., p. 330, note 2; Schacht, Abb. fremdenrecht, p. 253, note 2); and al-Suyūṭī, Isfākh al-Muwaṭṭā li-Ridāṭ al-Muwattāʾ, Delhi 1320 and Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Patrī, Muḥṣim b. Ḥiṣār al-Anwār, Lucknow 1285;

b. the recension of Muḥammad b. al-Hāsan al-Shahtānī (d. 189) which is also an edition and critical development of Malik’s work, as al-Shahtānī at the end of most chapters gives his own views and that of Abī Ḥanīfa on the questions discussed, sometimes with very full reasonings; often printed e.g. Lahore 1211-1219 (with Hindustānī and Arabic translation and notes), Lucknow 1291, 1292, 1293, 1297 (with introduction and commentary by Muḥammad abī al-Hayy al-Lakhnawī, d. 1910, edn.); several commentaries; cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., Schacht, op. cit., No. 2, 24, 24; and the works quoted under a.

On the relation of these riwaṭs to one another cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 223 sqq.

c. The quotations from the recension of Abī al-Ḥāfīz b. Wahib (d. 197) which are preserved in the two fragments of al-Ṭabari’s Kitāb al-Bukhārī al-Faṭḥā (ed. Kerm, Cairo 1902, and Schacht, op. cit., No. 22) are fairly comprehensive; this riwaṭ follows that of Yahyā b. Yahyā quite closely.

The other recensions of the Muwattāʾ are given by al-Lakhnawī, op. cit., p. 18 sqq.; further lists of transmitters of the Muwattāʾ are given in al-Suyūṭī, p. 48, 51 and in al-Nawawī.

2. Whether Malik composed other works besides the Muwattāʾ is doubtful (the statements in the Fihrist, p. 199, 9 sqq., which speak of a number of such writings by Malik are quite vague and uncertain).

The books ascribed to him fall into two groups: legal and otherwise. Among the legal we read of a Kitāb al-Sunnah or al-Sunnah (Fihrist, p. 199, 9 sqq.) transmitted by Ibn Wahib or by Abī al-Ḥāfīz b. Abī al-Ḥākam al-Miṣrī, a Kitāb al-Muṣannaf (al-Suyūṭī, p. 40), a Kitāb al-Muṣallāt, transmitted by Ibn Wahib (ibid.), a Kitāb al-Ṭawāf, transmitted by Abī al-Ḥāfīz b. Abī al-Dalīl (ibid., p. 41) and a Kitāb al-Ṭawāf, transmitted by Khaṭīb b. ʿAṣār and Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafī (ibid.). The genuineness of all these is, however, uncertain and even if they go back to Malik’s immediate pupils (sometimes they are actually attributed to the latter; cf. al-Lakhnawī, op. cit., p. 18) Malik’s own share in them would be uncertain. A book (Gotha 1143) said to have been transmitted by Abī al-Ḥāfīz b. Abī al-Ḥakam al-Miṣrī and heard by him along with Ibn Wahib and Ibn al-Ḵāsim is certainly apocryphal and besides does not pretend to give any attestations of Malik himself.

Of other titles are mentioned a Taʾfīr, a Kitāb al-Ṭawāf, another taʾfīr, a Kitāb al-Muṣallāt, a Kitāb al-Naẓīm and a Kitāb al-Sirr (al-Suyūṭī, p. 40 sqq.) which are in the usual style of the apocryphal literature. The suspicion of falsity is also strong in the case of the Kitāb containing advice to the caliph al-Rashīd, mentioned as early as the Fihrist alongside of the Muwattāʾ (printed Bīrū ḳī, 1311; cf. Brockelmann, op. cit.) which look like a Malikic counterpart of the Kitāb al-Daqrāt of Abī Yūsuf even al-Suyūṭī doubted its genuineness, although for reasons which are not convincing to us.

3. There are two other main sources for Malik’s teaching (setting aside the later accounts of the doctrine of the Malikī madhhab):

The more important is the al-Mudawwana al-Kubra of Saʿūdī (d. 240) which contains replies by Ibn Ḵāsim (d. 191) according to the school of Malik or according to his own raʾiy to questions of Saʿūdī as well as traditions and opinions of
Ilbn Wahb (d. 197) (cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., p. 177; Heffening, op. cit., p. 144; Krenkow, in the article SAHNUN).

Al-Tabari, who in his Kitāb Ihtīlāf al-Fuḥṣābī has preserved fragments of the Mawṣūṭa-recension of Ibn Wahb (cf. above), also quotes frequently traditions and opinions of Malik in his commentary on the Kurān on the “legal” verses.

IV. Malik’s position in the history of Fīkḥ

Malik represents, in time, a stage in the development of Fīkḥ in which the reasoning is not yet thorough and fundamental but only occasional and for a special purpose, in which the legal thought of Islaılm has not yet become jurisprudence and, in place, Medina where the decisive foundations of Muslim law were laid down. One of the main objects in the juristic thought that appears in the *Mawṣūṭa* is the permeation of the whole legal life by religious and moral ideas. This characteristic of the formation of legal ideas in early Islaılm is very clear, not only in the method of putting questions but in the structure of the legal material itself. The legal material, having in itself no connection with religion, that has to be permeated by religious and moral ideas, is the customary law of Medina, and we can only mean primitive but adapted to the demands of a highly developed trading community, which for us is the principal representative of old Arabian customary law: it appears in Malik sometimes as ṣawma “use and wont,” sometimes it is concealed under the Medina idjamūl which he ascertains with great care; broadly speaking this only means that objections on religious grounds have not been raised by anyone against a principle of customary law. The older jurisprudence had another main object: the formation of a system which sets out from principles of a more general character, which aim at the formation of legal concepts in contrast to the prevailing casuistry and is in some respect rounded off in a codification, if still a loose one, of the whole legal material.

While the Islamisation of the law had been already concluded in its essential principles before Malik, many generations had still to work at its systematisation; therefore Malik’s own legal achievement can only have consisted in the development of the formation of a system. How great his share in it was cannot be ascertained with certainty from the lack of material for comparison. The surprising success achieved by the *Mawṣūṭa* of Malik out of a number of similar works, would in any case be completely explained by the fact that it recorded the usual consensus of opinion in Medina without any considerable work of the author’s own and came to be regarded as authoritative as the expression of compromise (just as the works on Tradition came to be regarded as canonical). The *Mawṣūṭa* would in this case have to be regarded less as evidence of Malik’s individual activity than as evidence of the stage reached in the general development of law in his time. It may be said that this average character was just what Malik aimed at (cf. Sect. iii. 1).

The high estimation in which Malik is held in the older sources is justified by his strict criticism of Ḥadīth and not by his activity in the interest of Fīkḥ (al-Ṭabarī, ill. 2484, 2492; al-Saḥṣaḥ; al-Nawawī; Goldizher, op. cit., p. 147, 168; do., Zāhirīn, p. 230); even this only means that with his Ḥadīth he kept within the later consensus. That al-Ṣaḥḥi’s devoted special attention to him out of all the Medina scholars (cf. his Kitāb Ihtīlāf Malik wa’l-Ṣaḥḥi’) is explained by the fact that he was a disciple of his.

As to the style of legal reasoning found in the *Mawṣūṭa*, Ḥadīth is not by any means the highest or only court of appeal for Malik; on the one hand he gives the ṣawma, the actual undoubted practice in Medina, the preference over traditions, and on the other hand in cases where either Medina tradition or Medina idjamūl existed, he laid down the law independently; in other words he exercises ṣawma, and to such an extent that he is occasionally reproached with *tawārīkh* agreement with the Ṣaḥīḥīs (cf. Goldizher, *Mukh. Studien*, ii. 217; do., Zāhirīn, p. 4, 2, note 1). According to a later anti-ṣawma legend, he is said to have repented of it on his deathbed (Ibn Khallīkān). It is scarcely to be supposed that he had diverged seriously from his Medina contemporaries in the results of his ṣawma.

V. Malik’s Pupils

The Malikī Maḏḥab

In the strict sense Malik no more formed a school than did Abu Ḥanīfah; evidence of this is found in the oldest names Abī al-Ḥṣūrīs and Abī al-ṣīrī in the class of Malikī law. These names at times indicate the probable origin of the Malikī maḏḥab; after a regular Ṣaḥḥī school had been formed, which in view of al-Ṣaḥḥi’s personal achievement, is quite intelligible in the development of Fīkḥ (cf. Bergsträsser, op. cit., p. 76, 80 sq.), it became necessary for the two older great schools of Fīkḥ, whose difference was probably originally the result of geographical conditions in the main, also to combine to form a regular school, when a typical representative of the average views like Malik or Abū Ḥanīfah was regarded as head. In the case of Malik the high personal esteem, which he must have enjoyed even in his lifetime (cf. Sect. II) do not doubt contributed to this also. But it is to his pupils that his elevation to the head of a school is mainly due. Traces of this process are still to be found in the varying classification of old jurists as of the Ḥṣūrī school or as independent mujtahids (cf. also Fihrist, p. 199, sq.).

Among Malik’s pupils and companions who soon became known as Malikī may be mentioned: al-Lātīn b. Sa’d (d. 161 or 165 or 175), Abī al-Raḥmān b. al-Kāsim (d. 191), Abū Allāh b. Wahh (d. 197), Ma’n b. Ishaq (d. 198), Aḥbab b. Abī al-Āṣir r. (d. 204), Abū al-Malik b. Abū al-Āṣir (d. 212), Abū Allāh b. Abī al-Ḥakam (d. 214), Abī Allāh al-Kaḥibi (d. 221), Iṣlāh b. Uwayṣ (d. 226) and his brother Abū Bakr, Saḥnūn (d. 240). Saḥnūn was too late to hear Malik himself; with him the formation of the Malikī maḏḥab is already concluded.

Of the later Malikī literature two short compendia attained special fame as textbooks: the Ṣaḥīḥ of Abī Allāh b. Abī Zaid al-Kairawānī (d. 386) whom the author of the Fihrist mentions as an important contemporary (p. 201, sq.) and the Maḏḥabgar of Khalīl b. Lādiq (d. 707); numerous commentaries on and editions of both exist and they have also been discussed in Eran-
pean languages (cf. Bibl.). Their importance has sometimes been exaggerated in Europe; development did not stop with them (cf. Pröester, Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss., xlii. 422 sqq.; Pröester deals with an important later jurist, 'Ismā'īlī, ii. 430 sqq.). His immediate pupils are not to be regarded as opponents of rā' y any more than Mālik, and the Mālikī madhab is not at all more conservative or traditionalist than the Ḥanfī for example (B. Ducati in Islamicq, iii. 214 sqq., even endeavours to show that it is the most juridical of the Muslim schools of law).

The Mālikī madhab spread mainly in the west of the Muslim world; after it had succeeded in driving out the madhabī of al-Awāzī and the Zahir school, it prevailed not only in the Maghrib (Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, including Muslim Spain) but in all the rest of Africa, so far as it has adopted Islam. The Mālikī school has many followers in Egypt: in Upper Egypt it occupies the ancient position as the Shāhī thus in Lower Egypt. This geographical distribution seems to go back to corresponding conditions existing before the formation of the madhabī. Particularly ardent or successful disciples of Mālik's teaching were Ḥāfiz Alī al-Mālikī, d. 238 or 239, and Ḥāfiz b. al-Manṣūr (l. 282; Fikhrī, p. 199) but there must also have been earlier scholars for whose time the existence of a regular school is doubtful.


The older Maxikīte are given in Fīkhrī, p. 199 sqq. Of the Mālikī 'Abd al-Hā'īn the works there have been printed e.g. al-Dābī, ed. Ibn Farḥān (d. 799) along with the Tuhf al-Dābīsī of Ahmad Bāḥη b. 'Abd al-Hā'īn, ed. Ibn Farḥān (d. 1032), Fez 1898 and Na'il al-Dābīsī bi-Tārikh al-Dābīsī of the same Ahmad Bāḥη, Fez 1817 (cf. Fafiṣan, in Festschrift Cederer, p. 105). Individual Mālikī jurists cf. the articles on them. On the spread of the Mālikīs: Ahmad Pāsha Taimur, Nāsara fārkhān fī Ḥadīth al-Mālikī fī al-baḥrān, Cairo, 1944; Jungbluth, Handbuch der tiberischen Gesch., p. 243; ibn Hanbelid1 2, p. 21; Ibn Farḥān, op. cit. 177; Bergsträsser, Z. D. M. G., 1914, p. 410 sqq.

Discussion of the Mālikī teaching in European languages (some further references): Perron, Précis de jurisprudence ma'lidiane (transl. of the Mukhtasar with extracts from the commentaries), 1848; Sautaya-Chebron.
to him a series of poetical improvisations on this occasion, in which, after the fashion of the old Beduin paladins he explains and excuses his flight.

The defeated leader tried to make a stand at Liya, a few hours south of Tafif where he had a durr. What was a durr? In Medina at the time of the Hijra the name was given to an enclosure commanded by an ajam or tower. Malik's had probably only brick walls like the little strongholds in Yemen described by the geographer Maqdisi (Abūan al-Tawāš, ed. de Goeje, p. 84). A century ago, the traveller Maurice Taminier (Voyage en Arabie, Paris 1840, ii. 5) passing through Liya saw there "une forteresse flanquée de tours" intended, as in the days of Malik, to guard the road. In any case, whatever the strength of the little building, Muhammad easily destroyed it. When Malik learned of the approach of the Muslims, he thought prudent to seek refuge behind the ramparts of Tafif.

In the interval of the bloody t separate the story of the prisoners, Muhammad said: "If Malik comes to embrace Islam, I shall return him his family and property with the addition of a gift of a hundred camels". Whatever the decision adopted by Malik, this declaration could not fail to compromise him with the Thaqafa. He righty recognized that his position in Tafif had become untenable. He succeeded in escaping from the town and presented his submission to Muhammad who fulfilled his promise. Malik then pronounced the Muhammadan confession of faith and, to use the traditional formula, "his Islam was of good quality".

The new proselyte had extensive connections and was remarkably well acquainted with the Thaqafa region. The Prophet was glad to use him against Tafif which he had been unable to take by force. He put Malik at the head of the Ka'at tribes who had adopted Islam. Malik therefore organized a guerrilla war against his old allies in Tafif. No caravan could leave Tafif without being intercepted by Malik's men. Exhausted by this incessant struggle, the Thaqafa decided to sue for terms. Malik then became the representative of the Prophet among the Banu Hashim, and the emir, Abū Bakr, later confirmed him in the office. He took part in the wars of conquest, and was at the taking of Damascas and the victory of Kadijya in the Ittāk.


**MĀLIK b. NUWAIRA, chief of the Banū Warbū**. A considerable clan of the Banū Hashim, who were in turn a branch of the confederation of the Banū Tamim [q.v.]. His liberality, magnanimity and especially his courage had earned him a great reputation before the Hijra. His contemporaries said that in the last respect he was without a peer. There was a proverbial saying: lātū wa-ta lā-kā mālik, "a hero no doubt, but not comparable to Malik". His fame, however, came principally from the impression made by his tragic death and from the collection of elegies, which his brother Mu'tammins [q.v.] devoted to him.

Along with several other Tamim notables he embraced Islam in the lifetime of Muhammad. In return the latter appointed him to collect the canonical taxes, jāzādāt, from among his fellow-countrymen. By giving him an appointment like this the Prophet hoped to bring him definitely to his side. The death of the Prophet and the incident of the ridda [q.v.] served to show the foolishness of this hope. Like most of the nomads, Malik had joined Islam as a political organisation, having clearly made up his mind that he would not be absorbed by it to the extent of sacrificing the independence of his tribe and his own prerogatives.

When the Muslims, or more accurately the Kūnaqš, of Medina gave their votes for Abū Bakr, Malik refused to recognize the validity of this election which had been carried through without his participation in it. He argued for the strictly personal character of the sūrah, as the Beduins interpreted it. He explained himself in verse, for he was also a poet: — "If the thing turns out badly, we shall bring a remedy, crying: — long live the faith of Muhammad!". He did not stop at this but passing from words to deeds, he divided among the Tamim the taxes which had been collected. An even graver step, he next plundered a caravan which was taking to Medina the contributions of those nomads who had remained loyal. Then — an eminently Beduin trait — he celebrated in verse this strange exploit, which was equivalent to a declaration of war. He finally compromised himself completely by joining his cause with that of the prophetess Sahlah [q.v.].

In Medina, Abū Bakr had at first to shunt his eyes to these things. But as soon he felt himself master of the situation, he decided to act vigorously. Khalid b. al-Walid was sent against the secessionists. His orders were to spare only those who declared themselves Muslims. The individualism of the Beduins singularly facilitated the task. He attacked separately the tribes, who were divided or hesitating, and succeeded without difficulty in defeating the rebels in small sections. Thus he came to the Banū Tamim. The chiefs were suspicious of one another and declined to combine for joint action. Surprised by Khalid and finding himself almost alone, Malik had to refrain from fighting forces so markedly superior to his, and surrendered on an assurance that his life would be spared and finally declared himself a Muslim.

The prisoners including Malik were, nevertheless, executed with refinements of cruelty. It was said there had been some misunderstanding of Khalid's orders for which dialectic differences were to blame; so say those authors who feel the need of exculpating Khalid. It was by no means the first action of the kind in the impious Makhlīma. Did he want to get rid of a rival or deal the last blow to a rebellion by sacrificing, even against the laws of nations and his own orders, a person so highly esteemed as the chief of the Warbū? As he had been anxious to marry Lellà, the vivacious wife of Malik, he was credited with the first aim. 'Umar demanded that the
faithless leader should be dismissed and brought to judgment, but Abû Bakr refused. "Never," he replied, "shall I put back in the scabbard a blade which Allah has brought out of it!" The elegies on Mâlik by Mutamâmin remained celebrated in literary tradition. "No dead man," said the Arabs, "was ever lamented as Mâlik was by Mutamâmin".


(M. H. Lammens)

**Mâlik al-Tâlî**

Abî Walîd Mâlik b. Abî 'Sumî, was one of the greatest singers and composers of the Umâyяд and early ʻAbbasîd period. He was born during the reign of Mu'awiyah I (48–60 = 666–680) in the land of the Ṭâlî, his father belonging to the Banî Ṭâlî, a branch of the Ṭâlî, whilst his mother came from the Banû Makhrîz. In this way Mâlik could claim to be one of the aristocracy of Islam, and as a child he was adopted by 'Abdallah b. Dîjâfîr, the famous art-patron of Madîna, and was given a good education. In the year 64 (684), he became enamoured with the singing of the celebrated Ma'bâdî [q.v.], whom he heard at the house of ʻAmr b. 'Abdallah b. al-Zubairî, and the event changed his whole career. Taking lessons from Ma'bâdî and Dîjâfîr [q.v.], in singing, he soon astonished everyone by his abilities, and he became very popular with the aristocracy. He thus came to be recognized as a professional musician, for indeed his protector, 'Abdallah b. Dîjâfîr, had made his house a veritable conservatory of music (al-Masâ'îdî, _Mawâdî_ , v. 385, text). On the death of 'Abdallah b. Dîjâfîr, Mâlik attached himself to Salamîn b. 'Abî at-Tâhirî. In spite of this however (cf. J.A., Nov.–Dec., 1873, p. 499), Mâlik was favoured by the Umâyяд Yazîd b. Abî al-Mâlik and al-Walîd b. Yazîd. On the accession of the ʻAbbasâids (132 = 750) Salamîn was appointed governor of the Lower Tigris, and Mâlik accompanied him to his seat at Basra. After a short stay in this city, Mâlik returned to Madîna, where he died over eighty years of age about the year 137 (754).

Mâlik was certainly a fine singer. In one place in the _Ağhânî_ at least (i. 98; cf. ii. 127), he is mentioned as one of the "four great singers", by no means an authority than 'Abd al-Mawâsîlî, although the latter in another place ranks him after Ibn Surârîjû, Ibn Mu'âzîm, Ma'bâdî, and 'Abî Qarâdî (Ağhânî, ii. 151). He was apparently not an original composer but a good adapter. It would seem (Ağhânî, i. 173; xiii. 64). Certainly, he was at a disadvantage in not being a performer on the lute (ṣîrî), and Ma'bâdî had to correct his compositions for him.


(H. G. Farmer)

**Mâlikshâh** b. _Abî Arslân_ Abû 'l-Fâthî, _Sâlîdî_ _Sulţân_ (465–485 = 1073–92), born on the 9th or 19th Dümâdî, i. 447 (Raŵâdî and _Lubûh al-Tawârîkh_ wrongly 445) = Aug 6th or 16th, 1053. He accompanied his father on his last campaign into Transoxania and homaged was at once paid to him as Sulţân by the vizier Niṣân al-Mulk and the Turkish amirs on Alp Arslân's death. His uncle Kâwûrd [q.v.], the ruler of Kirmân, was not satisfied with this, however, because he thought that, as the oldest member of the family, he had the best claim to the throne and set out with his troops for Hâmadîn. When attacked by Mâlikshâh they made but feeble resistance, Kâwûrd himself was captured and later strangled (April 9). Mâlikshâh then returned to Transoxania by forced marches for the Kâshân of Şamsîn and, on hearing of the death of Alp Arslân, had seized the opportunity to occupy Tirmîdî and even Bâlkî had opened its gates to him. The Sulţân governor Ayîsî, a brother of Abî Alp Arslân, happened to be away at the time and when he hurried back, he suffered a terrible defeat and died soon afterwards. Şams al-Mulk, however, did not dare to risk another breach with Mâlikshâh, so the latter re-occupied Tirmîdî and proceeded to Şamsîn. The Kâshân thereupon submitted; Bâlkî and Tuhâkîristân were granted to Mâlikshâh's brother Tâzâh. These campaigns prevented the Sulţân from going at once to Bâghdâd to receive the homage of the Caliph in person, and an ambassador was sent to carry through the ceremony. The Caliph was quite ready to do so, and gave the Sulţân the honorific titles of Dilâjî al-Dawâlî, Mu'âzî al-Dawâlî, Kâsîm Amîr al-Mu'mînîn.

Our sources are silent about the happenings of the next few years; it is not till 472 that we hear of a campaign against Kirmân, which, however, came to a peaceful termination for Sulţânshâh, Kâwûrd's son, submitted to the Sulţân and was confirmed by him in the hereditary possession of this province. In Ibn al-Kalântîr (ed. Amedroz, p. 115), we are told that in 475 Mâlikshâh came to Ḥalâb, but Ibn al-Atlîhî and the other sources accessible to me make no reference to this. At this time the Sulţân made the mistake of discharging 7,000 of his soldiers, although those who were advised him against it, pointing out that if these men were deprived of their livelihood, they would in desperation become robbers and rebels and a public danger. This is what actually happened. The men went to Tâzâh and he thought that with their help he was strong enough to rebel against his brother. He took several towns and was preparing to occupy all Khorâsân so that Mâlikshâh was forced to take the field against him. Tâzâh then retired to Tîrîmîdî, and submitted when besieged there; on this occasion he was pardoned, but when he again rebelled without success a few years later (477 = 1054), he was blinded and thrown into prison in Takrit. In 479 (1066) Mâlikshâh left Isâfân which he had made his capital and went via al-Mawâsîlî, Harrân, al-Ruhâ and Kaṭîf Dîjâfîr to Ḥalâb. His object was to establish and re-organize Sâlîdî rule securely in these places, but one great inducement for this campaign was that the commander of Ḥalâb had appealed to Mâlikshâh because he was threatened by the latter's brother Tâzâh [q.v.]. The latter had conquered the Sâlîdî ruler of Asia Minor, Sulamîn b. ʿAbd al-Mu'âzîmî [q.v.], and was trying to
nated successor to the throne but died in 482 (1088). The obvious thing was for Prince Barkyaruk to take his place as was desired by Nişām al-Mulk and the Turkish amirs but Malikshah had in the meanwhile married another wife, the Princess Turkan Khatun, who made every effort to secure the throne for her son Mahmud born in 480. Malikshah, however, was more anxious about his daughter who had married the Caliph, for she was unhappy in Bagdad and complained of being neglected by her husband, so that finally the Sultan demanded that she should be sent home with the little son whom she had borne to the Caliph. She, therefore, returned to her father but died soon afterwards in 482; her son Dżafar however, became his grandfather's pet and he gave him the name of "Little Commander of the Faithful" in the hope that he would one day bear this title in reality. At the same time he decided to make Bagdad his winter capital and had extensive building operations carried out in the N.E. of the town when he was there in the winter of 1091/92, including a great mosque, the Dżami' al-Sultan; he also ordered Nişām al-Mulk and his amirs to build residences for themselves there. During this period the great amirs from the west, Aşkınçor, Tutuš etc., had come to Baghdad, great hunts and other pleasure parties were held, but the Caliph was completely ignored.

When in the autumn of 1092 he was on his way from Isfahān to Baghdad for the third time, the aged vizier Nişām al-Mulk was stabbed by a šahād at Sahn. It was now for the first time apparent how much the existence of the Seldjuk empire depended on this one man, for when the Sultan and his wife were no longer guided by his advice, they committed the gravest errors, which were very soon to plunge themselves and their empire into destruction. Scarcely had the Sultan arrived in Bagdad then, with the intention of making his grandson Caliph, — which was contrary to Maḥmudan law as he was a minor — he announced to Turkan that he must at once abdicate and leave the town. With difficulty the Caliph obtained a few days respite which he was spending in prayer and fasting, when suddenly the news came that the Sultan was dead. The exact date is not certain but it was about the middle of Shawwal 485 (middle of November 1092). He was said to have caught a severe fever while out hunting, which they attempted to cure without success by bleeding, and he died soon afterwards. But it can hardly be doubted that he was poisoned, as some writers expressly state: cf. Foutema, in Journal of Indian History, Sept. 1924, p. 147 sqq. The usual funeral ceremonies were not held; the body was sent to Isfahān and buried there. The Caliph had no difficulty in coming to terms with Turkan Khatun; he offered to recognize her young son Maḥmud as Sultan, if she would hand over to him his own son, the Sultan's grandson. This was done.

Next year, when the course of events took a disastrous turn for the Caliph and Turkan Khatun with the rise of Barkyaruk, the tragic deaths of the Sultan and his vizier were celebrated in verse by Mu'izz; cf. Schefer, Sürretevnik, suppl., p. 62 sq. Malikshah's was a highly honourable character, he was loyal to his relatives and to his servants, brave, just and gentle. His rule is, therefore, much praised by Christian as well as Muslim
authors, but he was uncultured and owed to his
viceroy the reputation of a patron of learning,
whose name is associated with a reform of the
calendar [cf. the article Malikshah], and with certain
new legislation; cf. al-Mas`ūdī al-Malikshahiyah,
in `Urdu fi ḥikayat al-Sulṭānihyyah, ed. Sülheim,
p. 63 sq. His connection with the Rûslāl-ı Malikshāhı,
a geographical work used by Hamād Allāh Mestawī,
is unknown but it was certainly not written by the Sulṭān himself, as Hākīm Khalīfa
says (6:71).

The name Malikshāh was further borne by: 1.
Malikshāh, the infant son of Barqayrūk, who after
the death of his father in 1104 held the title of
Sulṭān for a short time, but had soon to give
way to his uncle Muḥammad. 2. Malikshāh b. Muḥ-
mīd who, after the death of his uncle Mas`ūd
in 1152 became Sulṭān, but after a few months
was thrown into prison as he was quite an incapable
ruler, escaped from confinement, spent some time
in Khorasan and died in 1160. We also find in-
dividuals of this name among the Seldjūks of
Rûm and Syria and among the Khārzhūmāshīhs.

Bibliography: cf. the article Sulṭānih.
The best sketch of the character and reign of
Malikshāh is in the article on him by Ibn Khallikān,
who had taken many of his facts from a
history by al-Hamādī (MS. of vol i. till the year 307 in Pārī, Bibl. Nat., No. 1469).

(M. The Houtrma)

MALTA, the chief island of the Mal-
tese archipelago (Malta, Gozo, Comino,
Cominotto, Filfla and minor rocks), inhabited in
ancient times by a Mediterranean race, whose
megalithic monuments are preserved at Ħagiari
(Kim "standing stones"), Hal Tarxien and Hal
Safieni. It was colonized very early, certainly
before the 4th century B.C., by the Phoenicians,
and formed a base for their trading ships.

It is not certain that the name of Malta is
derived from the Phoenician, while the Phoenician
origin of Gozo (Gozo), meaning "a merchant
boat of round shape", seems certain.

The Carchagimers became masters of the island
in the 6th-7th century B.C., and kept it for
five or six centuries. The Romans conquered it
in 218 B.C., and for the next ten centuries Malta
remained under Roman and Greek influence,
being situated near Eastern Sicily, Gozo had only
Greek coins, and Greek and Roman coins in great
number were minted in Malta. Very early, with
St. Paul in the first century, the island was
converted to Christianity; during the Western Empire's
decay the Byzantines established themselves in it;
after their conquest of Northern Africa the pos-
session of Malta became indispensable to them.
The Muslim conquest of Malta is usually ad-
scribed to the year 756 (869-870); in reality it
was occupied long before. Ibn al-Aslih informs
us that in 221 (835-836), the Aghlabid Ibrahim
"despatched a fleet against the islands"; we have
every reason for believing that he refers to the
islands between Africa and Sicily, comprising the
Maltese islands. Further when Ibn al-Aslih speaks
of an army sent to Malta from Sicily in 256, he
adds that at that moment "the Christians raised
the siege". If Malta was besieged, undoubtedly
by the Greeks of Byzantium, it may be concluded
that it had already been occupied by the Muslims,
who probably, having landed in 824 at Mazara, in
Sicily, had occupied the Maltese islands beforehand.
The raids against Sicily and Malta began in
the 8th century A.D., and it is not rash to believe
that Malta fell before 800 A.D. under
Muslim influence. This is also de Goeij's opinion
(Z. D. M. G., lvii. 905, note 2).

In Malta the Muslim occupation was certainly
more permanent and strongly established than in
Sicily; the narrow island was completely subjugated
by the conquerors; and this helps us to under-
stand how the Arab-Berber Muslims of Africa
succeeded in forcing upon Malta the Arabic language,
from which the modern Maltese dialect is derived.

The question of the origin of the Maltese dialect
has occasioned many discussions between those who
sustained its Phoenician origin (Vassalli, Bres, 
Bellermann, Cambo, E. Caroana, Freca) and those
who derived it from Arabic (Gasenius, de Sačy, 
L. Bonelli, Stimmle, Nóldcke). The conclusion
must be accepted that Maltese is an Arabic dialect,
which in some ways shows resemblances to the
Eastern Arabic dialects, in many others recalls the
Arabic dialects of the Maghrib. Peculiarities of
Maltese phonetics are the i̯mblu of ā, which tends
to become İ and I (ye at the beginning of words,
as vānd for vando), the pronunciation of ĝ as hamsa,
the existence of ść and ści sounds in neo-latin and
arabic words; in morphology the use of ĝa as
prefix of the 1st person singular forms the main
affinity with the Maghrib dialects. The accent
tends to fall towards the beginning of words. In
Malta itself are to be found dialectal varieties
between town and country; in the country
and in Gozo the dialect is nearer the original Arabic,
sounds like ģē and ģō not heard in Valletta, are
noticeable in the Gozo vernacular.

A study of the Maltese lexicon, to show how
affinities with Arabic dialects, Eastern and Western,
may be explained, and how word-fossils have
been preserved in Maltese, is still to be under-
taken. The prevalence of the Latin-Italian race and
the flourishing of Italian civilization and culture
in the island have influenced its dialect, both as
to syntax and as to phonetics. The percentage of
Latin, or rather Italian, words in spoken Maltese
varies according to the degree of individual culture.
The Maltese, up to a few centuries ago, had
not chosen any particular alphabet for their dialect,
as they did not use it as a written language. In
the xviiith century Agnus de Soldanis, a Maltese,
turned his attention to the dialect and began to
study it; since his time several attempts have been
made to systematize the writing of Maltese; it
was also proposed to use the Arabic alphabet,
and a diacritical transliteration, precise and scientific,
was tried. In practice the use of the common
Latin alphabet, with the modification of some few
letters, was continued. The last attempt of this
kind, which has not met with public favour nor
with the approval of the vernacular press, was
that of the Ghajda takkitobta tal-Maltdi *Association of
the writers of Maltese", which has published a
small grammar, particularly concerned with the
sounds, called Tiegħef l'eg il-kita b matiż, Malta
in 1924; the preface mentions the precedent systems
of writing Maltese. The same Ghajda, in 1925,
began to publish a quarterly review called It-Maltdi;
it is mostly concerned with grammatical questions,
and has promoted a movement in favour of pure
Maltese (maltd saft).
Since about 1850 the question of the Maltese dialect has also acquired a political character; the English rulers favoured the development of the dialect at the expense of the Italian language (which remains the language of culture, of the Church and of the Bar). Bibliographical information on Maltese literature to about 1900 is to be found in the works of L. Bandull and H. Stumme.

Besides the Arabic dialect and place-names the Muslims have left in Malta a few coins and a considerable number of inscriptions on tomstones; one of them, the celebrated inscription called of Maimuna, dated 1173 A.D., was published more than a century ago, and repeatedly studied by orientalists (Italiani, Lanci, Amari, Nallino etc.); another one, found in Gozo, is to be seen in the Malta Museum; about twenty more have been found in the excavations made in 1922—1925 at Râhat (near the city Notabile); they are preserved in the Museum of the Villa Romana, near the place of excavation.

The Muslims lost Malta in 1565, when the Normans conquered it; they were however allowed to live on the island under the Norman government until 1249. From 1530 to 1798 Malta was the seat of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which the Turks had expelled from Rhodes in 1522. The Order organized there an important war navy. The island was in constant relations with the East and with Barbary; thousands of Muslim slaves were taken to Malta; the Maltese ships had repeated encounters with those of the Forte and of the Levantine and Barbary pirates. The Turks attempted to occupy Malta in 1565, with their well-known expedition which ended in disaster, and again in 1614; more than once they threatened to invade it under Sultan Muhammad IV.

Considering the Order's relations with the Muslim East and the fact that an important portion of the registers of Rhodes was saved, the importance of the Order's archives for the history of the Mediterranean Levant and of North Africa in the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries is easily understood.

A few Arabic MSS. and nautical charts, of no great value, are preserved in the Public Library of Malta and in its Museum.

Bibliography:

(ETTORE ROMI)

Malta, or properly Ma'At-tajjâ, the Arabic name of two villages in the ka'dâ of Dâhik in the old wîlîyet of Mawâlî. They are about 30 miles N. N. W. of Mawâlî at the point where the river of Dâhik (left bank tributary of the Tigris) enters the plain, whence the Aramaic name Ma'alâh is Malhâj, "entrance".

The pass of Ma'alâh, giving access to the country to the south of Lake Van must have played an important part in ancient times. Its importance is indicated by the famous bas-relief carved on the rock half an hour's walk to the south of Ma'alâh. They reproduce the same scene four times: a king standing in an attitude of adoration before a procession of seven gods, six of whom are standing, each on a mythological animal, and the seventh is seated on a throne placed on the back of a lion. There are no inscriptions accompanying them. Since, however, they are evidently connected with the similar bas-reliefs at Rûfîwân (30 miles N. E. of Mawâlî on the Khasir, a right bank tributary of the great Tôb) and these belong to the kings Salmânassar II (860—823 B.C.) and Sennacherib (689—681), it is supposed that the bas-reliefs of Ma'alâh were also executed in the time of Salmânassar II. The figures of the gods are especially interesting as forming a link between Assyrian and Hittite art.

Among the Nestorian Christians Ma'alâh gave its name to a diocese (also called šîw-Tâhu-Nâhâhî). A Nestorian bishop of Ma'alâh is mentioned as early as the fourth century (Lohm, op. cit., p. 52, 210); there are other references to the years 497, 544, 551, 576, 585, 605, 692, 1063, 1074, 1092, 1263 (Chabot, Synodicon Orientale, Paris 1902, Index, and Hoffmann, o. c.). In the seventh century the Metropolitan of the Jacobites, Mânîth, still numbered among his subordinates a bishop of Ma'alâh (Labort, Le Christianisme dans l'empire grec, 1904, p. 240). At the present day Ma'alâh is still inhabited by Nestorians (in part in union with the Catholic Church).

Balâqurt, p. 331, mentions al-Mâalla (sie) among the places in Mawâlî conquered by U'tiba b. Fâkhd in 641. Mânahaddi, p. 139, 145—146, talks highly of the wealth of the vicinity of Ma'alâh in coal, fruits, salt, meat and camphor. He locates the little town on the road from Mawâlî to al-Husayna (as Zakhbû on the little Khabûr; cf. M. Hartmann and G. Bell). The importance of this route for communication with the lands of the Kurds is evident from Ibn al-Athir (vili, 521). Yâkût, iv. 528, knows Ma'alâh as a little town (bâlût); the name of which is occasionally mentioned in the history of the later period.
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MALTIA — MALWA

Ninil, wife of Assur (a lion), Enill (a horned lion), Shu (a dragon), Shamma (a harnessed horse), Adad (a horned lion and a bull), Ishtar (a lion).

According to Thureau-Dangin the bas-reliefs should be attributed to Sennecherib; as to the motif of the mounted gods, usually explained as showing Hitite influence, examples are found in Sameraco-Asyrian art. Cf. also Bachmann, Palastreliefs in Assyrien (Bauwien, Malbath and Gumiluk), publ. by the Deutsche Orient-Gesell., Berlin 1927.

(V. Minoryev)

MAL'ULÀ, a town in Central Syria north-east of Damascus. It is mentioned as early as Georgios Kyripos (ed. Gelzer, p. 168, No. 993) as MUSAQ'ILA (MESS. MUSAQ'ILA, MUSAQ'ILA) in Phoinike Libanessa. Yakut also calls Mal'ula an islam (isla) near Damascus with many villages. The modern Mal'ula, a village of Christians, is picturesquely situated at the west end of a deep ravine of the Anti-Lebanon, which splits into a western and southern arm. At the entrance to the northern lies the monastery of Mar Takla built half into the rocks. The two ravines form the way to the other monastery of Mar Sarkis, which stands on a rocky plateau above the village. Numerous caves, mostly ancient dwelling-places, have been found on the west and southern corner of the rock on the eastern slopes of which the modern village is built in the form of an amphitheatere. Some Greek inscriptions have been found in the caves (Waddington, Inscriptions, N°. 1863—1865; Moritz, p. 145—148, N°. 30, including one dated 107 and 167 A.D.). Mal'ula and the adjoining villages of Bab'ha and Djabb 'Adin are noted for the fact that the Western Arabic dialect still spoken there represents the last remnants on Syrian soil of the Syriac spoken throughout Palestine and Syria in the time of Christ.


(E. Hönigmann)

MALWA — proper is an inland district of India bordered on the south by the Vindhyas, and lying between 23° 30′ and 24° 50′ N. and 74° 30′ and 75° 30′. To this tract, known in the age of the Mahebharata as Nishadha, and later as Avant, from the name of its capital, now Ujjain, was afterwards added Akara, or Eastern Malwa, with its capital, Bhilsa, and the country lying between the Vindhyas and the Satpuras. The province formed part of the dominions of the Mauryas, the Western Satraps, the Guptas of Magadha, the White Huns, and the Kingdom of Kanawâl, and then passed to the Malwa, from whom it has its name. These, when Hinduised formed the Paramâra (Pawar) tribe of Râjpûts, which bore sway in Malwa from 800 to 1200, and was overpowered in 1053 by a confederacy of the Câlukyas of Avalihâla and the Kalâcharas of Tripurâ. In 1235 Shams al-Din Itutmîsh of Iltihâl captured Ujjain, demolished the temple of Mahâkâlî, and sacked Bhilsa. Malwa became a province of Dilm, and, with interludes of Hindu revolt, remained so until, in 1320, on the dissolution of the kingdom of Dilm after Tûmûr's invasion, the Afghan governor, Dilwâr Khân Ghûrî, made it an independent kingdom. He was murdered in 1405 by his son Alp Khân, who ascended the throne under the title of Hâshâg Shâh. He transferred the capital from Dilm to Mândû [q. v.] and founded Hâshâgâbâd. On his death in 1435 he was succeeded by his son Ghâzî Khân, who, after a reign of a few months, was succeeded by his son's son Malûdân Khan. The child was removed by his cousin and guardian, Malumb Khâlid, who in 1436 ascended the throne as Malumb I, and whose reign of thirty-three years was the most glorious in the annals of Malwa. He waged war successfully against the kings of Gujûrât, the Dakhân, and Jâmpûr, the small state of Kulpî, and Râhû Kumbhâl of Cîtor; he retired, but without disgrace, before the superior power of Dilm, and he extended the frontiers of his kingdom on the north, the east, and the south. On his death in 1469 his third son, 'Abd al-Kâhir Ghiyâth al-Din, who succeeded him, surmounted with public business during his father's strenuous reign, retired into his harem and left the administration of the kingdom to his son, Nâsir al-Din, who in 1500 poisoned his father and ascended the throne. Nasir al-Din met his death in 1510 by falling, in a fit of drunkenness, into a tank or cistern, where his attendants, thankful to be rid of the monster, let him lie. He was succeeded by his son Mahmuûd II, who was as unfortunate in war as the first of that name had been fortunate. With the help of Muâsa'îr II of Gujûrât he rid himself of his powerful Râjpût minister, Medînî Râzi, but in doing so embroiled himself with Sangrama Kânâr of Cîtor, who defeated him in the field and took him prisoner, but generally released him. He then, with inconceivable folly and ingratitude, bitterly offended Bahâdur Shâh of Gujûrât, who invaded Malwa and, after giving Mahmûd every opportunity of averting his error, carried out his vengeance. On March 27, 1531, Mahmuûd and his sons were sent in custody towards Câmpûner, but the officer in charge of them, apprehending a rescue, put them to death.

Malwa now became a province of Gujûrât, and in 1555 the emperor Humâyûn, invading that kingdom, defeated Bahâdur Shâh at Mandosor and captured Mândû, but was recalled to Hindûstán in the following year by the menacing attitude of Shîr Khân in Bengali, and Malûdân Khân, an officer of Mahmuûd II, established himself in Malwa and assumed the title of Kâlûsh Shâh. Shudjâ'at Khân and Hâshâg Khân, two officers of Shîr Shâh, drove him from Malwa and assumed the government of the province. Shudjâ'at Khân died
in 1554, and was succeeded by his son Malik Bāyāzīd, known as Bāz Bahādur, who, during the decline of the power of the Sūr emperors, became independent. A severe defeat at the hands of the queen of the Gond kingdom of Garha Mandola engendered in him a distaste for warlike enterprise and he devoted himself to music and to the embraces of the beautiful Rūpmatī. In 1561 Akbar's army under Adham Khān surprised the volubility at Sārangpur, defeated his troops, put him to flight and captured his mistress, who took poison rather than become the conqueror's paramour. Bāz Bahādur fled into Khandesh and Pīr Muhammad Khān, second-in-command of Akbar's army, who followed him thither, was defeated by Mubārak Khān of Khandesh and drowned in the Narbādā. Bāz Bahādur returned and again reigned in Māndālī, but in 1562 another army under ʿAbd Allāh Khān the Usbāk invaded Mālwa and compelled him to flee to Cītor. He remained a fugitive until 1570, when he submitted to Akbar and entered his service.

Mālwa was now a province of the empire, and remained so until, in 1743, the Marāthās extended their rule over it, and the Peshāwā was made deputy-governor.

It was afterwards divided between the great Mārāthā generals whose descendants, Sindhyas of Gujrat, Holkar of Indore, and the Powānas of Bāhrā and Dewās still hold most of it.

From 1780 until 1818, when British supremacy was firmly established, the province was one of the principal arenas in which Muslim, Marāthā, and European contended for empire. Since then its history has been uneventful, but sporadic risings took place at six military stations during the mutiny of 1857.

Bibliography: Firroth, Guishonda Firokhī, Bombay 1833; Alī-ʾMos Akhbar, translated by Blochmann and Jarrett; An Arabic History of Gujarāt, ed. E. Denison Ross; The Cambridge History of India, vols. i. and iii.; History of the Mahārājas by G. C. Grant Duff, London 1921, Imperial Gazetter of India, 1908, vol. xvii; (T. W. Hail); MAZMAR B. AL-MUTHANNA; [See Asta URADA]; MAMLŪK (Ar. plural mamlūkûn and mamliktî), participle passive of mamlûk "to possess," denotes the slave in his master's possession. The term owes its origin probably to the current phrase of the Kurān mi nūdabat aynabandum "what your right hands possess," a general designation of slaves without specialisation of gender. Mamlûk occurs only in the Kurān (xvi. 79), in the expression ʿad mamlikt "a slave in the possession of his master," mamlûk alone not yet being a technical term for slave, but in appearance. In šudūtb, ʿad mamlikt occurs likewise (Dārīnī, Siyār, h. 04), but throughout the literature of šudūtb mamlikt alone is already a technical term synonymous with ʿadī. — The distinction between a slave born and a slave born from free parents, must be made by the addition of a genitive to ʿadī, in the former case ʿin (ʿadīn ʿinmīn), in the latter mamlūkha (mamlūkān ʿinmīnān). It may be remarked that neither in šudūtb nor, to all probability, in Arabic literature, has the term mamlûk ever received the religious meaning of devotee, as in the case with ʿadī.

The Kurān enjoins the master to be humane towards "what his right hands possess" (xvii. 40). Ṣudūtb is copious on this point. It assures us that Muhammad on his death-bed did not cease repeating "I recommend to you ʿadīn and what your right hands possess" (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Muṣnad, iii. 171; al. 76). "Whosoever does not treat his mamlûk as he ought to do, shall not enter Paradise" (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 8). "When the mamlûk performs ʿadīn, he is thy brother" (Ibn Mādjī, Adab, b. 19). "The mamlûk may claim his food and raiment" (Muṣlim, Ḧādhah, trad. 41). "The Apostle of Allāh used ... and to protect the mamlûk who appealed to his help" (Ibn Mādjī, Zaḥd, b. 16). "The mamlûk who acquits himself of his obligations towards Allāh and towards his master, will receive double wages" (Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, b. 31) and "one is bound to pardon his mamlûk even unto seventy times a day" (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 111).

For the legal position of slaves see ṬADī.

For the Egyptian dynasties called the Mamlûk, see the following article. — It may be finally remarked that in certain circles mamlûk had the special meaning of white slave. See Fagnan, Addition aux lexiques arabes, a. v. (A. J. WENSINCK)

MAMLŪK, a dynasty of rulers of Egypt and Syria.

A. Period from 1250 to 1517. The history of this dynasty is dealt with under the separate rulers; the general questions of art, religion and economics of their time are also dealt with in these articles and notably in Becker's article EGYPT [q. v.], and Hartmann's article DAMASCUS [q. v.]. Only a brief survey of the whole period is given here.

They were, as their name shows (cf. MAMLŪK), former slaves from the bodyguards of the sultāns and amirs who had distinguished themselves by ability and been given their freedom by their masters. A somewhat arbitrary distinction is made between two dynasties, the Bahri [q. v.], from 648—702 = 1250—1390 and the Burdji from 724—922 = 1324—1517. The name Bahri Mamlūk was given to the guards of Sultan ḑasim al-Dīn Ayyūb (637—47 = 1240—49), whose barracks were on the island of Roja [q. v.] in the Nile (Bahri). Except for the first three the Bahri Sultāns were chosen by the Mamlūks from among the descendants of the Sultan. Thus after Bahīrs there ruled two of his sons, after Kāliṣṭān two sons, a series of grandsons and a great grandson. It was different with the Burdji Mamlūks, a bodyguard founded by Kāliṣṭān, who were quartered in the towers of the citadel of Cairo. The first Burdji, Barāḏīr [q. v.], was able to secure the succession of his son and even a second son succeeded for a brief period to the throne, but after this the Mamlūk guards never tolerated hereditary succession again; no Sultan's son, who was proclaimed heir-apparent, ever succeeded in keeping the throne (the only exception is al-Nāṣir Muhammad II who occupied the throne for nearly three years). The Mamlūk did not always choose the ablest, but more often the oldest; a kind of system of seniority developed. The first Mamlūk on the throne was ʿAzīz al-Dīn Aḥsān (648—55 = 1250—57), the husband of Shajjar ad-Durr [q. v.] a slave whom Ayyūb had married.

In the period of its greatest extension under the Mamlūks, the frontiers of Egypt were in the west the Libyan desert as far as Barka, in the
the provinces. Every governor was a little Sultan who had to some extent the same retinue as the Sultan in Cairo. The Syrian governors were in general independent of one another (very few like the Amir Tengiz [see Damascus, i., p. 906] had other governors subordinated to them). In the beginning the Mamluks, perhaps influenced by the Mongols, had the tendency to make all offices secular and fill them with Mamluks who, as lords of the sword (ṣāhib al-sayf), belonged to the military caste. They kept this up in the highest offices throughout the dynasty, but they had to create the important offices of private secretary (kāth ib al-irr) and head of the chancellery (ṣāhib Divān al-ین) and fill them with civilians and even admit Christians, Jews, and especially converts to Islam to them, because the Turkish ruling caste was not fitted for them. The above mentioned chief official or the military and administrative aide remained however reserved for the constantly increasing oligarchy, into which neither native Moslems, nor the sons of Mamluks were admitted. It hardly ever happened (I only know of 3 cases of Arabs) that Arabs or sons of Mamluks became amirs of 1,000, or rose to the highest posts in the legal and scholastic world and in the other branches of the civil service.

The Mamluks were purchased on behalf of the government by a high officer, the purchaser of Mamluks (ṣāhib al-mamālik), educated in the first place in the Mamluk School in Cairo, then distributed in the different branches of the corps of pages to act as armour-bearers, cup-bearers, carvers, polo-grooms, club-bearers etc., for further training and then placed in the service of the amirs or of the Sultan as vacancies occurred. The Sultan’s lifeguards were called ṣāhib al-sayf and the amirs had also similar bodyguards. The army consisted of a) the bodyguard of the Sultan, b) the Ḥunayn, enlisted troops, who were paid in money and with the yield of the crown estates, c) the guards of the great amirs and former Sultans. In later times there was a body of reserves, awlad al-khālid, who were only called up for service in times of war but also received pay in times of peace. Military expeditions were usually decided upon by the council of state; the amirs were given money to equip and maintain their troops, to be able to lead them into the enemy’s country.

In addition to the military officers there were civil officials, ʿāqib al-balām (lords of the pen): a) the religious officials (al-ʿaynīya), who filled posts in the legal and scholastic world, and a series of other offices; b) the regular administrative officials (al-dawānīya) for the rest of the civil service.

The Sultan’s revenue was made up of the ground-rent and poor-tax, from the yield of the fields (in the Egyptian system of appanages cf. ii., p. 96) out of which he gave the necessary funds for the army and officials, the customs, the state factories and extraordinary taxes on goods and markets, which, not being laid down in the Kūrān, were considered illegal and resisted. He also sometimes made money by forced purchases and sales. The government bought up goods at a fixed price and forced purchasers to take them at a definite price. Finally there were monopolies out of which the Sultan made profits. Another favourite means of raising money was for the Sultan to visit some great man from whom he extorted large sums while a guest (especially Kūrān I., q.v.). Things
seem to have been similar in Syria but we know little about the division of the fees there.

The importance of the Mamlikūs in history lay in the fact that, protected by the deserts and the nomads they stemmed the flood of Asiatic conquerors; they conquered Cingla Khān’s Mongols and later the hordes of Timūr Lenk, who had conquered Syria for a short time, and other conquerors. After the defeat of the Tatars and the retreat of Timūr, the Sultans were forced to concentrate on the struggle with the gradually increasing power of the Ottomans. The struggle was long avoided by the formation of buffer states on both sides; among these the most notable were the dynasties of Dhu ‘l-Ghādir and of the White and Black Sheep (so-called from their standards). The success of Ka‘ib al-Qāda’s policy postponed the end but the rulers who followed him were weak. The rule of the Mamlikūs lost its vigour. They were weakened in long wars; their finances became quite hopeless as a result of their immediate expenditure, not commensurate with their means and a defective system of taxation, which in the later period enabled the Ottomans to escape the taxes. They therefore could not permanently resist the Ottomans, especially as the lack of discipline among the Mamlikūse leaders and the weakness of their field artillery made the army useless. The well-equipped fortresses were not defended against the Ottomans; they fell through treachery. The himself sultan Qansūh Ghaṭṭī was defeated and slain in 922 (1516) at Manṣūr Dālāj (in the province of Aleppo). The way to Egypt was thus opened to Sultan Selim; after six months’ residence the last Sultan ʿUmar ibn al-Jumhūrī had to surrender. He was hanged from the liṭh Zuwaille in Cairo. A number of the great smurs and the Caliph were taken to Constantinople. The caliphate ceased as no new Caliph was appointed; the Sultan of Constantinople became the first ruler in Islām. The protection of the holy places also passed automatically to him.

The period of the Mamlikūs was marked by great activity in building (IL 235). Of secular buildings, few palaces have survived; on the other hand fortresses (Cairo, Aleppo, Damascus and Birejīk) which were entirely rebuilt in the Mamlikūs period, as well as a large number of fine tombs, hospitals, baths, fountains and aqueducts still exist. Of religious buildings splendid mosques with schools attached to them were built. While even under the Ayyūbīs there had been only one “great mosque” in each town or independent suburb, where the Friday service was held, it became the custom under the Mamlikūs that many Sultans and governors and occasionally even one of the gullivers built “great mosques” for the Friday service in the large towns. Mention may be made of the mosques of Baybars, Kālibīn, Muḥammad al-Nāṣir, Sultān Hasnān, Dārūs, Muḥarrar, Ka‘ib al-Qāda in Cairo, as well as the mosques in the provincial capitals Aleppo, Damascus and Tripoli. While agriculture, industry and art showed great prosperity, trade suffered very much under the later Mamlikūs through the exorbitant taxes of the government. The trade through Egypt, based on treaties with Frankish and Oriental rulers, yielded huge sums. The customs and the treatment of merchants by the Sultans finally became so intolerable that the European powers did everything possible to secure the sea-route to India in order to avoid the transit through Egypt with its enormous expense and the roguery to which it was exposed.

The object of the last wars of Sultan Qansūh Ghaṭṭī was to gain a footing in South Arabia and nearer India to secure the Egyptian share in Indian trade.
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7. Medina: Sambuli, Wafa' at-Maqala (1856); Geschichte der Stadt Medina, transl. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1861. (M. Sobernheim)

B. Period from to 1517 to 1798. It is a significant fact, that even this period of nearly three centuries, during which Egypt belonged to the Ottoman Empire, may still be designated as a third Mamluk period. The change brought about by the conquest of Sultan Selim in 1517 was, after all, not so radical one, from the point of view of government. Egypt and its inhabitants remained under the rule of a powerful minority of foreign race. The antagonism that existed in the beginning between Ottoman Turks and Mamluks and which had led at first to much bloodshed (execution of 500 mamluks by Selim I in Cairo) did not last very long after the troubles of the occupation were over. The Turkish soldiers and officials who entered Egypt during Ottoman rule soon became mixed up to a large extent with the numerically more powerful class of the Mamluks, whose aid was, moreover, indispensable, for the government of the country. Besides, the number of Mamluks (al-Sharhā) continued to receive additions by purchase of slaves from the Caucasia. An author of the xviii. century (Vandue, p. 13) says that Egypt, in his day, was inhabited by Copts, Mouns (by whom he means the Islamised population), Arabs, Turks, Greeks, Jews and Franks. The "Turks" were the governing class and composed of Ottomans and Mamluks, between whom no distinction is made. We may even speak of a mamlukisation of the Ottoman element; the actual ottomatisation of the country belongs to the xixth century. In accordance with what is said, the history of those centuries never shows, among the parties and factions into which the Mamluks were divided, a pro- or anti-Ottoman party; those quarrels were only of local and personal character. Even the first governor of Egypt, Gehanbek, was a Mamluk, although, after him, the Pasha were sent, without exception, from Constantinople.

During the first 100 years, it is true, the authority of the Pasha sent from Constantinople to govern the country was undisputed. The Pasha could rely on three contingents of troops (vedāq) of which the inhabitants were added under Sulaimān I, composed of Mamluks. Their nominal strength was 20,000 men in all. They were not commanded by the Pasha, but by their own commanders, who belonged to the vedāq of the Janissaries and resided in the citadel of Cairo. Afterwards these troops behaved more and more independently and were able to depose Pashas whom they did not like, until, in the xviii. century, this military force became the instrument of some all-influential Mamluk bey. Important matters of administration were treated by a great Divan (or State Council), which only met in extraordinary cases and in which the high functionaries were represented, as well as the military chiefs and the high religious dignitaries. Local and special government functions were exercised by twelve Sandjak Beys; these represented at the same time the feudal aristocracy; from the beginning however, the ties that linked them to particular provinces seem to have been rather loose, for among them are mentioned the Khāja of the
Pasha, the Da'ud Pasha, the Amir al-Ḥaḍīfī and the Amir al-Kāẓim, the three first of whom were also members of the great Divān. Other Beys were commanders at Suez, Damietta and Alexandria, and governors of the five big provinces in the Nile delta. Besides these twelve Beys there were twelve other Beys with similar functions. The real provincial administration was exercised by a class of functionaries called Kāšīfī. Their chief task was the collection of the revenues. They may be considered as a kind of governor; some of the great Beys themselves were also Kāšīfī in their districts or had different Kāšīfī under them. Vansleb mentions 32 Kāšīfīs. As to the revenues, they were collected in various ways, the local customs in different parts of Lower Egypt and Upper Egypt varying considerably. The most common form was the farming out of revenues (hilāṭun); the multations had different kinds of right of possession on the lands, which were hereditary. They collected the revenue, in taxes or in kind, from the fellahs, generally through the village notables called Kāšīf al-Balad. In the tax-collating there were further employed, a host of subordinate technical and financial functionaries, many of whom were Copts. Some Kāšīfīs were at the same time multations. This system of administration characteristic of the close relation between administration and land-owning, which has always been characteristic of Egyptian conditions (cf. Εύνομο). It was the continuation of the system which had prevailed under the Mamlūk Sultāns (regulation by Kāfī Bay) and was regulated again in the Kāsim-nāmi Mīr of Sulaymān I (cf. i. von Hammer, Die osmanischen Reichsverfassung u. Staatsverwaltung, Vienna 1845, i. 101—142); here a special stress is laid on the rights and obligations of the Kāšīfīs.

In Cairo a large chancery, the chief of which was the Kāsim-nāmi, had to collect these taxes and look after the registers; the revenues collected were reserved partly for the pay of the troops and works of public utility such as irrigation, building of bridges and dikes, etc. and partly for the yearly tribute to the Sultan, which was in the beginning 800,000 ducats and afterwards lowered to 600,000 and later to 400,000 ducats. In the xviii century the paying of tribute practically fell into disuse.

Besides the land-tax, there existed a great number of other taxes, under different denominations; they were collected more or less arbitrarily, and, as in course of time, the anarchy in the government assumed greater proportions, they pressed ever heavier on the population. The rural population had as much to suffer from the exactions of their Mamlūk administrators and proprietors as from the raids of Arab tribes, which the government was unable to control.

The history of Egypt during this period is a not very interesting succession of domestic intrigues, struggles and revolts. Under the beginning of the xviii century the Pashas could more or less maintain their authority, but they were replaced often to have a lasting influence. No less than 117 Pashas governed Egypt until the arrival of the French (a complete list of them is given in Thurey, Sehil-i Ottoman, iv. 335 sqq.). Many of them tried to make their short stay as profitable for themselves as possible, and several of them had to pay their capitivity with their lives after their return to Constantinople. In the xviii century the real power in the country was exercised by the great Beys in Cairo, who had the troops in their hand and tolerated only those Pashas who did not interfere with their affairs. By this time the most powerful positions in the country were those of the commander of Cairo, called the Shālik al-Balad, and of the Amir al-Ḫaḍīfī. Some of the Shālik al-Balad are reputed as good rulers, especially Ismā'īl Bey, who held that office from 1757 to 1774. But the changes of power were always of a violent kind and prevented the forming of a dynasty; Ismā'īl's shālik al-baladship itself had been preceded by a curious struggle between the two rival parties of the Dhu 'l-Fikriyya and the Kāsimīya, which had lasted for three months outside Cairo. In 1747 the Porte tried for the first time to re-establish its authority by ordering the governor Rāghū Pasha to exterminate the Mamlūk Beys; this attempt failed, however, completely and the disorders continued until the appearance of the young Mamlūk 'Alī Bey [q. v.] who made himself for a short time independent Shālik al-Balad and ruler of Egypt, for the years 1770—1771. By this time the Porte began to take more serious measures to retain its hold on Egypt, but the regime of the Mamlūk Beys did not end until a foreign power, France, temporarily occupied Egypt (cf. Kurgiev).

Under such a regime the conditions of living of the population could not be flourishing. It was not so much the position of Egypt within the Ottoman province that caused the suffering of the population, as the lack of a strong central power. European travellers like Vansleb and Lucas point to the fact that Egypt was, in the xviii century a rich country and that by the practical stopping of the payment of tribute, all the money remained in the country itself. But the riches remained only in the possession of the ruling minority, while the rural population was oppressed very hardly. The bad organisation caused, moreover, from time to time terrible famines, while, about the middle of the xviii century, began a series of ravaging epidemics of plague. Since the last period of the Mamlūk Sultāns the country had lost, moreover, a rich source of revenue by the change of the trade-route to India. The transit trade was now restricted to inner African products and coffee and aromatics from Arabia, while the exportation of Egyptian products such as corn, cotton and sugar was limited. The timber that the country needed had to be imported from Turkey. Moreover, the trade with Christian countries often experienced serious hindrances from the arbitrary measures of the local authorities. At the same time the local industries declined rapidly; one of the causes may have been the transportation of a large number of skilled craftsmen to Constantinople by Selim I; the once flourishing guild organisation was paralysed by this measure (cf. Thorning, Beiträge zur Kenntnis des islamischen Vereinswesens, Berlin 1913, p. 85 and Al-Dibārī, l. 20).

In the decline of Egypt's economic strength, on the other hand, made Egypt a relatively quiet possession for the Porte. Only in the very beginning of Ottoman rule, in 1524, a Turkish governor, Ahmad Pasha, tried to take the title of sultan of Egypt, but afterwards no attempts to recover independence were made until the time of 'Ali Bey. Then, however, the political needs of the European colonial powers
made Egypt appear again as an important stage on the way to India and opened new possibilities of a more independent development, which were to be realised in the sixteenth century. In the meantime the possession of Egypt had been useful to Turkey in many respects; the Porte could always count on an Egyptian contingent of troops in its wars and the country itself was a base of action for the military operations in Syria, the Hijaz, and Yemen. The reconquest of Yemen under Selim II was carefully prepared in Cairo. As soon as the tendency to independence appeared, however, as under 'Ali Bey, the Turkish hold on Syria and Arabia was immediately endangered seriously.

The predominant position of Egypt in Islam was not seriously affected by the Ottoman occupation. Al-Ashar [q.v.] remained one of the most important centres of Islamic learning; the Turkish Pashas and other dignitaries showed their acknowledgement of this fact by gifts and by the execution of restorations to the building, as they did occasionally for other religious instituions in the country. Though Islamic science continued to flourish, Egypt did not produce many prominent figures in this period. In the domain of fiqh the most important figure was al-Ramlî (q.v.; d. 1596), the commentator of al-Nawawi, further the mystic al-Sharâni (q.v.; d. 1556), and, as representative of Arabic philology, 'Abd al-Kadir al-Baghdadi (q.v.; d. 1682). In popular mysticism the veneration of Ahmad al-Badawi [q.v.] by the Ahmadiya held a large place.

The period of Ottoman domination in Egypt is not wholly without interest from the point of view of architecture and art. Several governors, beginning with Khârbebek have constructed mosques; these mosques show a kind of transition from the Mamlûk to the Ottoman architectural style. There are also in Cairo several mosques founded by the Mamlûk Beya, like the mosque of Abd al-Habib, the traitor of 'Ali Bey, constructed in 1773. Some beautiful palaces have likewise been built by the Mamlûks, but only few of them are still extant (cf. on this subject: Mme. R. L. Devonshire, L'Egypte musulmane et les fondateurs de ses monuments, Paris 1926, p. 115 sqq.).

Bibliography: The sources for the history of Egypt under Ottoman rule have not been much studied. Of the many Arabic works to be mentioned (cf. Brockelman, G. A. L., ii. 289 sqq.), Ibn 'Iyâs, Badât al-Zubîr fi Waqtâ al-Dînâr, iii, Bâlak 1312, (until 1523); al-Mînakî, al-Badûr al-zubîr fi mun wałiya l-Kâhirah, MS. Vienna, N° 912 (until 1540); al-'Azhârî, al-Badât al-zubîr fi Ahhâr al-Fattah, MS. Cairo, N° 450 (until 1599); Ibn Zunbul, Falâs Fezîrî, many MSS. (1512—1519); al-Islâfî (cf. Bahârî, G. O. W., i. 360 sqq.), Dawlât al-Azhârî fi mun wałiya l-Diyâr al-Mirya also called Lâsîf al-Azhârî fi ma’twarqa fe-Misr min Arâb al-Dunâl, several times printed in Cairo 1276, 1296, 1300, 1304 (until 1623); do., al-Rawâf al-Asâm fi Ahhâr mul wałiya min al-Ahadîn, MSS. Paris, N° 1562 and Brit. Mus., N° 1251 (until 1623); al-Chilî, Dâhârât al-Asâm fi l-Tîrî bâl-Adresse, l-Mirya fi l-Falâsîr, only in MSS. (poem, until 1610); Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Abd al-Surâr, al-Tufsî al-Bâkîa fi Tâmilûk al-Ughrîn al-Diyar al-Mirya, several MSS. (until 1634); do., al-Rawâf al-Zubîrâ fi Waqtâ Misr al-Kâhirâ al-Mâshîya, several MSS. (until 1651); do., al-Rawâf al-Zubîrî al-Akhbâr Min al-Mâshîya, several MSS. (until 1645); al-Awâlî, Tâmurîdât al-Sânîbîh fi Waqtâ Min al-Sânîbîh, several MSS. (treats of some events in the years 1658 and 1661); 'Abd al-Kâdir, Târîkh, MS. Berlin (G. A. L., ii. 299; the years 1603—1643); Ibrahim al-Kâhirî, Mabâda' al-Awâlî, li-mâmil dhâlî al-Misr min al-Malâkî, MS. at Cairo (G. A. L., ii. 299; written about 1721); al-Damirî, al-Durrâ al-Ma'âlîm wa l-Wâfi, al-Kinâmî, several MSS. (G. A. L., ii. 300; the years 1688—1755); Muhammad ib. Ibrahim, Târîkh Misr, MS. Copenhagen, N° 159 (the years 1686—1739); al-Diabârî, 'Abd al-Azîz al-Tîrîkh l-Misrî wa l-Akhbâr, Cairo 1360, vol. i and ii. (from 1694 up to the French occupation).

Among the Turkish sources all the great historical works of the Ottoman Empire since the time of Selim I should be mentioned, to begin with the different Selim-nâmes; on the conquest of Egypt: Haidar Celebi, Tagebuch des ägyptischen Feldzügers Sultan Selim, tran. by K. Held Edhem, Weimar 1916 (Deutsche Orientbibliothek, vol. xx). The following deal specially with Egypt: 'Abd al-Samad, Nasîrûd-din al-Akhbâr, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 58 sqq.; Turkish translation and continuation of an older Arabic work, up till 1540); Sâlih b. Diabâr, Târîkh Misr, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 100 sqq.; written in 1546); Yusef b. Nurî-al-Allah, Târîkh Misr, MS. Turin (G. O. W., p. 121; Turkish translation of an older Arabic work and continuation up till 1592); 'Ali, 'Abd al-Kâhirî, Min al-Akhbâr al-Zubîrî, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 133; written in 1595); Mahmut b. 'Abd Allâh, Târîkh Misr, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 243 sqq.; up till 1769).

J. J. Marcel, Histoire de l'Egypte depuis la conquête Arabe jusqu'à l'âge des Français, Paris 1834, p. 416 sqq. (this author uses the more important Arabic sources); M. Delaporte, Abrégé chronologique de l'histoire des Mamelouks d'Egypte depuis leurs origines jusqu'à la conquête des Français, in Description de l'Egypte 2, xv, Paris 1826, p. 322 sqq.; M. A. Lacret, Mémoire sur le système d'imposition territoriale et sur l'administration des provinces de l'Egypte, in Description de l'Egypte 2, xi, Paris 1822, p. 451 sqq.; François Charles-Roux, Les origines de l'expédition d'Egypte, Paris 1910; the general works on the history of the Ottoman Empire.

Vansleb, Nouvelle Relation d'un voyage fait en Egypte, Paris 1677; Ewliya Çelebi, Seyhmet-nâme, 8th part, not printed; Paul Lacun, Voyage dans la Turquie, l'Asie, l'Arabie, le Paléiste, la Haute et Basse Euphrate, etc., Amsterdam 1720, 2 vols.; B. de Maillet, Description de l'Egypte, Paris 1735; cf. also the articles Egypt and Sûfî. (J. H. Kramers)

AL-MAMûN, 'Abu l-Akhbâr 'Abd Allah [s. Hârîrî], 'Abd al-azîd caliph, born in Rabî' I 170 (Sept. 786), son of Hârîrî al-Rashid and a Persian slave named Marâfî. After a desperate struggle, which ended in the assassination of the Caliph al-Amin [q.v.] in Maharram 198 (Sept. 813), the latter's brother al-Mamûn ascended the throne; it was six years, however, before he could make his entry into Baghdad. On account of his sympathy for things Persian, which was stimulated by the vizier al-Farîb b. Sulî [q.v.], the Caliph was not
at all popular with the Arabs. An 'Alid Muhammād b. Ibrāhīm, usually called Ibn Ṭabātābā, therefore set up as a pretender to the throne in Kūfa in Dhu’ al-Qa‘dah II 159 (Jan.–Feb. 815) and was supported by a former adherent of al-Ma‘mūn, Abu l-Sarayyā. The rebels had some success at first but Ibn Ṭabātābā died suddenly and when the general Halhama b. A’ayān [q.v.] advanced against him, Abu l-Sarayyā had to take to flight. Soon afterwards he was taken prisoner and put to death (Rābi‘ II 200 = Oct. 815). In the meanwhile the movement had spread, but the ‘Alids made themselves so hated that Halhama’s troops were able to restore order everywhere without difficulty. The victorious Halhama, however, was shamelessly rewarded for his services. After he had occupied Merw, the suspicious Caliph had him thrown into prison where he soon died (Dhu’ l-Qa‘dah II 200 = June 816). This increased the general discontent. While al-Ma‘mūn remained for the time in Merw, the people of Baghdād rebelled and placed al-Mansūr, a son of the Caliph al-Mahdī, at the head of the movement. When in Ramādān 201 (March 817) al-Ma‘mūn designated an ‘Alid, ‘Abd al-Ḵīda [q.v.], as heir apparent and argued the green of the ‘Alids instead of the black of the Ṭabātābās, the people of the capital elected Ibrāhīm, another son of al-Mahdī, Caliph (Iltu l-Ḫūṣayn 201 = July 817). There were troubles in Egypt and in Ḥadhrābdād, the pests were stirred up by the Khurramī Bālāk [q.v.], who terrorised the northern provinces for nearly 30 years. In these circumstances al-Ma‘mūn had finally to leave Merw and go to the Ḥurāz (202 = 817). But when the Arabs murdered the vizier al-Ṭaḏlī who was particularly hostile to them, and ‘Abd al-Ḵīda died suddenly, and in addition, the governor of Ṭūsṯ, al-Ḥasan b. Sahil, the vizier’s brother went mad, or at least was treated as such, the people of Baghdād had really no longer reason to support al-Ḫūṣayn and in Ṣaḥr 204 (Aug.–Sept. 819) al-Ma‘mūn entered the capital and the ‘Alid colours were exchanged for the ‘Abhāṣāt. Al-Ḥasan b. Sahil was then restored to his government, and a few years later the Caliph married his daughter Būrān [q.v.]. As soon as the Caliph had left Khurramā a rebellion broke out among the Ḥurāz. At the end of 205 (June/ July 820) or beginning of 206, Ṭāhir b. al-Ḥusayn [q.v.] was appointed governor of Khurramān. He proved in every way fitted for his difficult post but carried his independence so far that in 207 (822) he denounced his fealty to the Caliph. Although he died the following day, the Caliph did not dare to deprive his son of Ṭāhir’s government, and in this way the dynasty of the Ṭāhirids was founded in Khurramān. In 210 (825–826) ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṭāhir [q.v.] after defeating Nasr b. Shabštīr went by the Caliph’s orders to Egypt. Here the Yamānis, who were loyal to al-Ma‘mūn, had begun to fight with the Ḥūṣaynīs who sided with al-ʿĀṣim and the struggle lasted till the latter’s death. A more peaceful period ensued, but soon new troubles broke out, and with the arrival of the Spanish Muslims, banished by the Caliph al-Ḥasam I [q.v.] the situation became still more complicated. The latter seized the town of al-Iskandariya, but when ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṭāhir arrived in Egypt the native rebels had to submit, and the Spanish intruders retired to Crete. When ‘Abd Allāh was appointed governor of Khurramān, the Caliph made his brother, afterwards the Caliph al-Mu‘tasim, governor of Egypt. But in 214 (829) the Egyptians rose again against his deputy so that al-Mu‘tasim had to go himself to Egypt to bring the rebels to terms. Two years afterwards the people of Lower Egypt again rebelled against al-Mu‘tasim’s officers. The Copts defended themselves with desperate vigour until the Caliph himself arrived with fresh troops and ruthlessly put down all resistance. Towards the end of the reign of al-Ma‘mūn, the old struggle with the Byzantines broke out again. The cause is unknown but probably Bābāk was being supported by the Emperor Theophilos. In any case the Caliph in Muharram 215 (March 830) took the field against the Byzantines accompanied by his son al-Aṣim [q.v.]. In the next two years campaigns were conducted by al-Ma‘mūn in person; as usual the fortune of war varied, but the Muslims succeeded in taking the fortress of Luṭ’ in a long siege, whereupon the Theophilos wanted to make peace. But his offer was refused by al-Ma‘mūn and in 218 (833) he again invaded Byzantine territory but died in Ṣadjāb (August) of the same year in Badūnān not far from Tarās, after having had al-Mu‘tasim proclaimed as his successor.

In spite of all political troubles al-Ma‘mūn found time to devote his attention to religious problems and to the cause of learning. His rationalistic tendencies made him join the Mu‘tazilis, whose most prominent representative then was the Kāhī Ṭaḥmāš b. ‘Abd Allāh [q.v.]. Urged on by him, the Caliph went so far as in Rābi‘ I 212 (June 827) to publicly proclaim the dogma of the creation of the Qur’ān and therefore to raise the Mu‘tazilis to be the State religion. While he persecuted the orthodox and catechised them severely about the soundness of their belief in the Mu‘tazilis, he treated the ‘Alids with the greatest consideration. In his reign poetry and learning reached their golden age. It was then that lived men like Abū Tammām and al-Ṣulṭānī, each of whom collected a Ḥamālīn, the historian al-Wāṣqānī, the traditionist al-Bukhārī and the jurist Ṭabātābā b. Ḥanbāl. The Caliph also took a special interest in philosophy and the exact sciences. In Baghdād he built an astronomical observatory, with a fine library, and the medical school in Dhimādī Sāhīr [q.v.] was an object of his special care. Scientific works by Greek physicians and natural philosophers had previously been translated into Arabic through the Syrian, but under al-Ma‘mūn there was a great revival of activity in this branch of learning.

which made him master of Cordova. Six months later, al-Ma'mun was poisoned on the 11th Dhu 'l-Ka'da 407 (June 28, 1075) either at the instigation of al-Mutamid, king of Seville, or of Ibn 'Ukasha. His son Yahya al-Kadir succeeded him. A few years later, Alfonso VI took Toledo.

The long reign of al-Ma'mun is quite characteristic of the period of the caliphate of the Iberian Peninsula. He certainly increased his dominions but his conquests were ephemeral and he was one of the first to have no scruples about an alliance with the Christian princes of Castile and Leon in order to fight other Muslim princes of al-Andalus. He even allowed hospitality at his court for nine months to Alfonso VI when the latter was deposed by his brother Sancho of Castile.


AL-MA'MUN, ABD L-'ALI, ibn YUSUF, abd al-Ma'mun b. Abd 'al-Mu'tasib, last ninth sovereign of the Almohad dynasty, born in 581 (1185-1186) in Malaga, of the marriage of his father with the Spanish princess Sufia, daughter of the amir Abd al-Allah b. Mardanish (Martines). The Arab historians pay high tributes to the good qualities of this prince who was very well read, equally well versed in profane and religious learning. At a time when the Almohad dynasty was much troubled by the strife stirred up by pretenders, he was able by his energy to postpone for several years its final collapse.

At first al-Ma'mun served in Spain as the lieutenant of his brother Abü Muhammad 'Abd Allah al-Adil then on the throne. The latter had soon to leave the Peninsula and return to Morocco without having been able to subdue the rebel leader Abu Muhammad al-Bayazi supported by Ferdinand III of Castile, but he was soon betrayed by his own men in his own land and assassinated in 624 (1227). This murder was followed by the almost simultaneous proclamations of al-Ma'mun and another Almohad pretender, nephew of the preceding, Yahiya b. al-Nasir b. al-Ma'mun, who took the honorific 'Abd al-Mu'tasib billah. On his accession and without leaving Spain, al-Ma'mun was soon able to make himself recognised in the greater part of his empire and to get rid of the rebel al-Bayazi. But almost immediately a rebellion broke out in the east of al-Andalus, in which Muhammad b. Yusuf of the powerful family of the Banu Hbid was proclaimed caliph in the town of Murcia. At the same time the pretender of Yahiya al-Mu'tasim appeared in Morocco and his partisans became more and more numerous. Feeling himself powerless in Spain and forced to turn his eyes towards Africa, al-Ma'mun was forced to seek an alliance with the king of Castile. The latter agreed to support al-Ma'mun under very harsh terms, including the surrender of ten Muslim strongholds of the frontier and the building of a church and the granting of freedom of worship in Marrakush. In return, al-Ma'mun received a body of 12,000 Christian mercenaries with whom he was able to enter Marrakush in triumph, after having
defeated the army of al-Mu'tasim in 627 (1230).

Enraged at the defection of the Almohad Malik ibn al-Nasir, he turned his attention to the Maghribi Almohads, who had also defected from his father. The Almohad Malik ibn al-Nasir was convinced of having betrayed him. The rest of the Almohad army was spent in trying to put down several rebellions in the Maghribi; but he did not succeed in bringing his rival to terms for the latter was able to escape and plunder Marrakesh. On hearing this, al-Ma'mun, then busy with the siege of Ceuta, hurried off to the capital at once but was ill and died on the way in the valley of the Wadi 'l-Abyad at the end of Dhu l-Hijjah 629 (Oct. 1232).


(E. Levi-Provençal)

MA'MUNIS, name of a dynasty.

In the 11th (5th) century Qurshiyiyya, to the north of modern Khiva, was a dependency of Bukhara and was ruled by a line of princes called the Ma'munis. Nothing is mentioned about them by the Oriental historians till 982 (994) when Ma'mun b. Muhammad b. 'Ali, ruler of Qurshiyiyya, is said to have assisted Amir Nuh b. Mansur the Samanid in his exile during the temporary occupation of Bukhara by Buhriz Khan, ruler of Kshgar. In 985 (995) Ma'mun attacked Abu 'Abd Allah, ruler of Kshgar, in order to punish him for his treachery to Abu 'Ali Siminjiri, took him prisoner and annexed Kshgar. Ma'mun was assassinated in 987 (997). His son Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali succeeded to the throne, and married a sister of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna. Abu 'l-Hasan died about 999 (1008-1009) and was succeeded by his brother Abu 'l-Abbâs Ma'mun. Abu 'l-Abbâs married his brother's widow, the sister of Sultan Mahmud. Shortly after this he gave offence to his army by doing homage to Sultan Mahmud. The commanders of the army organised a rebellion against him, put him to death on Shawwalt 15, 407 (March 16, 1017) and raised one of his sons to the throne. On hearing this, Sultan Mahmud marched to Kshgar to avenge the death of his brother-in-law, defeated the rebels at Haskara on Safar 3, 408 (July 3, 1017), and executed the leaders of the insurrection. All the scions of the royal house were taken prisoners and sent to Khurasan. The kingdom of Kshgar was annexed and placed under the command of Altunshah with the title of Kshgarshah. But after the return of Sultan Mahmud to Ghazna, Abu 'l-Abbâs, father-in-law of Abu 'l-Abbâs Ma'mun, tried to establish himself in Kshgar but was defeated by Altunshah.

The rulers of this dynasty were famous patrons of learning, and it was at the court of Abu 'l-Abbâs Ma'mun that Abu Kairân al-Biruni, the astronomer, Abu 'Ali b. Sinâ and Abu 'l-Khair b. Khâmîskh, the physicians, and Abu Nasr b. 'Arrâk, the mathematician, flourished.

This dynasty has been confused by the Târîkh-i Qazâda and Târîkh-i Qâbân Areb of Kâudi Ahmad Ghaflî, with the Fatimites who were the rulers of Dînuqânâna.


MA'MUR ET AL-'AZIZ, the name given to the new town of Messer, built beside Kharput [q.v.] in honour of Sultan 'Abd al-'Aziz. In time the name became applied to the new wîlayet formed in 1879 around Kharput-Messer; this consisted of three sandjaks: al-'Aziz, Khozât and Ma'tyiya. As a result of the administrative reforms of 1340 (1921) each of these sandjaks became an independent wîlayet but later modifications were made.

According to the official annual of 1925—1926, the wîlayet of Ma'mur et al-'Aziz has an area of 11,299 sq. km. or 12,428,900 dîwans, of which 3,124,590 are arable. It contains 6 kâdas: the central kâda, Pâli, Kharput, Kebkâ, 'Arabkîr, Kemâliyyâ (this new name replaces the historical one of Egin).

The annual of 1926—1927 records an even more radical reorganisation. The area of the wîlayet of al-'Aziz is given as 17,268 sq. km. with 1,582,906 dîwans of arable land. The wîlayet which lost the western kâda ('Arabkîr and Egin) has been extended on N. and E. It has 11 kâdas subdivided into 32 mukhtars with names little known and difficult to transliterate:

1. the kâda al-'Aziz, with the mukhtar: Khânkendi, Malek-kendi, Tême, Khâlîqiyya ([?], Erener (Aywus), Bist-Bey, Kharput, 'Aârûkîr, 'Arabkîr (= Avust-kîr), Kemâliyyâ (Dîlîhî)

2. Kebên, with only one mukhtar: Tahir.

3. Bûskîl: Mûshâr-Huyuk, Lûli (Kumîr-khan), Karsebân (Merwân), Seywan.


5. Khûzât (Dersim): Hâlbân (Elghazî), Kermîli, Amûcta, Sn, Dere-Aghamîn.


8. Çabâbçûr: Perkhegûk (Kamûra).

The kâdas without mukhtars are:

Oswâlîk.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of the kâda</th>
<th>Number of villages</th>
<th>Number of inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>52,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>12,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The wilâyet (without Cemîcīh-gesek) has therefore 171,651 inhabitants. The events of the war and the suppression of the Kurd rising in 1925 must have had far-reaching effects on the ethnic aspect of this territory. Before the war the population was mixed: Kurd, Armenian and "Zam" (a people speaking an Iranian dialect, q.v.).


(M. MINORSKI)

MA'ÎKH AS-ABS, an early Muhammâdân poet of the tribe of the Bani Muzain. His period can be established with some accuracy. From the Kiûtî al-'Aghâni we know that he composed a panegyric on 'Omar I and a lampoon on 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair for his lack of hospitality; the latter is preserved in the Aghâni as is the beginning of the former. The panegyric survives also in the Dîmâr, where it is dedicated to 'Omar's son 'AbdAllah. The Aghâni further records that Ma'in lived to the beginning of the fitna between 'Abd Allah and Marwûh b. al-Hasâm, i.e. to 634 (656). The poet must therefore have been born about the beginning of the Muslim era. The Aghâni further gives details of his private life and the Dîmâr also gives similar information. He had an estate in Arabia and made journeys to Syria and the 'Irâq. One of his wives came from Syria. He also took part in the wars of his tribes. In his old age he became blind.

Up till recently all that we knew of Ma'in's poems were the fragments preserved in the Aghâni and elsewhere. P. Schwarz however discovered in the Escorial an incomplete manuscript of the Dîmâr with a commentary, the work of al-Khiyânî [q.v.] which he published in 1903 with a short introduction and translation of the notices in the Aghâni. H. Reckendorf supplemented this. In 1947 Kamal Mustafà published an edition in Cairo. It lacks some poems given by Schwarz; on the other hand it has two fragments not given by him. The introduction is in part literal translation of Schwarz, who is mentioned by name. It is not clear from it on what the edition is based. It seems however to be based simply on Schwarz's edition without new manuscripts and, compared with it, only shows corruptions of the text, omissions and additions from other sources.

Ma'in Ibn Aus, Hayyâtuhu, Shîra'uhu, Addârâhu, 'Amîânahu Kamal Mustafà, Cairo 1927.

(M. PLESSNER)

MA'ÎN B. MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD B. 'SAHâMIH AL-'UIGÂTî AL-'AWâQizont al-'Awâ'iq, al-'Awâ'iq, founder of a dynasty in the little principality of Alîm in Eastern Spain in the middle of the 18th century. The principality had been founded in 1052 by the two Amirî 'Slâvâ' Khârînî and Zohair. On the latter's death in 1037, their heir Abd al-'Azîz b. Abî 'Amîr, king of Valencia, declared it his property and in 1043 placed his brother-in-law Ma'in b. 'Sa'dîm as governor there. The latter belonged to a noble family of Arab origin; his father had been one of the generals of the celebrated Hadîjîh al-Mansûr [q.v.] and was governor of the town of Huesca. Ma'in remained loyal to the king of Valencia for nearly four years, when he cast off his allegiance and declared himself independent. He reigned at Almeria for a few years longer and died in Ramadân 443 (Jan. 1542).


(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

MA'ÎN B. ZAI'DA, Abu 'l-Walîd al-Jâhânî, a Muslim general and governor. In the Omânî period Ma'in was in the service of the governor of the 'Irâq, 'Abd b. 'Omar b. Hubâirs, and took part in the fighting against the 'Alîd rebels 'Abd Allah b. Ma'âwiya and the general of the 'Abhâsîs, Kâhatûns b. Shâbîb as well as against his son al-'Iyâs. He thus gained the enmity of al-Mansûr al-Musîr and after the murder of Ibn Hubâirs had to go into hiding to escape the vengeance of the 'Abhâsîs. But when the Rawandis [q.v.] went to al-Hâgîmîyâ (probably in 141 = 758–759) and tried to storm the palace of the caliph, because he had had his ringleaders arrested, Ma'in came out of his retirement, drove back the rebels with his men and rescued al-Mansûr, who at once pardoned him and gave him the governorship of the Yaman. Here he favoured his fellow tribesmen, the Bani Rabî'î, while the Yamanis were treated with the greatest severity. He was transferred to Suljûk, according to the main date, in 131 (768–769) and his son Za'idâ followed him as governor of the Yaman. Soon afterwards, probably the next year, Ma'in was murdered in Bust by some Khârijîs, who had gained an entrance to his house by pretending they were workmen doing repairs. 131 and 158 are given for the year of his death, in addition to 153.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

MA'ÎN (BAND), Emir of the Lebanon. Their political history begins with the Turkish conquest of Syria. We do not know if they were of Arab origin like the Bani Bâjtîr, or Kurds like the Dîmârî, or Maghribi like the Bani Abd al-Samad, the Talbût, etc., who came to the Lebanon in the time of the Fatimids. When, in the 12th century, the biographer Mahâshîfî (Khânîlîî al-Mishîrî fi 'l-Ma'n al-Masî'îh) [squares, i. 206] was collecting the records of the family of the Banî Ma'in, he found they were not agreed about the genealogy of their ancestors. But he is certain that they had long been in possession of the emirate of Shîîf (Southern Lebanon). He is certain that they did not belong to the princey family of the Lebanon Tu'mâhî. It is none the less surprising that in the monograph, which he devotes to the latter family (Tû'mâhî Batûrî, ed. Cheikhâ) Shîîf b. Yâhîya deliberately passes over the Banî Ma'in.

The Ma'in seem to have early adopted the teaching of the Druses. This step secured them the sympathies of the Druses of the Lebanon and...
of the Wālid 'l-Taim at the foot of Hermon. In the latter district they were allied with the Shihāb emirs. Enfeebled by the struggles with the 'Alam al-Dīn — their relations and also their secular rivals — the Banū Tanūkḥ, themselves divided into Kādis and Yamānis, endured the fate of such exhausted organisms and ended by breaking up. The Maʿnids were only waiting the opportunity to seize their political heritage. This was given by the Ottoman conquest of Syria.

On the eve of the battle of Dāhib (1546) between the Turks and the Mamluks of Egypt they divined in time to which side victory would incline; and wiser than the Tanūkḥ declared for the Turks. Their chief at that time was the emir Fakhr al-Dīn I. He was one of the first of the Syrian chiefs to hasten to Damascus to congratulate Selim I on his victory. Favourably impressed by his protestations of devotion, the Sultan sent him back to the Lebanon with enhanced prestige and authority at the expense of the Tanūkḥ. In this accession of power, the Maʿn emir was much assisted by Ghasālī, a traitor to the Mamluk cause, to whose fortunes he had decided to link that of his family. We do not know how he escaped the catastrophe that overwhelmed (Jan. 1521) his protector Ghasālī, who in the end played traitor to the Turks also.

In 1544 the emir Kurkūmās succeeded his father Fakhr al-Dīn and in 1585 there took place at Dūm ʿArkh the plundering of the caravan which was being taken to Constantinople the taxes collected in Egypt and Syria. The Ottomans accused the Maʿn of complicity and of having sheltered the criminals. Their troops invaded the Lebanon. The emir Kurkūmās shut himself up in the inaccessible rock of Shāfiṭ Turān near Dūm (Southern Lebanon) and died there of chagrin or poison (1585).

The most remarkable of the Maʿnids was undoubtedly the son and successor of Kurkūmās, called Fakhr al-Dīn (1585–1635), like his grandfather. The partisans of the cause of independence in the Lebanon regarded him as a precursor and have never ceased to invoke the example of his efforts for his country. For an account of his career see the article on him (ib., p. 45). The conquests beyond the Lebanon and his relations with European powers brought down upon him the vengeance of the Porte. He had to go into exile in Italy and leave to ʿAli, the eldest and most gifted of his sons along with his own brother Yūnūs, the administration of the Lebanon (1613). On a promise to dismantle the chief fortress of the Lebanon the Porte recognised ʿAli and even, after five years of exile, allowed his father Fakhr al-Dīn to return to the Lebanon. His son ʿAli displayed no enthusiasm at his return (1618). The new conquests of his father soon began to disturb the Porte, who resolved to make an end of the troublesome Maʿnīd vassal. Surprised by superior forces in the Wālid ʿl-Taim his son ʿAli fell fighting bravely and Fakhr al-Dīn was taken to Constantinople and put to death (1645).

The Central and Southern Lebanon, "the Mountain of the Druses" as it was officially called, was then handed to the family of the ʿAlam al-Dīn, whose ambitions had never ceased from the beginning of the rise of the Banū Tanūkḥ, to thwart the efforts of all the rulers of the Lebanon. One of their first acts was to exterminate the last actions of the Tanūkḥ. This crime facilitated the rise to power of the Shihāb. Their excesses and the regret for the Maʿnīds soon made the ʿAlam al-Dīn unpopular. After their expulsion from the Lebanon the Maʿnīd emir Muḥlim followed; his son Ahmad succeeded in regaining a precarious authority under the jealous supervision of the Turkish Pashas. The more distinguished of the two emirs was Muḥlim, son of the emir Yūnūs and nephew of the great Fakhr al-Dīn. He ruled for about 20 years. Both continued the liberal traditions of their illustrious ancestor. Like him they protected the colonies of Christian agriculturists whom he had invited from northern Lebanon and for whom he had built churches and monasteries.

Ahmad, grand-nephew of Fakhr al-Dīn II, died in 1657 without leaving male heirs and the family of the Maʿnīds thus became extinct. Turkey could no longer have any illusions about the rebellious nature of the Lebanese and their impudence under a foreign yoke. To assume the direct government of the Lebanon was not attractive to the Porte and would have forced it to undertake its conquest. The grave political crisis through which Turkey was then passing prevented a new expedition being undertaken, the risks of which were very well known. On the other hand the rule of the ʿAlam al-Dīn with official support had not given satisfactory results. On promise of the payment of an annual tribute, the notables of the Lebanon were authorised to form a general assembly at Sumḥānīa (province of Ṣūfī) to elect a governor to inherit the legacy of the Banū Maʿn. Their choice fell upon the Shihāb emirs, allies and relatives of the old emirs.

**Maʿn Emirs**

- Fakhr al-Dīn I (†1544)
- Kurkūmās (†1585)
- Fakhr al-Dīn II (†1635)
- Yūnūs (†1635)
- Muḥlim (†1657)
- Ahmad (†1697)


**Maʿnī (A.)** means in the old language vense, signification and is so used as a grammatical term. In philosophical language the use of the word varies from the most general to the most particular so that it is impossible to give a general translation for it. It occurs in quite untechnical connections as "thought", "what is meant" or simply "thing" etc. but also has the special meaning of "conception" or as the Dictionary of Technical Terms, ed. by Sprenger, has it as "an image of the intelligence" in so far as a word corresponds to it, i.e. in so far as
it is meant by a word". Horten has investigated the special meaning of the word in metaphysics
(Was bedeutet ḥulul als philologischer Terminus?, in Z.D.M.G., 95, 391 sqq.). According to him, ḥulul is an "incorporeal reality" not merely a subjective conception. In this use, it is regularly contrasted to īsmā.

The plural mišālim is the name of a branch of study, namely, rhetorical style.

Bibliography: in the article; cf. also the dictionaries and Tafsīrkūprāzā, Miṣḥāb al-Salādā s.v. Ḥulul al-Manāfīn. (M. Plessner)

MANĀF is the name of an early-Arabian tribe which was originally a portion of the Kuraish and Hudhali, as may be concluded from the fact that among these clans the name "Abd Manāf servant of Manāf" occurred. It is said that one of Muhammad's ancestors — the pedigree being Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Muttalib b. Ḥāshim b. 'Abd Manāf — received this name, because his mother consecrated him to Manāf, who was then the chief deity of Makka.

Whether this last statement be true or not, it does not restore to life a deity whose individuality remains to us as dim as that of all its companions. Ibn al-Kalbī knows nothing of its whereabouts, except that menstruating women were compelled to keep themselves at a distance from it.

The name does not occur either in the Kurān or in classical bādīḥ. It derives from a root n-n-n, which in several Semitic languages conveys the meaning of "being elevated".

Bibliography: al-Ṭabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 1091 sq.; Wellhausen, Reste arabischer Heidentum, p. 56 sq. (A. J. Wessink)

MANĀKIB (A.), plural of manākib, means the merits and doings of a miraculous nature of celebrated holy persons of Islam, heads of schools, saints and founder of iconography. Other terms like kawāmel, fādi'āt are used with the same meaning but less frequently. We have the titles or manuscritps of several works on eastern manākib. Ḥālijā Khālifā gives a long list of them. Among the most notable may be mentioned the manākib of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, of al-Shāfi'i and of Abū Ḥanīfa.

The literature of the manākib assumed a special development in Morocco from the end of the middle ages. The majority of the šukās who played a part in the great renaissance of Islam in this country at that time had one or more monographs devoted to their manākib after their deaths.

For a more detailed study of the place occupied by the genre of manākib in the Arabic literature of Morocco cf. my Historien des Chorfas, Études sur la littérature historique et biographique au Maroc du XVIe au XXe siècle, Paris 1922, P. 44–54 and 220 sqq. (E. Levi-Provençal)

MANĀRA, tower, minaret.

Material, structure and adornment. The use of brick or stone for manāras depended on the material generally used for building in the country in question. The manāras in Spain were therefore of stone so far as one can judge from those still extant, in the African Maghrib mainly of brick, in Cairo of stone, in Arabia, Syria, Anatolia, Armenia and Mesopotamia of both, in the Ḥira, Persia and Afghanistan of brick and in India of both. In Persia there are isolated exceptions, like the manāra in Kerāt, a structure of stone and lime with an outer covering of tiles; indeed stone and lime were very often used for the foundations and bases without affecting the character of the edifices themselves in brick. Of considerable importance from the artistic point of view is the outer covering of a layer of tiles in Persia and the Ḥira, from the variations and patterns of which the manāras receive their decorative interiors; by alternating horizontal and vertical layers (šārāfīyā, banding), by alternating reliefs and depressions, ornamental areas are formed from which strips of ornament or script arise formed of tiles specially prepared for the purpose. The Tuskešan and Timurid manāras are decorated with coloured glass. In the Timurid period also the glaze continually appears, especially in the pair of minarets which now commonly flank the entrance to a mosque (Tabrīz, Mashhad, etc.). It is in the Guldests, the balconies round the top, that the art of working decoratively in brick reaches its height. Here the necessary basis for the balcony was formed by brackets arranged in layers or rows of cells (stalactite-like cornices, wāṣṣar, mābūz).

Object and Significance. The term manāra or minār is applied to all Muslim towers. They were not only for religious purposes as places from which to call to prayer and to mark mosques but also, as before the Muslim conquest, for profane purposes as watch-towers and signal-towers. The tower on the top of a hill at Kerāt in Khorāsān (cf. below) is from its isolated commanding position intended as a signal-tower or column of victory and it shows that these towers were built in the Muslim period exactly like the manāras of mosques. In form and style these erections, serving different purposes, form one category, into which they also fall objectively from having the same name. There are a number of early references to such manāras, which were intended to be indicators for: caravans and watch-towers (cf. Dix, Persien, Islam. II. in Khorāsān, p. 59). Such towers were however found all over the Asian plains and through China to the Pacific Ocean. Of course very few of them were works of art. There are a number of exceptions in the contemporary names for such towers, like that of Mahmud of Ghazna which is called an ʿināb in an inscription (see below). One of the minarets of the maqāṣid in Kerāt is called simply ḫumarat in the inscription (cf. Niedermayer-Dieu, Afghānistan, p. 59). The ʿbanks of Ḫumarat erected by king Akoka in India between 250–332 H.C. may be claimed as precursors of the minarets of eastern Islam; although actually pillars of much smaller size than a minār, many of them already show the same division into a polygonal and a cylindrical section. Their object was also half religious and half monumental in character. They in turn came from the Indo-Aryan columns of wood which were put up from the earliest times as symbols of the deity. The Indo-Buddhist stambha of brick in Kābul of uncertain date is a connecting link between these and the earliest Muslim memorial towers in Ghazna (see below).

Shape. From this similarity just mentioned, it is evident that the manāras follow the traditional shape of the towers of the country in question. In the Mediterranean lands, as H. Thiessch has shown, it was the lighthouses and in Syria the watch-towers, dwelling- and church-towers that
were the predecessors in form of the manāras. The mālwiya's of Sūmārt and the manāra of Ibu Ṭīlīn in Cairo again go back to the Old Persian models. In Persia and Sīdjar, also, Nestorian church towers may have given the early manāras their square and polygonal shape (cf. Diez, Persien, t2, Ek. im Khwarzm, p. 75); but in the rivalry of shapes in the eastern empire the slender cylindrical manāra, which is often also called mil, won. It was the victory of the monumental building without windows over the western dwelling-tower with windows. Their earliest precursors were already mentioned, the Indian lātas. The observatory towers built by Sulaymān Maḥmūd and Manṣūr III in Ghazna were built as memorials of victories like the Indian Dīya-rāmabhās. Their shape was suggested by India but remodelled by the spirit of Muslim Persia and given a character of their own (cf. Diez, op. cit., p. 76 and 152 sqq.).

The best monumental evidence of Indian inspiration is the Kūh Minār [q.v.] in Dehlī (beg. of viiiith = eight century; cf. M. v. Berchem, in Diez, Chronologische Baukunde, p. 109 sqq.). The fact that the Persians called them mil points to their ancestry, the primitive poles and pillars used as indicators. To such poles, which can still be found at the present day at Sāmiyā’s tombs, revered by the common people in the country districts of Persia, may perhaps be traced the square and octagonal decorative shafts of the city and mosque towers, found in pairs in Persian towns with Turkish inhabitants and in Asīr Minor. Although they are frequently in the shape of minarets and have a gallery, their object is as a rule merely decorative. Both groups of manāras, the square and the round, are hollow towers with a staircase winding up inside opening out on the gallery. In the old Persian minarets of brick, these galleries or gateaux have been completely destroyed as they were made of wood. We must imagine them to have stood on cornices of cells with carved wooden railings, rafters and roofs such as may be seen everywhere in the surviving mināras at popular places of pilgrimage like Karbalā’, Kūm and Maḥāīb. A comparison with the galleries in the towers of the wooden churches of Eastern Europe (e.g. in Transylvania) points to the descent of the Isma‘ili galleries from wooden buildings of an everyday character.

Form and Significance of the manāras. In spite of the similarity of purpose there is a marked difference, indeed contrast, between the minarets of eastern and western Islam. The square and polygonal minarets of the Maghrib, Egypt, and Syria are still essentially buildings for habitation; the cylindrical manāras of the eastern lands are on the other hand distinctly monumental buildings, pillars symbolic of the deity. The angular minarets of the west are divided into stories by mouldings and have windows for communication with the outer world; they are usually heavy on a broad base, while in contrast the cylindrical minarets of the east incorporate the symbol of the absolute which has this form, the unique, the abstract, the irresistible ascension to the deity without intermediate stages or stopping places. The minarets of the west remain individual towers, of which hardly two are alike; in the second half of the viith (xiiith) century the cylindrical form was already established as the absolute and only one, never to be altered nor made capable of ascension, as the only possible form of manāra. The minarets of the west thus remain ex-watch-, church- or lighthouse-towers without bells or lights, decorative survivals of a culture foreign to their nature; those of the east on the other hand were etherealised and became spiritual manāras. The Cairo minarets were an interesting sport in their shape, the Persian and Turkish on the other hand a confession of faith in monumental form. They soar up to the heavens with unimpeded vigour. The silhouette of their tiled decoration rises upwards on a close inspection till finally the eye of the beholder is held by the marked effects of light and shade on the gilded. The form of the gilded however is chosen with an idea of magical effect. The spire rests on a gallery of cells, the secret of the construction of which the spectator cannot easily grasp and the decorative gallery of wooden rafters and railings glitters with bright colours above it. A coat of glaze and the gilt top reflect far and wide a magic reflection like the glazed domes.

Shaping Development of the manāras in different countries. — Syria is the original home of the square manāra, which there took over the old native form of watch-towers, dwellings-towers or grave-towers and the church-tower which succeeded them. Iṣnām at first used the existing pre-Islamic towers as minarets, on to which mosques were frequently built, when old churches which already had towers were not taken over and adapted (cf. Brünnow in Thiersch, Pharaos, p. 101). The oldest minarets of this kind are in Hawrān, the land of stone building where given, which contained many old undecaying stone-towers (Boomān, manāra of the mosque of ʿOmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, inscription on the time of the Caliph ʿOmar, Dar al-Muslim, etc.). In Damāsānas the two southern minarets of the Omāyād mosque began by Walīd in 86 (705?) belonged to the old church of St. John, while the northern minaret was a completely new building of Walīd’s. This is therefore the oldest independent Muslim manāra. The manāras of the Omāyād mosque became models not only for Syria but through the Omāyād migration to Spain (Cordova) for the Maghrib also. Wherever we later find in Syria the Egyptian tower-form, there is always definite Egyptian influence present and as a rule they are Mamlūk foundations. It is still hardly possible to compile a chronological list of Syrian manāras (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 99—110 and the illustrations).

Palestine. In this country on the borders of Egypt, the influence of the latter country made itself felt. The octagonal manāra on a square base predominates. The manāra of the chief mosque in Qasba shows an octagonal diminishing in width by successive stages, while the minaret of the mosque of al-Ḥākim has the same diameter throughout and is only divided into four stories with windows, by large mouldings. The smaller mosques have short square octagonal minarets. The manāra of ʿAli Bakr in Hebron is half rectangular and half octagonal with a high miḥrāb-like niche in the lower story. The octagonal tower is found as far as Jerusalem, where it meets with the northern Syrian square towers. The latter is again found at Ḥarām al-Sharif and in the mosque of ʿOmar ʿOmar beside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and along the coast in Jaffa, Hāifa, Sidon, Tyre and Haith. And in the interior in Tiberias, Şafāḍ, Nablūs, etc. On the other hand
Khusrawgird near Sahaqar in Khurāsān: Monument of 505 (1111)

Gharna: Monument of Mas'ud of 495 (1101–1102)
Cairo: Mausoleas of the Mamlûk period
Cairo: sections of the two Minarets with outer covering of the Mosque of Hakim

Sandbag near Machtul in Ghouta: Minaret of a Flaigmak (early) cent.
the manāra in Ramla of the viii (xiii) century is unique with its buttresses and pointed arched niches and dwarf pillars and columns. Thiersch takes it to be a copy of the most celebrated Christian tower of the country, the bell-tower of the Holy Sepulchre, built in 1160—1180 in Jerusalem, of which only the base is still standing; (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 119 sqq. and the pictures there).  

Egypt. The oldest manāra in Egypt is the tower of the Di'amālī in Tulīn. Like the Malwiyya of Si'amārī, this minaret stands outside the mosque and resembles them in form also, although it differs in its material which is limestone. The first storey is a square tower with a window with horseshoe arches, the second is cylindrical and an outer staircase leads up around them. The two upper octagonal stories are later in date, having been erected by the Mamluk Sultan Lādi'īn. Nothing final can be said about this minaret, apparently erected by a foreign architect and combining a number of foreign influences. The manāras next to it in time are the five towers of hewn stone of the mosque of Ḥakīm with their covering of tiles of a later date; they must be contemporary with the mosque, which was built in 393—404 (1002—1013), and were covered by Bahbars II and given new spires (703 = 1303—1304). They are of different shapes. The northern tower is cylindrical on a square base, the southern has a square lower half and four octagonal upper stories, each narrower than the one below it, the first of which has four semi-cylindrical cornices in the corners. The decoration in relief on the stone has analogies in the gateway of the same date (pictures in Dier, K. d. isl. Pāk., p. 58; , p. 54). Of these two towers the southern one may be considered the ancestor of the minarets of Cairo. Its square-octagonal form, usually crowned by a cylindrical storey, survives. The further development is limited to the proportions, which aim at greater elegance and slenderness, and the breaking up of the surface with niches and múcharāt cornices. Towards the end of the second Mamluk period, say under Kālīn Bey, it reached its culmination. The minaret of the mosque at his tomb was never to be surpassed in grace and wealth of ornament. A list of the most important minarets of Cairo between 1000—1356 A.D. is given by Thiersch with many illustrations.

Arabia. As in Palestine, in Arabia there was no native type of manāra and indeed Arabia never developed any sacred architecture with a character of its own. The minaret of the mosque of Wālid in Medīna may have been Syrian in form. The manāras at present standing in Medīna belong to the sixth restoration of the mosque by Kālīn Bey in 888 (1485). They are slender minarets of the Mamluk type with octagonal and cylindrical stories. The seven manāras in Mecca, the sanctuary of which was ten times restored, only show modern forms of tower, frequently influenced by the slender Turkish form (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 123). Two slender round minarets of the xiv (xvii) century still flank the ruined mosque on the island of Baalbān (cf. Dier, Jādhr. d. al. Kunr., 1925, ii. 3).  

Maghribi. The oldest manāra of the Maghribi are called, in Africa in Kānāwān, the massive three storied tower of the mosque of Sīdī Qāhrān of 1052 (764). The two upper receding stories with blind niches are of later date than the unadorned upper storey with loopholes on three sides and three windows only on the side that looks on the court. The cistern in the basement and the measurements of this tower which are exactly half those of the Pharos, suggested to Thiersch that it was an imitation of the Pharos. Another manāra, also of the ii (viii) century was the minaret of the Jāmā al-Zīthān in Tunis before its restoration in the xvi (b) century. Old pictures of it show a plain square lower storey with a narrower octagonal upper storey and the platform on top enclosed by a breast-high parapet with a pillared gallery. Of this probably only the lower part is old, while the second storey and the parapet date from the restoration of 1653 (pictures in K. d. O., ii. vu; Kühnel, Maurische Kunst, vi.). Egyptian influence, in so far as such existed, extended to Tunis. West of Tunis begins the Spanish sphere of influence, the model for which was the manāra in Cordova built by 'Abd al-Raḥmān III in 339—340 (951) and restored in 1153. A description of it is given by Idriṣī (c. 545 = 1154). According to him, the minaret of Cordova was a high quadrangular tower, square in plan, the sides of which were richly adorned with inscriptions in relief. The upper section terminated in two rows of blind arcades probably like those still to be seen in the mosque of Cordova and on other minarets of the Maghrib. On the platform was a second, probably also square, storey with four doors and upon the dome which crowned it shone three balls of gold and two of silver and lily leaves (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 127). This minaret however had a predecessor in a more modest tower built by 'Abd al-Raḥmān I, the model of which according to Marqāz (Rev. Afr., 1906) was Wald's minaret in Damascen. The second, imposing and splendid, minaret at Cordova seems to have served as a model for the manāras of Seville and Morocco. At the same time we must consider the claims of the minaret of the Kāf's Bānī Ḥamadh built in 393 (1001), the only tower that survives of the Fatimid period, which was half destroyed by the Almohads in 1152 (cf. Saladin, Bull. arch., 1904, p. 243 sqq.). It is a high square tower of hewn stone, smooth on three sides and embellished on the courtyard side only with shallow blind niches and balcony doors in three layers above. one another (pictures in Thiersch, op. cit., p. 130; Kühnel, op. cit., xvii.; Saladin, Manuel, p. 217; Marqāz, Manuel and op. cit.). This tower already shows the scheme of decoration of the Giralda and allied towers, namely the vertical combination of two windows or doors of the middle axis above one another by flanking double high shallow niches. The almost contemporaneous Giralda in Seville of about 1120 A.D., the so-called Tower of Hasan in Rabat and the ḫubityā in Mārktkūsh are alluded to it, the two latter of the end of the viii (xix) century (pictures in Thiersch, Kühlén, Marqāz, Marqāz, and Manuel). All square with narrower square top stories, of which only that of the ḫubityā still survives. These towers already show the system of decorating the surface now becoming typical in the later Maghrib manāras, the network of geometrical patterns in high relief and the beautiful windows with horseshoe and toothed arches and múcharāt niches. In the other towers of Morocco, in Fes, Tetuān, Tangier, etc., are more modern minarets. The characteristic type of Algeria is best seen in the numerous minarets in Tiemcen, mainly of the xvii—xviii
century. They continue the form, characterized above, only the geometrical decoration in relief gains the upper hand and the windows disappear; their appearance is not quite so solid. On the other hand, the huge minaret of the great mosque of Manṣūra is highly thought of in Morocco for its size as well as its decoration, because it was built by a Moroccan Marinid (701-702 = 1302). The square tower therefore dominates the whole of the west. It is only later in the xviith century that we find the octagonal tower appearing in Timbuktu, when Saladin attributes to Harun influence.

The ‘rîkû and ‘sâlik are given a picture of glazed decoration similar to that of Persia and the lands east of Persia. The oldest minâras still standing, the two maqâmats in Sâmarra of the iiiith (ixth) century, have remained the only examples of spiral towers but they are significant monuments of the early Muslim Arab variation of Babylonian architecture (the spiral as motif). These genuinely Arab buildings were followed by a reaction towards the Mediterranean style with square and octagonal towers and with the coming of the Turkish peoples and Salûqûk rule the cylindrical minaret, usually on a polygonal base. The following list is given by Hirschfeld (Arch. Relis, ii. 229): Ra’ûs, mosque extra muros, rectangular tower of the ivth (xth) or vth (xiith) century; Ra’ûs, intra muros, a round tower, Nur al-Dîn 561 (1166); Abû Hurairâ, round; Bâlî, octagonal, 589 (1193) to 615 (1218); Irrîl, round on octagonal base 586-650 (1190-1234); Sinjâr, round on polygonal base 598 (1201); Baghîdâl, Sinlân al-Ghazlî, round on a base (ivth (xth) = 1232); Mâsûlî, minaret of the great mosque, round on a cubical base; Mâsûlî, minaret of the Kasû, round on a cubical base; Mâsûlî, Manâra al-Makâsîra; Ta’dîk, round shaft on a polygonal base. In addition there is the unique octagonal minaret built of small broken stones with a covering of plaster, on the island of ‘Ain in the Euphrates of the viith (xiiith) century (Hirschfeld, op. cit., ii. 319, and PI. 137) and the bulk of the later minarets from the vith (xiiith) century onwards, which repeat this type.

P e r s i a. The oldest minâras of Iran and the countries adjoining on east and north, Afghanistan, Sâmarra and Turkmenistan seem to have been usually octagonal, as the ruins of the minâra, possibly of the iiiith (ixth) century in Zarandî, Nûd al-‘Ali, Sûdûst (now 25-30 feet, originally twice as high; cf. G. P. Tate, Selçûks, Calcutta 1910, p. 202 and Plate) shows. The models for these earliest minâras may have been the watch-towers found all over the Asiatic steppes, hence the blind window and the great diameter. Octagonal minarets still exist in Amârîn, Sûdûst (viith—viiith century); octagonal with cylindrical upper storey are the two observatory towers of Ghazna of about 410 (1019-1020) and 495 (1101-1102) (the original height was estimated at about 140 feet; the inscriptions on the two towers only say that their erection was ordered by Masûmî and Masûmî respectively, both with full titles; cf. Dieu, Chmr. Biran., p. 152 sqq.). Counterparts to these towers in two parts are the minarets in Sirward, east of Herât (c. 100 feet high) and Kariz in eastern Khorasan (c. 80 feet high), with octagonal bases and cylindrical shaft, both of the viith (xth)—viiith (xiith) centuries. Cylindrical minarets of the viith—viiith (xth—xiith) centuries still survive in Persia and the lands east of it in Sângbas, Fârâb, Kânâmâh (Sûdîjastân), Khorasûrd (Sâhrazar) of the year 505 (1111), Damghân, (2) Bastâm, Sàwà, Sên- nâ, Taba, Kûnûy Urgenj (old Khiwa), Termes on the Amû Daryâ, Bûkhasrî, Mâsûrî Kâlsû 542 (1147-1148), Kûshân, Mestoryûn (Turkoman steppes north of the Atrek, 2 towers) and ‘Ishânî (4) (cf. the list in Dieu, Pervins, Ist. Hist. in Chârûs, b. 165-169). In the Timurid period with the general flourishing of architecture the minâras are given a further last increase in their embellishment, a few examples of which are still to be seen in the Timurid ruins in Heraût. Here we still have a ruined group of nine polygonal-cylindrical minarets the soles of which are usually of marble, white marble with inscriptions in relief, the shafts to the top covered with glazed mosaics of fabulous beauty which in their delicacy recall the work of the carver in ivory (cf. Niedermayer-Dieu, Afghanistan, p. 58 sqq., and illustrations, p. 157 sqq.). To this Timurid group also belong the minâras in Samâkand mostly in ruins and the minarets of the Masjd-i Shâh in Mâshhad built by the ‘âmir Malik Shâh and the two minarets now destroyed of the Blue Mosque in Tâbrîz, built in the time of Dâhân Shâh (841-872 = 1437-1467). The last mentioned minarets belong to the group of double towers found all over Persia and Turkestân which either flank the doors or stand at the corners of the wall of a mosque or are built on the top of the doors. These double towers which become more and more common after the Salûqûk and Mongol invasions never of course attained the height of the single minarets just described and their importance lies mainly in their decoration.

A s i a M i n o r and Turkey. Among the Salûqûk and Ottomans the minaret lost the character and individuality which it revealed among most other peoples, at least in the early period. Apart from isolated exceptions like the very interesting fluted minaret at Aïdâla (pictures in Lancoronski, and Thiersch, op. cit., p. 149), the minarets are henceforth subordinated in the general architectural scheme to the main building, either placed as a pair at the gate or as a single tower built into the wall of the mosque. It is true that these arrangements are found also in Persia, which was filled with Turkish tribes, but there was constant change there, while in Asia Minor a certain style soon became predominant which culminated in the absolute uniformity of the Ottoman minarets. The early minarets of Asia Minor of the xiiith century usually have their surfaces broken up into round and smooth areas which give them a certain charm, especially when this plastic ornamentation is combined with the painting of frescoes and with relief (Laranda Masjd and Sandic Minareli, Konî, Içik Medrese, Sîrots, etc.). The Ottomans heightened the minaret which they had taken over from the Salûqûks, made it still more slender and gave it a long conical spire which has become typical. According to the importance of the mosque, it was given one tower on the front or flanked with two or even 4 or 5 minarets (the Mosque of Sulaymân Ahmad, Constantinople) and these were given one, two or three galleries.

I nd i a. In India there is only a single old minaret of importance: the Kûth Minâr (q.v. and the illustrations) in Old Delhi built by order of Aibeb Kûth al-Dîn and completed by Itutmish (diameter 45 feet and height 240 feet). The three lower stories of this, the highest and finest ma-
In the Muslim world, are built of red sandstone, the two upper, which have been restored, of white marble with layers of sandstone. The pavilion which once crowned the top fell down in 1803 during an earthquake and was put up again on the ground. The exterior is of angular and rounded flutings and ornamented with inscriptions from the Qur'an. There is no reason to doubt that the numerous mosques of the Pathan dynasties also had minarets but most of them seem to be destroyed and so far as I am aware no one has yet studied the subject. Isolated surviving manāras like the detached slender round minaret of the Lat-ki-Masjid in Hisar show however that they were usual (cf. Arch. Surv. India, Annual Report, Pt. 1, 1913–1914, Pl. I). But their occurrence in India was confined to particular areas. The mosques of Dāwnpur, Sirkej, Manda, Kulbargah and other places usually of the xviith–xvith century have no minarets. On the other hand they are characteristic of the xvith–xvith century mosques in Aḥmadābād, built in pairs flanking the doors or at the corners of the surrounding wall, as in the Mongol mosques of Persia. In shape, the towers of Aḥmadābād are quite Indian with well marked outlines, Many mouldings outside and six to ten galleries. In the Moghul empire again the smooth round or faceted minaret of Persian origin again became predominant but was hined by the pavilion placed on the top and by other alterations.

Bibliography: The fundamental monograph on the manāra is Herman Thiersch, Pheres in Antike, Islam und Occident (B. G. Teubner, Leipzig and Berlin 1909); where references are given to the detailed literature. Further general works: E. Dier, Die Kunst der islamischen Völker (Supplement to Hidhe. d. Kunstwiss. Wildpark-Postdam, 1 1915, 2 1917); Saladin, Manuel d'art musulman, Paris 1907; new ed. by G. Marçais, 1925; cf. also M. v. Berchem's article Architecture in this encyclopaedia.

For the separate countries:


MANĀT, an old Arabian goddess. Her character can only be deduced from her name, which may safely be connected as a plural (manāmat) with the Aramaic manāth, plur. manāmūth, portion, lot, Hebrew Modi, plur. Modi and also with the god of fate Modi, I. xxv. 11 (cf. lxv.). In Arabic we have corresponding to Lid, maniya, plur. maniyā, "the allotted, fate, especially of death." She was therefore a goddess of fate, especially of death. Her main sanctuary was a black stone among the Hudhaylas in Ḫudaib near Medina near a hill called Mudhhallal. She was however worshipped by many Arab tribes, primarily by the Aws and Khārajd in Ṭabarīb. In Mecca she was very popular along with the goddess al-Lat and al-ʿUzza [q.v.]; the three (according to the Qur'an) were regarded as All the daughters, and in a weak moment Muhammad declared their worship permitted (cf. Sur. liii. 19 ṣaqq). The obscure expression "Manāt, the third, the other" is probably due simply to the rhyme. According to Ibn al-Kalbi, she was the oldest deity, whose worship gave rise to that of the others, because names compounded with Manāt occur earlier than other theophoric names. Another view is found in the poem of Ibn Ḥabīb, p. 245, where the two daughters of ʿUzza" are Manāt and al-Lat. As an independent deity we find her in the Nabataean inscriptions of al-Hudār, where ṣaqq (the Aramaic plural form; cf. above) is often found among Δγλά and others. Manāt is connected in a peculiar way by some writers with the great ṣaqq [q.v.], for we are told that several tribes including the Aws and Khārajd assumed the ṣaqq at the sanctuary of Manāt and on the conclusion of the rites cut their hair there and dropped the ṣaqq [q.v.]. Wellhausen sees in this an erroneous confusion of an independent pilgrimage to Manāt with the great ṣaqq, as later writers acknowledge none but the latter; it is however possible that some such confusion may have really taken place in pagan times.

That Manāt was also a domestic deity is evident from the story in Ibn Ḥabīb, p. 350 (cf. Wākidī, ed. Wellhausen, p. 350). The destruction of the
great sanctuary in Kusaid after the capture of Mecca is attributed by some to Abu Sufyân, by others to ‘Ali, according to Wâkidji, op. cit., Ibn Sa‘îd, iii. 15, 35, to the Awwa Sa‘îd b. Zaid.

Bibliography: Yâkût, Muqaddim, iv. 652-654; Willkomm, Reise arabischen Heidentums*, p. 25-29; Ibn Halghâm, p. 55; Tabart, Annals, ed. de Goeje, i. 1649; Arabî, ed. Wustenfeld, C. S. M., i. 76, 82, 154; commentaries on Sînâlii, 19; Nûleke, in Z.D.M.G., xii. 709; Bughâtî, ed. Khreîb, lii. 161; Jausen and Savignac, Mission archéologique, i. 491 (Index); Cuscel, Dier Schikkel in der arabischen Poesie (Mergell, Texte und Forschungen, ed. by H. Fischer, 1/5). (Fr. Bohl)

MANÂZÈRED. [See MAÎZÈRED]

AL-MANÂZIL (A), pl. of al-mawâli, morn full, manâzil al-bamar, the stations of the moon. Just as for the sun the zodiacal circle is divided into 12 stations each of 30°, which it traverses in the course of a year, so the course of the moon is connected with 12 groups of stars, each of which corresponds to one day of its course, so that on an average each is an arc of 13° apart. The settings of the sun at these stations, Arabic new, pl. awmâ, are of decisive importance for the beginning and forecasting of the phenomena of the weather and the fertility or otherwise of a year which depends on them, i.e. for the peasant's calendar. He regards the testimony of the Arab poets, the reader may be referred to the verses given by al-Kawâni. M. Steinacker in particular has published very thorough investigations of the importance of the stations of the moon among the Hindus and Arabs from Arabic, Hebrew and Latin sources. The Arabic names of the stations and the constellations belonging to them are as follows:

1. al-Sharâfârân, "the two signs", also al-Abârî; the horns of the Ram (γ Ariës).
2. al-Bâjân, "the little paunch"; the paunch of the Ram (ζ Ariëts).
3. al-Turâyîyyân, "the Pleiades" ([v.]).
4. al-Dabûsâri, "the Aldebaran" ([α Tauri] with the Hydra.
5. al-Hâfâ, three small stars on the head of Orion.
6. al-Hamî, the stars al-Ziër and al-Maîmûn (γ Geminorum).
7. al-Dhârî, "the Lion's Paw"; Castor and Pollux ([α Geminorum).
8. al-Nâzîrî, "the nostril" of the Lion or fence with ass (in Cancer).
9. al-Turîf, i.e. Turîf al-Azâd, "the eye" of the Lion (ξ Cancri = Leonis).
10. al-Dhâbî, i.e. Dhâbî al-Azâd, "the forehead" of the Lion ([γ = Leonis).
11. al-Zubrî, i.e. Zubrî al-Azâd, "the mane" of the Lion ([β = Leonis).
12. al-Shurfa, "the weathercock" ([B Leonis).
13. al-Sârwa, "the barkers" or Dogs (β β Virg.)
14. al-Sinâlî, "the prominent", more accurately al-Sinâlî al-dâlî, the unarmed S. ([β = Spica; cf. E. L., iii. 450).
15. al-Shâhî, "the cover" ([δ Virgini).
16. al-Strûrî, i.e. Strûrî al-Azâd, "the placers" of the Scorpion (α Librae).
17. al-Dîlî, "the crown"; i.e. the head of the Scorpion, the three stars (δ, ε Librae).
18. al-Kâîrî, "the heart" of the Scorpion, the Antares (α Scorp.)
19. al-Shârûlî, "the tail" of sting of the Scorpion (α Scorp.).
20. al-Ne'mânî, "the ostriches"; 8 stars in Sagittarius (ε ε * Sagittarii).
21. al-Balîdâ, "the town", an area in Sag. without stars.
22. al-Sâdî al-Dhâbî, "the luck of the slayer" or sacrificers (α Caprici).
23. al-Sâdî al-Dhâbî, "the luck of the devourer" (κ Aquarii).
24. al-Sâdî al-Sâhî, "the greatest luck" (β Aquarii).
25. al-Sâdî al-Dhâbî, "the luck of the tents" (ε * η Aquarii).
26. al-Durâf al-mâwâ, "the fore socket" on the palm ([α Pegasi).
27. al-Durâf al-Dhâbî, "the hinder socket" on the palm ([γ Peg. = Androm.]

MANÎBIJ (Bâmbyke, Hierapolis, an ancient city in northern Syria, two days' journey or to farsakh N.E. of Halab, about 3 farsakhs from the Euphrates. It lay in a fertile plain, and had a double wall built by the Greeks. According to Ibn Khurdâhibhî, there was a very fine church there, built of wood (B.G.A., vi. 161 sqq.). Ps. Dionysius (ed. Chabot, p. 47, 68) mentions a church of the Virgin and another of St. Thomas in Manbijh. There were no buildings in the neighbourhood of the town (Nâsir-Khâsraw, ed. Shihâs, p. 31); Abu ‘l-Fida’ mentions the many canals, fruit- and particularly mulberry-trees there, the latter for the silkworm culture. As K. Ritter (Erzähluungen, p. 105 sqq.) showed, the name Bâmbyke for the silkworm can hardly be connected with "Bambyeke", the old name of Manbijh; on the other hand, the Levantine trade-name bembazino, bembago, common in the middle ages for raw cotton, seems to be derived from Manbijh; it is perhaps also concealed in the name of the ancient Phrygian Hierapolis, Pambuk-Kalef (as early as Michael Syrus, ed. Chabot, i. 148; Mabûb in Phrygia). The Arabs called the town made in Manbijh, manibijâmîja (Lammems, Fâtima, Rome 1912, p. 71).

Kansal dîn b. b. al-Adam gives the following account of its origin: Khâsraw [1] built it when he conquered Syria (in reality: the town in 540 A.D. ransomed itself from a threatened siege by paying tribute), built a fire-temple there and made a certain Yazdânîr of the family of Ardashîr b. Bâhak his governor. According to other authorities, Manbijh was the name of the fire-temple from which the town took its name (Ibn al-Shihâma, al-Durâf al-mâwâ, ft. Türkîh Halab, ed. Sârî, Beirut 1909, p. 227). Mabûb (Aqâpios) b. Kustânî of Manbijh says in his history of the world written
in the tenth century, at the end of the history of the patriarchs (ed. Vasilev, Patr. Orient., v. [1910], p. 664); "in the year 31 after the birth of Levi, the son of Jacob, queen Samrin built a great sanctuary for the worship of the idol Κυρ ρως, and on the banks of the Euphrates (κυρ ρως) installed 70 priests and called the town Hieropolis (Μαμύβ: Ιουν αλ-Σιήμα, p. 247? "Ιουν αλ-Σιήμα, v. 317, i. e. the City of the Priests; this was the town Mambyδ al-Attah). For Κυρ ρως κυρ ρως was read on the coins of Hieropolis this deity seems also to be depicted (Wroth, Catalogue of the Greek coins of Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria [Brit. Mus.], 1899, ii. iii.), and the Armenian Epiphanius (ed. Finch, p. 12) says: "Εραπίς consists of 3 towns: it is called Mnpēchē; in it is the idol Κυρ ρως;" with Preussen (Getting, Göt. Ana., cxvii. [1905], ii. p. 362. note 3) we should therefore also read Κυρ. The city of Mambyδ has already been acknowledged to the Assyrians (as Nappig or Nampi in Samalas, Karag-Menhul, rev. 35; Johns, Assy. Bibl., xi. ii., 82; cf. also Bamukki on the cuneiform tablet Brit. Mus. K 180, in Johns, Assy. Dirt. and Documents, No. 773; Chetn [Czech], Encycl. Bibl., s. v. Carcemith). If the name is of Semitic origin, it perhaps goes back to a Syriac word namapē "spring" (Nöldeke, Nachr. G.G.W., 1876, p. 5, note 8). The Greeks knew as the name of the town besides Hierapolis (on coins always Hierapolis) also the native form of Βαμῦβ (rarely Βαμῦβ): Βαμῦβ. (Bird., x. [1915], p. 197, col. v., l. 100); in the common proper name Βαμυβλογē etc., Nabataean Mambugha, the name of the town is concealed (for references see Pansy-Wissowa, Relig., suppl. vol., iv, p. 733). The town which at first was included in Kysrhene and afterwards was made, probably by Constantius, the capital of the Syrian Euphrates, played an important part in ancient times as the centre of the worship of Attargia. Bardaia was brought upon him by a heathen priest Anubdar and his son Kuduz. After the triumph of Christianity, the pagan cult was supplanted by the worship of holy relics, which also brought numbers of the faithful to Bambugo (Procopius of Gaza, Panegyr., ch. 18, in Migne, Patr. Gr., laxxxvii., iii., col. 2817). From the third century onwards the town is frequently mentioned as the place for the concentration of troops for campaigns against the east or for the defence of Syria. In the Byzantine period it was a great centre of the Monophysites, according to whose tradition Justinian married Theodora in Hierapolis; she is said to have belonged to the neighbourhood of the town (Michael Syrus, ii. 189). After the end of the Byzantine period, it was for a considerable period a stronghold of the Mononites (Michael Syrus, ii. 412, 517).

In the year 16 A.B. Abū Baida went to Ḥalab al-Sadīr and sent Ḥna al-Gūmīn to on Mambyδ. The inhabitants capitulated under the same conditions as the people of Antioch; when Abū Baida reached the town, the agreement was ratified (al-Baladkuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 1561, al-Yaṣīrī, ed. Hosea, 161; Ibn al-Shinba, ed. Bahrī, p. 228; Husain, Annal. d'un Caire, iii. p. 709, § 284, p. 797, § 390, p. 816, § 33). Mambyδ seems to have enjoyed a certain degree of independence down to the time of Yāṣīr I; the inhabitants of the town, for example, asked Umur for permission to trade within the caliphate (Lammens, M. F. O. Bu., vi. 431, note 1). The vicinity of the town was settled by Yamani tribes (Michael Syrus, iii. 47), notably the Basil Taghilī (Lammens, op. cit., p. 445, note 1). Ḥalab, when he created the Ḧāzim of Ḥinārīn threw Mambyδ into this military province (al-Baladkuri, p. 1831; Lammens, p. 437 sqq.). Hārūn al-Aschārī separated it again, made it the capital of the frontier district of the 'Awīs (q.v.) in 786 and appointed 'Abī al-Malik b. Ṣalīh b. Ḥārūn, "All as wall there in 973, to whom the town owed many buildings (al-Baladkuri, loc. cit.). In 131 (748) it was severely damaged by an earthquake, in which the church of the Jacobites collapsed during mass and buried many of the worshippers in its ruins (Ps. Dioneios, transl. Chabit, p. 47; Michael Syrus, ii. 510; Beal, Abū d. K. d. Mail, vi. 518, 1884, p. 126). The brother of the caliph Maṣ'ūs al-Asbās, who had taken part in the mutiny led by the general Uqdāf b. Anbaha, was tortured to death by Ḥaṣān b. Kāwūs, the Abbās of Uqūš, at Mambyδ in 223 (838) (Tabari, iii. 1265; Ibn al-Ṭabari, ed. Tornberg, vi. 334; Michael Syrus, iii. 101; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalf., ii. 320). The conquest of Syria by Ahmad b. Ṭūlūn in 264 (875-878) brought Mambyδ also under Egyptian suzerainty (Ibn al-Shinba, p. 228). In the account of the Māreq of Edessa, said to have been compiled by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogentos, a miracle is mentioned that took place in the time of Christ at the κόστος Ιαυροῦ, τοῦ Μαμπόγκη, τοῦ τώτου Μαμπόγκη (De imag. Edess., in Migne, Patr. Gr., lxixii., col. 433; better in von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, in Texte u. Unters. z. christl. Lit., xv., 518). Abgar's envoy, who was spending the night in a brickwork near Mambyδ on his way back from Jerusalem hid there among the bricks the sacred handkerchief with the portrait of Christ. Terrified by the bright light like that of fire, the heathen inhabitants of the neighbourhood hurried next morning to the brickworks and found there a brick with a miraculouis copy of the portrait, which they carefully preserved in their city. The ʿAmār Jamʿu Saʿīd al-Dawla, soon after the capture of Mambyδ in 947, made his cousin, the poet Abū Firās, governor of Mambyδ (Drovška, Abū Firās, p. 75). When the Domuskos Nicephorus Phocas invaded Syria in 962, Abū Firās, who happened to be hunting outside the town, was taken prisoner by the strategos Būdrus (Theodoros, Petros?), a nephew of the emperor, and taken first to Kharshana and then to Constantinople (Drovška, p. 98 sq.; Weil, iii. 17) where he wrote poems full of longing for Mambyδ and for his mother there (Drovška, p. 300, 302, 327, 397). In 962 when emperor, Nicephorus encamped near the sacred brick (al-Khirma, i.e. ιερογλύφων) but did them no other injury (Yahyā al-Antaki, Cod. mar. Bibl. Nat., rev. v. ser. Ar. No. 131 A, fol. 96v; the translation by Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 213, has been corrected by Rosen, Zasch. Imp. Acad. Natur., xliii., 1883, p. 97-98, note d). The Byzantine writers who apparently did not know that Μαμπόγκη was the Arabic name of Hierapolis and sought to locate it in Palestine or near Hims, wrongly make Nicephorus take Mambyδ in 968 and carry off the brick and some hairs from the head of John the Baptist (which was only done...
by his successor) (Leo Diaconus, Bonn, iv. 10, p. 71; John Skylitzes, ii. 364; Zonaras, xvi. 25, p. 505; Glykas, Bonn, p. 569 etc.) but this statement cannot be reconciled either with the route given for his campaign of 968 (cf. v. Dobschütz, op. cit., p. 172, note 1; Schümberger, Nicoph. Phocas, p. 704—706, note 5), nor with the bounds of his conquests given by Kamāl al-Dīn (in Freytag, 7. P. M. G., xi. 232). It was his successor John Tzimiscas, who first tried by his energies to carry on the work of Manbīj in 974, and found there Christ's sandals and some still bloody hairs of John the Baptist, which he brought as relics to Byzantium (Leo Diaconus, x. 4, p. 165).

In the year 1025 the Mirdasid Silīḫ took the town (J. J. Müller, Historia Meridieorum ex Halkænuseos Cemaliddinii annalibus exerpta, Bonn 1819; Rosen, op. cit., p. 68). The breach of the treaty between Māhmd and 'Atīya (cf. Ḥalāb, ii. p. 345) Manbīj passed in 456—457 to 'Atīya (Müller, op. cit., p. 56 sq.). In 472 (1079—1080) Tādji al-Dawla Tutanq occupied the town (Müller, p. 88). The emperor Romanus IV Diogenes took it on his Syrian campaign in 1068 and strengthened the defences of the citadel (J. J. Müller, Bonn, ii. 673, 675, 685; Michael Attalates, Bonn, p. 108 sq.; 111, 116; Zonaras, xvi. ii. 26, Bonn, iii. 691; Michael Syrak, iii. 168; Matthäus of Ûfham, transl. Dulauner, p. 162; Weil, iii. 112; Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Müller, op. cit., p. 63 sq. where it wrongly stated that Manbīj remained Greek for 70 years). It was not till 479 (1086) that Malikshāh deprived the Greeks of Manbīj and al-Rūbah, and gave the rule over Halab, Hamā, Manbīj and al-Lādhikīya to Al-Suṣhūr (Ibn al-Ṭair, x. 98; Weil, iii. 131).

In 504 (1110—1111) the Franks conquered Manbīj, occupied and plundered the town and advanced as far as Balis which they burned (Röhrich, Gesch. d. Krgr. Jerusalem, p. 88; Weil, iii. 193; according to Michael Syrak, iii. 215, probably wrongly, in the year 502). But they lost Manbīj again in the same year (504) (Aбу 'l-Fīda', Annal. Moslem., ed. Reiske, iii. 370). Baldwin II in 513 (1119) invaded the lands east of Halab as far as Manbīj and al-Nakra, and Joscelin, in the following year, was on the pretext that one of his followers had been imprisoned in Manbīj and that no compensation had been given to him for it, plundered the lands of al-Nakra and al-Abas (Recueil hist. eccl., iii. 623, 625). When Nūr al-Dawla Balag enticed the amir of Manbīj, Ḥasan al-Baṣalbakki, within his power and then imprisoned him in Pūlib, Ḥasan's brother 'Īsā seized the citadel of Manbīj, which Balag then attacked with siege artillery (1242). 'Īsā then appealed for help to Joscelin and had him proclaimed lord of Manbīj, but Joscelin suffered a severe defeat before the walls of the town. On the next day, however, Balag was mortally wounded by an arrow shot by an unknown hand (according to Kamāl al-Dīn, by 'Īsā himself; according to Matthäus of Ûfham, by a sun-worshipper). In 518 (1124) Ḥasan was liberated and returned to Manbīj (Ibn al-Ṭair, x. 436; Michael Syrak, iii. 211; Matthäus of Ûfham, transl. Dulauner, p. 311 sq.; Röhrich, op. cit., p. 161 sq.). The Crusaders never again took the town after the brief occupation in 504. Although we know of Frankish archbishops of the town (cf. William of Tyre, xii. ii. 14, xv. 14, xvii. 17) one of whom, Frano, took part in the Council of An-
Saladin’s third son Malik al-Zahir (Chast in 589 (1193) was allotted Ḥarim, Tell Ḥasār, Manbij, A’zaz and other fortresses (Reussel, 1176; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Terr., p. 658). In 591 (1195) the latter set out from Kinnasrin to Kurš Ḥasār in order to besiege Manbij which then belonged to al-Malik al-Manṣūr of Hamd but on receiving disquieting news hastened to Damascus (R. O. L., iv. 209). Saff al-Din ʿUṯūr al-Zahirī died a division of the army from Ḥamā, which attacked Manbij in 595 (1199), took many prisoners and brought them to Malik al-Zahir, who however released them again (R. O. L., iv. 218). The lord of Ḥamā in 596 (1200), at the request of Malik al-ʿAdil, gave Isḥāq al-Din Ibrahim al-Muqaddas the towns of Manbij, Fāmiya and Kafr Ṭārā in compensation for Fāmiya (Well, iii. 434, note 4). When the latter died in Fāmiya, Manbij was to go to his brother Shams al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Malik whom however Malik al-Zahir in 597 deprived of his rule over Manbij and Kālʾat Naḵẖān and carried off a prisoner with him; he offered the two towns to al-Malik al-Manṣūr of Hamā, who once previously in 588 (1192–1193) had refused Manbij (Reussel, v. 267, note 3), if he would assist him against Malik al-ʿAdil, which however he declined to do (Röhrich, ap. cit., p. 685). Al-Zahir thereupon destroyed the citadel of Manbij lest it should fall into an enemy’s hands and gave the town, now deprived of its defences, in 597 (1201) to al-Ḥaddājīs as a fief (R. O. L., iv. 222) and in the following year to Imād al-Dīn b. Saḥil al-Dīn al-ʿAbbās b. Aḥmad al-Maṣṭūḥ (Abu l-Fidaʿ, Uṣūl, ii. 193). But very soon afterwards, al-Zahir had again to send the amir of Ḥalab, Muḥammad b. Ḥakim al-Dīn, to the siege of Manbij; the latter however withdrew on the approach of Malik al-ʿPaṭ sims, son of Malik al-ʿAdil. Malik al-ʿPaṭ sims entered Manbij, rebuilt the citadel and fortified it. He then returned to his father al-ʿAdil in Nīraba, but while the Ḥalab troops avoided an encounter (R. O. L., iv. 223). Soon afterwards the Ḥalab army again marched on Manbij but was recalled by Malik al-Zahir, who was besieging Damascus. A little later, al-Zahir himself set out against Manbij to avenge himself on the inhabitants who had taken the side of the al-ʿPaṭ sims; but he was appeased by his amirs, pardoned the town which submitted to him and gave it as a fief in 598 (1202) to Ibn al-Maṣṭūḥ (R. O. L., iv. 224). The Sālājids, Kaḵānīs in 615 (1218–1219) went to Manbij, which opened its gates to him, placed one of his officers, Shīrīn al-Dīn al-Manbijī, as governor there and repaired the walls of the town; but when al-Malik al-ʿAlīsīs left, the town again and suffered heavy losses in his retreat (Reussel, v. 268; Uṣūl, i. 146; Kašiṣ al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 37; Abu l-Fidaʿ, Ann. Mus, iv. 266). When the Sulṭān of Ḥalab, al-Malik al-Nāṣir, concluded an alliance with the Sulṭān of Rūm for their mutual defence against the raids of the Turkomans, he sent the ṣāḥīb of Manbij, Abū al-Dīn, as a confidential envoy to him (R. O. L., v. 94). Al-Malik al-Maṣṭūḥ of Ḥarān fled in 635 (1237–1238) before the Khwārizmīs to Manbij to seek protection with his aunt (R. O. L., v. 103). When the Khwārizmīs three years later invaded Syria, a Ḥalab army met them but suffered an annihilating defeat on the Nahr al-Ḏahab (R. O. L., vi. 3). Thereupon the Khwārizmīs advanced on Manbij; the inhabitants of which retired behind its walls and barricaded the place where the walls were no longer standing. The town was stormed on the 21st Rabīʿ II 638; numerous inhabitants put to death, the houses destroyed and rich booty taken; the enemy even entered the mosque where many women had taken refuge and violated them (R. O. L., vi. 6). After the Khwārizmīs had been driven back, al-Malik al-Manṣūr re-entered Manbij (R. O. L., vi. 17). In the treaty between Sulṭān Kaḵānī and Leo of Armenia in the 1st Rabīʿ II 684 (June 6, 1285), Manbij is mentioned among the Egyptian towns (Makrizī, ed. Quatremère, Hist. des Sultans d’Mamūs, i, 168; transl., p. 205).

According to Ibn al-Shihāna (Barīʿī, p. 228), Manbij which previously, excluding its 8 suburbs, had paid annually 510,000 dirhams to the Sulṭān’s Diwān, was destroyed by the Tatars (who invaded Syria several times between the end of 699 (1299) and 702 (1302)); perhaps there is here a confusion with the Khwārizmīs. According to Abu l-Fidaʿ, the fortifications and the town were for the most part in ruins in his time; Kaḵān al-Zahirī does not mention it at all.

After the Russo-Türkisch War (1879) Circassians were settled in Manbij; since that date the few remains of antiquity noticed by earlier travellers have almost completely disappeared.

The ruins of Bahmiq, as the name of the place is now pronounced by the natives with a marked echo of the ancient Bambeye (Eating in M. Hartmann, Zeit. d. Gesch. f. Erdk., Berlin, xxix. 325; Littmann, Amer. Arch. Exped. to Syria, iii. 171, note 3), have been visited by Mannrell (1699), Poocke (1737), Drummond (1747), Sachau (1879), Cumont (1907) and Hogarth (1908). The old town walls, surrounded by a broad ditch which were several times restored in the middle ages, still survive almost in their entirety (Ainsworth, A personal narrative of the Expedition, i. 1888, p. 235).

MANHIDJ — MAND

The town of *Kāmūlūb*, the site of which is important to fix the limit of the habitations of the Mand, is sometimes located in Hind (Iṣṭāqīrī, p. 176), sometimes between Sind and Hind (Idrisī). The form of the name is uncertain (Fāmān, Mānḥal, Mānḥal, Anbal). Elliott, l. 365, identified it with Anahawārī; cf. al-Ibrī, p. 100. This last town (Anahiwāra, Nuhrwāra, founded in 746 a. d.) is identical with the modern Pīsim (on the Sarawat in northern Baroda; cf. imp. Gauhati of India, 1908, vol. xx.; Cunningham, op. cit., p. 290, places *Mānḥal* at Umarī). In all cases Kāmūlūb must mark the limit of the pastureages of the Mand to the S. E. of al-Muqrā (Hādārādārī), on the Indus; cf. Elliott, l. 370.

Among the Muslims sources a special place is occupied by the Mudjimil al-Tawdarī, written in Persian in 520 (1126). This work gives extracts from a book which was composed first in an Indian language, then translated into Arabic by Abu Sāliḥ b. Shīb ḫīb b. Dālī (in 417 = 1028) and finally translated from Arabic into Persian by Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Halabī, librarian in Tughrā. This source which is a very accurate resume of the Miḥābārat, begins with a chapter on the Mand and the Zuğt, two peoples of the land of Sind, descendants of Chām (Hūm), son of Noah. The Mand had conquered the Zuğt, who withdrew to the banks of the river Pas (or Bahr) and from there attacked the Mand by water. Finally tired of fighting, the two peoples agreed to approach king Dāhshāh b. Dālīrān (Duryodhana, son of Dhṛtarāṣṭra) to ask him to appoint a king over them. Dāhshāh sent them his sister Dūṣāl (Duqqāl), married to Bālindī (Jayadratha) who became a powerful king. At the request of Dūṣāl, Dāhshāh sent 50,000 Brahmans to people Sind. One part of the country was given to the Zuğt, who were given a ruler Lūfīrī (Yudhīhārī, eldest son of Dhṛtarāṣṭra). The Mand (Mudīyān) also were given a special office of Keepman, Fragments arabici et persiani relatifs à l'Inde, 1845, p. 2—3, 25—27.

Here we have an attempt to connect the history of the Mand and Zuğt with Indian tradition by quoting a passage in the Miḥābārat which says that Duqqāl was given in marriage to Jayadratha, "king of the lands watered by the Indus," (transl. Fauche, Paris 1863, i. 290, where 2742). Indian tradition however contains nothing definite of value about the Mand. In the Rāṣ-ha-Sambha, transl. Kern, J. R. A. S., 1871, p. 81—86 which is one of the sources for the enumeration of the peoples of India in al-Biruni (ed. Sachau, p. 150—157, transl. ii. 290—303), we find a Māndārāya people (located in the centre, north or northwest of India). The derivation of the Arabic Mand from some such name may be suspected (cf. the name of the
The old name of the river is usually transcribed in Arabic characters Sakkān (Iṣṭakhîrī, p. 120; Ibn Hawākin, p. 191; Ibrāhīm, tr. Jaubert, l. 401) but the orthography varies: Thākān, Fārān-nām, G. M. S., p. 152; Nushāt al-Kullā, p. 154; Zakān or Zakkān, Nushāt al-Kullā, p. 217; Sītāgān, Zābhīn-numa, p. 247; cf. also Sāḥikān in Haan Fāṣıl.

The identification of the Sakkān with the Eravāzs mentioned in the Periplo of Nearcchia (Arrian, Indica, xxviii. 8) is generally recognized. The identity of Sittakan with the Sittogasan (Sittoges) mentioned by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 26 is also usually admitted (Weinbach, 1927), but Herzfeld (1907) relying on the existence of another river, the Shādhkān (= Sittogasan?), has suggested doubts about the identification of the Sittakan with the Sittogasan. Now, according to Iṣṭakhîrī, p. 119, the Shādhkān flows into the Persian Gulf at Drah al-Dastakān (north of Būghtir). This Shādhkān must be identified with the river Shācxxīr. The Fārān-nām, ed. La Strangé, p. 163, mentions Rūbdāl-i Sītāgān (the banks of the Fārān-nām) as a station on the road from Shīla to Tawwaj. From this fact and especially from the name, Sītāgān seems to be connected with the left bank tributary of the Shācxxīr. Pliny, who follows Oesigerus, adds that by the Sittogasan one reaches Baṣaragedes in 7 days (qua Pastragades septima die navigatur). Whatever be the identity of the Sittogasan, the exaggeration in this statement is evident (especially in the direction of the sea to Pastragades) and the waters of Baṣaragedes (Mugād-i Murgāh) do not flow into the Persian Gulf. But there is nothing to prove the absolute impossibility of using the Sakkān as a subsidiary means of transport in the season of floods (the winter). According to Arrian, Nearcchia found at the mouth of the Sittakan large quantities of corn which Alexander had brought there for the army. Iṣṭakhîrī, p. 99 places the Sakkān among the rivers of Fārs which are navigable almost (al-zankāt al-khāli allāt tākhinē al-awfīli 1650 adhriyat fī-kā).

Another identity is the phonetical identity of the name Sittakan (Sittogasan?) and Sakkān. According to C. F. Andreas, Eravāzs is a nominative restored from a supposed genitive *Eravēzs (Sītākān); Sittogasan is a mistake for Sittogasan; but the peculiarity of the Arabic script could explain the change of Sittākān to Sakkān. Here we may add that Haan Fāṣıl gives one of the stretches of the river the strangely written form Sībākān (=<Sīthākān). Iṣṭakhîrī however derives the name of the river from that of the village of Sakk (Nushāt al-Kullā: Zakkān) in the district of Kasu considerably below the Shādhkān stretch of the river. To sum up the identification of the Sittakan with the Sittogasan does not seem sufficiently established.

The course of the river. The Sakkān (Mand) describes a great curve. At first it runs in the direction N.W.-S.E., to the northern base of the Kuh-i Marza-yi Shīkāf, which separates it from the valley of the river Shācxxīr. It follows this direction (c. 100 miles) to the end of Amān-gird mountains around which it makes a bend and turns south (70 miles). It then meets the parallel ranges which run along the Persian Gulf and continues its winding course to the sea in a westerly direction (c. 160 miles).

The Sakkān (Mand) and its tributaries drain and irrigate a considerable area. Iṣṭakhîrī says that
its waters contribute the largest share to the fertility of Farrā (akbar-i ‘Imārin). The sources of the river (Kān-i Zand, Chiluj-i Shahr and Sargh-rag) rise in the mountains of Kūh-i Nūr and Kūh-i Marrayj-Shikhta in the N.W. and W. of Shiraz. These streams unite before Kān-i Zinnān in the district of Mājār in the great Shahr-i Kāzirūn-Bāšīr. Iṣṭaḵtr, p. 120, places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Shīkhbār (7) in the district of Kuwaydīn (9). In the same author, p. 130, Kān-i Ḍazand in the Sakkān corresponds to the modern Khan-i Zinnān. The Farrānāma (and the Nuzhat al-Kulāb) places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Čāriyā (7). Under the Turkish name of Kārahānī, i.e. "the river of the dun," the combined streams flow through the districts of Mājār (=Kūh-i Marrayj-Shikhta), Siyāh (Iṣṭaḵtr, p. 120: Siyā), and Kāzirūn. In this last district, Rivadanezya, iii. 51, going from Shīrkūh to Fīrūzābād crossed the river by a "substantial bridge." It is in the district of Kāzirūn that Ḥasan Fas’ī gives the river the name of Șājičān. In Kāzirūn (Hasan Fas’ī) there used to be the barrage of Band-i Rawān, where a subterranean channel (jūmāt) part of the water was led into reservoirs (fīrūz) and then to the fields. In the bulūk of Șāji (Iṣṭaḵtr, p. 105: Șāji), which must be distinguished from the district of the same name in the kūra of Iṣṭaḵtr, the river turns south. AUCHER-ELROY, who crossed the river on the road (from Fīrūzābād to Djarūn (Djūrām) calls it "Tangui Tschaka" (= Tang-i Șājiḵār) and speaks of its "beautiful valley," Rivadanezya continuing his journey by Fīrūzābād to Djarūn crossed the river by a ford between the villages of Tawān and Assun-Dochehū (Asmīngūr). He also admires the pleasant and flourishing aspect of Șāji. Below the latter, the river enters the bulūk of Siyākān where, near the village of Sarghān, it receives on its left bank, the branchhi (šahr) river of Duhrām, and then flows through the ravine of Kāzirūn, and waters the bulūk of Șī-aw Kāzirūn. Abbott coming from Fassā crossed the river by a ford between Șī-aw-Bāšīr and Līfārūjān (cf. the name of the river of Kūr (in Farrā), Lìfārūjān, Iṣṭaḵtr, p. 113), where it was 100 yards wide and the water rose up to the horse’s belly. Farther down below the ford, Stack, going from Șīrok to Kāzirūn crossed the river, here 60 yards broad, by the bridge of Ṭarūs, built in a zig-zag and in two stories ("the queerest structure in the way of a bridge"). Near the village of Ni[h-śābīr, the river enters the bulūk of Aftār. After having wound round the fort of Kān-i Șājiḵār the river receives (near the place called Cam-i Kakkāh) the name of Bāz and then irrigates the bulūk of Khund (cf. Ibn Baṭṭūṭā, ii. 246: Khund-bāl = Khund-i Bal). In the district of Djarūn, the bulūk of Qalla-dār the river has two tributaries: near the village of Gahūr, the Dīr al-Muṣān, and two farsakh lower, that of Duhrām. The Dīr al-Muṣān comes from the left (east) side of the bulūk of Aftār. The Duhrām much more important comes from the right side after watering the historic district of Fīrūzābād (the ancient Gūr, capital of Ardashīr-Khurra); cf. the details in Le Strange, p. 256. Iṣṭaḵtr, p. 121 makes this tributary come from Djarūn (of Siyāh) and water first Khaniqāhī and then Gūr (in place of the name of the river Tema). Iṣṭaḵtr, p. 99, 121, one should probably read Būzāz; cf. of the Farrānāma, p. 151.

Nuzhat al-Kulāb, p. 117-118: Ḥakim Būzāz was the sage who dried up the Lake of Gūr.

After Djarūn, the river enters the district of Sanā’-wa-Shumā of the bulūk of Duhrām, and near the village of Bāghān receives on the right bank the river Čānkā which comes from the district of Taṣībū Dāštī. Finally near the village of Dūmālū the river enters the coast district of Māductān and receives the name of Mādūn. It flows into the sea near the village of Ziyārāt, halfway between the old harbours of Nadḵūn (to the north) and Siyā (to the south).

Māuditān. The district forms part of the bulūk of Duhrām (which is to be distinguished from Dāštī-Duhrām to the north of Duhrām up to Būshīh). Duhrām (35' × 18 farsakh) is composed of 4 districts: 1. Bādūtān, the part of the coast which is in the part of Dairī. 2. Māduitān on the coast to the north of Bādūtān and the two banks of the river Mādūn. 3. Sanā’ and Shumā on the river above Māduitān. 4. Taṣībū-Duhrām, a very narrow valley (11' × 1/2 farsakh), watered by the Čānkā and separating Sanā’ and Shumā from the bulūk Arba’ (on the lower course of the river of Fīrūzābād).

The whole of the bulūk belongs to the torrid zone (garmāsht) of Farrā. Māduitān (12' × 5 farsakh) includes lands so flat that the current of the river is imperceptible and the water cannot be used for irrigation. Agriculture (wheat, barley, palm-trees) is dependent on the winter floods. The district has 49 villages. The capital of the district and of the bulūk is Kākī. It used to be a few small families in Māduitān: the Shakhījān and the Ḥādji-Julūm. During the disturbances under Afghān rule (1722-1729) the Ḥādji-Ra’s Djamāl exterminated the Shakhījān and founded a little dynasty of hereditary governors who were able to annex the district of Bādūtān through matrimonial alliances. One of his descendants, Muḥammad Kān (d. at Būshīr in 1299 = 1881), was noted as a poet under the pen-name of Duhrām. Ḥasan Fas’ī explains the name Māduitān by a popular etymology: the place where the water flows slowly (waṣṣāmūda). Names in -ṣān are common in Farrā (Lāristān, Bādūtān) but even if such a formation was possible in a river-name, the element Mādūn would still be a puzzle. It is curious that Ḥasan Fas’ī sometimes writes it Mādūm (read Mādūm) and sometimes Mund (read Mādūm). It might be suggested as a pure hypothesis that there is a connection with the people Mān (cf. Man), of which there might have been a colony in Māduitān.

Bibliography: Weissbach, Šīkāh-i, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopædie 2, 2nd. Ser., vol. v, p. 1927, p. 377; Iṣṭaḵtr, p. 120; Ibn Ḥawālī, p. 191; Ibn Bābīl, Farrānāma, G.M.S., p. 156; Nuzhat al-Kulāb, G.M.S., p. 134; Ḥādji-Ra’s, Shīkhzāda, Zeidūn-nawm, p. 247; Ḥasan Fas’ī, Farrānāma-yi Nūṭārī, Thūrān 1314, ii. 210, 328-329; the author of this excellent work published separately a map of Farrā which is now very rare. AUCHER-ELROY, Relations, Paris 1854, p. 520; Keith Abbott, Notes on a Journey eastwards from Shirāz, J.R.G.S., 1857, p. 149-184; Hausknecht, Reise im Orient, map NO. iv: Centrale und südliche Perlen; Rivadanezya, Viage al interior de la Persia, Madrid 1580 in pi. 110; Stack, Six months, London 1882, chap. xvi, p. 111; E. C. Rox, Notes on the river
MANDINO, a people of the Western Sudan whose country of origin was on the Upper Niger stretching from Bamako to Seguiri inclusive. This region includes the gold-bearing district of Bource, Bute, or Bito as well as the provinces of Lower Faleme and of Bambuk which also produce gold. At the present time the Mandingoes have spread into the mountainous country in which the two branches of the Senegal arise; they occupy Sangaran, Gangaran, Bambuk, and the valley of the Gambia to the South while to the North they extend as far as the Western Sahara. In the 18th century, they colonised a part of the modern Mauretania and, according to the Arab authors of that period, who mention them under the name of Gangara (sing. Gangar) or Wangara a word which seems to be a corruption of the name of their country of origin: Gangara, Gwangara or Gangaran — they were to be met with in Holli. In our time the first of these names has been kept by the Moors and the Sarakole, the second by the Songhoy, the Pul of Massina and the Hausa.

The country of these natives is called according to the different dialects: Manding, Mandi, Mani, Mandeng, Maneng, Mande, Mans. The inhabitants are called by the names of Mandinka, Maninka, Maninga, Mansinka, Maninka or Manenga in the dialects of the Centre and of the East and Mandinko or Mandingo, in those of the North, South and West. This last form in use in the British possessions of Gambie and Sierra Leone has been adopted by the English while the French keep the form Manding or Mandingue.

The name of the country corrupted by the Pul has become in the language of these natives Mali, Malla, Malu, Melli, and that of the inhabitants has become Mallink or Maline. This last word has now come to stand for the South-Western portion of this people, or for their dialect.

Ethnography. The Mandingo group constitutes a well-marked ethnological group, but it does not form an organised people under one rule. Three chief divisions can be distinguished, and these can again be subdivided into many sections. They are the Malinke, the Bambara, or Banamba, and the Diula or Gula.

A Sudanese historian of the 18th century, Malikomed Kotti, who wrote the Turath-ul-Fasih in Arabic, distinguished in his time between the Malinke and the Wangara, regarding the former as warriors and the latter as merchants and traders. The Malinke are the least advanced of the Mandingoes from the social point of view, many of them remaining faithful to the matrilineal system and are still cultivators of the soil, hunters and gold-diggers.

An attempt has been made to derive their name from that of the hippopotamus: mati or mar, and thus "malinka" would signify the "people of the hippopotamus." This explanation is erroneous, the suffix "ka" signifying the nationality, can only be joined to the name of a country or of a tribe and never to that of an animal. It is possible however, that the name of the country which was the cradle of their race, could come from ma, mother, and dieg or dieg, child; this word then would signify "child of the mother," in allusion to the descent by the female line which is customary amongst them.

The Bambara inhabit the valleys of the Niger and of the Bani as far as Lake Debo, they are numerous in the Sahel. They are more advanced agriculturists than the Malinke and they recognize descent by the male line. An attempt has been wrongly made to derive their name from that of the crocodile: bama or bama. Some authors, on the other hand, have held that their name signifies "refusal to obey a master" (bana: refusal, ma: master, na: towards). This explanation, although it could be accepted linguistically, is not, according to M. Delafosse, to be rejected. He prefers that of "renunciation of the mother" (bana: refusal or renunciation, ba: mother, na: or na: to). The Dilu or Giula inhabiting some fairly important centres are chiefly merchants and traders. They are met with in small colonies, settled amongst the indigenous peoples to the East of Bani as far as the Upper Volta and the Gold Coast. Having been converted at an early date to Mahomedanism, they have remained fervent Muslims and there are amongst them quite a large number of learned men.

Their name is said to signify "from the foundation, from the stock" (diu). According to their own account, it was given to them because their ancestors belonged to families of noble birth.

At the basis of Mandingo society is an extended family (goba or gwa) comprising all the living descendants of an ancestor, sufficiently near in place and in time, for all the ties of relationship not to have been forgotten. In general this extended family covers four generations: the patriarch, his brothers and cousins, their children, the children and grand-children of the latter, and an equal number of generations of slaves. Persons of the same generation placed on the same level are called by the same name: father, brother, son, without distinguishing the fathers from the uncles, the brothers from the cousins, the sons from the nephews, all are collectively sharers in the family property, which they have helped to acquire and to augment by their labours. This family property consists of crops, of animals, arms, surplus utensils and clothing, as well as treasure in gold, silver or cowries gathered together by the founder of the family. It is administered by the patriarch, who cannot dispose of it without the consent of the majority of the other members. Each of those, man or woman, possesses in addition a private store of which he has the free use.

The chief exercises a political, domestic and religious authority. In this capacity he is charged with making sacrifices and offerings to their ancestors and to the patron deities of the family. A number of families observing the same religious prohibitions and bearing the same name (diu) form a clan; the members, who form a clan are of the same origin, but so far removed by birth
that it is impossible to trace their descent back to a common origin.

The chief Mandingo clans are those of Keyta, Kante, Tanore, the Deunbele, the Kanate, the Kalunahli, the Kuruma, the Diura, the Samake, the Mareko, the Kamara, the Bakayoko etc. None of them is either organised or under a single ruler.

There exists between persons of different clans a particular tie called yuobayu, without doubt the remains of an ancient phraternity which obliges them to assist one another and to exchange presents on certain occasions; the same persons can also quarrel among themselves or fight with one another without involving any serious consequences.

The organisation which is lacking in the clan and in the tribe shows itself on the contrary in each inhabited centre in the form of the hierarchical brotherhoods, which combine all the young people and the men of the same age who have together submitted to circumcision and to the tests of successive initiation. The first is that of men, grouping together the boys from the ages of 7 to 14 years, then there come the so-called secret societies, such as those of the houm or of the mame which consist of politico-religious groups within the village.

The village or dieng is the administrative unit, the union of a number of villages and the lands which surround it forming a district or kafé; a number of districts constitute a province or a kingdom, diamana, at the head of which there was in former times the Mansa or Massa. The latter was surrounded by different ministers and assisted by a treasurer.

Although Muhammadanism has long penetrated amongst the noble families of the Mandingo, the greater portion of the population has remained faithful to the worship of natural forces and of protecting deities, dungen la siré, yene and belli. The great religious festivals are the agrarian feasts and the most important correspond to the periods of sowing and harvest.

The Language. The Mandingo properly speaking are in number about 2,500,000 of whom 77,000 are in Senegal; 1,000,000 in French Sudan; 200,000 in the Upper Volta; 2,500 in Nigeria; 250,000 on the Ivory Coast; 55,000 in French Guinea; more than 680,000 live in Gambia, Sierra Leone, Portuguese Guinea and the Republic of Liberia. In addition to these natives, whose mother tongue is Mandingo, more than 2,000,000 other people speak this idiom; for this reason it is often spoken of as a language that is still spreading.

The Mandingo belongs to the African Negro language and more especially to the group which M. Delafosse calls Niger-Senegalaise; D. Westermann: Mandingo; and A. Drexel: Nko-Nice; it is closely alliled to Susu. Foreign Idioms seem to have had little influence, although it has borrowed certain abstract and religious terms from the Arabic; from Phoenician or Punic it has borrowed expressions relative to horsemanship and cotton; from Berber about a dozen words, and finally during the space of the last fifty years it has further borrowed from several European languages.

The roots are monosyllabic or disyllabic and many of them can be traced to an ancient African Negro origin. For example: fàkà, the action of killing or being dead, seems to come from a root fà or fàg; cf. in Susa šàlù; Hausa: fàwà; Mossi: fàwà; Fang: wà; Ful: wà (de); Musgu: fàdà; Congo: faw; Swahili: fà and wà; Ancient Egyptian: fà. The nominal class does not exist in this language.

Mandingo uses derivative suffixes which are used to form distinct substantives used as substantives only; for example: kà, kà, or nég, the instrumental suffix: tege, to cut; tege-à, the instrument for cutting, axe. It employs also adjectival suffixes; for example: ma or ma indicating the possession of the thing mentioned: gyì, water; gyì-à, "all of water"; là indicating on the contrary the lack of the thing expressed: gyì n-là, "without water".

Certain suffixes, joined to a simple or derived root, indicate the possession of a quality or of a state; for example: yo-surà, "short, little"; surù, "shortness" and also "to shorten or to approach". Suffixes also exist, indicating determination or relationship.

The Mandingo conjugation employs prefixes denoting the perfect, the aorist, the injunctive. Certain auxiliary prefixes serve to indicate time.

This language does not possess any trace of a system of syntax of agreement; the relations between one element of a sentence and another are entirely determined by the respective position of the two elements and their grammatical function is often determined only by the place which they occupy in the sentence.

In the syntax of this language, the complement of a noun, pronoun, or verb always precedes the noun, pronoun or verb in question; the adverb qualifying or determining a noun always follows this noun; the noun of number always the noun of the thing numbered; an adverb modifying a word follows it. The order of the words in the sentence is subject, prefix or auxiliary of conjugation, direct complement of the verb, verb root or derivative, indirect complement of the verb, adverb modifying the statement.

Mandingo is divided into a fairly large number of dialects revealing differences more or less marked. We distinguish the Bambara or Bamana dialects, the Dioula dialects and lastly the Malinke dialects, which are themselves divided into the Malinke of the Hill and the Malinke of the North (sometimes Kassonké), of the West and of the South.

History. The wide diffusion of this language is due to certain historical circumstances, and to the rise of the Mandingo hegemony which extended over almost all the Western Sudan from the year 1250 to 1500.

According to local tradition, the Mandingo sovereigns bore the title of Mansa or Massa; they belonged to the Keyta and married into that of the Koné or Kone. In the beginning, they owed their influence to their knowledge of sorcery and magical practices and little by little they emerged from obscurity. Ibn Khalid has transmitted to us the name of the first of them, Baramenlans, who about the year 1050, was converted to Islam, in order to obtain, according to al-Bakri, the end of a drought, which was cruelly trying the country of Mandin; thereon he made the pilgrimage to Mecca.

Native tradition has kept the name of two of the descendants of this prince, Hamana and Dyiigm-Bilali. The son of the latter, Mass, called Allakoy, reigned from the year 1200 to 1318. Four times he made a pilgrimage to Mecca,
and he extended the power of his dynasty. On the other hand, his son Nare Famosa (1218-1230) suffered a great reverse and was defeated by his neighbour, the king of Soso, Sumanguru Kante, who annexed Mandingo in 1224 and put to death eleven out of the twelve sons of the conquered monarch. The last son, Suta Diata or Mari Diata (1230-1255), who was weak and delicate suddenly recovered his health and strength after touching his father's sceptre. Little by little he got together a powerful army, with the help of which he conquered a part of Futa Djalon, the country situated between the Niger and Bani, in the region of Kita and that of Beledugu. In 1235 he attacked his enemy Sumanguru Kante and defeated him at Kirina, not far from the Niger. After having subdued shortly afterwards the whole of the Soso, he advanced in 1240 as far as the celebrated city of Ghina which he plundered. During the following years, Suta Diata took possession of Gangaran and of the gold-bearing district of Bambuk, without neglecting the good administration of his lands, in which he encouraged agriculture and extended the cultivation of the cotton plant. Towards the year 1240 he abandoned the ancient capital of the Mandingo, Djeriba, and transferred it to Niani, wrongly called Mali or Mellili by the Arab historians. He died in 1255 in the vicinity of this town. One of his sons succeeded Suta Diata, whose name only is handed down to us, namely Mansa Ule or the Red King (1255-1270). After him reigned the princes Walt, Khalib and Abu Bakari between the years 1270 and 1285 about whom we possess no information. After the death of the latter, the power passed into the hands of a slave of the Keya called Sakura or Sahakura, who kept it from the year 1285 to 1300. Then the Keya regained the throne and under Gaun, Manaku, and Abu Bakari they held it from 1300 to 1307. At the end of this undistinguished period, Khanan Musa, also called Gongo Mūsā (1307-1322), the son of the last of these sovereigns, seems to have raised to its zenith the power of his dynasty. We owe to Ibn Khaldun some details about his person and the events of his reign. He was an ascetic prince and full of piety, and he made a pilgrimage to Meccca in 1325 and on his return he brought back with him to the Saha, al-Mamer, a descendant of the founder of the dynasty of the Almohads, as well as the Arab poet al-Saḥīḥ. When he was still in the Sahara, Kankan Musa learnt that his troops had seized Gao, Tumbuktu, Walata and the kingdom of Songhay. He decided to visit the first two of these towns, and on the advice of the strangers who accompanied him he built in each of them a mosquée and a palace, thus introducing Arab architecture into the country. When he died in 1322, his authority extended from the valley of the Bani to that of the Faleme, and from the Sahara as far as the thick forest, and he had entered into relations with the Sultan of Fez.

His son and successor Maghan (1332-1350) was not able to keep intact the kingdom bequeathed to him by his father. During the reign of this prince the Mossi pillaged Tumbuktu, and Songhay cast off the Mandingo yoke.

On his death, Saliamin (1355-1359), the brother of Kankan Musa, ascended the throne. According to Ibn Khaldin, the first son of the new sovereign was to assert his authority in his possessions in the North. He was not successful in regaining Songhay, but he established peace and security in his kingdom, which he reorganised. The traveller Ibn Battūta, who passed through Mandingo in the year 1351-1352 furnishes us with valuable information on the country, the administration, justice and the court.

Kamba, the son of Saliamin, succeeded his father but was deposed at the end of a few months by Mari Diata, the son of Maghan who kept his power until 1374. He died of sleeping sickness and is remembered as a cruel, debauched and extravagant prince.

His successors Musā II (1374-1387), Maghan II, Sandgul, Maghan III, Musā III and Musā Ule II reigned until the beginning of the xvth century. From this time onwards exact information ceases, as our authority, the historian Ibn Khaldūn, died in the year 1406.

The decline of the Mandingo empire was hastened during the xvth century by the attacks of the Tuaregs, the Songhoy, the Mossi and the king of Tekrur. In the year 1451 Mansa Mamadu feeling himself to be in danger, approached the Turks who were established on the coast of Africa and sought their protection. This movement and others similar which followed it influenced the kings John II and John III in sending to the court of the king of the Mandingo two ambassadors, the one in 1483, the other in 1534, but without leading any military aid.

In the year 1545 the Askia Dīdī of Gao came and plundered the Mandingo capital. The Moroccans who had come from Tumbuktu some months before, joined in the year 1591 the enemies who surrounded the kingdom. The period from 1660-1670 marks the last stage of Mandingo power. But two new principalities were formed on its ruins at Segu and in Kaarta.

According to the legend, the Bambara under the guidance of two brothers, Baramangolo and Niangolo, were flying before their enemies. They were on the point of perishing under the blows of their enemies, since a river barred their route when they were saved by a miraculous fish which carried them to the opposite bank. After this miracle they took the name of "Kulu bali", that is to say the men without boats.

In the middle of the xviii th century the descendants of Baramangolo had spread into the valley of the Niger and of the Bani but they paid tribute to the inhabitants of Djenne and to the Moroccans of Tumbuktu; their capital was Segu. Biton Kulubali (1660-170) liberated them from this tutelage. Having collected a powerful army and fortified Segu, he made war first against the sovereign of the Mandingo, then seized the great bank of the Niger and finally Massina and even Tumbuktu. He died of tetanus after organising his kingdom and dividing it into sixty districts.

His son Denkoro (1711-1730), a cruel and debauched prince, was assassinated; All, the brother of Denkoro, only reigned a few days and was deposed by the army of the Tonlou or government troops. The period 1736-1750 was troubled by internal disorders, and in the year 1750 the power passed to the family of the Diara, who kept it until 1861. At this time the conquering al-Mujāhidī 'Omar seized Segu and put All, the last king of the dynasty, to death.

The descendants of Niangolo Kulubali are cal...

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
led "Massasi", that is to say "royal race". At the end of the xviiith century, they occupied all the province of Kaarta itself and they were the rivals of the Bambara of Segu. In the middle of the xviiith century, Massa Bakari succeeded in bringing under his authority Kaarta, Kingui, Bakana, Guidjene and Dafuna. One of his successors, Bessekoro, received the explorer Mungo Park at Guené in the year 1796. In the year 1854 the last sovereign of the line of the Massasi, called Kandian, was reigning at Nioro when al-Halidji 'Omar seized the village and executed all members of the royal family.

After these events the Mandingoes remained divided and until the year 1860 only played a modest part in history. In this year, there arose in the vicinity of Kankan, in the district of Wassulu, Samori Ture, at first the leader of a band and then the sovereign of the province of Bissandugu. This new conqueror, although he was quite illiterate, seized in a short time the whole of Wassulu and took the title of "Almami". Crossing the Niger he extended his warlike expeditions into Sankaran and advanced within 80 miles of Kita, a post recently founded by the French. The latter fought against Samori first from the years 1881 to 1886 and in the next year imposed upon him the treaty of Bissandugo, which he respected for only a few months. From 1885 to 1891 Almami attacked Tiebe, the king of Sikasso, without any success; thereafter he resumed hostilities against the French, who at the end of the year 1893 occupied Wassulu. Samori then fled into the Upper Ivory Coast, which he ravaged from the year 1894 to 1897, and destroyed Konon, Bondoukou and Buna. In front of this town, a detachment commanded by Captain Brulot was exterminated in the year 1897 by the warriors of Sarantie Mori, his son and his lieutenant. France thereupon determined to settle with Almami against whom a combined force was sent. It resulted in the capture of Samori and of his army on 29th Sept. 1898 at Gueleunu on the Upper Ivory Coast. Samori was deported with his family to the Cabo where he died in 1909; he was about 65 years old. Since the dismemberment of his warriors, no event of importance has disturbed the peace of Mandingo.
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Mandu, a fortress now in ruins, was formerly the capital of Malwa [q.v.], and stands in 22° 21' N. and 75° 26' E. It has probably been a stronghold from time immemorial, but little is known of its history until the fortifications were erected in their present form by Dilavkar Khân Ghûrî (1392—1405), the first independent Muslim king of Malwa, and his successors. His son, Hūshang Shāh, made it his capital, and it remained the capital of the kingdom and province of Malwa throughout the period of Muslim rule, and he stood many sieges. Its streets run with the foundation of 19,000 Jaqqâl, laden by Mahdī II of Malwa when he recovered his capital from his rebellious troops.

Of the ten gates of the fortress (two on the south, two on the west, one on the east, and five on the north), the Târâjûl Gate was built by Dilâvar Khân, the Dâ妖怪grî Pîrâ Gate by the emperor Dâ妖怪grî, and the Alamgir Gate by an officer of the emperor Awarangî in A.D. 1668. The Bhagwânâla Gate was built in 1577, in the reign of Mahdī Khânâ, and the Songâr Gate is an old gate rebuilt early in the nineteenth century by Maina Bai, the great Râj of Dhâr. The Lawati, Rûmpol, Dhilli, and Bhangi Gates are old, but bear no inscriptions. The last has
temporarily a token coinage in copper to be withdrawn from currency when the finances of the state improved. 800 mängir was struck to the oke of copper and put into currency as half aspers. When the situation did not improve, the value was raised to one asper; the remedy proved worse than the disease for very soon the country was flooded with copper coins and gold and silver driven out of circulation.

Mängir is also the name given to imitations of sequins in brass or other cheap metal worn as ornaments.


**Mängishlak**, a mountainous peninsula on the eastern shores of the Caspian Sea, first mentioned under the Persian name Siyah-köhe ("Black Mountain"); cf. B. G. A. i. 218; the same name was given to the hills west of the Sea of Aral (op. cit., vii. 92; see *Müti-Daryà*). According to Išqahšir (op. cit., i. 219), the peninsula used to be uninhabited; it was only shortly before the present time (or that of his predecessor al-Balkhi) that Turks, who had quarrelled with the Ghuzz (q.v., i.e. with their own kin, had come there and found springs and pastures for their flocks. Ships which were wrecked on the cliffs of the peninsula used to be plundered by these Turks. Muğaddast (or Muğădiš) mentions the mountain of Binkishlah as marking the frontier between the land of the Khazars and *Ljurdjâna* (q.v.) (cf. B. G. A., iii. 355).

In the form Mankšlakh (vocalised Mankšlāgh by Yākūt) the name first appears in documents of the vii-th (xith) century (W. Barthold, *Turkestan*, i. 34, 44 and 79) and in Yākūt (iv. 670). According to Yākūt, this name was borne by a strong fortress near the sea between Khwarīzim (q.v.), *Sağsïn* (q.v.) and the land of the Rus. The peninsula was evidently no longer, as it had once been, a place held in terror not only for its natural conditions but also for its inhabitants; via Mängishlak there ran, as later almost to modern times, an important trade route from the Volga territory to Khwarizm; goods were unloaded in the bay near Cape Tīb-Karag and taken to Khwarizm by caravans. Before its conquest between 1127-1128 and 1138 by the Khwarizmshāh Širāz (q.v.), Mängishlak was a separate and practically independent principality on the frontiers of the Muslim world (it was, of course, regarded as within the empire of the Sadjiš; q.v.). As the verse quoted shows, the conquest resulted in the destruction of the town. No permanent settlement is again mentioned on the peninsula until its occupation by the Russians, in spite of its importance for commerce.

For the latter centuries (perhaps even earlier) the peninsula has been inhabited by Turkomans. Towards the beginning of the xiv-th (xv-th) century these were the Salar (q.v.); on the coast lived the "inner Salar" (išqī Salar), on the road from Khwarizm to the coast (about 500 miles; it took 20 days to traverse) lived the "outer (taghī) Salar" (Zap., xv. 208). Abu 'l-Ghazz (ed. Dehamsahs, p. 267) gives the Ensu or the Salar; towards the end of this century, this tribe was almost completely driven out by the Mangūt (q.v., i.e. by the Nogai; later we find the Kalmucks (q.v.)
conquering here. On their rule in Mangishlak, cf. Abu l-Ghâstî, p. 316; the name of the peninsula is written by Abu l-Ghâstî (see Index). Mangishlak, Mangishhâl, and Mangâshhâl. In addition to the regular traffic by sea with Astarâkhan [q.v.], frequently mentioned in Russian sources, there was also a connection with Shîrwan mentioned by Abu l-Ghâstî (p. 257 and 273) and other sources. Three Turkoman tribes, the Cavward, the Igdir and the So'mdâlûz, were deported by the Kalmucks under Ayaks (1670—1724), according to others as early as the reign of Tamsuk-Mulak (1667—70) from Mangâshhâl to the northern part of the Caucasus, but a section of the Cavward continued to dwell in Mangishlak. When, under Russian rule, the land of the Turkomans was organized as the "Trans-Caspian territory" (Zakazhsky oblast'), the "district of Mangâshhâl" was included in it; the capital was the little settlement founded in 1839 as "Novo-Petrovskoye—ukreplenyî" and known from 1859 as "Fort Aleksandrovsk" (now: Fort Uryekogo). In the sixth century the Turkomans were gradually driven out of Mangishlak by the Kazakhs [cf. Kergiz]; therefore after the Revolution the district of Mangâshhâl was separated from the land of the Turkomans and now belongs to the republic of Kazakhstan.

After the western shore of the Caspian Sea had passed under Russian rule, it was recognized that the Gulf of Balakhan [q.v.] formed a better gateway to the Central Asia than Mangishlak. In 1819 the ambassador Murayzew proposed to the Khân of Khiva, Muhammad Rafhi, that the caravan route from the Caspian Sea to Khiva should no longer start from Mangishlak but from the port of Krasnovodsk on the Gulf of Bokhan. The Khân replied: "It is true, the road via Mangishlak is much longer than the road via Krasnovodsk but the people in Mangishlak are my subjects, whereas the Yomut as far as Astarâkhan belong for the most part to the Kajdars [q.v.] (N. Murayzew, Putezhodstviye v Turkmeniyu i Khvino, Moscow 1822, p. 134). It was only after Russian rule was firmly established in Central Asia that this question could be settled in favour of the Gulf of Balâkhân. Since Krasnovodsk became the starting point for the Central Asian railway, Mangishlak has lost any importance it had in favour of the Gulf of Balâkhân. According to the census of 1897, the population of Krasnovodsk was 6,322 and of Fort Aleksandrovsk only 895.
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Descriptions of the district of Mangishlak will be found in all works on Turkistan, e.g. V. Manâfâski, Turkestanskiy Král', St. Petersburg 1913, p. 627 sq. (W. Bartkold).

Mangit, the name of a tribe and a people. In the time of Chieghâ-Khân [q.v.], the word Mangit appears as the name of a Mongol people in Rashid al-Din (Trudy Vost. Otd. Arkh. Obšč., vili. 205 sq.: Mangít). From the Mongol period onwards the name Mangit (written Manghit, Manghit, Manghit, Manghit and Manghit) like many other Mongol names (Naimân, Yemân, etc.) appears as the tribal name of Turkish or Turkicizing peoples. According to the Zafar-nâma (Ind. and. l. 277) the Mangit were a tribe (nîmâ hiti) of the Golden Horde, which produced the celebrated Emir Idigâ (in Russian sources Vedigâ), the contemporary and opponent of Timur and Toghtamish. The people called Nogai in Russian sources is always called Mangit by Abu l-Ghâstî (see Index) and other Oriental sources of the same period. Now Nogai alone is used as the name of the people. The statement that the Mangit tribe makes up about 90% of them wants more careful investigation (M. Timshqaev, Materiali k istorii Kurgan—Karabkhoj mora, Tashkent 1925, p. 28); the name Mangit is said to be also found as the name of a family among the Yavuts. In the Bâb al-Arsor of Mahmûd b. Wali (MS. Ind. Off., N° 575, f. 35b) the tribe (nîmâ hiti) of the Mangit: and the tribe (li) of the Kangrat are mentioned as the two most important branches of the Ozbek. The Mangit tribe was of some political importance for the political life of Bukhârâ and Khivârum. In the fighting with other tribes the Mangits of Bukhârâ were supported by their brethren in Khiva and vice versa but it was only in Bukhârâ that they became supreme. On the dynasty of the Mangit see there article BUKHÂRÂ (there written Manjkit); the dynasty was overthrown in the revolution of 1920. In Khiva the Mangits combined with the Nâkîs to form a double tribe (the other double tribes were the Ujger—Naimân, Kîtaî—Kîla and Kiyat—Kungrat).

The place called Mangit on modern maps was only founded in Radjab 1215 (Nov.—Dec. 1800) by members of the tribe who had been driven by the Turkoman Yomut to the east (History of Khiva, MS. of the Asiatic Museum, p. 590 supra, l. 73). At the present day the Mangits number 99,000 in Bukhârâ (of whom 44,000 are in Bukhârâ itself and 31,000 in Karshi; q.v.) and only 10,300 in Khiva.


Mangû. [See MONGâK] Mangû-Timûr, so on his coins, Mongol Môngke-Timûr, as in the article BEKE, [q.v.], written Mongîk (e.g. Rashîd al-Din, ed. Blochot, p. 199), in the Russian annals Mengutim and Mengutem, Khan of the Golden Horde (1266—1280), grandson of the Khan Bâlî [q.v.], son of Timur Tâuilân. According to Egyptian sources, the death of his predecessor Berke took place in 665 (Oct. 1266—Sept. 1267); in Safar 666 (Oct.—Nov. 1267) an embassy left Cairo which was to bring the new Kâhân an expression of sympathy and congratulations from Sultan Batârî I [q.v.]. In 667 (Sept. 1268—Aug. 1269) an embassy from the Kâhân arrived in Egypt. The exchange of embassies was maintained throughout the whole of the Kâhân’s reign. When in 670 (1271—1272) an embassy on the way to Egypt was captured by a Frankish ship from Marseilles, the ambassadors and all their goods had to be released on the Sultan’s demand. When in 680 (April 1281—1282) an Egyptian embassy left for the Golden Horde nothing was yet known of the death of the Kâhân. Only later did they learn that he was no more, having died in Rashî [1279 in the district of Akâlah (apparently nowhere else mentioned);
In death is said to have been caused by the unskilful removal of a boil on the neck. In Rashid al-Din (ed. Blochet, p. 142) the date of Mangü-Timur's death is given as 681 (Apr. 1228–March 1229); there are coins of his brother and successor Tadj-Mangü struck in this year.

The Egyptian government tried to induce the Khân to resume the war on the Persian Mongols by his predecessor Berke; but soon after his accession Mangü-Timur concluded peace with Abâksâ and never again attacked Persia. Rashid al-Din by an oversight attributes to Mangü-Timur the campaign against Arghûb of the year 689 = 1290 (in Blochet's edition in p. 140, we have read for Hûc' d'Olhosson (Hist. des Mongols, iv. 42) and Barthold (article AKBâN) have been misled by this.

On Mangü-Timur's participation in events in Central Asia down to the Kurultâi of 687 (1296) (sending an army of 50,000 men under Berkenjâr, a brother of Ber and Berke) see the article AKBâÂN. Accounts of this are found in the still unprinted parts of the DîjâmÁl Târîkhât of Rashid al-Din (reign of Abâksâ, cf. d'Olhosson, op. cit., iii. 428). The alliance between Mangü-Timur and Kâlidih, whom he was then supporting, is also mentioned later; when in 1277 two sons of the emperor Kubilai Khân were taken prisoners in the war with Kâlidih, the latter had the princes sent to the court of Mangü-Timur, from which they were later sent back to their father (Rashid al-Din, ed. Blochet, p. 83; d'Olhosson, op. cit., ii. 452 ff.).

Russian rulers appealed to Mangü-Timur for support as they had done to his predecessors and successors. Law of Galicia received assistance from him against the Lithuanians but the Tatai auxiliaries proved a great burden not only to his enemies but also to their protectors. In 1277, a Russian army was fighting in the Caucasus against the Alani under the Khân's orders. From Mangü-Timur dates the earliest extant edict of a Khân of the Golden Horde on the privileges of the Greek orthodox clergy; it is dated in the year of the Hare (probably 1267). The bishop of Sarâ, Theognostes, was sent by Mangü-Timur as an ambassador to Constantinople.

In contrast to the last two decades of the xiiith century the Golden Horde under Mangü-Timur was a great power, free from internal troubles. Coins were still struck only in the old commercial city of Buğârâ (q.v.) but, unlike those of his predecessors, in his own name not in that of the Great Khân. Of his coins, the seal of the Golden Horde appears for the first time.
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- W. Barthold: *Mangi.*

**MANI**

- See ZINDIK.

**MANI** is the name given in Ottoman Turkish to popular songs in quatrains. The name is a corruption of the Arabic word *mâna*, meaning "thought, idea", and is by no means found throughout the whole area where Ottoman Turkish is spoken. In many districts isolated quatrains, like songs of several verses, are simply called *târâk*. Songs in quatrains are known among almost all Turkish peoples; they must therefore be considered to have been known to the original Turkish stock.

The rhythm of the mani is, as in Turkish popular poetry generally, sometimes purely sylabic (a definite number of syllables without a fixed caesura), and sometimes depends on the accented syllables with a fixed caesura and therefore with the order of weak and strong syllables to some degree fixed. The lines show as a rule 7 syllables (4-3, 3-4, rarely 2-3-3-2). Quatrains with all four lines alike are rare, the third line usually differs from the others (3-4, 4-3, 3-4, or 4-3, 4-3, 3-4, and so on). The original arrangement of the rhyme in Turkish quatrains is * ABIY* (two lines rhyming) which clearly shows the quatrain was originally a distich. In the Ottoman mani we have a development of this form also, with three rhyming lines (AABY). The rhyme however which connects the second and fourth lines is often fuller and more distinct than that which connects the first and second lines. Alliteration, which is highly developed among many Turks, especially in the north, is only found sporadically in the mani; it is found both as line alliteration (similarity in the initial letters of the words of a line, e.g. karâ beyan hamrammar, getâ memah bieh, etc.) as verse alliteration (similarity of the initial letters of the lines in a verse, e.g. sari güllüm yermel, semin inauf merdece, sede yeş olun diyem, sana şımpir veremem).

As regards matter, the majority of the mani fall into two distinct parts, an introduction dealing with nature, and a concluding part of a personal character. Originally the two parts must have been very closely connected. It would however be a mistake to find such a connection in all the manis, because the singers very often only improvise new conclusions to ready made introductions taken from older poems, without troubling in the least about the train of thought. The great majority of manis are tinged with eroticism, but we also find satirical ones, also soldiers' and robbers' songs in the form of quatrains. The quatrains composed on the Anatolian regicide Çakûlulj have been much admired by European scholars. Isolated, originally independent manis are now often strung together to form ballads of some length. It would therefore be wrong to regard mani and târâk as two fundamentally different classes of songs.

The number of mani current among the people is enormous. They are sung at all kinds of festivals and ceremonies, and by people over their work in the house in the long winter nights. On Hâdîres, St. George's Day (April 23), they are used as maqâl by young girls.

Very popular also among the Ottoman Turks are the so-called *gânî* mani: punning manis. These are quatrains, the rhymes of which are identical syllables but have each a different meaning.
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Collections of manis are also found in the following works: Kuno, *Türkische Volkslieder, W. Z. K. M.*, iv. (1890),
Christothemia Turcica, Budapest 1899; E. Littmann, Tschakidsch, ein Räuberhauptmann der Gigenwar, Berlin 1915; T. Towalski, Piastowscien kudowsko- łowicki i wójtostwo łowickie, Krosno 1915.

Mani, a mountainous region in western Anatolia which is famous for its ancient monastic communities.

MANISA, Magonisia (Μαγονία), in Arabic Maghniya, capital of the district of Sarya in western Anatolia.

Maghnia is a two-hour drive distant from the southern part of the river Gedi or Gedis (the ancient Hermos); on its course, cf. Tschakhach, Avis Minor, ii (1860), p. 232, estimated on the northern slope of Mount Maghnia-dagh or Yanamlar (the ancient Sipylos) which separates it from Smyrna (the distance between the two towns by the Sabunci-belki pass is only 20 miles; by rail 40 miles).

In ancient times the town "Maghnia ad Sipylos" was mainly noted for the victory won in its vicinity by the two Scipios over Antiochos the Great of Syria (190 a.c.). The town was then incorporated in the Roman empire. It flourished until the fifth century as its coins show. Maghnia is also often mentioned in Byzantine history: after the taking of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204 John Kolonas returned to Magnesia where he held out till 1255.

The Byzantine chief Surni Khan [q. v.] who had formed a principality for himself on the ruins of the Seljuk kingdom of Konya, took Magnesia in 1313 and the town was the capital of his dynasty for 78 years. It was in the reign of Surki Khan that Ibn Battuta (ii. 312) visited the town where he stayed in a konya of the brotherhood of the Mutfan. The town was large and beautiful, rich in gardens and with a plentiful supply of water. On the buildings erected by the Surki Khan dynasty see the article on them.

After the battle of Angora (505 A.D.) Timur ordered his grandson Sultra Muhammad to lay waste (ālibān) the district between Brusa and Magnesia and to take up his winter quarters in the latter town. The author of the Zafar-nama, ii. 466-467, 480, calls it "Maghni-stūl in the Sarya-el" [cf. Urdı-begii, p. 34; Sürık-hanı and comments on the excellence of its water-supply and the pleasantness of its climate. According to Turkish sources (cf. Urdı), Tavallsh-ı Ali Ömer, ed. Bahinger, p. 34-35; "Ailbick-paša, p. 70; Münzeo- džim-bašhi, ii. 33]. Timur restored the fiefs of Anatolia to their old holders (kayb-keyyem) but by 813 (1410) Sultra Muhammad I had retaken the region of Surki Khan [q. v.].

Magonisia became the residence (Ziyān-kum, p. 635: Ziyān-al-umma) of the Ottoman princes but for a time (1405-1425) its district was within the sphere of influence of the rebel Djünesid (son of the Ottoman governor of al-Aydınd; von Hammer, op. cit., p. 271-327). Murad II having abdicated the throne in 1444 chose Mahgusa as his place of retirement. The Ottoman offensive drew him out of it but after the victory of Warna (Nov. 10, 1444) he returned to Magnesia (v. Hammer, G.O.R.3, i. 351, 357) where the remains of his palace and gardens can still be seen. Murad III (1574-1595) and his wife also contributed to beautifying the town; cf. Ziyān-kum, p. 835: Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor, Oxford 1775, p. 207-209 and 260-268 speaks of the palace and precious jewels of Murad III) and of his foundations (tekkēs = college of arishes, luminous auxiliaries etc.).

In 1633 in the reign of Murad IV, the governor of Kars (q. v.) Ilyas Pasha rebelled and laid siege to Magnesia which was taken and plundered for three days. Ilyas was taken prisoner and the Sultan in ordering him to be beheaded reproached him with having devastated "the residence of his ancestors" (l. c., iii. 115-114).

In the xvii cent. Magnesia became the capital of the powerful family of the Kara Othman Oghlu whose authority extended from the Maonsid to the Pontus. It was not till 1844 that these hereditary chiefs, whose administration is praised by Keppel, Narrative of a Journey across the Balkans, London 1831, ii. 294-301, were replaced by a regular Turkish governor.

With the introduction of the system of vilaiets, Magnesia became the capital of the sandjak of Sara-khan in the vilayet of Aydınn (Smyrna). Simid-bey, Kanik al-Afâm, Constantinople 1898, vi. 4348 estimated the population of the town at 76,552 of whom 21,000 were Muslims, 10,400 Greeks, 2000 Armenians etc. Magnesia which is divided up by streams into 3 quarters had 25 djumā, 38 mosques, 25 mevlas, 18 tekēs etc. The kadi of Magnesia had 4 nāhibi: Amlāk, Vont-dagh Palamut and Belek. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, iii., 1894, p. 523-534 gives the following as the nāhibi of the sandjak: Magnesia, Soma, Kırık-Ağhaç, Aş-Keşir, Kasaba, Gürdüm, Demirli, Sali- b, Kule, Ali-shehr, Eghine. After the reform of 1921 Sara-khan became a vilayet with 11 kadaş (the old nāhibes). The population of the new vilayet is 302,752 souls and of the kadi's Magnesia, 75,021 souls; cf. the Türkiye Dışarn-yetinçisı (Sad-i-nebi, 1926-1927, p. 926-933. In view of the movements of the population the ethnical composition of the sandjak must have undergone profound modifications.

MANSHUR (m. a.) means literally "spread out" (as in the Kur'an xvii. 14 and iii. 34: opposite maqṣūr "folded"), or not sealed (opposite maqṣūr) hence means a certificate, an edict, a diploma of appointment, and particularly a patent granting an appanage.

In Egypt in the early Arab period mansūr seems to be a name for the passes which the government compelled the felātān to have in order to check the flight of colonists from the land, which threatened to become overstocked (Ziyān-kum, as above, ii. p. 44 and 994b). In any case the Führer durch die Ausstellung (Pfyser, Erhebungen Rainer), N°. 631 (cf. also N°. 601-602) such a certificate of the year 1890 (796) is called a mansūr and in Makrī, Ḫāljī, ii. 493, we are told
document was then sent by courier (harid) or pigeon post (ṣalṭ al-adnaihāt al-bābīm) to Cairo to the government (al-abulbīl al-ilāfī). Here it was received by the postmaster (dawādar), later by the private secretary (ḥattāt al-bābīl al-adlīl) for approval, to receive the sultan's signature (ḥattat al-adlīl) and the note (ṣulūk) ("let it be written out"); see Kalkashandi, 167–199). The document then went to the Military Dictum in Cairo (al-dīwān al-adlīl), occasionally also called (al-dīwān al-adlīl), where it was filed, after what was called the murābba's file had been made out. The latter was sent to the (al-dīwān al-adlīl) and the private secretary, the head of this Dictum, wrote his requisition (ṣuṣīn) for the (al-dīwān al-adlīl) writer concerned and now finally the patent of the appanage (manṣūr) proper could be made out in the (al-dīwān al-adlīl) in Cairo, while the murābba's file in the army Dictum remained filed in the (al-dīwān al-adlīl) as ṣuṣīn (proof) (cf. Kalkashandi, vi, 201).

Full particulars are given in the formulae used in these manṣūrs and of their outer form in Shikhīn al-Dīn b. ʿAfdj Allāh, al-Tūrīf iṣṭ al-Muṣtaṣaṭ al-Ṣarīf, p. 88 sq.; Kalkashandi, xiii, 153 sqq. and Quatremaire, Histoire des Sultanis Manṣūr, p. 300 sq., note 83. There are many variants of format (ṣuṣīn, q.v.) and script according to the military rank of the recipient. Thus manṣūr for the Muḥammadan iṣṭ al-Muṣtaṣaṭ were written on ʿad-al-ṣaṣūn, for the Ṣafīban al-Tubbaṣān on ʿad al-ṣaṣūn, and for the Manṣūr al-Muṣtaṣaṣaṭ and Muḥammadan iṣṭ al-Muṣtaṣaṭ were written on ʿad al-ṣaṣūn. Many rules were laid down for the wording to be used; the text is to be shorter and less florid than in the other appointments and there are none of the usual rules about script (ṣuṣīn); an original "virgin" (muṣṣaṣaṭ al-adlīl) is recommended as the finest form of a manṣūr. Special formulae are further required for grants of appanages which were concerned with renewal (ṣuṣīn, add.), addition (ṣuṣīn, add.) or substitution (ṣuṣīn, add.). A regular signature of the sultan, such as is usual on appointments as information (ṣuṣīn, add.), is not usual on the manṣūr; instead of this the sultan writes formulae like: God is my hope (Allāhu ʿAmār), God is my Protector (Allāhu Waṣīyy), God is sufficient for me (Allāhu Ṣāliḥ), To God belongs the rule (al-Mustu ʿalā), or: God alone has grace (al-Miṣr Ṣāliḥ waṣiyy). Occasionally the manṣūr for the highest ranks (Muḥammadan iṣṭ al-Muṣtaṣaṣ and Muḥammadan iṣṭ al-Muṣṭaṣaṣ) had a ṣaṣūn (q.v., q.) at the top. The ṣaṣūn were prepared by a special official beforehand and gummed on to the finished diplomas. In Kalkashandi, viii, 165 sq. the ṣaṣūn of Naṣīr Muḥammad b. Kaṣhānī (693–741) were reproduced and described; they differ considerably from the better known formula of the ṣaṣūn of the Ottoman Sultan. After Ashraf Shābān, ṣaṣūn were no longer used on the manṣūr; these were only used for purposes of display on letters to infidel rulers.

The completed manṣūr was then again taken back by a courier from Cairo to the town concerned, e.g. Damascus and handed over to the tenant of the appanage. The inspector of the army there (ṣuṣīn al-dīwān) however first entered it in his register for he had to keep a roll of the holders of siefs in his province. Kalkashandi, xiii, 167–199 gives as examples of manṣūrs no fewer
than 26 texts, beginning with one drawn up by Muhayi T-Dum b. 'Abd al-Zahir in the reign of Khālid b. al-Walid.  

The term mağhar was also used for patrons of appointment in the Ottoman empire; but it does not seem to have been used to designate an official status or exclusively in this sense; there are however mağharī for viziers, generals, and governors (seccahat mağharī, muhāfizet mağharī, eyālet mağharī), and in the treaties of peace made after the Balkan War in 1913, it is still provided that the chief muftis may be appointed in Bulgaria and Greece are to receive their mağharī from the Şāh al-Aslām in Stambul and they have also to put forward for approval the mağharī of the ordinary muftis subordinate to them (cf. e.g. Karl Strupp, Ausgewählte diplomatische Aktenstücke zur orientalischen Frage, Gotha 1916, p. 295, 308).

The name mağharī was also applied to the pastoral letters and epistles of the Christian patriarchs and bishops. In conclusion it may be mentioned that mağhūrī in mathematical language means "prism" (varieties e.g. M. mīrzā bilobū'īx prism, M. 6ā'sīm straight prism, M. mawṣūmānī 6-ā'xī parabolic prism, M. mawṣūmānī regular prism, M. mawṣūmānī triaxial parabolic prism, M. mawṣūmānī triangular prism, M. mawṣūmānī trapezoidal prism), and in the language of the Persian poets the epithets are called "the mağharī writers of the garden" (mawṣūmānī mağharīn-i sāleẖ).

Bibliography: In addition to the passages quoted, cf. Ibn Shihāb, Muḥammad al-Khālīfa, p. 62, Khattā al-Zahirī, Zubdat Qaṣaf al-Mağharī, p. 100, 102; Gaufried-Demouyehns, La Syrie à l'époque des Mağharīs, Index; W. Būrkman, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskünste im islamischen Ägypten, Index 1.

(M. W. Būrkman)

MANSŪKH [See Ninaksh.]

AL-MANSūR, ABU DHA'BAR 'ABD ALLAH B. MUHAMMAD, the second 'Abbasīd caliph. His mother was a Berber slave girl called Sulāma, his brother the Shi'ite Abu l-'Abbas al-Saffār [q.v.]. In the fighting against the Omajjads he distinguished himself and took part in the siege of Wāṣit, which had been fortified by Ibn Hubaira [q.v.], the last important supporter of Marwān. The treacherous murder of Ibn Hubaira, to whom the two 'Abbasīs had expressly promised a pardon, is however not out of keeping with Abū 'Alī's character. His brother gave him the governorship of Armenia, Aḥzābādji and Mesopotamia, which he administered till his accession. On the way back from the pilgrimage, he learned that Abu l-'Abbas had died in 'Iṣla b-Ṭāfṣa 136 (June 754) and that he himself had been proclaimed caliph. His uncle Abu 'Alī B. All [q.v.] wished to dispute the succession but was defeated by Abū 'Abdul-Malik [q.v.]. Soon afterwards the Copts had the latter put out of the way, which led to a rising in Khurāsān. The leader of this was a Persian named Suhbāb; he advanced far into Media but was defeated between Hamādhan and al-Rayy by the caliph's troops led by Dhuwar b. Mārza and soon afterwards slain. When Dhuwar also cast off his allegiance to the caliph, the latter sent an army under Muhammad b. al-'Abbās against him (138 = 755–756). Dhuwar was defeated and fled to Aḥsharūdja, where he was put to death. About the same time the Khaṭīrīs rebelled in Mesopotamia under their leader Māmūn b. Zayd b. Hāmara b. Shāhīhī who inflicted severe reverses on al-Mansūr's armies, until the rebellion was finally suppressed by Khālid b. Khazīma in 758 and Muḥammad al-Ghāfari at al-Aḥsharūdja also there was a rising (probably in 139 = 758–759). A body of the so-called Rāwandi [q.v.] who identified the caliph with God himself, went to the capital and when al-Mansūr had some of them arrested, they were forcibly rescued by their friends. But for the valiant Ma'n b. Zayd [q.v.] it would hardly have been possible for the caliph to dispose of these mad fanatics. A few years later, the 'Alīs also rebelled under their leader 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥassān [q.v.]. In the autumn of 762, a rebellion broke out in al-Madinah, and Muḥammad son of 'Abd Allāh was proclaimed caliph there, but in Kūsa 140 (Febr. 763). In Spain the Ommayyad 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mu'āwiyah had founded an independent kingdom in 758 (767) and in Africa there was fighting for several years with the Berbers and Khārdjīs. It was only after the Abkhād Abū ʿAbd al-Mīr [q.v.], had been defeated by the Caliph's troops under Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in 767 that order was restored there. Yazīd remained in Kūsa as governor till his death in 780 (785). In Khurāsān a new rebellion broke out in 768–769 (775) and 770. The leader Ustāzīdāhsī declared himself caliph and gathered numerous followers around him but was defeated by Khālid b. Khazīma, who 'erected a fearful massacre among the rebels. The frontier also resumed with the noise of battle. The war against the Byzantines was continued under al-Mansūr, but was confined mainly to raids or the destruction of individual strongholds. Al-Mansūr devoted special attention to protecting the frontier by building fortresses, and the two towns of Malaṭya (Melitene) and al-Maqṣūta (Mopsuestia) were rebuilt in his reign. Several expeditions were sent against Dīlam and Taḥarīsīn in the early years of al-Mansūr's reign and after the extinction of the old line of Ishāhshūs of the Bath of Dīlam [q.v.] in Taḥarīsīn, this province too received Arab governors. In 765 (766) the Khāzars invaded Armenia, seized the town of Tiḥrīf and defeated the caliph's troops but retired again. There were also encounters with the people beyond the Oξass and in India; but these were of little importance. At first al-Mansūr lived at al-Aḥsharūdja near Kūsa, as did his predecessor; he later decided to build a new capital and in 768 (774) he founded the foundation stone of Boghdād [q.v.].  

(M. W. Būrkman)
recognise him. His career however was brief and his power unenduring: for when in 933 (1003) he died, his governor in Šan‘a' had already gone over to Yūnāf al-Dīrī. He was however the first since al-Nāṣir Ahmad, and the fourth in all to be entered — although by everyone in the lists as Imam of Yemen (but cf. on the above claimants: Munaḍjījumāt, in Sachau, Ein Verzeichnis neunzehnter Dynastien, in Abh. Pr. Ak. W., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1923, i 23).

Only for an equally short time 942-449 (1010-1013) his son al-Hāsm b. al-Mahdi was able to regain his father's office. His early death in battle is noteworthy because it produced a quite un-Zaidi belief in his return and for a period founded a special sect, the "Husnīnīya" in the name of that consecrated imām. Some years later another son of al-Kāsim, Liǧārī, began a struggle full of vicissitudes with the other 'Allid claimants to the imamate, which was complicated by a party grouping of the tribes of the country: about 453 (1061) San‘ī fell to the Iṣmā‘īlī Shāhids and then to Hamdānī chiefs. Only in 545 (1150) Aḥmad b. Sulaimān al-Mutanawwakhīhī, whose genealogy also goes back to al-Nāṣir Ahmad b. al-Hāfd but neither through the Khāleṣī nor the Muḥtārī, succeeded in restoring the imamate for a long and brilliant period. For the history of the following centuries, which were full of incidents and individual imāmas of importance cf. the article AL-MANṣūR AL-DIN AL-AllāH a. f. The family of Yūnāf al-Dīrī remained victorious in the end. His descendant in the twelfth (11th) generation: IL. AL-MANṣūR AL-DIN AL-AllāH (cf. supra, p. 1109), was the founder of the modern Yemeni dynasty. At the end of 1005 (1597) he appeared in the field and held his own against five Turkish governors. Not only did he find opponents and people he could not trust among his own Zaidis, who went over to the Turks but among the latter the change of governor frequently led to trouble and even to mutiny: the tribes were an incalculable element; the Turks were often able to call to their help the Iṣmā‘īlīs (Karagjstāns), always hostile to the Zaidis. The lack of equipment was a great hardship to the Imām; for example in one battle he is said to have mustered only 20 rifles against the Turks' 800. It is very difficult to get a clear idea of this minor war but the following are the main facts that emerge: After the proclamation of the holy war at Djiḍijī al-Šihrī in the northern district of Shāhī al-Šarqī at the end of Maharrar 1006 (Sept. 1597), al-Kāsim conquered the highlands of al-Himīn and al-Shāfī‘a, the latter with the fortress of the same name, which had been a bulwark of the Zaidis for 300 years with occasional interruptions; turning to the southeast he established himself in the mountains of Ḥāḍir al-Shāfī‘ī (also called Ḥāḍir Bandi Aṣī; cf. the article gADIF in the important Thulī [see IHH] in the N.W. of Šan‘a'; his followers then rose throughout the land and for a time even cut off the Turkish communications with the sea. But after two years, the collapse began before General Sinīn: by the end of 1010 or beginning of 1011 (1602) he had to flee from Shāhīra. But in 1605 again he rebelled against Sinīn in the district of Shāhīra who had been appointed governor this time from Shāfī‘a; he also took Ša‘da. After Sinīn Fadl was recalled, al-Kāsim was able to induce his successor Liǧārī Fadl to make a truce, which
was observed for about ten years with a few interruptions especially on the arrival of new governors in 1022 and 1025. After renewed fighting a formal peace in 1028 left the imām in possession of the four separate areas: around Shaḥrūz, around Khāshab in the east, around Saʿda in the north, and lastly in the S.W. of Saʿdir around Ḥaima [q.v.], the inhabitants were however for the most part not Zaidi but Ṣahābī. Al-Kaʿīsam died in Rabiʿ I 1029 (Feb. 1620). In the middle of 1038 (beg. of 1629) Hādar Paḥa had to evacuate Saʿdi before his son and successor al-Muʿayyad Muḥammad.

Al-Kaʿīsam b. Muḥammad was a conscientious Zaidi, as a youth when a fugitive before the Turks he had studied with many spiritual authorities; he composed numerous appeals for the rebellions; works of a legal and dogmatic nature by him still exist.


(R. STROTHMANN)

AL-MANṢŪR, the sixth ruler of the Ḥammādī dynasty, succeeded his father al-Nāṣir in the year 481 (1085). The latter had witnessed the rise to the height of its power of the dynasty of somewhat artificial development of Ḵāl’s Bānt Ḥammād [q.v.], as a result of the destruction of Ṣarawān by the Arabs. Two years after the accession of al-Mansūr, the Arabs, who had advanced towards the west and who had spread over all the region adjoining the Ḵafā, began to make existence there difficult. The prince moved his capital from Ḵafā to Bougie which he considered less accessible to the nomads; it should be mentioned that his father al-Nāṣir had already made preparations for the exodus by transforming a little fishing port into a regular town, which he called al-Nāṣiriyah and which was to become Bougie, while on the other hand, the Ḵafā was not completely abandoned by al-Mansūr and he even embellished it with a number of palaces. The Ḥammādī kingdom had therefore at this time two capitals joined by a royal road.

After taking up his quarters at Bougie, al-Mansūr had the first place to quell the revolt of one of his uncle, Belhar, the governor of Constantine. He sent against the rebel another Ḥammādī Emir, Abīl Yakhān. The latter after his victory was given the governorship of Constantine and shortly after he in his turn as well as his brother, who had been given the governorship of Bone, rebelled. These risings over which al-Mansūr, thanks to his energy, was triumphant, brought to the side of the rebels of the Ḥammādī family the Zirids of al-Mahdiya, who wished to get back some power in Barbary, the Almoravids of the Maghrīb, who wished to extend towards the East and the Arabs who were always ready to join in the feuds of their powerful neighbours.

Al-Mansūr was, on the other hand, led to oppose the advance of the Almoravids who were curiously allied with the traditional opposition of the Zenātīs [q.v.]. With the probable object of disarming the opposition al-Nāṣir and al-Mansūr had married two sisters of Mākhūkh, the chief of the Banū Wānāni, at that time the most powerful of the Zenātī group. This alliance did not hinder the time-honoured feud from breaking out again. It became more acute when al-Mansūr murdered his wife, the sister of his enemy, The latter then asked for support from the Almoravids.

From Tlemcen, where they had been installed for more than twenty years, the Almoravids had after many attempts, endeavoured to expand towards the East at the expense of their brethren of the same race, the Ṣanḥādja b. Ḥammād. Al-Mansūr had twice reduced them to impotence. It was at this time that the murder of the sister of Mākhūkh by al-Mansūr drove the Wānāni chief into an alliance with the Almoravids of Tlemcen. The alliance formed in this way was a great blow to the Ḥammādī kingdom, Algiers was besieged for two days; Asīr was taken.

The fall of the latter fortress, the oldest stronghold of the family, was bitterly resented by al-Mansūr. He got together an army of 20,000 men, composed of the Ṣanḥādja, the Arabs and even the Zenātīs; he marched against Tlemcen, met the governor Tāḥfūn b. Tinʿamer to the North-East of the town and put him to flight. Tlemcen was not spared even at the supplication of Tāḥfūn’s wife, who invoked the ties of relationship uniting them with the Ṣanḥādja (496 = 1104).

After the defeat of the Almoravids, al-Mansūr severely punished the Zenātīs and the rebel tribes of the Bougie district, whom he forced to flee into the mountains of Kabylia.

Thus al-Mansūr seems on the eve of his death (498 = 1104) to have thoroughly re-established the power of the Ḥammādīs. According to a tradition, which is not above suspicion, recorded by Ibn Khalduhn, the two capitals owed very important buildings to him: Bougie, the Palace of the Star and the Palace of Salvation; the Ḵafā, the government palace and the Kaṣr al-Mansūr the beautiful donjon of which is still in part extant.


(G. MARÇAIS)

AL-MANṢŪR, Ahmad b. Muḥammad, born in 1549, seventh ruler of the Ṣaḍiyan dynasty of Morocco, son of Sultan Muḥammad al-Mahdī and Sahāb al-Rahmāniya. His victories and his wealth earned him the epithets al-Mansūr and al-Dhahabi.
He was still a child when on the accession of his eldest brother 'Abd Allâh (1557) he accompanied into exile his other brothers 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd-al-Mu'min, who went for safety from Sijilmâsâ to Tiemcen. The fugitives were potential claimants to the throne of the Shartfons, by virtue of an agreement concluded in the lifetime of their father by which the one to inherit the power was not the Sultan's heir but the eldest of the family. 'Abd al-Mu'min was assassinated at the instigation of his nephew Muhammed b. 'Abd Allâh called al-Mutawakkil and Aḥmad retired to Algiers to join 'Abd al-Malik who was already there. He was henceforth always a loyal lieutenant of his brother whose ability he fully realised. The death of 'Abd Allâh in 1574 gave the exiles the opportunity to assert their rights. Pretenders and rebels could always rely on the support of the natural enemies of every reigning shârîf: Spain and Turkey.

Philip II had remained deaf to the repeated appeals of 'Abd al-Malik, who appealed to the Grand Turk and in 1574 went to Constantinople where his marriage with the daughter of the renegade al-Hâjî[M] Morato assured him of patronage. In Algiers Aḥmad conducted successful negotiations with certain Moroccan notables, mainly in Fès. It was perhaps he who gave the signal when an expedition appeared to have some chances of success. He was at his brother's side when the latter entered Morocco in 1576 with a Turkish army led by Ramadân Pâsha and helped him to raise troops in the region of Tiemcen. We do not know exactly what part he played in the battles of al-Rukn and al-Sharrij which gave Morocco to 'Abd al-Malik but we know that he was the task of pursuing the dethroned sultan on his flight to Marrâkûsh.

One of 'Abd al-Malik's first acts was to recognise his brother as his heir. It seems, however, that he did not show the latter as much esteem as affection and he had left in Constantinople, with his wife, his son Isma'il. But he was, according to his policy. In these circumstances Aḥmad naturally had the vice-royalty of Fès. He did not stay there long, for he was recalled to save Marrâkûsh from a return of al-Mutawakkil. Taking command of one of the three armies charged with pursuing the vanquished sultan in al-Sûs and the Atlas, he does not seem to have found an opportunity for a decisive military success; he returned to his governorship while Muhammad was driven to seek refuge behind the walls of Ceuta.

In June 1578, 'Abd al-Malik summoned him with all his forces to Kaşr al-Kabîr (Alcarnaguir, q.v.) to stop the advance of the King of Portugal's army. The latter had foolishly sought to realise the dream of conquering Morocco cherished by John III. When Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh after vainly appealing for help to Philip II, turned to Sebastian, he at once received a favourable reply. A large army, with about 20,000 effective fighters left Portugal in June, headed at Tangier, crossed the Strait of Giribaîn, and went to the cities of Sûs, which 'Abd al-Karîm b. Tûda had just relieved, and proceeded by land towards Larache. The Moroccan forces coming from MARRAKESH and Fès met them at al-Kaşr. Aḥmad found his brother seriously ill, poisoned by the şâ'id of his staff, it is said. The battle was fought a few miles from al-Kaşr on Aug 1578. Sebastian's men, abnormally led, having exhausted all their provisions, fought with their backs to the river of the Wâdi 'Al-Makhlûsîn. The šârif arranged his army in a crescent. In about 5 hours the Christians were annihilated by the Moorish cavalry. 'Abd al-Malik died in his litter during the battle. Sebastian was killed or committed suicide and al-Mutawakkil was drowned. That evening Aḥmad henceforth known as Aḥmad al-Mansûr was proclaimed emperor.

Elegant, cultivated, very learned in religious matters, more a man of the council-chamber than of the camp, he was succeeding a popular and fearless ruler, of exceptional energy, who having acquired a taste for innovations in Turkey had begun to introduce them, perhaps too eagerly, into Morocco. Designated as his successor by 'Abd al-Malik, and benefiting by the great reputation left by his father, Aḥmad al-Mansûr was rapidly able to overcome the difficulties which awaited him, as they did every sovereign of Morocco on his accession: mutinies of the troops, demands from allied tribes and the Zawiyas, and agitation among the Berbers. While in Spain it was feared that the Christian garrison would be attacked and swept away, al-Mansûr had to hurry to Fès to make himself recognised as ruler there, to put down unrest and behead a few notables. He inflamed the people by playing the skin of Muhammad al-Mašîkh to stuff with straw in the regions of al-Sûs and the Atlas, where the influence of the former sultan had survived for a brief space his tenure of the throne.

Aḥmad al-Mansûr very soon sought means of enriching himself. The booty taken in the field of al-Kaşr, the work done by the prisoners reduced to slavery, the ransoms extorted from the gentlemen gave the šârif and his people enormous sums. The Sultan kept the nobles for himself, so were soon brought to him and he set about bargaining about them. In a little time, less than a year, the ransoms had been arranged.

The haste displayed by foreign courts to congratulate the Moor on his triumph was remarkable. Ambassadors thronged to Marrâkesh; those of Spain and Portugal bringing magnificent gifts. Aḥmad al-Mansûr had the sense to understand that these presents were the most he was likely to get from European action. For its neighbours, Morocco was a weak and troublesome state. The cupidity of its neighbours was its best protection. Many reasons urged the Turks to obtain a footing there: the cupidity of the beglerbegs of Algiers ambitious of extending their powers to the west; the naval basis of Mazagan of al-Ma'mûn and of Larache; the formal promises that had been given by 'Abd al-Malik, when he was begging assistance, and there was always the troublesome question of spiritual supremacy, as the Turkish Sultan did not admit that the Moorish šârif had an authority in religious matters as great as his. To extricate himself, al-Mansûr played the usual game, following the example of his brother, who had made advances to the kings of Spain, Portugal and France, to the Queen of England and to the Grand Duke of Tuscany; he turned without ceremony from the Grand Turk and threw himself into the arms of Philip II, overwhelming the Catholic King with demonstrations of friendship, of which the most significant was the return without ransom of the body of Sebastian; he was even promised Larache. The quarrel with Turkey was soon to come to an end. 'Akk, Beglerbeg of Algiers, exerted all his influence to get war declared. Aḥmad al-Mansûr
Duke, who freely received Moors in Tuscany and did all he could to develop commerce between the two countries, with Elizabeth, with the English, French and Dutch traders, relations were close. Sugar was exported from the South and Morocco also supplied corn in good years, gold from the Siāla, saltpetre, copper and hides. It imported principally cloth and for Al-Manṣūr himself, the materials for his buildings. From the Shariah court there went undefinable surveys, at once ambassadors, spies, procurers of jewels and of women. But on the other hand especially interested the Sharif, contraband of war and the sale, advantageous for every one, of the cargoes and slaves brought in by the corsairs. The English were the most pitiful contrabandists and the trade with Morocco developed so well that in 1585 the Barka Company was founded with a monopoly and a regular constitution. But Ahmad al-Manṣūr was not too fond of regular traders. The many Christians settled in Morocco must be considered to have been adventurers. Quasi-prisoners of the Sharif and his people, they were able to realise illusory fortunes, always liable to extortions. In 1585 bare appertences were numerous in Morocco and the royal company could not survive. The captives of the sovereign drove off many other foreign traders.

These economic relations gradually developed into political ones. It was to exercise pressure on Spain that Ahmad al-Manṣūr pretended to submit to the wishes of a combination of Dutch and English. After the destruction of the Armada in 1588, he entered without hesitation into the English camp; he received at his court Don Christoffo, son of the Portuguese pretender Don Antonio, and agreed to a loan to Elizabeth. Then he turned back again. The taking of Cadiz in 1596 again influenced his feelings; he spoke of an alliance and made definite offers. Nothing resulted from these demonstrations, except a painful impression caused by the cloak after deception. So long as Elizabeth was alive, relations were friendly, for the two rulers had kindly feelings for one another, but James I, on his accession, at once showed a much less benevolent attitude towards the Shariah court.

It was in the direction of the Siāla that Ahmad al-Manṣūr gave reign to his desire for glory and conquest. His troops had had some experience in the Sahara. In 1581, the vases of Tult and Tīgārīn, which had long been free from the Shariah yoke, had been conquered brilliantly. In 1584 an unsuccessful expedition had ended in the disappearance in the desert of a large army which had not even reached Teghān. In 1590, having sought a quarrel with the usāba Ishāk over the ownership of the salt mines of Teghān, al-Manṣūr persuaded his Council to go to war; a little army under the Pasha Dājūlībīr crossed the desert and destroyed the Siālan empire. The occupation of the conquered country was nothing but systematic plunder and massacre. The Shariah collected great wealth there; he received the congratulations of the Powers and gained a prestige which still survives; his lieutenants also enriched themselves. With remarkable regularity, almost every year, reinforcements set out for Gago and very often reached it. Fourteen years brought gold, wealth and slaves back to Marrākush. The most famous of the prisoners was the Jezzi Ahmad Bāhi (q.v.) for whom Marrākush was a gilded prison where he taught quite freely. The
Sudan was drained dry. In 1600 al-Manṣūr saw the necessity of reorganising trade there but does not seem to have succeeded. Morocco was, on the whole, prosperous during his reign. The first Sa’dians had done much for the development of commerce and agriculture. Sugar factories were built up and down the country which were the Sultan’s private property but were farmed out by him to Jews and Christians. Trade was active at the ports. The profits from the sale of captives or their labour contributed to make the nobles wealthy and through this to the prosperity of the country. Besides the industrial monopolies, the normal revenue came from the customs duties and the taxes established by Muhammad al-Mahdi, which al-Manṣūr heavily increased. The collection of these taxes provoked murmurs of discontent and served as an excuse for military demonstrations which maintained good order in the country. Al-Manṣūr had also a considerable army (he never formed a fleet) composed of excellent troops, Moors from Spain and particularly renegades, a nursery for jazīrīs and officers of ability and energy. He was rich enough to pay them well. All this contributed to make rebellions few and they were always quickly and harshly suppressed by the Sharif’s lieutenants: the rising of the people of Sakāṣa, stirred up by Māwīlī Dāwūlī, son of ʿAbd al-Muʾāmmīn in 1581 and the rebellion of the Berbers of Amīzīnt in 1597. The throne itself was never seriously threatened except in 1596 when al-Nūṣir came from Spain and landed at Mālīla. Starting without resources, for Philip II would do nothing for him, al-Nūṣir nevertheless proved a redoubtable enemy for gathering round him all those who were dissatisfied with the rule of al-Manṣūr and raised troops from the Barānsī (Braves), always ready to rebel and who had until lately been vassals of the Turks. He took Tānī and tried to raise the Rif and the country around Fès. Defeated at al-Rukn on Aug. 3, 1595, he held out till May, 1596. Decisively defeated at Taghātī, he was put to death. Al-Manṣūr had rarely need to leave Marrākush and he did not like to do so. His mother had acquired a great reputation for her pious foundations. He himself, six months after his accession, began the building of the palace of al-Baḍī‘ which was finished in 1602. Marble for it came from Italy and artists from Spain, and Marrākush became one great workshop. A splendid palace arose, sumptuous pavilions surrounded by beautiful gardens in which stood numerous fountains. Foreigners were fitted out and the Sharif displayed his generosity specially on the occasion of religious festivals: he displayed great pomp and ceremony. His wealth earned him great fame abroad and it was no doubt to it that he owed most of his glory. At his court the principal posts were held by renegades: Jews who had charge of his finances, Christians who conducted his private trading for him, and the agents of foreign consuls. Al-Manṣūr was one of the richest and most courted rulers of his time. Spain kept a regular ambassador or a representative permanently at Marrākush; France had a consul there; there was a constant passage of embassies between the Sharīf and the Señoríle Parte. The palace of al-Baḍī‘ was destroyed by Mawīlī Imaqīl. The mausoleum in it still remains, a very fine specimen of the art of a decadent period.

Towards the end of his life al-Manṣūr was thinking of creating a new Marrākush on the model of Fès. ʿAbd al-Manṣūr at first ruled as an autocrat. His orders were clear, his decisions rapid and sometimes, as might be expected, drastic to cruelty. His intimates, the jazīrīs Rūḥī, a Jew, whom we only know from European sources and ʿAzīz, seem to have been his secretaries, like al-Fīḥīsī, his biographer and poet-laureate whose works have not survived. The Paulīs ʿRājīm, very powerful in the beginning of the reign, acquired such influence that the Sharīf had him beheaded in 1581. In time the notables acquired a great deal of independence and the Sultan hardly dared check their abuse of their power; two factors caused him much anxiety, the anti-French and audacious ʿAbd al-Karīm b. Tuda and his own son Abū Fāris. By a concubine, al-Khazīrnānī, al-Manṣūr had two sons, al-Shaikh and Abū Fāris, and by his wife ʿAbālī ʿAbū I-Iṣān was killed in 1594. In 1579 he had designated as his heir al-Shaikh, called al-Maʿmūn who held the vice-royalty of Fès. The remainder of Morocco was divided into governorships under other princes. These were several times rearranged; Abū Fāris, having considered everything, remained at Marrākush near his father to be ready in case of his death. In Fès, al-Maʿmūn, supported by his favourite Munṭaṣafī, conducted himself like an independent ruler. He had displayed his gifts of energy, leadership, and bravery on the occasion of al-Nūṣir’s escape in 1595; living in great pomp, beloved by his troops, he was undoubtedly a cause of anxiety. His father allowed himself to be led by Abū Fāris. The conflict broke out in 1598. Forced to sacrifice his favourite, he threw himself into prison and then half pardoned, al-Maʿmūn had to renounce all hope of winning in the struggle against Zāīdat who was supported by Abū Fāris. After 1600 he sought support from Spain and Algiers.

Under ʿAbd al-Manṣūr, the dynasty attained its zenith. But it is hardly correct to say that the decline of the Sa’dians only dates from the death of the great Sultan. After the conquest of the Ḍmūn portions, the anarchy reigning in Algiers, the weakness of Spain in Europe, the death of al-Nūṣir, the conversion to Christianity of another pretender, al-Shaikh, Morocco was rich, seemed powerful and the Sharīsīs throne stable. ʿAbd al-Manṣūr, by not being able to arrange for his own successor, nor even to keep his son in obedience, gave his country the chance to destroy itself. This process began under his own eyes, He had gone to Fès to try to reconcile his children and put through the appointment of Abū Fāris as heir apparent when the plague carried him off in 1603. Civil war broke out over his dead body. He had passed the last few years of his life wandering about living in a tent, shifting his camp every ten days, driven from Marrākush by the plague, which had begun to rage in Morocco in 1598.


(C. Fonse-Brentano)

AL-MANSUR IBN ABI 'AMIR, a famous hākim of al-Andalus in the tenth century A.D., was the amanuensis of the Christian chronicles of medieval Spain; his full name was Ibn ʿAmir Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allah b. Muhammad Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir. He belonged to an Arab family which had settled in the Iberian peninsula at an early date: one of his ancestors, ʿAbd al-Malik al-Maʾsūrī, had landed there with Thārīk [q.v.] and settled at Torrox in the province of Algeciras where he had founded a family. Al-Mansūr's father, ʿAbd ʿAmir ʿAbd Allah, was a jurist noted for his knowledge and piety who died on his way back from the pilgrimage at Tripoli in Barbary at the end of the reign of the Caliph ʿAbd al-Rahmān III al-Nasir (cf. Ibn al-ʿAbbās, Tahābil al-Sīla, B.A., v—vi, NR. 1351, p. 437—438; al-Maḥāfīr, Anadīlec, l. 904).

While still quite a young man, Muhammad Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir conceived great political ambitions; they were to dominate his whole career. After studying in Cordova and holding a minor office with the qāḍī of the capital, Muhammad b. al-Salām, he entered the service of the Omayyad court (in 356 [969] as superintendent of the estates of a princess of Basque origin, ʿUbdh, the wife of the Caliph al-Hakam II and his son ʿAbd al-Rahmān, who had just been born. Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir was not long in making his persona grata with this princess and it was without doubt on the intervention of the latter that the young superintendent found himself within two years the holder of the new offices of superintendent of the mint, treasurer and administrator of intestate estates. A few years later (in 358 [970]) he was appointed qāḍī of the district of Seville and Niebla. In 361 [972] the Caliph al-Hakam II gave him command of a section of his police corps (shārtā).

All these offices, combined in the person of Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir assured him a considerable income and soon enabled him to lead a very luxurious life in Cordova. He built himself a palace in the aristocratic quarter of Rūṣdā and his generosity, courtly disposition and his splendor soon placed him in the forefront of the dignitaries of the Omayyad court. In a few years he had filled the first part of his programme: to become popular and indispensable, to make numerous friends, ready to support him on the day on which he would begin his attempt on the throne of the caliph.

Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir very soon realised that it was not sufficient to be popular in Cordova but that he had also to create reliable friends among the generals of the Caliph's armies. The circumstances of the time were peculiarly in his favour. Al-Hakam II, following the example of his predecessor ʿAbd al-Rahmān III, had his North African policy and his armies were busy suppressing a Maghribi revolt which had broken out as a result of an expedition of reprisal sent against the petty Idrīsīd dynasty of Tangier, ʿHasan b. Gannūn. The Omayyad troops, under the orders of the general Ghālib, were sent to dethrone all the petty Idrīsī rulers of Morocco who were more or less vassals of the Fāṭimids. This expedition was crowned with success and ʿHasan b. Gannūn was obliged to take refuge in a fortress of the Rif, ʿHadżrat al-Naṣr, in which Ghālib besieged him. But the Spanish army in Africa was a heavy burden on the treasury of the Caliph. Ghālib had distributed money recklessly among the chiefs of the Berber tribes of the North of Morocco in order to buy them over. Al-Hakam II decided to send over a controller-general of finance and he chose Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir who set off with the title of chief qāḍī (ḫāṣib al-ḥaqāʾiq) and exact instructions. He carried out his very delicate task with untarnished tact. He returned to Cordova at the same time as the army. When al-Hakam II died, leaving the throne to his young son ʿHishām in 366 (976), the new Caliph at the same time as he appointed ʿAbd al-Rahmān the favorite vizier of his father, ʿAbd ʿHasan ʿAlī b. ʿUthmān al-Muṣṭaffa, appointed Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir as the latter's vizier. The ambitious minister now worked unceasingly to get rid of his chief, al-Muṣṭaffa. In the first place he was able to reduce to nothing the considerable power which the Slavs (Ṣaḥḥaṭa, q.v.) had in the Caliph's entourage. In Cordova they formed a body of mercenaries who guarded the royal palace, and at this time their leaders were two of their number, Fāṭiḥ al-Naṣīr, grand master of the wardrobe, and Dāwūdar, grand goldsmith and chief falconer. On the death of al-Hakam they had attempted to oppose the proclamation of ʿHishām who was still a child and to put on the throne of Cordova his uncle al-Muṣṭafa. The latter was slain at the instigation of al-Muṣṭaffa and it seems likely that Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir played an active part in the plot which ended in this murder. In any case very soon after the accession of ʿHishām II as a result of the rigorous measures taken against them, the Slavs lost all influence at the Omayyad court to the great satisfaction of the people of Cordova who had long suffered from their abuses. Ibn ʿAbi ʿAmir also gained in popularity, still further increased when he displayed for the first time the possession of military talents which had not been suspected.

A little later he succeeded in getting the command of an expedition against the Christians of the North who had taken up arms against ʿĪṣām as soon as al-Hakam II had fallen ill. Setting out from Cordova in Ṣaḥīb 366 (Feb., 977) he laid siege to the fortress of los Ríos in Galicia and returned to the capital with considerable spoil. He then cultivated the friendship of the aged and
distinguished general Ghâlib, governor of Madinat Sûlim (Medinaceli, q.v.), and obtained his help to bring about the fall of the hâjîlî al-Mu'ajjał. Ghâlib on the intervention of Ibn 'Abî Amir received the much coveted title of lîn il-futûrsâtiin and the command of the forces on the frontier in the expeditions against the Christians. This friendship was strengthened in a new campaign in which Ibn Abî Amir commanded the troops from the capital alongside of Ghâlib. This expedition was again crowned with success and earned Ibn Abî Amir a new and honourable office, that of commandant of Cordova in place of the son of al-Mu'ajjał who was dismissed. Al-Mu'ajjał, conscious of the danger which threatened him, then tried to play off Ghâlib against Ibn Abî Amir but this was labour lost. The young minister even became son-in-law of Ghâlib who gave him the hand of his daughter Assâ. A few months later, al-Mu'ajjał and the members of his family, who still held offices at the court, were dismissed and their property confiscated. On the same day Ibn Abî Amir was appointed hâjîlî. With his father-in-law, Ghâlib, he was at the head of the administration of the empire.

It was not only the plots he had woven with success nor his personal ability that had enabled Ibn Abî Amir to advance so rapidly in his career. It seems very probable that the princess Şuhî, widow of al-Hakam II and mother of the reigning Caliph, was the mistress of the former superintendent of her son’s estates. This liaison was not unknown to the Cordovans and produced bitter criticisms of the princess and her lover. Public opinion, which had at first been so favourable to the hâjîlî, began to be hostile to him. A plot to overthrow Hîshâm II and put in his place another grandson of Abî al-Rahîm III was prepared but halted in the bud. The Cordovans jurors then spread the rumour that Ibn Abî Amir was devoted to philosophy and that his orthodoxy therefore was quite nominal. He proved them wrong. Ibn Abî Amir did not hesitate to burn from the splendid library formed by the cultured al-Hakam II all the books dealing with branches of knowledge prohibited by the ‘Ulama’. He conciliated them by this act of vandalism the gravity of which can hardly have escaped him. But with his absolute and unfettered ambition nothing which might prevent him attaining his object was allowed to deter him.

But the young Caliph Hîshâm II was now growing up. He had to be prevented from taking an active part in the conduct of affairs. Business was then conducted in the Caliph’s palace in Cordova. In order to set aside the ruler finally, Ibn Abî Amir in 368 (978) decided to build near the capital a regular town for administrative purposes. This was al-Madînat al-Zahîra [q.v.] which in a few years became an important city at the very gates of Cordova. As to Hîshâm, he then began the life of a recluse, either at Cordova or at Madînat al-Zahîra, which was to last throughout his reign. At the same time as he settled the problem of the possible intervention of the ruling prince in the affairs of state in a manner as energetic as it was unscrupulous, Ibn Abî Amir was reorganising the army and inaugurating a new policy in the country. The Omayyad army, in the form in which it was then constituted, was recruited in the country itself and the permanent bodies of mercenaries were not large. Ibn Abî Amir required new ones; this is why from now on till the end of his life, he appealed for Berber volunteers from the north of Morocco and Al-Hisâya. At the same time he realised that the occupation of certain parts of the Maghrib by the Omayyad was only a source of annoyance to the Caliph’s treasury and that any plan of territorial expansion in that direction would be disastrous to the ruler of Cordova. He therefore abandoned all theseprojects, retaining in Africa only one of the keys of the Strait of Gibraltar, the citadel of Ceuta. The administration of the rest of the country he handed over to petty local dynasties under the nominal suzerainty of Cordova. Along with the Berber troops in his pay, Ibn Abî Amir formed other corps by recruiting Christian mercenaries from the north of Spain, from Leon, Castille and Navarre. He was able by his generosity and attentions to secure the complete devotion of his new soldiers.

Having thus a strong and veteran army at his disposal, Ibn Abî Amir renewed with ardour the old feud against the Christians on the frontiers of the empire. He first of all got rid of his father-in-law Ghâlib, whom he had displeased by the manner in which he had upset the old military organisation of the country; then he undertook in 371 (981) an expedition on a grand scale against the kingdom of Leon. He took and plundered Zamora, where he took 4,000 prisoners. The King of Leon, Ramiro III, then made an alliance with Garcia Fernandez, Count of Castile, and the King of Navarre. But all three were defeated by the Muslim general al Rueda to the south-west of Siviance and this town itself was taken by him. Ibn Abî Amir continued his advance on the town of Leon and inflicted another defeat on Ramiro III. The return of the Hâjîlî to Cordova was a regular triumph and it was on this occasion that he took the honorific ḥâbâb of al-Mansûr bî’lîth, "the victorios in God".

All powerful at Cordova and a successful general, al-Mansûr Ibn Abî Amir was to devote the rest of his life to an unceasing war on the Christian frontiers and to increasing considerably the territory ruled by the Muslims in the Peninsula. After his defeat, the nobles of Leon had deposed Ramiro III and proclaimed in their place Bermuda II. The latter finally found himself forced to seek al-Mansûr’s help and to recognise him as suzerain. Al-Mansûr then decided to make an expedition into Catalonia in 374 (985): he defeated Count Borrell and stormed Barcelona, which he sacked. According to Ibn al-'Abbâr, it was the Amirid’s twenty-third campaign.

Ibn Gannûn, the poet Idrîsid dynasty in the north of Morocco having again rebelled against Cordova, al-Mansûr sent his cousin Ibn 'Ashkalûdja to subdue him. Ibn Gannûn surrendered on being promised his life. But al-Mansûr had him executed along with Ibn "Ashkalûdja whom he accused of having plotted against him. This breach of faith and brutal execution having produced a reaction of feeling in the capital, al-Mansûr to rehabilitate himself undertook a pious work: in 377 (987) he extended the cathedral mosque of Cordova which had become too small. Eight new naves were built on the east and the western wall of the hall of prayer and of the qûmân was moved out 150 feet. The Arab historians say that al-Mansûr made gangs of Christian prisoners do this work, for the greater glory of Islam.
In the same year the war against the kingdom of Leon was resumed. The Muslim troops, that al-Manṣūr had sent there, had oppressed the country and Bermuda II had finally driven them out. Al-Manṣūr, punished his boldness with the greatest rigour. In two campaigns several months apart, he took Oviedo, which he laid waste, Leon which he left completely in ruins, and Zamora. The Counts of Leon had then to lay down their arms and submit to al-Manṣūr and Bermuda II was only left possessions very much reduced in extent.

The campaigns that followed were again directed against the N.-W. of the Peninsula. The best known is that of St. Jorge de Campoamor in 387 (997). This famous sanctuary of western Christianity (cf. the article SANTO VÁLKB) was taken by the Muslim troops on the 2nd July (1084 August) and only the tomb of the apostle was spared, by order of al-Manṣūr.

The last expedition against the Christians dates from the year 1003. Its object was Castile. Al-Manṣūr took the capital and destroyed the convent of San Millán de la Cogolla. But on his return from the expedition, he fell ill and died at Madrid in the 27th Ramadan 392 (Aug. 10, 1002). He was buried in this town.

The last years of the life of al-Manṣūr in spite of his successful career and victorious expeditions had been marked by events which might have been fatal to him if he had not once again displayed an iron will and extreme violence in the suppression of plots hatched against him. The few attempts that were made on behalf of Hishām II to regain for him the power, which had been betrayed by his first ministers was in vain. In 381 (991) al-Manṣūr gave up his title of Ḥāfṣih in favour of his son Abū al-Malik. Five years later he assumed with an undaunting worth of him the princely title of malik kirmā "noble king" and reserved for himself the title sayyid "lord". The only thing that he did not dare to do or could not do was to announce the overthrow of the Omeyyad caliphate and the constitution of an Amīrid caliphate in its stead. He arranged however for the power to pass to his heir after him, and it was his son Abū al-Malik al-Manṣūrī who succeeded him on his death and he continued for a few more years the destinies of the Muslim empire in Spain.

Various judgments have been passed on al-Manṣūr. His lack of scrupulosity has been emphasised and the often criminal means which he used to attain his ends. His career is nevertheless an extraordinary one. This dictator was undoubtedly one of the greatest men of affairs that Islam has ever produced and under his "reign" Muslim Spain remained the great nation, which in the caliphate of Abū al-Rahmān III had shown itself one of the most remarkable centres of culture and civilisation in the medieval west.


**MANŠÜR v. NÜH, THE NAME OF TWO SÁMMÁN RULERS:**

1. MANŠÜR b. NÜH I (Abū Saʿīd), ruler of Khorásan and Transoxiana (359—363 = 969—976) succeeded his brother Abū al-Malik b. Nūh (q.v.). Ibn Hāshān was able to describe the internal conditions of the Sámmān kingdom under Manṣūr as an eye witness; cf. especially ib. G. A., i. 341: Manṣūr b. Nūh; p. 344—45 on the character of Manṣūr the justest king among our contemporaries, in spite of his physical weakness and the slowness of his frame. On the virile Hāshān, see saʿīd where also information is given about the Persian version of Tabari's history composed in 352 (964) by or by orders of this vizier. On the rebellion of the commander of the Sámmān bodyguard, Al-Teqī, and the independence kingdom founded by him in Ghazna and on the establishment of Sámmān rule there in the reign of Manṣūr and the son and successor of Al-Teqī, Muḥammad b. Abū Isḥāq (cf. Abū Isḥāq, IBRĀHĪM) see see ABBASI and IBRAHĪM, in Barthold, Der islamische Iran, G. M. S., New Series v., p. 551, note 4, Abū Isḥāq, Towifūk should be read for Isḥāq b. Brāthim (this passage is misunderstood in the Russian original), in other directions also in the reign the Sámmān kingdom prospered in its foreign affairs; the fighting with the Byūjids (q.v.) and the Byzantines was a rule victorious.

2. MANŠÜR b. NÜH II (Abū ʿI-Hārūk), ruler of Transoxiana (387—389 = 997—999). His father Nūh b. Manṣūr, to whom out of all the Sámmān empire only a portion of Transoxiana was left, died on Friday 14th Rajab 387 (July 25, 997) but it was not till Dhul-ʿIlāh (November) that the succession was paid to Manṣūr as his successor. Ibn Bābak (ed. Morley, p. 503) talks highly of his courage and eloquence; on the other hand he is said to have been feared by every one for his extraordinary severity. During his brief and impotent reign he was hardly able to restore terror into any one. The last Sámmānids were quite helpless against the kings and generals who were surrounding over the inheritance of the dying dynasty. One of these generals, Fārīsh, succeeded even in taking Bukhārā at the head of only 3000 horsemen; Manṣūr had to fly to Ṭirmiz (q.v.), but he was called back by Fārīsh. The last months of his reign were devoted to fruitless efforts to settle peacefully the question of the government of Khorāsān, which
was claimed by various parties, but before the
problem had been settled by force of arms, Mansur
was deposed on Wednesday, 12th Sahr 339
(Peb. 1, 999) by his general Fakh and Baghlan,
who succeeded him in the caliphate.

Bibliography: On the chronicles of the
11-13 centuries, ed. by later historians for
the Fatimid period, cf. Becker,
"Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Ägypten" unter dem Titel:

AL-MASSUR, Abu Tahrih or Abu
Tahrih, the Fatimid caliph, was 33 when
he succeeded his father Abu T-Kaisim al-Kahim in
Shawwal 334 (May 946) under particularly difficult
conditions: Abu Yazid, the Khairidji agitator
supported by many Berber tribes and the people of
Kairawan had failed before the Mahdiyya but
was still besieging the city. Abu Mansur executed
his father's death and did not alter the formula of
the Khairidji, of the coin-legends or of the standard
coin. Abu Yazid should profit by the weakness of
Ayub, which was a regular feature of Arab
rule. The siege was relieved by the efforts of the
rehma of the caliphate, which was sent by Abu Mansur
to relieve it. After a short siege, the city was
opened to the attack. Abu Mansur tried to make
peace with him and gave him back his property
in Kairawan. Abu Yazid, in spite of his promise,
attacked him again and was completely defeated
in a pitched battle (Aug. 946). He was then pursued to the
west. After a long delay caused by the illness of Abu Mansur,
Abu Yazid, who was a victim of the caliphate of
Abd al-Malik, was forced to return to
Baghlan, where he was taken prisoner by the
Djibiel Khayma, north of Mina, in Muharram 336 (Aug. 947).

This success established Abu Mansur's
caliphate. A section of the tribes of the Central Maghribi
who had embraced the cause of Abu Yazid made their
submission, like the Maghribi under Muhammad
b. al-Kairi. Taking advantage of the
difficulties of the Fatimids, the Qaamiyah of Spain had
surrendered themselves more securely in Western
Baghlan. A former Fatimid officer, Maimun b. Yusuf,
was ruling the Maghribi in the name of the caliphate
of Cordoba and laid siege to Tiberias. Abu Mansur
released the town and appointed the Imam of Cordoba
b. Muhammad to rule it. He invested with
considerable authority the chief of the Saidiyya Ziri
b. Mansur, who had proved a loyal ally
during his days of trial.

In the case of Kairawan, Abu Mansur had again to
take the field against the son of Abu Yazid who
was trying to stir up a rebellion. Besides
taking the steps in Baghlan and to put an
end to the Khairidji movement, Abu Mansur
developed the naval power of Ifriqiya. His freedman
Farid, supported by the governor of Baghlan,
won a striking victory over the Greeks in the south
of Italy and came home laden with booty (340 = 951).

Lastly Abu Mansur holds a high place among the
builders of Ifriqiya for his buildings. The capital
was no longer Mahdiyya but was Baghlan
where he himself made it so. From 947
Baghlan, also called al-Mansuriyya from its founder,
was the capital. The town built at the gates
of Kairawan was beautified by the palaces which he
built and grew rich on the basins which he
removed from the old city.

Al-Mansur was 39 and had ruled 7 years, when he
died suddenly on a journey from a chill caught
by taking a bath in cold weather (Shawwal 29, 344
= March 953).

Bibliography: On the chronicles of the
11-13 centuries, ed. by later historians for
the Fatimid period, cf. Becker,
"Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Ägypten" unter dem Titel:

MANSUR, founded by Mansur b. Uqamdat
al-Kalbi, was from 258 (871) the capital of Sind
under the Arab. It is described as more
fertile and populous than Multan. Before the arrival
of the Arab, it was uninhabited
(probably identical with the modern Khairdah) and the capital of
Sind, and its name was changed to Mansur after
the Arab conquest. For notices of Mansur by
early travellers to India, see Gazetteer of the Bombay
Presidency, i, Part 1, p. 566, 567, 571, 575.

Bibliography: al-Baladur, Fakh al-
Baladun, p. 439, 444, 445; Abu T-Fids, Tel-
'Ata al-Bulund, p. 62, 346, 350, and E. H. Atkin,
"Gazetteer of the Province of Sind" (Kharoch
1907), p. 94, 96 and 508.

MANSUR, a large town in Lower Egypt,
on the right bank of the Damietta branch of the
Nile, capital of the province, and a large
branch of the Nile went from here to
Ashmun in the north-eastern direction. It
was originally a camping-place for the army, founded
in 616 (1219) by al-Malik, when he
tried to recapture Damiet, then occupied by the
Crusaders. In 1249 the Crusaders were defeated in the
neighbourhood of al-Mansur by al-Sufi of
Mas'ud Tahir, which occasion Lewis IX of
France was taken prisoner. The town is now
an important emporium for the cotton trade; in
1917 there were 46,187 inhabitants. (Baudeler.
It possesses no remarkable buildings; a railway
bridge crosses the Nile at this place.

There are still various other places in Egypt,
called al-Mansur.

Bibliography: Maspero and Wief, "Mamluks pour servir à la géographie de l'Egypte",
Cairo 1909, p. 195 sq. (where the geographical
and historical sources are cited); "Ali Pasha
Mubarak, al-Qifti al-Buldun, vol. 58 sq.;
Baudeler, Egypt, Leipzig, 1849; 1899.

J. H. KRAMER.

MANSUR, the name of a town now
ruined built by the Sufis of Fakr about 5
miles to the west of Tlemcen. The very
precise account given by Ibn Khaldun enables us
to reconstruct with certainty the history of this
typical town-camp. In the year 688 (1291) the
Mansurid Abu Ya'qub Yusuf, who had come to lay
siege to the capital of the Berber-Abi-al-Wal,
which he had closely surrounded with entrenchments, set up his camp on the plain which stretches to the west. As it was a long drawn out blockade he built a few dwellings for himself and the leaders of his army and laid the foundation of a mosque. In the year 702 (Y.2) the "Victorious Camp", al-Maḥalla al-Mansūra, was given the form of a regular town by the construction of a rampart. Besides the mosque, the dwellings of the chiefs, the store-houses for munitions and the shelters for the army, there were baths and caravanserais. As Tlemcen was inaccessible to caravans, al-Mansūr or New Tlemcen, as it was called, naturally attracted to itself the business of the invested town. After a siege of eight years and three months the Marinids withdrew from Tlemcen, and al-Mansūr was methodically evacuated under the direction of Ibrahim b. 'Abd al-Daula, the vizier of the Sultan Abu al-Hasan. The people of Tlemcen were compelled, by the terms of the treaty made with the Marinids to respect the rival town for some time. Some time after, when the entente between the two empires had been broken, they demolished its buildings and rendered uninhabitable the entrenchments left at their gate by their hereditary enemy.

Thirty years later, in the year 735 (1335), the Moorish army under Sultan Abu al-Hasan was once more at the gates of Tlemcen. On this occasion the 'Abd al-Wad Capital was forced to surrender (27th Ramadān 732 = 1st May 1332). Al-Mansūr was rebuilt. It became the official capital of the Marinids during their occupation of the central Maghrib. It was in fact, during this time that the great mosque was built and that the "Palace of Victory" was erected.

After the retreat of the Marinids, al-Mansūr, once more abandoned, fell little by little into ruins. At the present day the rampart of terre pisé flanked by square towers is still comparatively intact; but the interior is land under cultivation and contains a French village. There still exists, however, the ruins of a palace no longer distinct, a section of a paved street, and a very much deteriorated wall of the mosque, but instead of the great minaret in stone, which arose above the principal entrance. Although the inlaid ceramic work has almost entirely disappeared, the façade of the square tower, which is 120 feet high, is one of the most perfect pieces of Maqṣūrī art of the 10th century that survives. The columns and the capitals in marble of the mosque are preserved in the Museum of Tlemcen and Algiers.


MANTIK (A.), Logic. The logic of the Arab philosophers is that of Aristotle, here and there modified by the Stoic and Neo-Platonic tendencies of the Greek commentators. The Arab philosophers did not develop this logic but they gave résumés of it, reproduced it and wrote commentaries on it, often with success; they understood it very well and it is in logic that they came nearest to the authentic Aristotelianism. As to the matter, it was easier for them to grasp the exact sense of the logical writings of Aristotle than of his other works since the translation of the Logic had been made and remains with great care (cf. e.g. the two versions of the beginning of the Interpretation in J. Pollak, Die Hermeneutik des Aristoteles in der arabischen Literatur, Leipzig 1915) while the translation of the Metaphysics for example was very defective and incomplete. The system of the Ḥikma al-Ṣafīr — who evidently did not care much for the subject of logic — at the beginning of his little treatises on logic "the ancient ages have dealt with these subjects and their work is in the hands of the reader, but they are very diffuse, for the translators did not understand the exact meaning" is then not justified.

To the six works of Aristotle, the Categories, Hermeneutics, the Prior Analytics and Posterior Analytics, the Topics, and the Sophistics, the Arabs, like the latest Greek commentators — added the Khoter and the Politics (as to the Physics, Aristotle himself had regarded it [Khoter, i.e. 1356 a 9] as a lateral branch of the Dialectics and Politics). They explained the order of these works in the manner of the later Greek commentary (cf. Elia in Aristotelis Categoriarum Comment., ed. Bonetus, p. 116 sqq.). The most important of these treatises was the fourth, the Posterior Analytics, to which the three preceding are only the preparation and introduction; in the Posterior Analytics Aristotle was thought to have treated of the absolutely True, in the Poetics of the absolutely False and in the intermediate treatises, according as they approach the Poetics, the element of improbability begins to preponderate. Then, still in the manner of the Greeks, they placed in front of these works the Enquiry of Porphyry which as its name, Ṭāʿārāt, and the "Apostrophe of Parleying", Kibla, is one of the several works to which al-Mansūr shows an introduction to the logic of Aristotle.

Among the Greeks there were two further kinds of introduction to philosophy or — since the study of philosophy began with logic — to the logic of Aristotle. In the one which preceded the categories, Ṭāʿārāt (enquiry), ten questions were put (among them: Whence came the names of the different "philosophical schools"? What is the division of the works of Aristotle? etc.) to which a brief reply was given. Among the Arabs, we still find an introduction of this kind in a little work by al-Fārābī, Kīlāt fi-tāriakh an-nahyāt wa-fla'īlīm, translated as "Dictionnaire des Sciences" (transl. Schmoller in his Deux écoles, philoz. arah). The other kind of introduction, the prototype Ṭāʿārāt, is composed of which is given by the pupil of Erasistrus, Ammonius Hermias, was introductory to the Ṭāʿārāt. In the first part two definitions were dealt with in the second division of philosophy. The Arabic treatises on the division of the sciences go to this kind of introduction which they further developed. We still possess from the pens of the two of the greatest Arab philosophers, al-Fārābī and Avicenna, such treatises on the divisions of the sciences. Avicenna's entitled Majāliṣ fi Taṣawwuf al-Ḥikma wa l-Uṣūl was printed at Constantinople.
among the Tafsīrīs, the Ḥijrama, and the Tauba'īyya. For the manuscripts, the publication—a little review of the text, Tafsīrī, in 1924 at Saida (Syria)—and the emendation of the text of al-Fardūlī, Kitāb ʿIrāq al-ʿUlamāʾ, cf. the excellent study by M. Bouyges S. J., in the Milamagre de l'Université St. Joseph, vol. xx, fasc. 2, Beirut 1922. These two treatises were translated into Latin and that of al-Fardūlī in particular, with the Latin title De Scientiis; since it was incorporated almost completely into the De divisione philosophorum of Gundissalinus, had a great influence on the European scholars of the middle ages.

There were three opinions among the Greek logicians as to the relationship of logic to the system of philosophy: 1. To the Peripatetics, logic was simply a methodology, an introduction to philosophy; 2. except for its integral realism the structure of reality is in conformity with the structure of the mind; the rules of logic therefore deal with realities themselves and logic would then be a part of philosophy; this was the opinion of the Stoics and especially of Plutarch, ʿEma, 1, § 3; 3. the combination of these two views in several Neo-Platonic writers: logic was at the same time an introduction to and a part of philosophy. Among the Arabs these three points of view were also represented (cf. Kharrati, Kitāb Mashāfî al-ʿUlamāʾ, ed. van Vloten, p. 152) but the Peripatetic view was in the majority. The third view is found, for example, in Avicenna (cf. Logica, f. 20, Venice 1508).

Logic, according to the Arab logicians, leads, to a knowledge of the unknown from the known (cf. Aristotle, Post. Anal., at the beginning) but its supreme object, according to them and the later Greek commentators, is that, by making us distinguish good from evil, it can guide us to the greatest perfection of soul and the greatest happiness.

Although, on certain points in logic, there were differences among the Arab Aristotelians, they argue on the main lines and even Averroes, who frequently attacks his predecessors with vigour, in other passages of his works often expresses his support of their views that have been disputed; further, the solutions of problems in the Aristotelians and perhaps in other philosophers also sometimes consist of formalism, the meaning of which on examination is not always quite clear. I may here note some general points which are connected with the great problems of Metaphysics.

As for Aristotle, knowledge for the Arab logicians is a representation, an image of reality; there are in the soul resemblances of things (quaqabara, amīqat) which in judgment are put together. According to the Aristotelian conception, since it is at the same time affirmed and denies the knowledge of reality—thought would never be in contact with reality. Naturally implicit or explicit, this contact is often affirmed by Aristotle. A curious example of the conception of knowledge as an image, but in which at the same time the contact with reality is openly affirmed, is found in the theory of the duality of existence, a theory which the Arabs took over from the Greek commentators. The two categories have a double existence, according as they are found in the outer world or as images in the soul and the word existence has therefore two meanings: 1. reality or objective existence and 2. subjective existence of the soul. The intelligence may direct itself in an intention primus (prima ṣaḥib) towards the exterior world of which the highest kinds are the ten categories, but it can turn inwards upon itself in an intention secundus (secunda ṣaḥib), upon its concepts, of which the highest kinds are the five vowels of Porphyry. Everything has an existence, if not in the exterior world, at least in the soul. This theory gives rise to difficulties: in the first place the term "existence" becomes ambiguous; secondly, since the negation of such kind of existence is the soul, "what is not in the soul" must exist in the soul. It is particularly in the Kalām (q.v.) notably among the Ashʿarīs and probably under the influence of Stoic discussions on the existence or non-existence of the "not things" (ʿawna) that the existence of concepts like the impossible and the negative has been discussed.

The Arab Aristotelians were very often content to admit a concept "thing" (ʿamal, the rv. of the Stoics) more general than being, without paying too much attention to the fact that by this they were contradicting the thesis that everything is. For the rest, in the Aristotelian philosophy the concept of existence or of being gives rise to grave difficulties (it is used in Islam, not only among the philosophers but also for metaphysical questions connected with it among the theologians and the mystics. Aristotle had already affirmed (e.g. 1040, b 18) that existence or being is neither kind nor substance and the Arab philosophers al-Fardūlī, Avicenna, Ghazālī and Averroes supported this view with the stereotyped reasoning that existence cannot express the essence of things, since being man implies being animal, being a-living body, being a body etc., but it does not at all imply that man is being. On the other hand being (rv. ūd) and substance (ʿawna) are synonyms in Aristotelian philosophy. How are these two views to be reconciled? Avicenna says, as the theologians had already done before him, that only in God substance (being) and existence coincide; for the other substances, existence must be added to them as an accident. For Averroes on the other hand, as before him for the Ashʿarīs, being is always substance and never accident and he says that in judgments, in which being is predicated and thus apparently an accident, as when one says "substance is", "is" is an intention seconda.

As to the theory of ideas, the Arab logicians deny, with Aristotle and using his own arguments, the separate existence of the universals, but admit with Plato their supersensible existence. This is the theory very prevalent in the last period of philosophy (in the Middle-Platonism, Neo-Pythagoreanism and Neo-Platonism) according to which ideas or universal forms exist from eternity in God. The intelligibility of things comes from this, that their essence is an intelligence; as the idea of the statue in the soul of the sculptor is the essence of the existence and intelligibility of the statue, so the intelligence of the creator of the world is the cause of the intelligibility of natural things. Avicenna expressed this theory by the formula that the Universe is ante multitudinem in multiplicitate (in things) and post multitudinem (in our soul). It is the second element in this formula "in multiplicitate" that offers a difficulty (a difficulty already found in Aristotle): how to conceive of the existence of universals in things which are themselves individuals? Often a conceptu-
nalist tendency is seen in the Arab Aristotelians; it is explicitly stated that the universal is only found in the mind; and following Averroës, the forms in matter, the nozha ala, are regarded as individuals. But since in the system of Aristotle, forms are universals by definition, contradiction cannot be avoided, and the theories of the universals among the Arab philosophers are often very complicated and very obscure. Another nominalist or subjectivist tendency is found in their conception of the relation, which they call — with the Stoics — *what the mind puts into things*. But it is the theologians who under the influence of materialist, nominalist and sensualist Stuartian have developed a nominalist system which often admits atomic and individual facts without a connection, in which all relation is regarded as subjective or even non-existent.

The ambiguous manner in which we deals with the concepts *possible*, *impossible*, and *necessary* gives rise in Aristotle as well as in the Arab logicians, who follow their master faithfully, to grave difficulties. Aristotle (*Prior Analytics*, 32a, 81—85) — like the Arab logicians (cf. Avicenna, *Ikhârī*, ed. Forget, p. 34) — distinguishes two aspects of the concept of the possible; the possible is the negation at once of the impossible and of the necessary, but he does not always observe these two aspects and thus the necessary and the actual are considered as possible since what happens is not impossible. On the other hand, the actual is considered as the necessary, since what happens, happens necessarily; and although the definition of the possible is *what may or may not happen*, for Aristotle *possible* is also *what will happen* since what never happens is not possible. These contradictions are occasioned by the fact that the problem which is at the basis of all this, that is to say, the objectivity or subjectivity of the possible and of the necessary, is differently treated by Aristotle. Aristotle hesitates between determinism and indeterminism. Of two future events, he says in the *Hermeneutics* that one of two will be true, but which is not determined in advance. He says that nothing does not govern the celestial world and that the whole of the world is the reign of contingency. He also says that God alone is absolutely necessary, that all the rest is hypothetically necessary, that is to say, contains an element of contingency. On the other hand, everything is caused, and goes back necessarily to a first cause. All these contradictions are found among the Arab Aristotelians. The Maturakîlims, who, like the Stoics, wish to exclude the possible from reality (but they sometimes regard, like certain Stoics, the *possible* and *necessary* as both subjective; thus affirming that everything is possible) have with justice declared that: if there is a necessary cause, the effect of it must also be necessary and that there is therefore no contingency in the world. According to the Maturakîlims, Ghazâlî seems to admit the justice of this argument but elsewhere he repeats all the theories of his master.

Although Ghazâlî confesses that theology, while opposed to the metaphysics of the philosophers cannot however deny the evidence of their logical techniques, certain arguments of Greek scepticism against logic are sometimes repeated by the Maturakîlims. Definition, *they say*, not possible, because by the particular one cannot reach the universal, and the syllogism is a *petitio principii* since the conclusion is already contained in the major premise. These arguments are justified against Aristotelianism, regarded as an empirical theory which sets out from the particular fact. There is however a rationalistic tendency in Aristotle and the Arab logicians; they admit that the intelligence can at once know first principles and that without induction from particular facts it can grasp relations between universals. But when the Maturakîlims say that knowledge and the Universal cannot give the truth, since according to the definition of truth, agreement must exist between true knowledge and reality, and knowledge is universal and reality individual, they reveal by this argument one of the greatest contradictions in Aristotelianism.

Averroes tried in vain to refute it.


**MANÛF**, name of two towns, in the region between the two main Nile arms called al-Liûna, generally distinguished as MANûF al-'Ulyâ and MANûF al-Sûfî. The latter was situated on the right bank of the western Nile arm, while the former lay more to the east on a smaller canal. Both are described by the geographers as large towns, surrounded by fertile districts and inhabited by wealthy people, especially MANûF al-'Ulyâ, where, according to Ibn Hawâk (p. 92), there resided a governor. The *alâra* of MANûF al-'Ulyâ is often called the *alâra* of Damas and MANûF, while the *alâra* of MANûF al-Sûfî is designated as Tawwâ and MANûF (cf. e.g. al-Maqrî, ed. Wiet, i, 307). Both the ancient towns have decayed since the 11th century, and al-'Ulyâ only knows a village of that name. The name has survived, however, until our day, in the name of the province al-Manûfîyya, the capital of the *mawâlîf* of his name is now Shihûn al-Kawm, and the modern MANûF is a provincial town, situated to its southwest.

MANûF al-'Ulyâ is known in Greek sources as 'Ouâ'ôzôs, *the Coptic name being Penouft Rts; the other MANûF is not mentioned in Greek documents and is called in Coptic *Penouft Htn.*


**MÁPPILLAS** (Moplahs), a group of Musulmân, of mixed Arab and Hindu descent, of the west coast of Southern India, numbering 4,099,453 according to the Census of 1921. Their name is said to be derived from the Malayalam word *māp* ("great") and *pillā* ("child"), an honorary title originally bestowed upon all foreigners and
first applied to Christians, Jews and Muslims, but now confined to the last; this derivation, however, is disputed (Thornton, p. 460—461). They owe their origin to Arab merchants, who were attracted to this coast by the trade in spices, ivory, etc.; settling in various commercial centres, they intermarried with the natives of the country and added to their numbers by proselytising; but fresh accessions of the Arab element having ceased long ago, the Māppillas now approximate to the aboriginal type and exhibit no signs of any admixture of foreign blood. The earliest date of their settlements is uncertain, and the legendary accounts given by the Māppillas themselves are of no historic value (Zain al-Dīn, p. 23—25).

The foreign traders appear to have been encouraged by the Hindu rājas, who made use of them to man their fleets, and by the beginning of the xvii century the Māppillas were estimated to have formed one-fifth of the population of Malabar (Barboza, p. 310), but the arrival of the Portuguese in this part of India checked the growth of Muslim power and ruined the Arab trade. The Māppillas are still successful traders, especially on the coast; inland, many of them are agriculturists. There are both Muslims and Shi’is among them; the former belong to the Shi‘ī school. Their religious leaders are called Singal (an honorific plural of the personal name Zanoor, commonly used in addressing superiors) and are treated with profound respect; many of them receive their training in a college attached to the Džāmī’at mosque in Ponnāri, the chief centre of their religious organisation; the Singal of Ponnāri is an Arab who claims descent from the Prophet; in accordance with local custom he inherits his sacred office in the female line, i.e., his nephew and not his son succeeds him.

The history of the Māppillas is full of incidents of fanaticism and turbulence. In 1524 they attacked the Jews in Cranganor and massacred them without mercy, so that in 1565 the remnant of them fled into Cochin, where they founded the Jewish settlement that survives to the present day (Zain al-Dīn, p. 50—51); Francis Day, p. 351—352). The Māppillas also persuaded Zanoor of Calicut to expel the Syrian Christians from his dominions (Francis Day, p. 357), Even their co-religionists found them to be turbulent subjects; they joined the Hindus in fighting Haidar Ali, as did the Hindus in fighting Haidar Ali, after he had extended his power over the Malabar coast, and they rose in rebellion against Tipu Sultan (q.v.) in 1785, and frequently plundered their territories (Francis Day, p. 365). During the last hundred years as many as 58 fanatic outbreaks have taken place among them, especially in the Ernak sub-divisions of the district of Malabar. Some Māppillas generally begin by murdering a Hindu landlord and then seek martyrs by slaying kith and kin; others join them, after divorcing their wives, and clad in the white clothes of the martyr (gadd, q.v.) go out to die fighting against the infidel, with a complete contempt for death. They destroy and burn Hindu temples, and forcibly circumcise such Hindus as they do not murder. None of these outbreaks appears to have been stimulated by agrarian discontent at the oppressive action of Hindu landowners, but the last (in 1921) was entirely political in character and was excited by the Khilafat movement; it differed from all preceding ones in its wide-spread and clear evidence of systematic preparation and organisation; the outrages committed upon Hindus were of a specially revolting character.

The Māppillas of South Malabar generally observe the Muhammadan law; those of North Malabar follow the local Maromakkattayam system of inheritance, according to which the sons of a man’s sister inherit his property, and his wife is not regarded as a member of the husband’s family but resides in her mother’s home and only receives periodical visits from her husband. On the other hand, a man’s self-acquisitions usually descend to his wife and family in accordance with Muhammadan law.

The Māppillas speak the Malayalam language, but use a modified form of the Arabic script in writing it. The majority of them are illiterate, and few only can read and write. Their literature is mainly composed of songs descriptive of religious war, and they are fond of singing them in order to stir up fanaticism. Their mosques are quite unlike those of other Muhammadans, having no minarets and often consisting of several stories, with two or more roofs; they often resemble Hindu temples in style, and in fact many Māppillas mosques were once Hindu temples.

Māppillas are also found in the Laccadive Islands, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements and Burma.

Bibliography: Zain al-Dīn, Tabāfa’ul-Maṣḥidōn; Historia des Portugueses au Malabar par Zinadīn, publicado e traduzido por David Lopes, Lisbon 1808; The Tabāfa’ul-Maṣḥidōn, translated by M. J. Rowlandson, London 1835; Oudhur Barbosa (who calls them Māpilāri) in Ramusio, Navigazioni et Viaggi, Venice 1565, i. 310 E.; L. K. Ananth A. Krishna Iyer, Cochin Triches and Castes, Madras 1912, ii., chap. xvit.; Kālīm Hāsina Khān, South Indian Māhāmandis, Madras 1910; E. Thurston, Castes and Tribes of Southern India, Madras 1900, vi. 455 sqq.; C. A. Innes, Malabar (Madras Naval and Native Gazette), Madras 1908, p. 82—89; 189—199; L. Bouvet, Les Mofziqas du Sud de l’Inde (K. M. M., xvi. 65 sqq.); F. Holland-Pryor, Māpillas ou Mofziqas, Calcutta 1904; F. Fawcett, A popular Moghul song (Indian Antiquity, xxviii., p. 64—71); Bombay 1899; War Songs of the People of Malabar (1844, xxx., p. 499—508); Bombay 1901; Correspondence on Mofziqas in Malabar, for the years 1849—1853, Madras 1863; Parliamentary Papers, South India (Mofziqas Reformed), London 1921; J. J. Banning, The Mofziqas Rebellion of 1921 (The Modern World, xiii. 379 sqq.); New York 1924. (T. W. Arnold)

MARABUT. (See Muraqqa’-e-Maghrib).

MARAGHA, the old capital of Khwarizm. Position. The town lies at a height of 4,500 feet above sea level on the southern slope of Mount Sahand (11,300 feet high) which separates it from Tabriz (q.v.). This explains the very considerable difference in climate between the two towns which are only 50 miles apart as the crow flies (by the high road 80 miles). The climate of Maragha is mild and rather moist (Hamad Allah and Mocqueney, 1904). The plentiful water supply makes the vegetation rich. The fruit of Maragha is celebrated in Persia and a good deal of it is exported to Russia via Astabad. The district is watered by the streams which come down from the Sahand and then

Māpillas, or Māppillas, a Vernacular term. (See Muraqqa’-e-Maghrib.)
turns west to Lake Urmia which is 20 miles from Marāqha. The town is built on the left bank of the river Ṣift (Ṣofī) which then waters Bināb. A little distance to the east runs the parallel river Murdīrī which waters the district to which Mecquennem gives the name Pahandur (Bayan dur); on the left bank of it are the heights of Mandilur (= with head bound). The next stream is the Lašlan which flows into the Dighzah (= sānduq-nulku). The rivers farther east (Kasamūnghū and its sources which water the Haagurālīd district) belong to the system of the Safid-rād (= q.v.), i.e. the basin of the Caspian Sea.

From the geographical point of view, Marāqha is quite independent of Tabriz. It lies a little off the great road from Tabriz to Kirmāngāhī which runs near Lake Urmia (via Bināb). The direct bridle-path Tabriz—Marāqha by the passes of the Sahand is only practicable in summer. There is also a direct route along the Sahand on the south and southeast side, joining Marāqha to Ardīl and Zanjān. This road has always been of importance whenever Marāqha was the capital of Ardābhālid. The important place on the route was Kīānāra (cf. below).

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Marāqha had 6,000 families (Jārān al-Sabāḥī, 1789 (1850) it had 13,829 inhabitants of whom 6,394 were men and 6,394 women (H. Schindler). Mecquennem (1894) gives Marāqha 15,000 inhabitants.

At the present day the inhabitants speak Kūhī Turkish but in the sixteenth century they still spoke "arabishic Pahlawi" (Nūḥāt al-ḵᵛān; pahlānī-yī mawdū′āh), which means an Iranian dialect of the northwestern group.

The walls of the town are in ruins. Its gates have the following names: Āmbarī, Kirān Khān, Alyādāk, Fālūr, Bināb (or Gilāsāt) and Ḥalajūl-Mnal. The quarters are: Ḡalāb-berg, Madān, Darbāz, Sānduq Khān.

Prehistory. The valley of the Murdīrī is famous for its deposits of fossil vertebrates discovered by Khanykov in 1853. Excavations have been conducted by Gooch (Russia), Stran, Rodler, Pohlig (Austria), Günther (England) and Mecquennem (France). On occasion there have been found an hippopontus, the rhinoceros etc. dating from the period before the eruption of the volcano of Sahand. Cf. J. F. Brandt, Über die von A. Geobot ... bei der Stadt Maragha gefundenen Säugethiere, Deutsch. u. Natureforscher-Verins in Riga, 1876, and the bibliographies in Mecquennem, Contribution à l’étude du géographie des murdirois de Maragheh, Paris 1905; cf. another article of the same author and title in Annales de paléontologie, 1924, 3, 123—160.

The name. According to Bālāḏūrī, the town was at first called Akn-țūrī (Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 283; Aḥmad-țūrī; Yāḥyā, iv. 476; Aḥmād-țūrī). This name which means in Persian the river of "Akūn" recalls very much the name of the town of Ḥāshā who Mark Antony besieged in this region on his campaign against the Pāhlāns in 36 b.c. (Plutarch, Vtn Antuk, xxvlix, Parthia, 1804, p. 1113 and Persol. Appian, Parthia, ed. Segréhen, Leipzig 1785, iii. 77, 99). It has long been supposed that the names Šiva in Strabo xi., ch. xii. and Index, p. 935, Ḥashā, Ptolemy, vi., ch. xii., Ḥashā, Dēn Ča, aliv. 25 are varieties of the same name which was probably that of the ancient capital of Atropatene; cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, i., p. 770. If the identification of Ḥāṣā (summer capital, Strabo) with Tabāt-ī Sallān, suggested by Rawlinson has been accepted (cf. Hoffmann, Amschige aus orientischen Abteten, p. 252; Marquart, Erdehār, p. 108; William Jackson, Persia, Past and Present, p. 136), the identification of Ḥāḥā is still uncertain. On general principles it is improbable that a town like Marāqha so advantageously situated by nature was not in existence in Roman times as the ancient name of Marāqha increases the probability of the identification Ḥāḥā = Marāqha (of course with a reservation as to the exact site of the ancient town).

A place-name Marāqha is mentioned in Arābī (Yaḥyāī) and a little town of the same name is in Egypt near Tašā. The etymology "place where an animal rolls" (from marā-ğ) proposed itself to the Arabs here, but in Ardābālān (cf. also the village of Marāqha near Abarkhōr, Nūḥāt al-ḵᵛān, p. 122) the name is rather a popular Arab etymology of some local name. It is to be observed that Ptolomy, vi., ch. 2, calls Lake Urmia Margiane (margiān; Ḥašā) and gives the same name to the country along the coast of Assyria. Lastly Marqūṭ in Erthehār, p. 143, 221, 313 retains the variant Marqūṭ but Ḥašā seems also to be based on a good tradition (cf. Ptolomy, i., 1838, p. 391).

The Araba. Marāqha must have been among the towns of Ardābālān conquered by Mūṣṭafā b. Shībā al-Thakāfī in the year 22 (Balāḏūrī, p. 325; Yaḥyāī, Kirāt al-Balāḏūrī, p. 271). Mūṣṭafā b. Muḥammad returning from his expedition to Mān and Gīlān in 123 (740) (cf. Yaḥyāī, Historia, iii. 365) stopped here. As the place was full of dung (šargātī < Pers. šargūn) the old village (šargūn) was given the name of Marāqha (cf. above). Marāqha did some building there. The town later passed to the daughters of Ḥārūn al-Raḍīlī. On the rebellion of Wāḏfī b. Rawādī, lord of Tabrīz (q.v.), Būṣūzīma b. Ḥākīmī who was appointed governor of Ardābālān and Armutula (probably in 187; cf. Yasmer, Kermānologie amnesti, Armutul, Zap. Kultur, vestebewexr, 1925, 1, 397), built walls round Marāqha and put a garison there. Whom Bāzak rebelled in 201 the people sought refuge in Marāqha. Marūn sent men to restore the walls and the suburb (rūbad) became inhabited again (Balāḏūrī, l.c.). In 231 Marāqha is mentioned as the winter-quarters of Ḥūṣain in his campaign against Bāzak (Tabart, ii. 1556).

In 260 (893) the Sulṭān Muḥammad Ṣafī b. Dīwān seized Marāqha from a certain Abū Allāh b. Ḥusain, who was killed (Tabart, iii. 2337; Marāqha, Marāqha, viii. 145). In 290 (908) the caliph confirmed Ṣafī b. Dīwān in possession of Marāqha and the whole of Ardābālān. A diwān is known of this year struck by Ṣafī at Marāqha (Yasmer, O mēmehēk Sulṭānāber, Bārī, 1925, p. 14). According to Ibn Ḥawki, in 328, there was at Marāqha a military camp (waṣākh), a governor’s residence (dār al-waṣākh), a treasury (fīṣārān) and government offices (dawwāran al-mudhālay) but Yūsuf razed the walls of Marāqha and transferred the capital to Ardābil (cf. Iṣlahār, p. 184). Marāqha is only mentioned as the name of a place where the last Sulṭān Abū l-Māṣīfī al-Ṭūlī was killed in 317 (920) (Arīb, Tabarī, continuatoris, ed. de Goeje, p. 145).

The Daijamīr. In 322 (932) (during the rule
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of the Dailam Mustafaids) the Russians (Karali) had taken Bayshs's [q. v.] Ibn Miskawali (G. M.S., vi. 100) speaks of the diseases which decimated them because they ate too much fruit in Maragha. This reference to Maragha is quite unexpected: in the text and Margoliouth has rightly proposed to read خِبَّرُ in place of خَبَّرُ. A coin struck at Maragha in 337 by Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Razzaq is a record of the brief conquest of Adharbaydjan by the general of the Rupid Ruka al-Dawla (Vasmer, Die Chronologie e. Gestaufen, Islamica, iii. 4, 1927, p. 170). Of 347 we also have dirhams of Maragha in the names of the two sons of the Dailam Murzubak, Ibrahim and Djastan (ibid., p. 172).

The Rawwadi and the Saldjaks. After the disappearance of the Dailams we find in Tabriz the family of Rawwadi Kurds who seem to have been related with the Murzubaks by marriage only. On the other hand, it is very likely that the Rawwadi were already the descendants of the Assyrians Rawwadi al-Audi, lord of Adharbaydjan (Balshahuri, p. 331) who became assimilated by their neighbours in Adharbaydjan. The best known of these Rawwadi is Mawlabd b. Mamalik (Muhammad; the change of d to t in Kurdi is common) who is mentioned between 420 and 446 (Ibn al-Khatir, 727, 351, 410) and who in addition to Tabriz possessed other strongholds in the mountains (Sahand). When in 420 the Ghuris reached Maragha and executed there a great number of Hasbûd Kurds, the latter united under Wahshadan and drove out the Ghuris (Ibn al-Khatir, 37, 446-472). This incident shows that the district of Maragha was already the sphere of influence of Wahshadan. In 446 Wahshadan became a vassal of the Seljukids, but Ibn al-Khatir, 410, p. 410 says nothing about the extent of his possessions around Sahand.

In 357 the peace between the sons of Malik Shah, Barkiyaruck and Muhammad was signed near Maragha and in 408 Muhammad visited Maragha.

The Ahmadids. In 356 we have for the first time mention of the Amir Ahmad b. Ibrahim b. Wahshadan al-Rawwadi al-Kurdzi, lord of Maragha and Kurdu (Kilisara?) (Ibn al-Khatir, 361). He was the founder of a little local dynasty, which lasted till about 624. We know very little of the history of the Ahmadids, which has never been closely studied.

Ahmadid was certainly the grandson of Wahshadan b. Mamluk of Tabriz (cf. above) and this explains the insistence with which the attihge of Maragha tried to refute Tabriz. Only inescractable hereditary rights can explain the strange fact of the possession of a Kurd among the vassals of the Seljukids. The name Ahmadid is a peculiar formation; the name of Mamlukid, a village to the south of Maragha, belongs to the same category of diminutives. The Ahmadid however very soon adopted Turkish names.

Ahmadid with a large army took part in the Anti-Crusade of 505. During the siege of Tell Bashir, Joscelin came to terms with him (inforh) and he withdrew from the town (Kamlit al-Din, Tell Bashir, Rec. des hist. des croisades, iii. 509). Ahmadid soon abandoned Syria entirely, for he coveted the lands of Sukmai Shah-i Arman who had just died. We know that Sukmai had extended his sway over Tabriz [q. v.] and the reference is probably to this town. According to Shih b. al-Djawa, ibid., p. 536, Ahmadid had 3,000 horsemen and the revenues from his fiefs amounted to 400,000 dinars a year. In 516 (or 508) Ahmadid wasstabbed in Bagdad by the Isma'ilis to whom he had done much injury (ibid., p. 536; Ibn al-Khatir, s. 361).

Akh-Sunukr I. In 514 Malik Mas'ud, governor of Mawri and Adharbaydjan, rebelled against his brother Muhammad and gave Maragha to his attihge Kanim al-Dawla al-Buzurj but the rebellion collapsed and in 516 Akh-Sunukr al-Ahmadid (client of Ahmadid?) lord of Maragha, who was in Bagdad, was authorized by Sultan Malik Mas'ud to return to his fief. As the Amir Kuv-tughid, atabeg of Malik Tughid (lord of Astar, Ibn al-Khatir, 390), had died in 515 Akh-Sunukr expected to get his place with Tughid. The latter ordered Akh-Sunukr to raise 10,000 men in Maragha and set out with him to conquer Ardabil in which they failed. In the meanwhile Maragha was occupied by Djuqshiy Beg, sent by Sultan Malik Mas'ud. The Georgian Chronicle (Brosset, i. 368) mentions under 516 (1123) the defeat of Akh-Sunukr (whose he calls Akh-Sunukr, atabeg of Rana) (Rana) during a demonstration against the Georgians carried out by Tughid from Shurwam. In 533 Akh-Sunukr took a part but not a very active one in the suppression of the intrigues of the Mustafids Dabistan. In 534 he was one of the promoters of the election of Sultan Dawsid, whose attihge he was. In 536 Tughid, uncle of Dawsid, defeated the latter and occupied Maragha and Tabriz (al-Bundari, cf. Houtouma, p. 161). Dawsid along with his uncle Mas'ud and Akh-Sunukr sought refuge in Bagdad. With the support of the Caliph and the assistance of Akh-Sunukr, Mas'ud reoccupied Adharbaydjan. After the capture of Hamadan, Akh-Sunukr was killed there by the Isma'ilis (537) instigated by Tughid's viceroy (al-Bundari, p. 169).

Akh-Sunukr II. The name of Akh-Sunukr's son is transmitted in different forms. Ibn al-Khatir, 1166 and 172, calls him Akh-Sunukr (II); cf. also Tariq al-Din al-Istakhris, p. 475, who calls him Al-Mir al-Kabir Nizafat al-Din Khayb, and, p. 243, Nizafat al-Din Arslan Abu (cf. Khashgari, Dima al-Iskandar al-Turk, i. 80). The Khusrau al-Sunukr, p. 241, 244, 252 gives his name the attihge of Arslan Aba, Al-Bundari treats him as an equal of the great amir Idgah [q. v.], whose family finally triumphed over the lords of Maragha. Akh-Sunukr II's adversary was the amir Khushbukh li Bilingeri (?) who was the favourite of Sultan Mas'ud and sought to establish himself in Astar and Adharbaydjan. This Khusrau had besieged Maragha in 541 (al-Bundari, p. 271). In 545 Sultan Mas'ud took Maragha and Al-Bundari refers to these events (ibid.) but a second Sevilmishid later took place between Khushbukh and Akh-Sunukr II under the walls of Rayy-nd (cf. below). The execution of Khusrau in 547 (1153) by Sultan Muhammad alienated Idgah and Akh-Sunukr II and they installed Salamini on the throne of Hamadan. Muhammad on his return to power sent an embassy to restore good relations with the two lords of Adharbaydjan (Khusrau A). Peace was concluded in 549 and the two great amirs shared Adharbaydjan between them (al-Bundari, p. 243). On his deathbed (554) Muhammad entrusted his young son (Malik Dawsid, cf. the genealogical tree in the Khusra al-Sunukr) to Akh-Sunukr. As Idgah was furthering the interests
of his ward Sultan Arslan, Pahlawan b. Idigiz advanced against Aq-Sunkur II but the latter with the help of Shah-i Arman defeated him on the Safsil-rud. In 556 Aq-Sunkur sent 3,000 men to the help of the governor of Kaly, Ismail, who was fighting Idigiz. The latter gained the upper hand and in 557 Aq-Sunkur II took part in the expedition of Idigiz against the Georgians ( Ibn al-Atbar, xi, 189). In 563 however, Aq-Sunkur II obtained recognition for his ward from Haiduddin. Pahlawan b. Idigiz at once besieged Aq-Sunkur in Maragha (ibid., p. 218) but a peace put an end to hostilities.

In 564 the Amir of Kaly, Ismail, was killed (Ibn al-Atbar, xi, 270). The Turhi b. Gudush, p. 72, seems to suggest that the rebellion in Maragha of Kutlug b., brother of Aq-Sunkur II, was due to Ismail's influence. He was punished by the Atabeg Pahlawan b. Idigiz and Maragha was given to his brothers 'Ali al-Din and Bakr al-Din.

Under 370 Ibn al-Atbar (xi, 280) mentions at Maragha Falak al-Din, son of Ibn Aq-Sunkur (i.e. son of Aq-Sunkur II), to whom his father had bequeathed his estates. Pahlawan besieged the fortress of Ruyin-din and Maragha. On this occasion peace was concluded on the cession of Tabriz to the family of Idigiz. This important detail shows that down to 570 the isf of the Ahmaddi comprised all the country round mount Sahand including Tabriz [q.v.].

In 602 the lord of Maragha 'Ali al-Din came to an agreement with the Atabeg of Arbil Musaffar al-Din to give him Fakhr-al-Din to deprive the Idigiz family of the castle of Idigiz. Al-fakhr al-Din whose brothers were Idigiz, died in 605. Al-fakhr returned to his own lands and Al-fakhr Baker with his brothers had left Maragha. Al-fakhr al-Din had to surrender the fortress which was the bone of contention but was given in compensation of the town of Urmiya and Ushghil. In 624, 'Ali al-Din whose brother was Idigiz and lived near Maragha, died and left one son, a minor. A brave servant of 'Ali al-Din assumed the guardianship of the child but the latter died in 630. Al-fakhr Baker then took possession of all the lands of the Ahmaddi except Ruyin-din where the servant already mentioned had entrenched himself with his late master's treasures.

It is not clear if 'Ali al-Din Kahe-Sunkur II is identical with the brother of Al-fakhr al-Din mentioned in 564. For the date of his accession and his importance we have a hint. According to the praise of the Haft-pakht of Nishat [q.v.], this poem (finished in 593) was composed at the request of 'Ali al-Din Krb (i.e. Arslan (the Rizai) who had paid him tribute [Al-masin]; the Georgians suffered reverses at his hands). This poem was definitely identified by Rieu, Catologe, ii, 595 and Supplement, 1895, p. 154 with 'Ali al-Din of Maragha. Nishat mentions two sons of 'Ali al-Din, Nuqarat al-Din Muhammad and Ahmad, but to reconcile this with Ibn al-Atbar we should have to suppose that both died before their father.

The family of the Ahmaddi was continued for some time in the female line. In 618 the Mongols arrived before Maragha and the town was stormed on the 4th Safar. The Mongols sacked and burned the town and massacred the inhabitants (ibid., xii, 246, 263) but the lady of Maragha (daughter of 'Ali al-Din), who lived in Ruyin-din, escaped the catastrophe.

Djalal al-Din. In 622, the Khwārezmshah Djalal al-Din came to Maragha via Dalalak. He entered it without difficulty for the inhabitants were complaining of all kinds of oppressions and raids by the Georgians (Nasawi, Sīrmat Djalal al-Din, ed. Houdas, p. 110). Djalal al-Din tried to restore the prosperity of Maragha; cf. Ibn al-Atbar, xiii, 285, 286.

In 623 (1227) while Djalal al-Din was in the Persian Ispah, his visitor Sharaf al-Mulk was forced to reconquer Ardashirbad. In the course of his campaign he besieged Ruyin-din, the lady of which was a grand-daughter (mīn khaḍīdil) of the Atabeg 'Ali al-Din Karim b. (Nasawi, p. 129). This princess was married to the dead-mute Khamīš, only son of the Eldigizī Izber. The Atabeg Nasrat al-Din, son of Khamīš, mentioned incidentally by Dunawī, G.M.S., ii, 242, must have been his son. As a way out, she offered her hand to Sharaf al-Mulk. Djalal al-Din suddenly arrived from the Ispah, and married the princess himself. Ruyin-din was given to a certain Sab al-din who occupied the castle containing some thousands of houses (k̲h̲awīd) occupied by the former inhabitants of the town (jālân-dar). Sa'd al-Din decided to evacuate them but as a result of his tactlessness the fortress closed its gates again (to Sa'd) (Nasawi, p. 129, 137). Ibn al-Atbar, xii, 322 seems to deal with the course of these events. Under 627, he says that the troops of Djalal al-Din besieged Ruyin-din for some time. The fortress was about to capitulate when some malcontents summoned the assistance of a Turkoman amir Sindi (Sindī) of the tribe of Kūsh-yalun. The domination of this chief and his relatives who succeeded him only lasted two years.

Ruyin-din. This fortress lay near Maragha (Ibn al-Atbar, xii, 322). According to Zakriya Kawsani who gives a very accurate description of Ruyin-din, it was 3 farakhs from Maragha. It was almost uninhabited at times (Djalal al-Din, 85, 337) and the Atabegs of Arbil occupied the town some years (337) (k̲h̲awīmatk̲h̲awī mašqal) suggests that it was built on the site of Sahand. The Russian map marks on the Solt-e Tail 40 miles (c. 3 farakhs) above Maragha a place called Yav-akhtār (in Turkish = "summer-town") besides which two streams flow into the Solt-e Tail (on the left bank) and between them is written the corrupt name "Ras or Eras". It is very probable that this is the site of the famous fortress on either side of which there was a stream (nahr); for Ras one should read Rizai kahe Ruyin-din. The date of this final destruction of Ruyin-din is unknown. As late as 751 the Coleman Alasaf imprisoned his vizier there. (v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Äthemen, ii, 337) but the Nuzhat al-Gulāb, 740 (1340) only knows the other Ruyin-din, that of Sindiwān (still in 1340 a farakhs from Ardashir).

Kāzāra. Ibn al-Atbar, xii, 340, calls Almādī "lord of Maragha and of Kūshā"). This last name (k̲h̲awīmatk̲h̲awī) seems to be a corruption of Kāzára (Kūshā) or Kūzāra, a little town well known to the Arab geographers on the Maragha-Ardabil road (10-12 farakhs from Maragha and 20-27 from Ardashir); cf. Ibn Khurdādbih, p. 120; Ku-
The Mongols. Maragha was definitely taken by the Mongols in 628 (Jum al-Athar, xii. 324). After the taking of Bagh hlūd in 650 (1258) Hulūg took up his quarters in Maragha and ordered an observatory to be built there from the plans of Nāṣir al-Dīn Tūsī (who had as advisers four astronomers, one of whom, Fakhr al-Dīn, was a native of Maragha). Rashid al-Din, ed. Quatre- mère, p. 352). The observatory was built on a fort at the hill to the west of the town where only traces of foundations of the walls are still to be seen. According to Schindler's plan (1893), the levelled area on the hill measures 137 x 347 metres. On the observatory cf. Tourdjane, Mémoires sur les instruments employés à l'observatoire de Maragah, in the Magasin encyclopédique, edited by A. L. Milin, Paris 1800, vol. vi, p. 45-101 (transl. of an Arabic MS. belonging to the Bâbî National Library and attributed to Nāṣir al-Dīn's colleague Muâẓzam al-Dīn al-Āndī and Ritter, Beiträge zur, i.e. p. 839-843. To contain his treasure Hulūg built a castle on the island of Shāhī 1-2 days distant from the capital. Here he was buried. On the fortifications of Shāhī cf. Tabori, ill. 1171. The hand- some sepulchral towers of which there are four at Maragha (Meqemmon 1908) date from Hulūg or his immediate successors: 1. the one at the entrance to the bridge of Shār-i-ān is built of red brick on a square foundation and has a vaulted cellar (Gunhah-Khurram); 2. similar, situated in the gardens to the south of the town on the road from Khānāqā; 3 and 4 near the old cemetery in the interior of the town; the octagonal tower No. 3 is of red brick overlaid with blue enamelled tiles (Gunbad-i kābūṭ) and No. 4 is round, covered with plaster which is decorated with arabesques (Ān-i harg) *Tower of the Ram.* There is a photograph of No. 1 in de Morgan (1894), p. 337 and Särrä, op. cit., text, p. 15-16: of No. 3 in Särrä, ibid., and of No. 4 in de Morgan, ibid., p. 340. H. Schindler claimed to have read on the Gunbad-i Khurram (No. 2) the name of Akū Bākī Sa'd-i Zangī (allegory of Fārs, 623-638). According to Särrä, No. 4 is later than 1550. The monuments require to be again studied on the spot. Lehmann- Haupt says that inscriptions will still be seen in their interiors.

The early Mongol Ilkhanids led a semi-nomadic life which explains the absence from Maragha of any other kind of memorial. It was only with Chāsīn that a regular capital was built at Tabriz [q.v.]. Maragha continued to be of some importance as a center of its post-ragras and was a station on the road between Adharbājān and Mesoopotamia. Its name continually appears in the history of the Ilkhanids. In 703 (1304) Ūljûji received at Maragha the ambassadors from the Khan of China and installed at the observatory the son of Nāṣir al-Dīn Tūsī. In 712 (1312) Kâšān-kâr, son of Ulmūr, of Aleppo, bearing the wrath of the Sultan of Egypt, Nāṣir, sought an asylum in Persia with Uljůjji who gave him Maragha. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who tells this (I. 779) adds that this town was known as "Little Damascus" (Dimūq al-ṣaḥāba). Kâšān-kâr died in 728 (1230) (d'Ohsson, Hist. des Mongols, iv. 699).

The Geographers of the Mongol period. Zanburī Kašwī (1735) seems to have been personally acquainted with the town. According to him there were in the town members of the pre-Islamic period. He describes the mineral springs (near the village of Kāyāmat-ābād) and a cave which must correspond to the Čai-bāgh visited by Motār, Lehmann-Haupt, Minorsky et al. Kašwī also mentions the mountain of Zandāqūn with a cedarspring, the village of Ḫulqūd (Gunbadā) with a bottomless well (p. 350) and gives a description of Rūyūn-dīr (p. 358).

The Nakkût al-Kutub (written in 1349), ed. M.S., p. 27 estimates the revenues of Maragha paid to the treasury at 70,000 dākār (Arslūd paid 58,000) and those of its wīlāyāt at 150,000 dākār. The fauna of Maragha comprised the southern part of Adharbājān, in the north it was bounded by the wīlāyāt of Tabridis, in the west by that of Khūz (Urmāz), in the south by the lands of Kūrūz (Vaurus) and in the east by Fārsī Adham (Zaujīn, Sāfjān). All the lands now under the modern Sawādūlkhāl [q.v.] were then ruled from Maragha. As dependencies of Maragha, Hāmid Allāh gave the towns of Dīh-i Khwāmān (in popular Turkish Tahārgūn) to the south of Tabris, Lālūn on the right bank tributary of the Djāhgu (cf. Rawlinson, 1841, p. 39: the ruins of Kābūt-i Bātista) and Pāwst in Lāhūstān, in the valley of the Tīrīn (cf. Rawlinson, 1841, p. 39: the ruins of Kābūt-i Bātista). The town comprised six cantons (the names are much mutilated): Sāfjān (f.), Nāyāfān (f.), Dāzgrīh (f.) the mountain Dâzgrīh on the middle course of the Djāhgu), Gāfwāk (at the confluence of the river of the Khwāmān the name is also read Gawdīl, Gawdawmān. It is remarkable that Firdawsi (ed. Moli, vii. 141, 151) mentions in these regions.

Dāšt-i Dīrkh and Kābūt Dīrkh where Bahram Cūhān was defeated by Khwārīz (Bīhūzīn) (probably the district of Hācht on the Tāsūwā, Bāghtān (to the east of Shāhān on the Kārāngūn). The district of Angūrān on the Kūlānān was also a dependency of Christia.
of John the Baptist 2/3 of a farsakh north of Mağrâba. After the accession of Gáhân (1295) the persecution of the Christians began, instigated by the Jew. The mob plundered the residence of the patriarch and the church of St. George built by the monk Rabban Šawra (it had been furnished with articles from the portable church of Arghán’s camp). The patriarch sought refuge in the suite of the Armenian king Hâton. On his return to Mağrâba, Gáhân punished the sowers of the troubles. In 1298 Yakhâbâd was confirmed in his rights. In Sept. 1301 he finished the monastery of St. John. His biographer and contemporary gives an account of the beautiful buildings, the numerous relics and riches of the monastery (Chabot, op. cit., p. 133). The village of Dahrî (7) to the east of Mağrâba was purchased to serve as a waqf of the monastery (to the N.E. of the town there is still a village of Killás-kândi “village of the church”). Gáhân and his successor Udjušt visited the monastery. Yakhâbâd died and was buried there in 1317.

On the south side of the hill of the observatory there are chambers carved out of the rock (2 rooms 12 feet high communicating with one another, and a corridor). Inside there are niches in the shape of altars. Local tradition sees a church in these (perhaps the Sînânian period); cf. MacDonald, Kinneir, H. Schindler, Lehmann-Haupt and Mimirsky, Zesp., xxiv, 1917, p. 167.

After the Mongols. In 1237 (1237) the Ilâyirid Shahiš Hâsan inflicted a defeat on Tughril-Timûr [q.v.] near Mağrâba (or at Haşhtarâb). The pretender Muhammad was buried at Mağrâba in 736 (Naṣīdīr, p. 319). Later the political struggles of the Turksmans’ had their principal arena in the northern part of Arbar-budjin. In the same period the Kûshâb inhabitants of the districts south of Lake Urmia became consolidated and received reinforcements from the districts of Mâwar (Shiwar-nâmâ, l. 238). The Mâkrî Kurds united extended their influence over Mağrâba and even as far as Dîh-Khwarâ Gian. The Turks during their rule over Arbarâbîjin included Mağrâba with Taxta and levied 15 kharâvars of gold per annum on it which caused its inhabitants to go away (ibid., p. 294). In 1303 (1293) the name of the fortress of Saru-korgan (demolished in 795 by Timûr; cf. Shiwar-nâmâ, l. 628 and rebuilt by the Mâkrî) in the region of Mağrâba often occurs in the Shiwar-nâmâ, p. 294–295; this name recalls that of the Sar, the right bank tributary of the Dijâghît. During the second Ottoman occupation (1725) Mağrâba was governed by ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz Paschâ; this administrative unit consisted of 5 sandjakâ of which 2 were hereditary and 3 granted by the government (v. Hammer, iv. 228; according to Celebi-zâde). In 1442 (1729) Nâdir defeated the Ottomans at Miyânsâbîl on the Dijâghît and occupied Dim-lâm, Sawdji-bâd, Murâq and Dîh-Khwarâ Gian (Maldî-ḵân, Torqâ-i Nâdir, Tahâr 1284, p. 66; transl. Jones, l. 104). According to the recently discovered history of Nâdir, the monarch transplanted 3,000 inhabitants from Mağrâba to Kalâb (Borthicolor, in Zesp., xxv, p. 58).

The Morning. As early as the time of Nâdir, the Turkish tribe of Mûdâqand (Mâsrud) is mentioned as settling in the region of Mağrâba (Macdonald, Kinneir: 15,000 men). Aḥmad Khan Mûdâqand played a considerable part in the affairs of Ablâk-bâdûn. Janbâr, Yezîdî, p. 160 knew him in 1805 as beghelâbi of Ablâk-bâdûn under prince ʿAbd al-Mârîz. In 1810 he exterminated the Bûlûs chief whom he had invited to Mağrâba (cf. Sâwâd-mlâk). According to Morier, Second Journey, p. 293, this patrician was aged 90 in 1815 (cf. Brylîghe, Dynasty of the Kozârî, p. 60). The governor of Mağrâba ʿEmâd Kân, a partisan of Muhammad i. the Shâh who besieged Taxta in 1909, was of the family of Aḥmad Kân. At the present day the Mûdâqand are concentrated round Miîyûndûbah.

In 1828 Mağrâba was occupied by Russian troops. In 1878, the Kürd invasion by Šâhîk Ubâydi was reached the gates of Mağrâba. The town was not taken but the whole country round was in ruins when H. Schindler visited it in 1882. During the war of 1914–1918, Mağrâba was within the zone of the Russo-Turkish operations (cf. Tanâj). Bibliography: In addition to the native sources quoted in the text: Panânt, Nîkâh al-Anwâr, G.M.S., xx, fol. 519 (he also derives the nîkâh Mağrâba from the clan al-Mârîz of the tribe of al-ʿAzîz); Ḥosâb Khalîfa, Dâhirî-nâmâ, p. 389; cf. Mâhtab-Čelbi, Shiwar-nâmâ, iv, 573 (confused and of doubtful reading); Zain al-ʿAbîdîn, Bastîn al-Siyâṣa, p. 555.


(V. Minorsky)

MARAND (r.), a town in the Persian province of Arbarâbîjin.

Position. The town lies about 40 miles N. of Tabriz, halfway between it and the Araxes (it is 42 miles from Marand to Diilût). The road
from Tabriz to Khoi also branches off at Marand. A shorter road from Tabriz to Khoi follows the north bank of Lake Urmi and crosses the Mishowdagh range by the pass between Tawidj [q.v.] and Dität al-Dim. Marand, which is surrounded by many gardens, occupies the eastern corner of a rather beautiful plain, about ten miles broad and sloping slightly to the west. To the south the Mishowdagh range (western continuation of the Sawalalda) separates it from the plain of Tabriz and Lake Urmi. The pass to the south of Marand often mentioned by historians is called Yam (Mongol — post-station). The pass between the plain of Marand and Tabriz [q.v.] takes its name from the village of Waliyyan. To the east of Marand lies the wild and mountainous region of Karadjadagh (capital: Ahar). To the north, the plain of Marand is separated from the Araxes by a range, a continuation of the central heights of the Karadjadagh which is crossed by the defile of the Darab. The plain of Marand is watered by the river Zanife which flows into the Araxes (an important right bank tributary of the Araxes) about 20 miles N.E. of Khoi. The length of the Zanife is about 40 miles (Hund Allah Mustawf, 8 farasakhs). Hardt. A lofty tell which rises beside the town is evidence of the great antiquity of this as an inhabited site; it must have existed in the time of the Zoroastrian and Sassanian kings. Its Greek name Mesopotamia is perhaps connected with the people Macepdamia who, according to Ptolemy VI, the king of Euromus, is included in the lands as far as Lake Urmi. A legend of Armenian origin based on the popular etymology mae and ma-"mother" informs that Marand is the tomb of Noah's wife (Hübchenschmitt, De alto antiquitatis Ordinum, 1904, p. 346 and 452; Ker Porter, Travels, I, 217). Moses of Choreme places Marand in the district of Bakurazet. There was another Marand mentioned by the Armenian historian Orbelian (c. 1300) in the province of Surikik (north of the Araxes) and a village of Marand still exists east of Tightam in the khanaate of Mahal [q.v.].

Ibn Batţit. After the Arab conquest a certain Háshas of the tribe of Rabi'a took Marand. His son Ba[h]t, a soldier of fortune (ma'dah) in the service of Ibn al-Rawdát, fortified Marand. Muhammad b. Ba[h]t erected castles there (barād) (Baladgar, p. 330). This chief had acquired considerable authority. In 790 (815) he had taken from the family of Rawdát, the strongholds of Shâht and Tabrīz (Tabarti, iii. 1377). In another passage, Tabarti, iii. 1379, mentions Yakdar [i] in place of Tibriz, Ibn Ba[h]t lived at Shâht which stood in the centre of Lake Urmi (the peninsula of Shâht, where at a later date Hâshas Khuâs kept his treasure and where he was buried). Ibn Ba[h]t was at first on good terms with the Khurram Bâhâk, whose authority must have prevailed in the Karadjadagh in particular, in the north-eastern corner of which was his residence al-Bâshâm. Ibn Ba[h]t suddenly changed his tactics and seized by a ruse Ígam, one of Bâhâk's generals whom he sent to the caliph al-Mu’âmin. In 770 Ibn Ba[h]t accompanied Bagha on his expedition against the Bâshâm (Ibn Khawdît, 1379, 1503). Under the caliphate of Mutawakkil, Ibn Ba[h]t committed some crime (al-bâd) and was imprisoned in Surman-ma‘a. On the intercession of Bagha al-Sha[fb], 50 people of repute became guarantors of Ibn al-Bâshâm’s good behaviour and he must have been allowed considerable liberty. For in 734 (848) he escaped to Marand. Ibn Khurâdâdhîthi, who writes in 734, mentions Marand as being Ibn Ba[h]t’s bâgh. Tabarti, ii. 1379—1386, gives a very graphic account of the expedition sent against this town. The wall which enclosed Marand and its gardens was a faraday (stout wall). The caliph ordered a great ditch to be dug round within it. The dense forest outside was a further protection to the town. Ibn Ba[h]t collected 2,000 adventures who were reinforced by a number of non-Arabs (wâsl) armed with slings. He had ballistae constructed to repel the assailants. During the 8 months that the siege lasted, 100 individuals of note (muhditt al-nukhût) were killed and 400 wounded. When Bugha al-Sha[fb] (Baladgar, p. 330; Bugha al-Saghir) arrived he succeeded in detaching the men of the tribe of the Rabi’a tribe from Ibn Ba[h]t. Ibn Ba[h]t and his relatives were seized and his house and those of his partisans plundered. In Shaywâl of 735 Bugha arrived with 180 prisoners at the caliph’s courts. The capital of Marand was fortified but the latter receded towards the south and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gifts (rasm wa‘dan bu-alad) and gave him his life. Ibn Ba[h]t died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenaries (al-jâbiyyâ). According to one of Tabarti’s authorities (iii. 1388), the caliph al-Ma’âm and Ibn Ba[h]t also quoted his Persian verses (al-fâristâns). This important passage already quoted by Barhold, Bull. School of Oriental Studies, vol. ii., P. 11, 1923, p. 835—838, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persia in the N.W. of Iran at the beginning of the ninth century. Ibn Ba[h]t must have been transmigrated to a considerable extent, and, as he has been mentioned, he reigned for support on the non-Arab element in his state (Shâht al-wâliyyân). Later History. The Arab geographers of the tenth century (Izlaysh, p. 182; Ibn Hawâlî, p. 239) mention Marand among the little towns of Aghbârâdân where the material called sâk was manufactured. Muâthâd, 51, 374, 377, puts Marand under Dâhâl and notes its gardens, its flourishing suburb and a cathedral-mosque in the centre of the market. The same author, p. 384, mentions a direct road from Marand to Marâghâ (via Nûrîn [i], somewhere west of Tabrîz). Later, Marand must have shared the fate of Tabrîz [q.v.]. According to Yâakhir, iv. 505, the town had begun to decline after it was plundered by the Georgians (Karâd) who carried off its inhabitants. This is valuable confirmation of the Georgian expedition to Persia, a detailed account of which is given in the Georgian Chronicle for 1208—1210 (605—607) (cf. Taran and Târîx). Among the theologians, born in Marand, Yâakhir mentions one who died in 745 and another who had studied in Damascus in 433. In 624 (1226) Marand which had not sufficient defence, was occupied by the Emir al-Muktafi of Akhât, Sharaf al-Makr, governor for the Khârijim, retook the town and wrought great slaughter in it (Izlaysh, ed. Houssay, 150, 161). The only historical monument in Marand is the old mosque now in ruins with a mowdâd in a tamarisk bearing the date of rebuilding: 734 (1331) (reign of the Muhâd Alih Sa’îd). Cf. Sarre, Denkmâler pers. Baukunst, Berlin 1910, p. 24—25 and pl. xvii.
and the observations by Herfeld, Die Gumbalchli, Marawiyah, in the Folio... presented to E. G. Browne, 1922, p. 194-195. In the same period (1340) Hand Allah Mustawfi, Nuhshat al-Kulub, G. M. S., xxii., p. 58, counted 60 villages in the district of Maras. The walls (kurdi) of the town were 8000paces (qusim) around but the town only occupied half the area.

Maras is several times mentioned in connection with the Turco-Persian wars. According to Emily Celebi (in 1647), SipahHNmanna, ii. 242, Maras was a hunting-resort of the Timurid Shhurra. In spite of the damage done by the invasion of Sultan Murad, the town looked prosperous and had 5000 houses. Emily enumerates a number of celebrated theologians buried north of Maras.

In the autumn of 1724, Abd Allah Pasha Kopruli sent the Kurd Khan of Bithia Muhummad (see above) to occupy Maras and the inhabitants of which had fled. Resistance centred around the town of Zunfa (10 miles N. of Maras) which had 7000 (?) houses and a castle called Diza by the Persians. To dispose of the threat to their flank, the Janissaries before advancing on Tabriz, fought a battle here in May 1725 with the Persians of whom a large number were slain. Diza was taken and dismantled (cf. van Hamman, G. O. F. A. S., iv, p. 226, following Celebi's tale).

Maras has often been mentioned by European travellers since Chardin (1811 edition, i. 518; cf. the notices by Ker Porter, Jaubert, Miroir, Quenev and Moutech of which a resume is given by Kitter, Erdkunde, i., p. 907). Maras has recently gained in importance since it lies on the modern high road from Tabriz to Dizful built by the Russians in 1906 and replaced by a railway in 1915.

(a) A town in the district of Khultei, in the north of the Oman; cf. Makaddani, p. 49, 290-291.

(Y. Minorsky)

MARASH, a town in Syria near the Asian Minor frontier (al-Turbet at el-Shawwah). It lies about 2000 feet above sea-level on the northern edge of the hollow ('Amak or Marash; now Cağal Owa and south of it Sheker Owa or Marash Owa) which lies east of the Lasham and is separated by its tributary, the Nahirdhitt (Ak-Su). As a result of the construction of the roads which run to Antaklya, to Atin Zara and el-Masjaya, to Anissan (Abu Shara) and Yarpita, via Goksin (Kokosso) to Kasiant, via Behemsi (Bahanah) to Summaiali and via el-Halab and Zibata to Malajja, Marash was from the earliest times one of the most important centres of trade in the Syrian frontier region. It is repeatedly mentioned as early as Assyrian texts as Marash, capital of the kingdom of Gurgum (cf. the article MARASHI), and several Hittite monuments have been found there (cf. Unger, MARASHI, in Elberth's Realthef. d. Vorphisch., viii., 1927, 48).

In the Roman imperial period it was called Germanikel in honour of Caligula (on the coins of Germanicus; cf. Grorée, Rev. d. Études. publ. en Bul. II, 1908, p. 247 sqq.). The identity of Germanikel with Marash is certain from numerous literary, especially Syrian, references. The Armenians probably knew, but probably from a learned tradition only, the name Germenik (Kermigian in Vahram; cf. Math. of Edessa, ed. Dulauz, p. 217 infra; St. Martin, Min. sur l'Arm., i. 200). The statement in the Description of the district of Hala (Paris, MS. Arm. N. 4682, fol. 72b) that the Armenian name of the town was Nahirik (Blochet, R.O.I., ii, p. 325 sq., note 6) is wrong; this is a mistake for Gurnak, a name later given to the neighbouring village al-Halab (ibid.). The Emperor Heraclius passed the town in 626 (Theoph., Chron. ed. de Boue, p. 315; Ramsay, Class. Review, x. 188; Gerland, Byz. Zeitsschrift, iii., 1894, p. 362). The Emperor Leo III came from Marash (Germanikia); later authors (like Theoph., op. cit., p. 391 wrongly called him "Isarnian" (a confusion with Germanikia); cf. K. Schenck, Byz. Zeitsschrift, ii., 1896, p. 296-298).

In the year 16 Abd ul-Haider sent Khaddib al-Walid from Mambij against Marash and the Greek garrison surrendered; the fortress on being granted permission to withdraw unmolested; Khaddib then destroyed it (Caetani, Annali dell' Istit., iii., 1910, p. 794, 806; Syfifin b. Awf al-Ghamidi in 30 (650-651) set out from Masm and settled soldiers in this "Arab Castle" (as Laumann, M. F. Ö. B., vi, 1913, p. 437 calls it). After Yezid's death the attacks of the Greeks on the town became so severe that the inhabitants abandoned it.

After Muhummad b. Marwan in 74 (693-694) had broken the truce concluded by Abd al-Malik with the Greeks, in Dumat al-Jandal in the following year the Greeks set out from Marash against al-Amys (= Amis of Antiokia; cf. Le Strange, Palestine, etc., p. 351) but were again driven back in the Amis of Marash. Marash was restored by al-Athbi, son of al-Walid (I.), and fortified and repopulated; a large mosque was also built there.

The people of Kinnar (i.e. probably the tribe of Kinnar) had to send troops every year to Marash. During Marwan II's fighting against Himas, the Emperor Constans restored again besieged Marash, which had finally to capitulate (746) and was destroyed (al-Balduhurt, ed. de Goeje, p. 182; Theophanes, Chron. ed. de Boue, p. 422; Georg, Kedronos, ed. Boni, ii. 7). The inhabitants migrated to Mosopotamia and the Djam of Kinnar. After the capture of Himas, Marwan sent troops to Marash, who rebuilt the town in 130 (747); the castel in the centre of the town was therefore called al-Marawiyun after him (Yama, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 498 sq.). But by 337 (754) the Greeks again sacked the town. Al-Mansur then had it rebuilt by Salih b. 'Ali (d. 150 = 767) and gave it a garrison which al-Mahdi strengthened and supplied with ample munitions (al-Balduhurt, ed. de Goeje, p. 189; Theophanes, Chron. ed. de Goeje, iii. 445, ed. de Goeje et de Hozov, Thesmophorion K. 'Hababak). The Arabs in 769 (1080) entered the 'Amak of Marash and deported the inhabitants of the region who were accused of espionage on behalf of the Byzantines, to al-Raml (Michael Syrus, Chron. ed. Chabot, ii. 526). According to the Syrian inscription of Enauch on the Epistle, in 770-777 A.P. (1088 S.P.) the people of the hollow (umank) of Marash invaded Asia Minor (Beth Rama'tay) to plunder (Chabot, J. A. soc. ix. viii., 1900, p. 286 sq.; Pogrm, Livre, secre. de la Syrie et de la Mésopotamie, p. 146-150, No. 84). A Greek army of 16,000 men in 161-162 (778-779) under Michael Lachanodrakos besieged Marash which was defended by 'Abu b. 'Ali (Tirahud in Theophil, op. cit., p. 541), grandson of the Caliph al-Mahdi, destroyed al-Halab and laid waste the Syrian frontier (Weil, Grieck. d.
Alexius later sent the general Butumites against Marash (රི་མོ་བན) who took the town, fortified the surrounding small towns and villages and gave them garrisons and left Monastru there as Ὁσσος (Anna Comnena, Ἀλαζάς ed. Reifferscheid, i. 232, n. 12; F. Chalandon, Les Communes, i. Paris, 1900, p. 234). The town of Marash was placed under the Armenian prince Thadak, who had distinguished himself in its defence against Byzantium (Matthews, Descriptions, ed. Dufour, ii. 90); Chalandon, Les Communes, i. 102, p. 1). But by 1104 he had to abandon it and surrender it to Joscelin de Courtenay, lord of Tell Rıbaa (Matthews, op. cit., p. 257, ch. cxxxviii.; Rauol de Caen, ch. 148; Röhrich, op. cit., p. 49, note 8; p. 32, note 4). This Thadak is perhaps the same Armenian as had given his daughter in marriage to Godfrey's brother Baldwin (in William of Tyre, x. 1, he is called Ταφους; in Albert of Aisa, iii. 31, v. 38; Theophas. continuat., ed. Boum, p. 280). According to the Παρεγωγιων, Ταφους (ἐν θείωσισ) settled, Migne, Patrolog. Graec. cxxvi. 1891, Abb. viii. 66, is therefore presumably wrong). The Byzantine Andronicus in 292 (904—905) invaded the region of Marash, defeated the garrisons of Taras and Monastir destroyed Kurus (ibn al-Athir, ed.Tornburg, vii. 317; al-Tabari, ii. 2298; Well, op. cit., ii. 533; Vasili, Φιλοστράτιον Αρχαίον, i. 555, 1902, p. 154). The Armenian Melch (Arch. Malby) plundered Marash in 916; 50,000 prisoners were carried off from it and Taras (Well, op. cit., i. 654; Vasili, op. cit., p. 223 sq.). In the fighting against Siuf al-Dawla, the Greeks under John Kursas took Marash in the spring of 537 (949) (Kanul al-Din in Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 187; Well, op. cit., i. 14, note 1; Vasili, op. cit., p. 268). In 341 (954) the Hasmoneans defeated the Demokritos of Marash and in June rebuilt the defences of the town (Freytag, op. cit., p. 191; Vasili, op. cit., p. 291). When the Hasmonids Abu 'I-Aqbar in 950 was taken prisoner by the Byzantines, his father-in-law Abu Firas followed as far as Marash in the attempt to rescue him but could not overtake his captor (Dufourc, Aba Firdaws, Leyden 1895, p. 31; Vasili, op. cit., p. 297). Necrophores Focas in Eubai. i. 541 (Aug. 692) occupied Marash, Dulfik and Rabban (Freytag, op. cit., p. 199; Rosen, Zaptique Imp. Abad. Notit. alv. 152, note 160). Bagdattakin in 382 (992) carried out a raid on Marash and came back with great loot (Freytag, p. 248; Rosen, p. 250, 263). The Armenian Philaretes Brachamias (Filardins al-Rum) who in the second half of the 9th century, as leader of a robber band and ally of the Byzantine emperor, conquered a little kingdom for himself on the Syrian frontier, belonged to the village of Shurfa in the district of Marash (Michael Syrus, iii. 173, 174, note 9). After the Franks under Godfrey de Bouillon had taken Marash in 390 (1007), they installed a bishop there (Michael Syrus, iii. 191). Bohemund of Antioch was taken prisoner in June 1100 in the 'long Marash in the village of Gâniz (Michael Syrus, iii. 188) on his campaign against Malaya by Gümüşhisar in the Dinarbakh (Recueil des hist. or. des évêques, i. 389; Röhrich, Gesch. des Koenigs Tremis, p. 97; Well, op. cit., i. 179). The emperor
and Hüs Mangür; Nûr al-Dîn kept the rest (Michael Syrus, ii. 397; Will. of Tyre, xvii. 16). When Malik's son Kûlid Arslân, lord of Marâşh (Michael Syrus, iii. 318), attacked an Armenian village, the Armenians under Stephan, brother of the prince Thori, in 1156 revolted themselves by setting Marâşh on fire and carried off the whole population into captivity, during the absence of the Sultan and his Turks (Michael Syrus, iii. 314 [expanded from Barhebræus, Chron. syr.]; differently in Abd Şâma, Rec. hist. or. crit., iv. 927; F. Chalandon, Les Communs, ii. [1921], p. 434). Among those carried off was the bishop Dionysios bar Salih, who escaped to the monastery of Kâbulû (according to Chabot, loc. cit., the karmân Karbûyûn of Anna Comnena, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 219) and wrote three amîrûn about the devastation of his former diocese of Marâşh (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.; Baumgart, Geist, d. syr. litér, p. 298). Thori of Little Armenia in 1156 plundered Marâşh (Barhebræus, Chron. syr., ed. Strozzini, ii. 331; Rûrîchitz, op. cit., p. 319, note 8; Chalandon, loc. cit., ii. 531, note 1). Nûr al-Dîn again took Kûlid Arslân II when he was on a campaign against the Dînâmânshidî Dhu l-Nûn (Michael Syrus, iii. 350) in the beginning of Dhu l-Ka'dâd 568 (June 114, 1173) and Babunsh in Dhu l-Hijjâd (Rec. hist. or. crit., i. 43, 592; iv. 158; Mathioli Utayyecî, ed. Dunzlâver, p. 360; Abu l-Fîdä, Ann. Mâlikî, ed. Reiske, iv. 4; Rûrîchitz, op. cit., p. 303, who is followed by Chalandon, Les Communs, i. 463, wrongly puts these events as early as 1159).

Nûr al-Dîn perhaps handled Marâšh over to his ally Meşh of Little Armenia. When the dynast of Marâşh raided the district of Kâbulû, al-Malik al-Zâhir in 592 (1196-97) took the field against him, whereupon the lord of Marâşh sought forgiveness and recognized his suzerainty (Kamil al-Dîn, trans. Hlochet, K. O. L. I., iv. 318). The Armenian ruler Rûpen III took back Mamiu Mîn of Anjûkîya prisoner in 1185 and forced him to code the territory from the Dînâmânshidî up to Kastûn (Michael Syrus, iii. 356 sp.; Rûrîchitz, op. cit., p. 403, note 7; 607). Ghûayb al-Dîn Kaktûsurw, son of Kûlid Arslân II, in 605 (1208), when on a campaign against Little Armenia took Marâšh (Abu l-Fîdä, Annal. Mâlikî, ed. Reiske, iv. 252) and made Hûsam al-Dîn Tâmmûz governor of the town. He was succeeded in this office by his son Abû Zakîr, who in turn was succeeded by his son Nuqûr al-Dîn, who ruled Marâšh for 50 years. The long reign of his son Munqîr al-Dîn was followed by that of his brother Imâd al-Dîn who however in 656 (1258) abandoned the town which was much harassed by the Armenians and Georgians, after failing to find support either from the Dhu l-Ka'dâd of Rûm or al-Malik al-Sâlîr of Egypt. The town then surrendered to the Armenians (Ibn al-Shîrûn, Bûyûr, 1190, p. 192.

Marâşh did not escape during the great Mongol invasion of Asia Minor. Balâbars I of Egypt in his campaign against them in 670 (1271) sent from Lebdis a division under Taybars al-Wazîrî and Talh b. Mahbûb, who drove all the Tatars from there and set Diet (Rom. Act., ii. 246; Maktûrî, ed. Quatremère, Hist. de Sûltan Mûsî, i. 107). In the wars with the rulers of Little Armenia troops from Halab went as far as Marâšh in 675 and destroyed the gates of the outer town (Weiss, Gesch. d. Chal., iv. 77). In the next few years Barbars negotiated with ensayn from Sûl, from whom he demanded the surrender of Marâşh and Bahmûn; but he was satisfied instead with a considerable sum of money (Maktûrî, ed. Quatremère, sp. cit., i/ii. 1125 [year 673 = 1274]; i/ii. 1124 [668 = 1268]). It was not till 692 (1292) that aikâni Khâlîfî by a treaty received Bahmûn, Marâşh and Tell Harîb (Maknûsî, b. Abû l-Fâjdî, Hist. des Sûltans Mûsî, i. 232; in Patriâ, Orient., xiv. 557; Weiss, op. cit., i/ii. 1386; S. Lane-Poole, Hist. of Egypt in the Middle Ages, London 1901, p. 287). But the Armenians must have taken the two last named towns not long afterwards (Weiss, ii. 215, note 1), for in 697 (1297) Marâşh was again taken by the emir Bâban Tabâkhî, Nîlîh of Halâsh, for Lûtîn. A treaty was then concluded with the ruler of Little Armenia, by which the Dînâmânshidî was to be the frontier between the two countries; Hâmûn, Tell Hamûnî, Kûhûrâ, al-Nâkîrî (its position cf. L. Allâhî, Sîmûn, p. 495-496), Hûdâr Shughîn, Sîrfandâkî and Marâşh thus passed to Egypt (Maktnî, sp. cit., i/ii. 63; Abu l-Fîdä, Ann. Mâlikî, i. 410).

In the second half of the viiiith (ninth) century Zain al-Dîn Karâjî and his son Khâlîfî, the founders of the house of the Dhu l-Kadâr-oghlu, conquered the lands along the Egyptian Asia Minor frontier with Mâlûtayy, al-Bâsîrî, Marâşh, Bahmûn and Kârâtîrî (cf. Ibn al-Kârim). In the mosque of Marâšh one of his successors, Malik Arslân, was murdered in 870 (1465-66); his portrait with the inscription Sultan âlîlûn is painted in the Codex Venetus 516 of the Geography of Plaimy, which he apparently intended to dedicate to his father-in-law Mahmûd II (Olsheimen, in Herber, xv., 1856, p. 417-418).

Conquered by Selîta I, Marâşh became Ottomân; on his campaign against the Dhu l-Kadârîya in 1515 he encamped on his way back before Marâşh and then returned via Karî Marâşh (now Kaur Bâkîr or Karî Dhu l-Kadârîya) and Gûmûn to Kariyatî (cf. Tschänscher, Türk. Bibl., xxii., p. 39, note 4). From 1832 belonging to Egypt, Marâşh passed finally in 1840 back to the Turks. The town was occupied by the French from 1918-1920, after its evacuation it was the scene of massacres of Armenians (F. Tourneux, in Dict. d'hîst. et de géogr., milit., iv, Paris 1925, 401, 360-362).

Marâşh is now the capital of a wîlâyêt which in 1928 had about 185,000 inhabitants; the town itself has about 50,000 inhabitants.

The extent of the territory belonging to Marâşh was liable to vary considerably with the vicissitudes of the town in the middle ages. The following places are mentioned as belonging to the territory of the town.


Ushayrî (Michael Syrus, ii. 447); cf. Ouoph, Upsîl neal Allahîn, Stammî, p. 2389. This place perhaps lay on the Nahr 'Affûn (Asyr. Aprîc) which Barhebræus (Chron. Syr., ed. Abelbevis-Laymy, i. 599 sp.) calls Nahru 'Ufrûn.

Beheîdûn "which is now destroyed" was the
birthplace of Nestorius near Marañ (Furat Orient., vol. 162 sq.).

Shelah, the birthplace of Philaretos (see above).


Zaitun, north of Marañ, scene of the Armenian rising against Turkey in 1844-1845, noted for its rich iron mines (Aghass, Zaitun, Paris 1897; Anatolio Latino, G. Armoni e Zeitum, Florence 1897)

Altibah (q. v.), also north of Marañ;

Andarin, west of the town and the Djafân (not to be confused with Aderin in the Syrian steppes); the capital of the town is Kaban (Armen. Chalan), the capital of Leo of Little Armenia;

Pekanjâli, between Marañ and Altibah; the capital is Bagdian.


AL-MARÅSHI (See SHEBAHART).

MARÅTHA, commonly mis-spelt in Hindi and in Indian Persian Maratha, is the name of a people of western India inhabiting Mahârâstrâ, the country lying to the west of the Western Ghats between the seventeenth and the twenty-fifth parallels of north latitude and extending at one point as far east as the seventy-ninth degree of east longitude. The Maratha state is an agricultural caste, of common origin and nearly identical with the great Kuka caste, but sometimes claiming a Kshatriya descent. The Marathas served in the armies of the Muslim Kingdoms of Southern India, and there gained military experience, but their opportunity came with the decline of the power of the Mughal Empire in the seventeenth century, when their national hero, Shivâji Bhonsla, converted the peasant population of Mahârâstrâ into a military nation. Shivâji was born at Shiner, near DJUNAR, in 1627 and with his fanatical followers he carved a small kingdom of the Carnatic for Bajâpur obtained possession of many hill forts in the Western Ghats. The Satîn of Bijâpur was unable to subdue him, and in 1659 he slew Aâjî Khan, commander of the army of Bijâpur, at a friendly conference. In 1664 he sacked the city of Shantar, and was obliged to contend with an imperial army sent by Awrangzeb to punish him. In 1666 he was induced to pay homage to the emperor at Dîhi, but was so disgusted by his reception that he escaped and, returning to the Deccan, extended his authority there until in 1674, he assumed the title of Râja, and was ennobled at Rejjgarh. He gained possession of the province of the Carnatic which his father had received from Bijâpur, and died in 1680. His eldest son and successor, Sambhedji, fell into the hands of Awrangzeb, who put him to death, but preserved his infant son Shahu, whom he retained at his court, and Râja Râm, Shivâji's younger son, became the ruler of the Marathas, now a nation. On the death of Awrangzeb in 1707 Shahu was liberated, and mounted the throne of his grandfather, but was never more than a puppet-king, and left all business of state to his Brahman minister, or Pishâw, Bajâdî Wahswamit, who reduced his sovereign to the condition of a state prisoner and founded the dynasty of the Pishâws. He left an army to Dîhi, and exerted himself for the effe government, and for the recognition of the Maratha state and the right to levy tax, or one-quarter of the revenue, throughout the Deccan. In the time of his two successors, Bajâdî Râo I (1720-1740), and Bajâdî Râo II (1740-1761), the Marathas conquered Gujûjarat, Mâlwa, Berar, Goudâwina, and Utra, and invaded the Carnatic, Bengal, and the Pasûjâla. They seemed to be on the point of superseding the Mughal power in India when Akbar Shah Abulâ or Durrânsi [q. v.] crushed them at the battle of Pansâ in 1761. The Maratha power survived, however, in the hands of the Pishâw, Bajâdî Râo II, who had founded the dynasty of the Pishâws and had become a great power, and the Mahrâstra, in 1775, tempted the Bombay Government to intervene. In 1778 the Marathas surrounded the Bombay army near Puna and compelled its leader to sign a humiliating convention, but an army sent from Bengal by Warren Hastings humbled Goliath and the Pishâw, and another force defeated Sindhiya and captured Goliath. Peace was restored on terms favourable to the Marathas, but their confidence was much weakened. In 1803 Bajâdî Râo II, who had died from Pünâ, took refuge with the Government of Bombay and entered into a subsidiary alliance with the Government of India. He was reinstated in Puna by
Major General Arthur Wellesley, but Sindhya, Bhonda and Holkar, resenting the Pashawar's suzerainty to the British, took up arms, and the third Maratha War began. In the Deccan Arthur Wellesley captured Ahmednagar, won the decisive victories of Assaye and Argaon, and stormed the strong fortress of Gwalior. In Hindustan General Lake defeated Sindhya's army at Laswari, and occupied Dihli. Bhonda, Josi Jyotis and Berar, Sindhya his possessions in the Deccan, and his guardianship of the emperor, and Holkar was humbled, but after the peace the freebooters known as the Pindaris, whom the Marathas had employed, continued to ravage states under British protection, and even British territory, and when in 1817, the Marquees of Hastings concentrated troops to deal with these marauders, the Pishwa, Bhonda, and Holkar rose against the British Residents at their courts. The first was defeated at Khikri, and the second at Sitaula, and the army of the third was destroyed at Mahipata. The dominions of the Pishwa were forfeited and annexed to the Bombay Presidency, and Holkar and Bhonda lost much territory. Bhonda died in 1855, and his dominions were ceded, in default of male issue, to the British Government. The dethroned Pishwa also lived until 1853, and his adopted son, Douda Panj, was the Naib Sthal of the Indian Ministry. Three great Maratha states remain to this day: those of Sindhya in Gadilwar, Holkar in Indir, and Gekewar in Gujjarat, but not one of them is in Maharrashtra.


MARDITES. These are the Djaradjins [q.v.], singular Djaradjin, of the Arabs: they are sometimes confused with the Djarawinka, singular Djarawina, so called from the name of their town Djarawina. They occupied the rugged regions of the Amur and of the Taurus, separating Syria from Cilicia, as well as the marshy districts of Antioch. They enjoyed a semi-independent dominion under the Byzantines to whom they furnished recruits and irregular troops. When the Arabs seized Antioch the Mardites agreed to serve them as auxiliaries and scouts and were thus enabled to watch the passes, the "Palis" of the Amur. In the small forts built on the heights beside the cities commanding the entrance to or the exit from Syria, they, in conjunction with the Arabs, supplied the garrisons. Exempt from the poll-tax, they obtained the right to quaff on the field of battle. They were in every sense of the word irregular, lying by war and by raids and asking only to fight for whosoever paid for their services; half-nomads, they came and went again like a flash. Very lukewarm Christian Monomphetics or Monophysites — we do not know exactly — their loyalty either to the Byzantines or to the Muslims was quite intermittent. Sometimes, says Bakalhurst, "they obeyed our officials; at other times they betrayed us for the benefit of the Greeks." The precarious nature of the Arab conquest in the North of Syria — a varying frontier region continually devastated by the Muslims and by the Byzantines — and the difficulty of gaining access to the land of the Mardites, made it impossible to chastise such nockie allies.

Towards the year 46 (668) the Greek Emperor succeeded in sending them against Syria. This was not a raid of the type usual to the mountainous parts of the Amur, but a regular invasion supported by a few squadrons of cavalry and led by officers of the imperial army; their bands penetrated into the heart of the Lebanon and occupied its chief strategic points as far as Palestine. The Mardites, discontented with Arab rule and also the thousands of slaves whom the Muslim conquers on land and on sea had collected in Syria, hastened in a body to take refuge with the invaders. The highlanders of this country, who had kept their independence, also threw in their lot with the Mardites. At all costs the Omayyad government had to put an end to this dangerous movement, limit the extent of the invasion and to make sure at once of the neutrality of Byzantium who had let loose this hurricane. Not for a moment did Mu'awiyah hesitate to subscribe to the generous terms of the Emperor — an annual tribute of 3,000 pieces of gold, the liberation of 3,000 prisoners, the delivery of 50 thoroughbred horses. In return the Emperor agreed to withdraw from the Mardites his support in men, arms and money. There is, however, no evidence that these adventurers definitely evacuated from that time their strong positions in the heart of the Syrian mountains. The neutrality of the Empire, the partial checks sustained by them and finally the establishment on the border of the Mardite territory of a strong colony of Tizi [q.v.] reduced for the moment to inaction the Djaradjins, abandoned by the Byzantines.

A quarter of a century later, they once more attracted attention. This was under 'Abd al-Malik, who was engaged in an interminable war with the anti-Caliph Ibn al-Zuhair and was taken by surprise by the sudden rising of the Omayyad 'Amr al-Asi [q.v.] in the year 69—70 A.H. (688—689). The Emperor Justinian II took advantage of these difficulties to let the Mardites once more loose against Syria. The result was the repetition of the movement in the reign of Mu'awiyah I. Byzantium furnished them with subsidies and with arms. At the same time he sent the army of Anatolia to advance and support the irregulars. In the same manner as in the first invasion their ranks were swollen by the accession of thousands of slaves, fugitives and miscontents, amongst whom one could probably reckon the Monomphites [cf. Trlahan]. Taken unaware, 'Abd al-Malik at once followed the policy of Mu'awiyah. The Emperor increased his demands. In addition to the conditions previously agreed to by the Sufyânid Caliph, the Arabs were forced to abandon to the Byzantines half the tribute of Cyprus, of Armenia and of Iberia. In return for this, Justinian agreed to withdraw the Mardites. The majority of the invaders agreed to evacuate Syria. One of their chiefs, who persisted in continuing the war on his own account in the mountainous massif in the districts of Homs and of Damascus, perished, treacherously assassinated by a partisan of the Caliph. A few Mardite bands remained in the country, where we find them again still feared
and handled carefully in the caliphate of Walid I.

Entrenched in the Amanus, protected by the great marshes and the lake region of 'Umk in Antioch, the Djaródjum lived in practical independence of the Empire and of the Caliphate. They chose their masters and their rulers at their own convenience. At the same time some of them were quite ready to put their swords at the service of the Arabs. Amongst these must be named a leader of a band called Malīma or Maimun. He with his contingent (about a thousand men, probably all Mardawīd like himself) perished at the siege of Tyane. His compatriots in the Amanus seem to have wished to profit by the death of 'Abd al-Malik to renew their raids upon the Syrian provinces. Mādāma, the son of the Caliph, resolved to put an end to these rebels. He penetrated into their country, laid siege to their capital Djaród, and forced it to capitulate. Thousands of Mardawīd perished in this campaign. To the remainder he granted the right to retain their Christian faith, to serve in the Muslim armies, in fact he gave them the same terms as were obtained by their ancestors at the beginning of the Arab conquest. After this severe lesson the Mardawīd peril, which had been the cause of incessant trouble during the reign of the preceding caliphs, was practically at an end. The people of Antiochene saw emigration begin to thin their ranks, many of them having decided to emigrate to Anatolia or to enter the service of the Emperor. This resolution, however, did not prevent the Mardawīd, who remained in Syria, from fighting under the banner of the Caliph. We still find them in the reign of Yazīd II when they co-operated with the Syrian army in the suppression of the troubles in the Ṭrik.


H. Lammens

MARDAWĪD B. ZAYN, AHI-'ES-HĀDĪDAH, the founder of the Ziarādī dynasty, was descended on his father's side from the rulers of Gīla and on his mother's side from the Isphahānīs of Rūyān. He had taken service under the 'Abīd ruler of Tabaristan and was a captain in the army under Abū Sāfār b. Dār al-Dawat, who died (948), and shortly after that rebelled against Asfār, made himself independent at Zanjān which he held in ḫiyār and captured Kāzvīn. He then defeated Asfār, forced him to fly to Tabas in Kuhistan and put him to death in 950 when he was attempting to reach the castle of Alamāt (q.v.).

Mardawīd thus became master of Razī and Tabaristan. He then defeated Mādāma (q.v.) and annexed Tabaristan. Mādāma attempted twice to capture Tabaristan, with the help of powerful allies, but Mardawīd defeated him on each occasion and forced him to take refuge in Khorāsān. At this time (970—976) 'Alī, Hasan and Ahmad, the three sons of Bawār, who were commanders of the army of Mādāma, deserted to Mardawīd who conferred on 'Ali the eldest the governorship of the province of Karadāj.

Having consolidated his power over Tabaristan and Gurgān, Mardawīd next turned his attention to Džūbāl, defeated Ḥārūn b. Ṣharīb the governor, in the neighbourhood of Hamedam in 978 (931) and conquered the whole of Džūbāl up to the confines of Hulwān. In the following year Maḥ- tadīr, the Caliph, formally recognised him as ruler of the provinces which he had conquered on condition that he evacuated Isfahān, but as Maḥtadīr was assassinated shortly after this Mardawīd evaded compliance. About this time 'Ali b. Bawār, the governor of Karadāj, rebelled and took possession of Isfahān. Mardawīd sent his brother Washmūn against 'Ali who abandoned Isfahān and retired to Arradžān. To deal more efficiently with 'Ali, Mardawīd made an alliance of friendship with Yāḥūn, governor of Shirāz, marched to Isfahān and threatened to take the field against 'Ali. 'Ali now offered submission and, as a guarantee of good faith, sent his brother Ḥasan as a hostage to Mardawīd.

In 979 (934) the Caliph Kāhīr confirmed Mardawīd in his government on the condition of his evacuating Isfahān. Mardawīd obeyed and sent instructions to his brother Washmūn, the governor of Isfahān, to deliver the province to the Caliph's agent. Mādāma, however, but as Kāhīr was deposed shortly after this in Djaródjum of the same year (April—May 979 A.H.), Mardawīd again evaded compliance.

In Saffar 353 (Jan. 973) Mardawīd was assassinated by his Turkish slaves at Isfahān. He was loved by his soldiers, who, it is stated, carried his coffin on their shoulders all the way to Rayy for burial. Mardawīd was a man of high ambition and had drawn up a plan for the conquest of Buhārī and the restoration of the Persian Empire in his own person, but he was murdered before he could carry out this scheme.

MARDIN (written Mādīrī in Arabic, in Syrian Mārdā, a town in upper Mesopotamia (Diyar Kahrāmān). Position. In Upper Mesopotamia, the watershed between the Tigris and Euphrates where they emerge from the heights which culminate at Karadj-dagh (9,636 feet) S.W. of Hāyar-bakr. This broad massif is continued eastwards in the direction of Djasrat Ibn 'Omar by the limestone chain known in ancient times as Māsās and later as Ila(la (q.v.). The eastern part of this ridge forms the district of Djasrat-Tür or Tür 'Abdīn (q.v.) the capital of which is Midrāj. From the southern slopes of the Māsās descend numerous watercourses, the majority of which join one another before flowing between the mountains of 'Abīd al-'Āzī (in the west) and Tell-K historian and Singā (in the east); their combined waters form the river Ḥabīr (q.v.).
Mardin lies near the point where there is an easy pass through the mountains from the lands south of the Tigris to the Tigris, on the slopes of the Khabur [the stream called Zawirak which rises north of Mardin], in other words Mardin commands the Diyar-bakr-Nisinlun road (which then turns towards Ijjar in the south), to the land of the sources of the Khabur. On the other side towards the west several (Ritter, xi. 356, gives three) direct roads connect Mardin to the Urfa and Birejik (on the Ephesus); to the S.W. a road runs from Mardin to Kâs al-Ayn (there is now a railway) and to Harran. The direct distances are as follows: Mardin-Diyar-bakr 55 miles; Mardin-Nisinlun 30 miles; Mardin-Sawur-Midyât 55 miles; Mardin-Birejik 160 miles; Mardin-Adana (by rail) 450 miles.

The advantages of this position at the intersection of important roads are enhanced by the very strong natural situation of the town, built at a height of 4,000 feet on an isolated eminence on the top of which is a fort 300 feet above the town (cf. the sketch in Cernik, pl. ii., No. 17). Buckingham compares its position with that of Quito in South America. All travellers (cf. Ibn Hawšâb, p. 352) have been struck by the unique spectacle of the vast Mesopotamian plain which from the height of the town is seen to stretch southwards as far as the eye can see. Only a hundred years ago Mardin was still considered impregnable, but the difficulty of access sensibly affected its commerce. According to Cernik loaded camel trains could not ascend right up to the town. A branch line 13 miles in length now connects Mardin with the station of Darbâzîya on the "Baghîdâd" railway, but the station for Mardin is five miles from the town.

Ancient History. It is noteworthy that in spite of its remarkable situation Mardin does not seem to be mentioned in the cuneiform sources. Ammi-yanas: Marcellinus (ix. 19, 4) is the first to mention two fortresses "Mardite and Lorne" between which the road passed from Amid (Diyar-bakr) to Nisibin. Theophanes Simokaita (ii. 2, 85) mentions the Makedon and (v. 3, 17) the Makedon 3 parasanges from Dara. Procopius, De Aedificiis (ii. 4) mentions the Makedon (or Makedon) and the Aëtoci and Georgius Cyprius, ed. Gelter, 1826, p. 462. Makedon Aëtoci.

The name Makedon is in Ptolemy, vi. 1, however, refers to another place in Assyria to the east of the Tigis.

Muslim Conquest: The Muslims under Tup b. Ghanm occupied the fortress of Mardin along with Tur 'Abdin and Dara in 19 (620) (Bâlâshîh, p. 176). In 133 Mardin is mentioned in connection with a rebellion in Upper Mesopotamia. The town formed part of the possessions of Buraka chief of the Râsa who was defeated by the "Abbadî Abd Allah 'Divar (Talari, iii. 53). In 279, Aliya b. Hâl took Mardin from Muhammad b. 'Isa b. Kandilî (iibid., iii. 229b). Hamdan b. Hamdan attacked the town in 87 (1472) seized Mardin. In 879 the caliph Ifhidam marched on the town, Hamdan fled and left Mardin to his son. The latter surrendered the fortress which was dismantled (iibid., iii. 2142). The "grey fortress" (al-kâr al-

dispossessed by his brother Fu'dl Allah 'Abd Taghibil. By the peace of 363, concluded between the Bayad Bakhtîyâr and 'Abd Taghibil, Hamdan recovered his possessions with the exception of Mardin. (Ibn Miskawîh, ed. Amedro, ii. 254 and 319).

The Arab geographers give few details about Mardin but they emphasise its importance. According to Ibn al-Fâkid, p. 132, 366, the Mârîf of Mardin was equal to that of Mayyâr (865,000 dirhams). Ishaqîhîrî, p. 76k, says that it is a large town on the summit of a peak the ascent of which is a faraşî in length; Duniaizâr [q. v.] was one of its dependencies. Ibn Hawšâb, p. 143, gives the ascent at two faraşîs. The quarters of the town itself was flourishing; thence populated with large markets. The water supply was brought by subterranean canals from the springs to the town. The rain-water was also collected in cisterns (ja-hârîj wa-birâk). Yâkût, iv. 390 (cf. al-Kazwîni, p. 172), speaks of the splendour of the quarters outside Mardin (i.e. below the town itself) and its many madrasas, hânîfîs etc.; as to the "l-a" there was nowhere in the world so strong a defence; its dwelling-houses rose in terraces one above the other.

The Mazâwîids and the Sa'dîjîs. It is probable that Mardin was within the sphere of influence of the Marwânis, for according to their historian (cf. Amedro, J. R. A. S., 1904), their ancestor Bâdî (d. 830 = 990) had extended his power over Diyar-Karâbîn (Nisibin, Tur 'Abdin). The Sa'djîs ruled there next. After the death of Malikshah, Tutbuz b. Alp Arslân seized for a time all the lands as far as Nisibin. Under Barkîyâr Mardin was given to his old bard (mughamîn).

The Ortoqids. At this time arose the dynasty whose fortunes are especially associated with Mardin. The son (or grandson) of Ortoq called Ya'kîti assumed the title of sultan in the town which he had been imprisoned but he was taken from him by his brother Sakmân b. Ortoq who died in 498. In 502 we find at Mardin Il-ghezî b. Ortoq (Ibn al-Luhî, x. 269, 321) whose line ruled there till 811 (1406) (cf. the art. of Ortoqids). On their coins attacked at Mardin in 599, 600, 654, 657, 648, 655, 656 etc., (cf. Ghâlib Edhem, Catalogue des monnaies turcomanes, Constantinople 1894.

S. Lane Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. iii. and x. (Index, s.v., Mârîf).

In 759 (1183) Saladin came to Harram (6 miles S.W. of Mardin) but was unable to take the town. In 594 Malik 'Adil b. Alyûb seized the suburb which was pillaged but the siege of the town itself was abandoned in the following year. In 599, 'Adil sent against Mardin his son al-Sharaf who appointed governor (zâhîbî) in its dependencies. The Alyûbîs of Aleppo al-Zâhir b. Salâm al-Dîn offered his good offices and 'Adil was content with an indemnity of 150,000 dinars and the acknowledgment of his suzerainty by the Ortoqîs of Mardin (cf. Abu 'l-Faragî, ed. Poço
cas, p. 439, 445, 447).

The Mongols. In 657 the Mongol HüLisa Khánr demanded the homage of the prince of Mardin, Nasâm al-Dîn Ghâsî Sa'dî, who sent his son Mu'azzâm to him but maintained a neutral attitude. In 658 the town was besieged for 8 months by the troops of Yâshûrîn, son of HüLisa, Famine and an epidemic raged in the town. Ac-
ccording to Rashid al-Din (ed. Quattrémère, p. 375), Muqaffar killed his father in order to put an end to the sufferings of the inhabitants (Abu 'l-Faraj) and Waṣṣīf give different versions, cf. d'Oizieux, iii. 368, 358). Muqaffar was confirmed as lord of Mardin; his descendants also received from the Mongols the insignia of royalty (crown and parasol). In the reign of Salih b. Mas'ud (765-780/1367) whose sister Dūnay Khādītī was the wife of the tālukdar Khandāsh, Ibn Batūta (i. 442-445) visited Mardin.

The Ak-Koyunlu. The Ortoqdī Salīnā Isḥāq (778-809) was king of Mardin at the invasion of Timūr in 796. Sulțān Isḥāq came to pay his homage to the conqueror but the citizens attacked those of Timūr's men who ventured into the town. Mālit Isḥāq was put in chains and taken to Sulțāniyya (Zafar-nāma, i. 663, 671—672). In April 1404, Timūr returned to the attack and the town was taken by storm. Then the siege of the upper fortress (Abū naṣr al-ḫālkhār) was begun but it was never taken. Timūr was content with presents and promises of kharāj and returned to the plain (ibid., i. 676—679). Then the people of Mardin obtained an amnesty on the birth of Ulugh-beg. Sulțān Salīh was appointed at Mardin in place of his brother, Sulțān Isḥāq (ibid., i. 676—681), but three years afterwards the latter was pardoned and restored to his sīf (ibid., i. 787). When in 803 Timūr reappeared in Mesopotamia, Sulțān Isḥāq shut himself up in Mardin. As the siege would have taken some time and supplies were short, Timūr did not stop before the town but ordered Kara Othmān An Koyunlu to besiege Mardin (ibid., ii. 354).

The Ak-Koyunlu. This was the beginning of Ak-Koyunlu interference in Mardin but Kara Othmān's forces were not yet equal to this task. In 805, Sulțān Isḥāq came of his own accord to Timūr and was pardoned (ibid., ii. 512).

For a brief period the Kara-Koyunlu tried to resist the extension of Timūr's power of the Ak-Koyunlu to Mardin. When, after the death of Timūr, Kara Yusuf left Egypt to re-enter into possession of his territory he joined Sulțān Isḥāq and advanced against Kara Othmān. The battle lasted 20 days and was settled by agreement. As soon as Kara Yusuf had left for Adhābdjiqān, Kara Othmān returned to the attack, defeated Sulțān Isḥāq near Dāwās (there is a Dāwās 10 miles W. of Mardin on the road from Derek) and besieged Mardin but once more without success (Mīr Mīrād-jīm bījāh, ii. 685). It is not clear what connection these hostsilities had with an expedition against Diyarbekr conducted by Bābak in or Dījkān (governor of Aleppo, a former Mamlūk of Barākāk) in which Mīr Bābak took part. In the battle which Muhammad (?) son of Kara-Bījāh and Kara Othmān fought against the allies on the 15th Dībā 'l-Kāda' sūq, Sulțān Isḥāq sūq, Sulțān Isḥāq sūq was slain (cf. the Egyptian sources consulted by Rice for Howorth, iii. 685). Sulțān Şehīb succeeded a second time to Sulțān Isḥāq, but the Ak-Koyunlu continued to harass him and finally in 811 he ceded Mardin to the Kara-Koyunlu who gave him Mawṣil in exchange.

We do not know the exact course of subsequent events but, according to Mīr Mīrād-jūlāh, Kara Othmān's successor 'All Beg (832-845, cf. Ahmad Tewfiq, Muḥi't Imp. Ottoman, Mâr., mar., part iv., Constantinople 1905) gave his brother Hammān the task of establishing the Turkomans in the vicinity of Mardin. Dīhāngir (848-857), son of 'All, was already master of the town. In the reign of Utnān Hasan, Joseph Bartholomew visited Mardin and was lodged in the hostel (ospedale) built by Dīhāngir Beg (Zangia). We have coins struck at Mardin by Utnān Hasan (875) and by his son Yaḵūb. After the death of Yaḵūb 'All al-Daula, prince of the Dībā Ḳadard Turkomans, seized the land of Diyarbekr but, as the anonymous Venetian merchant shows, the Ak-Koyunlu retained Mardin. In 903 (1409) Abu 'l-Muṣafar Kāsim b. Dīhāngir dated his firman to the name of the prince of Egli from his capital (diyar Dūsûlu) Mardin; cf. Balāspī, Der älteste Firman der Congi-shehi, Wisswiss. Mitt. aus Ostasi, i. vi., Vienna 1869, p. 497. The coins of Erken come down to 908. The taḵāna of Kāsim-pāshā which Niebuhr mentions must date from the same ruler.

Persian Conquest. In 913 (1507) all the lands as far as Malatya were conquered by Shāh Ismā'īl who appointed his general Ustādu'llah Muḥammad to it. According to the Venetian merchant who travelled there in 1507 (op. cit., p. 149), Mardin was occupied without bloodshed. The same traveller mentions the fine palaces and mosques of the town; there were more Armenians and Jews in Mardin than Muslims. The battle of Kābilār (914) shook the power of the Persians. In place of Ustādū'llah Muḥammad killed at Kābilār, his brother Kara-Kāhān was appointed and established his headquarters at Mardin. Soon the Ottomans occupied Diyarbekr and then the town of Mardin, but the Persians who never lost the fortress restored the status quo.

Ottoman Conquest. Finally in 922 (1516) Kara-Kāhān was defeated and slain in battle at Kargarhan-dede near the old town of Koč-bişār, 10 miles S.W. of Mardin. Persian domination in Upper Mesopotamia thus collapsed, but the fortress of Mardin still remained in the hands of Salāmān Kūhan, brother of Kara-Kāhān. The siege lasted a year and not till Bābak Muḥammad Pāšā arrived from Syria with reinforcements did it storm and its valiant defenders put to the sword ('Ālam-ud-dīn, p. 24, 32; this Persian source mentions 'Ālam-ud-dīn [?] in place of Koč-bişār) (v. Hammer, G. O. A. Z., i. 736—740, quoting Abu 'l-Fadlī, son of Dāwās and continuus of his Hammān). In the Baghdad campaign of 941, Mardin was created a sanjak and included in the eyālet of Diyarbekr. Ewliya Celebi, iv. 59 gives Mardin 36 qasâm and 455 timāshāts; Mardin could put in the field 1,060 armed men (dēvēčī). In the xviiith century Mardin became a dependency of the Pāšā of Baghādād; Otter (1737) found at Mardin a tawza made appointed by Ahmad Pāšā. As late as the time of Kāmīr (1810), Mardin was the frontier town of the pashašī of Baghādād and was governed by a mütevālius sent from Baghādād.

The reforms of Mahmut were badly received in Upper Mesopotamia. In 1832 (Alinsworth) Mardin rebelled. Power in Mardin had passed to the Kurd beyis. Southgate (1836) speaks of a heterogeneous family who ruled in Mardin. The two brothers of the "ruiling bey" seized the power and refused to recognise the authority of the Porte. (It may be asked if these beyis were not of the Mill tribe; or their chiefs cf. Buckingham, cf. cit., p. 156). Rashid Pāšā, the pacifier of Kurdistan, besieged the town and blew up the great mosque.
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(Ainsworth). Order was temporarily restored. Considerable works were undertaken to improve the road giving access to the town. Rashid Pasha died in January 1837 (Foujoulas). When the Egyptians invaded Syria, their partisan Timur b. Ayûb of the Millî tribe seized Mardin (Sir Mark Sykes, The Callip's Last Heritage, London 1915, p. 328) but was killed. The defeat of the Ottomans at Nîrîsh (June 1839) brought matters to a head. The Porte entrusted Mardin to Sa'îl Allah Pasha of Diyarbakır but the inhabitants preferred to submit to Ibrahim Pasha of Mawlawi who was opposed to the Shâmilis. This Pasha appointed a governor to Mardin but the rebel still held the citadel (Ainsworth 1840) and the governor soon perished in a rising. By the šâmilî law of 1287 (1870) Mardin became a sandjak of the vilayet of Diyarbakır. It had 5 šâmilís: Mardin, Nişîrîn, Diyarbakır, Midyân and Âzînî. The area of the sandjak was 7,750 square miles and the number of towns and villages 1,008. The sandjak was mainly agricultural. The town of Mardin produced a small quantity of silk, wool and cotton, leather, shawls etc., but in spite of the excellence of the work these articles were mainly meant for local consumption (Çufnet). By the reforms of 1921 Mardin formed a vilayet with 6 šâmilís: Mardin, 19 towns and villages, and 123,509 inhabitants (Yüreğî Dönmü 'ıçinde 1925—1926 Siyâsetî Mecmuası). The Siyâsetî of 1926—1927 made a number of changes. There are now 8 šâmilís. The area is 6,000 square miles with 6 1/2 million akçe of arable land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Number of towns</th>
<th>Corresponding villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Kot-büşer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawur ('Avniya)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Ömerkân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişîrîn</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Hüsâb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midyân</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Âyîzîn (Dirin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâ's al-Âlî</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kervanıran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direk</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Djebehtî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liçane</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Bâ-derin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ker-lässî</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Hanz-haall-ı Matrañ (Shanarrak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liçane</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Slûth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

922

The wilayet now marches with the zone of the French mandate.

Population. Niebuhr (1766) counted 5,000 houses in Mardin (of which 1,000 were Christian) with 60,000 inhabitants. Dupré (1808) estimated the population at 27,000 of whom 20,000 were Turks (i.e., Muslims), 3,200 Jacobites, 2,000 Armenians and 5,000 Shia. The statements of other travellers are as follows: Kinneir (1843): 11,000 of whom 7,500 were Armenians; Southgate (1857): 3,000 of whom 1,700 were Muslims, 500 Armenian Catholics, 230 Syrian Catholics, 100 Chaldaens; Mühlmann (1852): 12—15,000 inhabitants; Sachau (1859): 20,000; Çufnet (1891): 25,000 of whom 15,500 are Muslims. According to Southgate, Arabic and Kurdish are the predominating languages in the town. The rural population of Tar. 'Abdin speaks the "Tarîçî" dialect of Aramaic; cf. Prin. and Socin, Der new-aramäische Dialect des Tur-'Abdin, Göttingen 1881; on the Kurd dialect of Makas, Kurdîsches Texte aus der Gegend Mardin, Leningrad 1924.

Among the religious sects of Mardin the Şamaliya would merit a special study. In the time of Niebuhr (1766) there were about a hundred families in the town, and Buckingham (op. cit., p. 192) and Southgate (1857) also mention them. The Şamaliya probably represent the last survivors of a local pagan cult. Towards the middle of the 18th century they were led to declare themselves Jacobite Christians but only formally (cf. Ritter grim, p. 503—505).

Christianity at Mardin. The district of Mardin has played an exceptionally important part in the development of Eastern Christianity. A brilliant period of the Nestorian church which begins in 755 is closely associated with Mardin. Towards the end of the eighth century numerous monasteries were established round the town by the bishop John of Mardin. In 1771 the Jacobite patriarchate was transferred from Diyarbakır (Amid) to Mardin. In 1307 it was moved to Delî-Zâfaran. the few's journey from Mardin, to return to Mardin in 1555 (Assmann, Bibli. Orient., u. 110, 221, 470; Winlock, A short Hist. of Syria, Literature, 1891 [Index]). On the position of the Christians before 1914 cf. the works of Southgate, Parry, Cufnet etc.

Antiquities. According to Niebuhr, there are many Arabic inscriptions at Mardin. Those of the Orkûkis have been studied by 'Ali Emiri Efendi who examined the inscriptions relating to the principal buildings of this dynasty at Mardin (cf. Kâbit Ferdi [1944]. Mardin Mucâm-ı Evrakî Tarihî, ed. and annot. by 'Ali Emiri, Stambul 1931). For the list of buildings cf. the article Evcûkûs. The monuments of Mardin which must be of considerable artistic interest have never been described in detail. Buckingham (p. 191) gives a few details about the minaret of the "great mosque" (a cylinder decorated with carved arches, on a square base, etc.; a stone gallery with a pointed roof on the top); i.e., the Mosque of Na'dam al-Din Ali Alpt built in 536—573; but the buildings have never been studied. We do not know if the monuments of Kâbit Pâdashâh Al-Koyanî (Niebuhr) is still in existence. The domes of the mosques of Mardin are "ribbed and guttered," their vertical ribs radiating from the summit.

Bibliography: Idristi, transl. Fahlb., ii. 141 (Mardin = town of al-Dişair); Tin Dibak, G. M., s. p. 241; Ibn Battûtah, i. 128—148; Abu 'l-Fida', Geographie, transl. Reinaria, Paris 1849, ii. 4, p. 55 = Arabic text, p. 479 (Mardin in Diyar Bakû'a); Ebu'l-Cebîl, Siyâsetî-Mecmuası, iv. 57—60.

The Travels of Janos Barabas (1431) and The Travels of a merchant in Persia (1547), in the vol. of the Hakluyt Society, publ. in 1873; 1. della Vallee, Vogels, Brignon 1843, p. 515 (the traveller's wife was a native of Mardin); Tavroviol (1644), Le viage de France, 1692, i. 187; Niebuhr (1766), Reisetheilendungen, Colenburg 1778, ii. p. 391—398, and plate 69: Ch. Glemiet (1795), Voyages. Paris 12 (rep.), iv. 242; Dupré (1808), Voyage, i. 77—82; Kinneir, A voyage through Asia Minor, London 1818, p. 433; Buckingham, Travels in Mesopotamia, London 1827, p. 186—194 (with a general view of the
MARDJ RĀHĪT, the name of a plain near Damascus. On leaving Damascus in the direction of Homs, just before crossing the pass of the Eagle, al-'Ukāb, one reaches the village of Mardj Adhrā. To the east of this place stretches the plain, Mardj Rāhīt, which extends as far as the desert. It was here and not in the "Hocheleine von Qatīfah" (11. Mardīj's the time of the Omacyids after the death of Mu'sawira II was settled. This decisive battle since it was fought in the neighbourhood of Mardj Adhrā was named by the poet al-Kaṯīr after this place. With greater exactitude the contemporary poet al-Aḫṭal, who was more cognizant with Omacyid history, places this battle "between the 'Ukāb and Rāhīt" namely in "the vast plain of Mardj" mentioned by the poets (Aḏkahtī, xvii. 112).

During the discussions of the congress of Dijbīya [q.v.] the concentration of the Kaṭi forces was taking place under the command of Dāhīb b. Kāš [q.v.] supported by the Yemen contingent and the Kaṭi maḥṣūntūt to the south-east of Damascus. Their total — which has probably been exaggerated — has been placed at 30,000. Mardj b. al-Jafak had at his command eight or ten thousand combatants, the majority of whom were Kāšī. The Kāšt seem to have taken up their position first at Mardj al-'Ṣaffar [q.v.] to the north of Dijbīya. After an engagement in this place had settled to their disadvantage, they were forced to double back to the north. In the meantime a sudden attack launched against Damascus which was depleted of troops, had delivered into the hands of the Omacyids supports the treasury and the arsenals of this town. The Kaṭi in order to avoid being caught between the capital and the Kaṭi army advancing from Dijbīya retreated, while harassed at this quarter by better-armed forces. These engagements occupied nearly twenty days.

On arriving on the heights of Mardj Rāhīt, trapped between the defiles of 'Ukūb and the desert, they accepted battle. One must ask how the Kaṭi succeeded in making up for their glaring inferiority in numbers. Mardj b. al-Jafak, without explaining further, speaks of a stratagem devised by Mardīj. This stratagem, which is mentioned by the author of
the 'Irak al-safar, should be described not as a case of war but as a crime. After the advantage gained at Marj al-Suflar, the Omayyads had had the time, and without doubt made use of it, to detach from the Kharij their temporary allies, the Yezidis, of the Sufyānids. It was the very pressure of these states that had brought upon the 'Irak by the family of Ziyād b. Abīth. They may have been of assistance in doing this. The Syrian Arabs, not at their ease in the camp of Daḥḥik, do not understand how much the triumph of Ibn al-Zubair would be prejudicial to their hitherto privileged position and to the hegemony wielded since the days of the Sufyānids by the Syrian tribes. Their defection must, we think, have determined the issue of the engagement at Marj Rāḥit and hastened the triumph of the Omayyad army. Whatever was the cause this victory was decisive (the middle of July 684). 3,000 Kharij are said to have been killed. The death of Daḥḥik seems to have been the signal of defeat, which became a popular disaster, in which the principal chiefs of Kālib and Kūtīm died, the last being most prominent among them, Zafar b. al-Hārith (q.v.).

The memory of Marj Rāḥit was deeply impressed upon the Kharij. It detached them from the Omayyad cause. Under the first two Marwānī caliphs, their battle-cry became "Vengeance for the victims of Raḥit!". From this time a smile is said never to have appeared on the countenances of the surviving chiefs. Between them and their ancient rivals of Kālib the split became much deeper. Between the latter's songs of victory answered the cries of rage of the Kharij. In celebrating the battle of Raḥit the Kālib poets gave more emphasis to their triumph than to that of the Omayyads. Their compositions clumsily develop this theme without regard to the Marwānīs, their debtors rather than their sovereigns. This glorious victory afforded the aged Marwan the opportunity of proclaiming himself as Caliph of Damascus before beginning the conquest of the old Sufyānid lands now under the authority of Ibn al-Zubair. In the bosom of the Caliphate, it nourished the most dangerous rebellion; it inaugurated a savage war of extermination between Kālib and Kūtīm. The tribes of Kūtīm's first, then the Yezidis and lastly the Taghlib saw themselves in turn fatally involved. These internal feuds in which the members of the Marwānī family had the impudence to take part, to the satisfaction of their maternal connections, precipitated the fall of the Omayyad dynasty by destroying the agreement and the unity amongst the Arab tribes, which had been but imperfectly realised with the Sufyānids and the Taghlib.


**MARDJ AL-SUFLAR, a plain situated 20 miles south of Damascus near the modern Tell Saḥḥa; a stream called the "Wadi Atārūn" runs through it. The place plays a part in the military history of the first century A.H.; first in the accounts of the Arab conquests of Syria and later at the beginning of the Marwānī dynasty. The name has been sometimes confused with that of Marj Rāḥit (q.v.). For the history of Syria in the first century A.H., we are exclusively dependent upon the 'Irak annalists. Forgetting that the name "Marj" abounds in the toponomy of the Damascus region, writers have confused two distinct battles and made them one and referred them to Marj Rāḥit, a name which occurs frequently in the poems of the Marwānī period.

At the close of the year 13 A.H., the Arabs, victorious at Fih, endeavoured to reach Damascus by cutting across the Ḥawwāl. One of their bands, under the command of the Omayyad Khalīl b. Saḥīf, encamped at Marj al-Suflar and allowed themselves to be taken by surprise by the Byzantine troops. The latter killed and dispersed the contingent decimated. But the arrival of Muslim reinforcements enabled them to regain the advantage. The Greeks then proceeded to shut themselves in Damascus to which the Arabs at once laid siege.

In the month of May 684 (64), supporters of the Omayyads joined with Dabīhya (q.v.) in order to elect a successor to Muḥammad II. Daḥḥik b. Kās (q.v.), the leader of the rival section of the Zabīlātī and the governor of Damascus, was invited to the conference. He promised to come to the conclave and marched out of Damascus at the head of imposing forces. But, having gone about half way on the road to Dabīhya, on the heights of Marj al-Suflar, he determined to await events there. The presence of water and of forage made it suitable for the encampment of an army. An excellent point of observation, the site not only commanded the congress of Dabīhya, but also commanded the road leading to Damascus. Daḥḥik brought about at this point the concentration of the Kharij of Syria, who were in revolt against the Omayyads. At Dabīhya after 40 days' deliberation, the Kharij and the Omayyad partisans elected Marwān b. al-Hakam (q.v.) to be Caliph. Then in their advance upon Damascus, they attacked Daḥḥik and the Kharij encamped at Marj al-Suflar and succeeded in defeating them.

Of this campaign the 'Irak annalists and their copyists have only recorded and have only desired to record the decisive battle, namely that of Marj Rāḥit, to the north of Damascus. For a quarter of a century no mention is made of any battle between the Kharij and the Khalīl b. Marj Rāḥit. The extraordinary prominence given to this latter battle by the poets of both sides helped to throw into oblivion the preceding engagements commencing with that of Marj al-Suflar. Certain texts have however preserved their memory. Yāšir (Maḏjar, iii. 400) places in this place a battle celebrated in the history and poetry of the Marwānī period." Otherwise there is no reference to Marj al-Suflar in the military history of the younger branch of the Omayyads. As regards poetry it has kept for us the testimony of the Taghlib poet al-Akhṭal (Dīwān, ed. Salhani, p. 324, v. 1). This contemporary poet, who was a habitant of the Omayyad court while praising the glorious deeds of his
tribe, claims for it "many victories even before Mardjar al-Suffar". As we know that the Taghlibites fought in the ranks of the Omayyads, for whom they showed themselves at all times strong partisans, the reference must be to this battle. Moreover the manner in which al-Akhali praises this victory suggests that he was not dealing with a small skirmish.

In the meanwhile an Omayyad partisan residing at Damascus had seized the capital. The position became untenable at Mardjar al-Suffar for the Kharijas. It was to avoid being caught between Damascans and the victorious Khalids that Daljak fell back precipitously to Muruj al-Dahhah where he was defeated and killed. On the 22d June 564, the election of Muruj b. al-Hakam was proclaimed at Djasirah. It is probable then that the battle of Mardjar al-Suffar must be located in the early days of July.


MAREA. [See MAREJ].

MARGHELAN, originally Marghian, a town in Fergana [q. v.]; where also the minor importance of the town in the 19th century (E. G. A., iii. 272; 273; maghiana) and its rise in the centuries following are discussed (Samand, K. al-Amidi, G.M.S., xx, 1. 528; min maghian al-Balad-dan; Ya'qub, iv. 500; 511; min maghiana al-Ab). The town does not seem to have been of political importance during this period, although raids were occasionally struck here under the dynasty of the Ilek-Khans [q. v.]; A. Markow, Inventories of A. Markow, Katalog manumisi, unter dem Namen K.(p. 260, 265 and 273). Bahar (fac. ed. Beveridge, fac. ed. Beveridge, p. 8) gives a brief description of the town at this period. The population at this time consisted of Slavs [q. v.] i.e., according to the linguistic usage of the time, of Tajiks [q. v.]; since then the Tajiks have been driven by the Oghuz and the others there outside of the plain. The more recent, probably Slav form Marghian is found for example in Abd al-Karim Bukhari (ed. Schifer, p. 94) whereas the Russian Margelian; the river on which the town stands is called Margelian-Sai. In literature the old form Marghian or Marghian is still frequently used e.g. in the Turki Shakhkari, ed. Pantusow, p. 195.

Margelian was occupied without resistance by the Russians on the 12th Sept. 1873; New Margelian founded as the capital of Fergana in 1877 by the Russians about 7 miles from Marghelan was called Skobelew from 1907 (since the Revolution: Fergana). The original Margelian was mainly noted for its silk industry: according to the census of 1897, the population was 36,490, in 1911 45,780 of whom only 144 were Russians. A building which is certainly not ancient is called Ishkandar Pasha and said to be the tomb of Alexander the Great (W. Massalisky, Turkestanische Kriti, Petersburg 1913, p. 705 sq.).

Bibliography: in the text.—(W. Baptist).
3. 'Omar Nīṣām al-Dīn al-Fārghānī. Two works by him are recorded: 1. Ǧīhād (H. Khūn, No. 9305); 2. Ǧīhayāt al-Fīḥā, which he compiled from the Māshayiq of Zāhīr and other works (H. Khūn, No. 4291; MSS. in Brockelmann, G. A. L., l. 376, note 2, where the mark of interrogation should be deleted; cf. Kurshū, l. 394; Laknawī, p. 149).


Bidayya

author's own commentary

Hidayya

comm. by al-Sighānšt: Ǧīhayāt (written in 700 = 1300)

comm. by Abū Ǧīhād (忿 756 = 1358):

comm. by Abū al-Kuršūn (viiīth = xiiith century):

synopses by Maḥmūd b. Ǧāḥir al-Shābī's I

(ʿilāl = iiiith century):

Widayya

comm. by Ǧāḥir al-Shābī's II (忿 747 = 1346):

/sec al-Widayya (written in 743)

synopses by Ǧāḥir al-Shābī's II

Nahiyah

comm. by al-Khīlātīn (忿 750 = 1353):

Qāmaṭ al-Shārīn

II. Another family of Ḥanāfi lawyers goes back to ʿAmbūr al-ʿAḍīz b. ʿAbū al-ʿArāzīr b. ʿAnār, al-Dīfārī b. Sulaymān al-Maḡīribīn, who died in 477 (1084–1085) in Maḥmūdīn at the age of 68. Of his six sons who attained fame as muftis we may mention Abī ʿl-Ḥasan Zaḥīr al-Dīn ʿAṣūr (忿 506 = 1112–1113). His son and pupil was Zaḥīr al-Dīn al-Raḥmān b. Abī ʿAbī Dāʾūrīl al-Maḡīribīn. Four works by him are recorded: Ǧīhayāt, Ǧīhād, Fawā'id, and Zaḥīrīyya; only the last of which survives in manuscript. He was the teacher of the famous Fakhr al-Dīn Kaḥlidīn (忿 592 = 1196) and of Burūz al-Dīn al-Maḡīribīn (q.v.).


Maʿrib (Marin) a town in the southwest of Arabia, formerly the capital of the Sabaeans and now the capital of the province of the same name.

The ancient town of Maʿrib, which so far has only been visited by three European travellers,
vol. iii. [1874], p. 22) thought — distinct gateilik breaks in the stone walls. They are now called Bāb al-'Aṣīr (W.), Bāb al-Ḥadd (S.W.), then along the south wall to the east and from here to the north, Bāb al-Nāṣr, Bāb Abū 'l-Kār, Bāb al-Maḥram, Bāb al-Darb, Bāb al-Kibla, Bāb al-Maṭṭāna. The names Bāb al-Nāṣr, Bāb al-Darb and Bāb al-Ḥadd are still borne by the gates of the modern village of Mārib but the modern Bāb al-Nāṣr corresponds to the Bāb al-'Aṣīr of the ancient town, since from the latter by traversing the whole of the old town the village is reached through the Bāb al-Nāṣr.

The old town forms at the present day a considerable mound or rather a number of mounds of ruins, out of which project remains of walls and portions of columns. Excavations conducted here would, as Glaser pointed out, bring to light most unexpected things. Four distinct areas may be distinguished in the site: 1. The mound on which stands the modern village which stands in the eastern part, almost in the S.E. corner, of the old town and seems to consist entirely of refuse and rubble, beneath which at a considerable depth one comes upon old buildings. Glaser believed that these old buildings represent the oldest part of the town upon which in the later centuries of the Sabaean period which was shot. It is also possible that the town of Mārib or at least many of its buildings have been several times destroyed. The topmost stratum is of course of comparatively recent date if we exclude the many old stones with Sabaean inscriptions. The village, which, according to Glaser, can hardly have more than 600 inhabitants, consists of about 80 houses, usually in several stories on a rectangular plan narrowing a little as they ascend. Only the lower parts are of stone, the rest is of clay. Only the two fort-like houses of the anits are built entirely of hewn stone. The outer wall of the village consists simply of the walls of the outermost houses, which are built on to one another and are linked up by connecting walls. The village has two gates of some size, one facing west and the other south, and several small doors. There is an old well outside the village between this and the eastern gate of the old town, and also the chief sanctuary (Māṣjūd Sulamān). 2. The Maḍīnān Umm al-Kī identified by Glaser in his Karteibuch, p. 8 with Umm Bilba, in the S.E. corner with great mounds of ruins, which perhaps come from castles. 3. The S.W. area which apparently contained temples and castles. 4. A large round open space (Maṣādīn) in the N.W. and western part of the town which does not seem to have been built on in ancient times either. It stretches almost to the modern village and particularly on the south side is surrounded by portions of columns and other ruins (E. Glaser, Karteibuch Mārib, p. 48 sqq., 73). These faceted columns which still protrude 3-4 feet out of the ruins, one of which lying on the ground measured 15-15 feet, are also mentioned by Arnaud (p. 22).

The place is probably identical with the "Champs de Mars" mentioned by the French traveller in his report to Frendel (J. Ar., ser. iv., vol. v. [1845], p. 325).

The place in any case was at one time surrounded by large buildings which are now in ruins and form great mounds, which are also dotted with fragments of columns and Glaser leaves the question open whether there were here the palaces of the kings and notables or the temples of the ancient Sabaean. To the south of the Māḍīnān in particular may still be seen the foundations of a colossal building which Glaser wanted to identify with the famous royal citadel of Sallūn celebrated by later tradition.

The old town which occupied an area of about 1,000 yards square, a calculation by E. Glaser, which agrees with Th. Arnaud's plan of the town (J. Ar., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 11) [Glaser gives the distance between the two opposite gates as 1/4 hour], is built entirely on the left bank of the Wādī Dammāne. It seems, to conclude from the remains of the 3 feet thick wall around it, which has only survived in places, to have practically formed an oblique angled parallelogram. The longer sides of which follow the line of the Wādī Dammāne while the eastern and western sides (breadthwise) run practically due north and south. The southern wall which runs parallel to the river bank turns from north to east at an angle of 60° and runs almost E.N.E. This fact is clear not only from E. Glaser's description of his Karteibuch Mārib (p. 36 sqq., 48) and the Mārib Tügebuch but also from Glaser's Skizzen (N°. 51) which is based the appended plan of Mārib and vicinity. It is a striking contrast to Th. Arnaud's description and map (J. Ar., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 11) which makes the wall around Mārib describe a circle and also to Glaser's earlier sketches in his large Kartei-

The wall which unfortunately is almost completely destroyed, does not run in a straight line but at regular intervals there are rectangular projections, as is clearly shown in E. Glaser's already mentioned sketch N°. 51 and in that of his Tügebuch, xii., p. 125, which moreover gives the plan of the town as a rectangle — Glaser notes here the city wall was apparently built as a quadrilateral" — while N°. 51 shows rather a trapezium the base of which lies away from the river while the shorter side parallel runs along the river. The rectangular projections found at regular intervals were probably towers, which strengthened the defences and stood out as regular intervals in the style we know from Assyrian fortifications (cf. the similar quadrangular plan of a fortress with gates near the corner and towers covered by steeple battlements in B. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien, 1. Kulturgesch., Bibliothek, i. 3). Heidelberg 1920).

That the city walls of Mārib had towers is also evident from the great inscription (Glaser 418-419) which is older than the great Sīwāt inscription GI. 1000. In this we are told in line 4 that the unknown ruler built "the two gates of Mārib (22) and built towers for Mārib of Balāk stone" (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Mésopotamische Texte, l. 6 sqq.).

Rhodokanakis suggests, presumably rightly, that this king was continuing the work of the unnamed son of the Sabaean monarch Somunha-Salās. Yānāf (22) (22) 22 who, according to the inscriptions (Glaser 418 = Arnaud 41, 419 = Arnaud 42, 414, 427, 445, 500, 510, 537, 580, 600, 634 and perhaps also 751) "built a wall around Mārib
through Karâbî xxvii, 23 and were still standing in his time and so firmly rooted on the ground that they could not be overthrown. Glaser, Reise nach Mârib, p. 139 however assumes that the reference here is to the Haram of Bîlîs with its pillars but admits the possibility that a citadel of the town proper is being described, since Salîn is talked of immediately afterwards. Dujdjîl Sâlîn, Khalîl al-Arâbṣh bîd al-Islam, p. 143 also assumes that the palace of Salîn is referred to. Sprunger, Poroi u. Reisertuena, p. 140 also tells of this throne of Bîlîs that it stood on stone pillars 29 ells high which were still intact and the foundations were as deep as its height (this statement is erroneously attributed by Sprunger to Bakrī but presumably comes from Ibn al-Mujâhid). The Bîlîs-ward also (cf. Jomard in F. Mengan, Histoire de l'Égypte, p. 244) says that the throne of Bîlîs was built on columns 28 ells high in Bâb (Mârib). This sounds very improbable if we should really understand by arâb a throne, which according to Nashîwân al-Himyari, p. 50, stood in the palace of Bîlîs in Mârib. When however we are told by Nashîwân, p. 70, that arâb is a castle which was built on columns of stone and the verse of Asâd Tabhâ's quoted gives the name arâb to the palace of Bîlîs, we may then in the above passages take it to mean a citadel rather than a throne and with Glaser, Reise nach Mârib, p. 73, look for it in the S.E. corner of the old town. Legend has associated the name Arâb Bîlîs with other localities also. According to Abû '1-Râshid Sulaimân b. al-Râshid in Yâkânî, Mû'jamân, lii, 619, it is the name of a place a day's journey from Dhamman on which stand six great marble columns and the principal group of pillars of the old ruins of Sârîwâ still bear this name (J. Halâwy, Reptor, J.A., ser.vi, xiv. [1872], p. 67 sq.; Glaser, Reise nach Mârib, p. 179). On the other hand, it is an open question where the two other citadels al-Kâshîb and al-Hajjar mentioned by al-Hamdânî and Bakrî (Mû'jamân, lii, 502) are to be located. According to Yâkânî, Mû'jamân, iv, 104, al-Kâshîb was built by order of king Sharâbîh b. Yâhush, who put up on it a copper plate inscribed "They who built this castle are Thawbân and Sabâr; its building was entrusted to them by Sharâbîh b. Yâhush, the king of Sabâ and of the Tihāna and its Arabs". D. H. Müller in Burgen u. Schlösser, i, 1039, note 1 has already identified Sharâbîh b. Yâhush with king Tihâshrâb Yâbîhî of the Sabaean inscriptions (Glaser, N°. 444, 250; Bibl. Nat., N°. 2) and for Thawbân compared the Sabaean Thawbî and for Sabâr (so to be read, not 202) the similar Sabaean name. If the inscription given by Yâkût really goes back to a genuine mansard inscription, Kâshîb must have been built about the first century A.D. If the Sabaean king here mentioned whose epithet in the Himyarrî bâbil (verse 109) publ. by A. v. Kemes is to be read Yâhush, in the Sabaean inscription Bibl. Nat., N°. 2 (cf. article Sâlîn) speaks expressly of Salîn, Ghumdân and Sârîwâ only and does not mention al-Kâshîb, this is not itself proof that Yâkût's foundation inscription is not genuine. The building might easily be later than the inscription Bibl. Nat., N°. 2. A difficulty however is raised by the fact that al-Hamdânî (in Müller, Burgen und Schlösser, i, 1039) and Nashîwân al-
Himyar (quoted ibid, note 1) give al-Kabīb b. Dhi ḫaṭaf as the builder. Glaser, *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 155, goes so far as to say that the name ḫaṭaf is derived from the verb ǧabba or ḥāṣa, which frequently occurs in dedicatory inscriptions, and the form of the king’s titles points to the last period of ḥimyar rule, and the king is to be identified with Shahrabīb Ya‘fur; indeed, it must be conceded that the style and titles are quite unusual for a king of Saba‘ and Dhi ḫaṭaf, and for this reason the *Naskāh* inscription must be regarded as a forgery. This does not mean that al-Hamdānī’s note is to be rejected as worthless. F. Hommel, *Ethnologie u. Geographic d. alten Orientes*, p. 666 and note 2, has shown that the possibility that the castle of Ḩadjar (the name means “the town”) was perhaps the principal castle, on the ruins of which the modern village of Mārib was planted and, the older and more celebrated Sallāh was a smaller castle. If we remember the meaning “new” given in *Yūfr*, iv. 164 and Nashawān, p. 86 a, v. ḫṣaṭa, al-Kabīb might also be an epithet of the citadel as “the new” which came to be erroneously differentiated from al-Ḥadjar as the name of a third castle. Al-Bakri, *Ma’dīqas*, ii. 505, 754 explains the difficulty by saying that al-Kabīb was the last of the castles to be built in Mārib and therefore called the “new”.

The Masqūd Sulaqīm lies to the west just below the village which is built on a great mound of rubble. This Masqūd Sulaqīm is Dīwādīn, now the principal mosque of Mārib, according to Aramaic (J. A., viii. 8, vol. iii. [1874], p. 13) an obviously modern building, square with a flat roof and built of hewn stones, is of interest because according to E. Glaser (*Reise nach Mārib*, p. 41, 73 esp.), its north side is built against 7 or 8 colossal columns (monoliths) which correspond exactly to those of the Haram Biḥrā and the Ammād to be discussed below. Glaser suggests that there was once a temple here similar to the Haram Biḥrā. F. Hommel, *Ethnologie u. Geographie d. alten Orientes*, p. 664, 665 affirms the Masqūd Sulaqīm was the temple of the chief deity. This principal temple in his opinion formed a group with the second temple, which lay on the south side of the Ma’dīqas, According to Aramaic (plan of Mārib) local tradition this was the site of an ancient temple. The length (2,000 yards), suggested by this second temple, is greater than that of the Masqūd Sulaqīm, is however too high, as both Glaser and Aramaic put the distance between the two opposite walls at only 1,000 yards. J. Halévy’s figure (Raupach, J. A., sec. vii., xix. [1872], p. 96) which puts the diameter of the Mārib ruins at about 500 yards would give a much shorter distance but the estimate is certainly a very casual one and hardly to be taken seriously.

In the south and west outside the old town walls lies an old cemetery with a number of tombs, some vertical and some horizontal, the latter of which have a small opening at the top. It is now called Medjennat (or Diḥījāb) Ghara. It is probably from here that have come a number of old Sabaean tombstones (Glaser, No. 436, 574, 575, 581, 582, 605, 664, 665, 667, 685–689, 745, 759, 775, 792) with rectangular niches sometimes rounded below or peaked at the top, in which is placed the bust of deceased with an inscription below. On two of these tombstones (Glaser, No. 684, 745), Glaser found the bust let into the stone still in its place (cf. *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 75, 91; *Tājebāt*, xi. 59). We may probably find a model of the tombs in the steles of Asa‘ūr. Stone sarcophagi are also sometimes found. One is still in use in front of the great well of Mārib as a drinking-trough for animals (*Reise nach Mārib*, p. 74).

In the southwest of the old town outside the city walls, Glaser found a remarkable building still partly preserved (cf. the plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Maryah) which was probably used for distributing the water and had on its north side the inscription Glaser 474 = 1671. It consists of two huge stretches of walls running due east and west in one line with a gap in the centre. The two corners of the northern entrance of this passage are angular while at the south side the two are rounded. The inscription, which is placed on the north side of the eastern wall states that Dimmi-alays Watar, Makkulis of Saba‘, son of Karla-bu, built a ʿbjel (şajj) opposite (cf. in front of) the sanctuary of Attagat. Glaser actually found some 3000 N.W. or W.N.W. of this building, actually outside of the old city walls but close to them, a ruin unfortunately reduced to a heap of rubble, from which a plan suggests a sanctuary, since on the N.E. side (the right stretch of wall) the niches for an idol can still be seen (*Reise nach Mārib*, p. 406; *Tājebāt*, xi. 47; H on the plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Maryah).

S.S.E. of the modern village of Mārib (A) at a distance of about 3 miles between the Wāḥi Dhume and Wāḥi “Feledj” is the Haram Biḥrā (D) which was visited by Th. J. Aramaic on July 20, 1843 and by E. Glaser on March 8, 1858 (cf. J. A., sec. vii., vol. iii. [1874], pp. 14-15). Glaser, *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 41, 44; 73, 137, 141; the latter corrects Aramaic on a number of essential points. The Haram is a large, elliptical in form, the longer axis of which 300 feet long runs from N.W. to S.E. The shorter axis runs N.E. to S.W. and is 250 feet in length. It is built of regularly hewn square blocks which are placed one above the other in 31 layers up to the frieze so that the height of the wall is 31 feet. This wall is finished off with a double cornice at the top which consists of two rows of blocks which follow one another at short intervals and look like dice on top of the wall, the result being a mournful-like frieze which recalls the relief found by Th. Bent in Jehl in Abyssinia (cf. Th. Bent, *The Sacred City of the Ethiopians, London* 1893, p. 141) and the relief of the Sabaean relief in D. Nielsen, *Handbuch der altäthiopischen Altertumswissenschaft* (p. 137, fig. 44). The rows of blocks below the lower cornices form a simple and effective decoration by placing the blocks four to six inches apart so as to leave little gaps. A similar kind of mural decoration is known from the Sabaean temple of Jehl (cf. Deutsches Akademie-Expedition, ii. 86, fig. 165). The frieze is still quite intact in places, especially on the east side. There is no trace of a roof, but it cannot be asserted definitely that there never was one, as Glaser assumes; the windowless building was (at least) have been lit by sky-lighters. There are two doors in the wall, the larger (a) at the northeast end of the shorter axis and the smaller (b) at the N.W. end of the building at the end of the larger axis.
Exactly N.E. of the centre of the building there are four other monolithic pillars in the wall itself. Originally there were a larger number here, so that the main gateway (a) had a pillared way leading to it. N.E. of these at a distance of 32 paces are 8 columns which are also erected in a line running from S.E. to N.W. (F). They are rectangular prisms, smooth, 15 feet high without capitals and terminate in dice-shaped tops 4 inches long on which stood the architrave. On the S.S.E. side of the Haram just outside the wall, four small pillars form a little square the sides of which lie W. to E. and S. to N. (J). Perhaps we have here the pillars for the canopy of a throne which was probably similar in appearance to the Almonite king’s throne illustrated in Deutsches Akanum-Expedition, ii. 65, fig. 139. The floor of the building never seems to have been levelled, as a natural rock rises almost in the middle. Unfortunately in the interior the walls are nowhere clear, so that Glaser could form no deductions as to what it must have looked like inside. He expressly states however that he could discover no chambers in the walls as he had expected. On the other hand, the fine inscriptions on the outside of the walls give us information as to the purpose of the building — it is a temple of the Sabean moon-god Almakah — as well as the history of its erection. Armand was only able to copy 3 of these inscriptions, two others whose existence he established were covered by sand, which has since made further progress, so that he could not copy them. The oldest in-
and in other Sa'ean inscriptions was this very temple. From it the god Almahkā is called "lord of 'Awn" (אֲחַמֵּה). The completion of this temple which was begun by Yif'lis'il Dhibārī, by Tikhrāša, son of Sumumah-ālaya Dhibārī, king of Sa'ān, is stated in the inscription Glaser, 485 = Arnaud 55, which is on the west side of the Hāram on the 14th layer of stones (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii, 12 n. 99). Glaser, 485 = Arnaud 56, which is on the 13th and 14th layer on the north side records the completion of the wall from the inscription to the top by Tubakānī, a prominent official and general of three Sa'ean kings (N. Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii, 15 n. 99). Connected with this are two inscriptions of similar context, Glaser, 482 = Arnaud 54 on the south side of the 13th layer and Glaser, 483 = Arnaud 54 on the east side at the same height.

They record the restoration of a ruined part of the wall (presumably of the part of the temple) under King Tikhrāša's wara' Yāhānām of Sa'ān and Dhit Rāidān, the son of Dhibārī-ālaya Bayān, and his son Halīk-šaman. Whether this concludes the history of the building of the Hāram seems doubtful since, according to Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 46, inscriptions may still be concealed under the sand on the north and west sides also.

The orientation of the building is of interest. The little door of the Hāram (ב) faces that temple of the old town of Mārib on the site of which now stands the Masjid al-Balāmīn. On the prolongation of the shorter axis to the N.E. lies the ruin called al-Mikrāb, and Glaser has, perhaps, rightly, suggested from this arrangement of the two buildings that there was some connection between their purposes. Both buildings are moreover oriented by the course of the Wādī Dhimme. On the south side of the old city wall may still be seen the remains of a bridge which was built almost exactly in the direction of the Hāram and, according to the local tradition, once reached to it. Even if this is an exaggeration it is nevertheless probable that a bridge was built over the river Dhimme on the same axis as the road which must certainly have inundated the fields; the continuation of this bridge to the Hāram was probably only a dam of which no trace now remains.

However unusual the elliptical form for the plan of a temple may appear, this is certainly not an isolated example in Southern Arabia. F. Frendel (J.A.A., ser. iv., vol. vii. p. 223) mentions the great ruins of Khatrā (Surwāl) which cover an even greater area than those of the Hāram Bīlkiš and include a semi-elliptical and long rows of pillars still in position. According to Arnaud, this elliptical plan has also been found by Halāy (J.A.A., ser. vii., vol. viii. p. 67). Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, i, 110, 137; Śekine, i, 67 n.

According to the inscription Glaser, No. 901-903, its builder was the Sa'ean mukarrib Yil'dīs'il Dhibārī, who also built the temple of 'Awn and the round temple of al-Maṣjidādī.

F. Hommel (Ehremologie, p. 664 n. 47) has endeavoured to show how this temple came to have its modern name of Hāram Bīlkiš. In analogy to the Assyrian and Babylonian temples extra murus which were always dedicated to the wife of the chief deity and in which in the month of the new year his wedding ceremony took place, Hommel seen in the Hāram Bīlkiš the wedding house of Almahkā, the sanctuary of his wife Harimat and seems to assume that the name is also connected with this. D. H. Müller (Bungen und Schläfer, ii, 976 sq.) has shown how the Arab archaeologists transformed the god Almahkā into Yāhānām and then gave this name to the legendary Bīlkiš and also made a haram (women's apartments) out of the temple so the sanctuary of the god, E. Frendel's reasoning moves on similar lines (J. A.A., ser. iv., vol. vii. p. 326 sq., 373 sq.). He assumed that Bīlkiš was not the correct name of the queen of Sa'ān but rather Bīlkiš (so Ibn 'Abbās in the "Abū al-Farrāb ibn Al-Dhawār in the Mit̲aj al-Zaman) which was formed from Almahkā. The queen of Sa'ān was in this way defiled by the Sa'eans and became the isla of the Arabs.

In the S. S. E. of Mārib and according to Arnaud 1/4 hour E. E. S. of the Hāram Bīlkiš — while the latter, according to Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 41 lies almost due east barely 1/4 hour from the five pillars there stand on the opposite bank of the Wādī Dhimme, 1/4 hour or 1½ miles (according to Glaser, Śekine, No. 51) from the town, the pillars called 'A'mād'id. Five are still upright; these are 25-30 feet high, 32 inches broad and 24 deep, prismatic, rectangular monoliths which were erected perpendicular to the direction of the Wādī Dhimme. Two which have been overthrown lie beside them on the ground. The pillars had no capitals and were just like the other pillars (at the Hāram Bīlkiš and other ruins outside the town). On the fragments of the two fallen pillars Glaser discovered inscriptions on which (Glaser, 479 and 480 = Arnaud 53) from which it appears that a sanctuary Barān (בָּרָן | בָּרָן) dedicated to the god Almahkā or some such sanctuary stood here. This name occurs not only in this inscription but is mentioned in Ottoman Mas., No. 17 (Z. D. M. G., xxxiii., 436, No. 1, 2) where J. H. Mordtmann reads [הָרָן] [בָּרָן] and the name of this place is also found in Halāy, No. 43, No. 48, No. 49, No. 53 (תָּרָן) and No. 54 (תָּרָן). To the west just beside the pillars lies a mound of ruins, which perhaps represents the remains of this sanctuary. Arnaud (J. A.A., ser. viii., iii. [1874], p. 13) describes these pillars as pilasters of the Hāram Bīlkiš and puts their height at 28 spans. In contradiction to Glaser, Arnaud says they have square capitals. His illustration under the plan of the Hāram Bīlkiš shows a pillar with a stepped capital like those from Akūnīn and Kohailo in Abyssinia (Deutsche Aksum-Expedition, ed. by D. Krencker, Berlin 1913, p. 102, fig. 222 and p. 155, fig. 319a). Which of the two explorers is right, it is difficult to say as Glaser is usually very accurate in his observations. On the other hand, Arnaud cannot possibly have invented this rather unusual but nevertheless typical form for ancient South Arabia and made his drawing accordingly. The only way out of the difficulty is to suppose that in Glaser's time the capitals — of which Arnaud says he cannot say definitely that they belonged to the pillar — had been broken off. According to Arnaud, the pillars stand close together at intervals corresponding to their thickness. That the pieces of stone on the ground are the rows of pillars once being longer than the pillars still noticed by Arnaud (p. 16) although he copied one of the inscriptions on them (Arnaud 53 = Glaser, No. 480) (cf. E. Glaser, Reise im Mārib, p. 401, 414).
The numerous separate finds made by Glaser in the neighbourhood of Mārib, sacrificial altars, masons' workshops etc. cannot be discussed here. On the other hand, there is one erection which demands a rather thorough discussion as it surpasses all these already mentioned in magnitude and preserved the fame of Mārib down to the late Islamic period, namely the dam and works connected with it, known in Muslim tradition as Sudd Mārib or Sudd al-Arais. The Wādī Ḍheerah in the course of time had cut its course through the Balāq hills here and divided the rocks into two parts Balāq al-Kibīl and Balāq al-Awsāq. The Sabaens had built a dam of earth across the gap some 770 paces long behind which the water was collected. The dam, which Glaser (Reise nach Mārib, p. 58 172-173 sq.) describes minutely, rises some 20-25 feet above the present level of the Wādī and is simply a mound of earth the section of which is an isosceles triangle the angle at the top of which is quite sharp. The angle of inclination of the two surfaces to the base is about 45° and the breadth of the base about 30 feet. The proper base and the height of the dam cannot be accurately ascertained as they have been completely overgrown by the depth of many feet. But it can be assumed that the dam rested on a foundation of rock as the narrow passage between the two Balāq hills has a rocky foundation which comes up very nearly to the surface. But for this firm foundation of rock it would have been impossible to build the dam at all. The side of the dam which met the water (the western) is covered with small sharp unshaven stones, held together so strongly by mortar that it is impossible to detach one of them. The dam, which is 11/4 hours from Mārib, is flanked in the north and south by two great sluices, the southern one of which is known as Marbay al-Dīlima. Here on the site of the dam a great rock (A) 95 paces long and 15 in width, at the narrow place only 8-10 has become detached from the Dheer Balāq al-Awsāq; it runs to the N.E. with a slight tendency to E.-N.E. The main body of the rock, the northern wall of which runs eastwards forms with this isolated rock a pair of lines converging towards the S.W. end of the latter. The two rocky walls do not meet here but are separated by a gap spanned by a wall six paces long and 12 feet high (C). In the opening of the angle but within the eastern ends of the two walls is another detached block of rock (B) the north side of which runs parallel to the first mentioned detached rock and the south side parallel to the main rock (C) but quite close to the latter. All three rocks, particularly the main body (C) and the loose block (B), have steep sides, not however over 12 feet high. On the north side the great isolated rock (A) is very irregular in shape. It almost looks as if we had an artificial cleavage here. But Glaser does not think this possible because an earthquake is quite sufficient to account for the remarkable cleavage of the rocks. In any case it looks as if human hands had worked a good deal on the natural lines of fracture. The great block of rock (A) rises 25 feet above the present level of the river bed and has two inscriptions engraved on its south side (Glaser, N° 512, 523).

On all three rocks there are or were great buildings of hewn stone. The large block of rock (A) seems to have supported the main building. Its masonry consisting entirely of finely hewn blocks of stone, arranged in pairs one above the other and held together by melted lead poured into corresponding cavities; it follows closely, especially on the south side, the rock which forms the foundation so that it does not form a straight line, as Arnau (J. A., v. vii., vol. iii., p. 64, Dégue de Marco) has represented it. The whole length of this wall is about 200 feet, its average breadth 15 feet, the height at the S.W. end about 13 feet, rather more at the N.E. end, as the rock is not high enough here. In general the top is horizontal, but with slight differences of level where it rises and falls. The S.W. corner of the masonry consists of round towers (a) facing S.W. which stands about 3 feet above the level of the rest of the walls. The whole building and the tower have perpendicular sides and do not slope at all. The dam which runs N.N.W. seems to have joined the wall 25 feet from the towers on the N.W. On the side facing the Wādī at the N.E. end of the rock, steps have been hewn out of the rock which led from the bottom of the river bed (in S.S.W. direction) to the walls. Almost exactly south of the already mentioned tower which has also very steep steps cut in a perpendicular passage hewn into the side of the rock, there stands on the natural mass of rock (C) a second tower (d) of the same height, round on the west but flat on the other sides. Between the two towers, is the already mentioned wall linking up the two rocks. As already mentioned, the top of this wall is 20-25 feet above the level of the river so that the towers are 35 to 40 feet above it. The dam seems to have been not much higher than the connecting wall. The out-flow of the water must have taken place over the connecting wall as well as through openings under the wall, probably now filled up with rubble, into the Ḍaḥēlīn canal, and under or rather through the rock on which this great piece of masonry stands, into the Ḍaḥēlīn canal. Indeed one can still see quite clearly the surface of the great isolated rock is covered deeply down by a ridge of rock (i), only the rounded top of which is visible, with the smaller block, so that the two channels were separated from one another. It is also possible that in earlier times the outflow went below and only later, when the water-level was raised by silting, over the wall. Grooves for boards are still recognizable. The smaller block of rock, steep and high on the western side, slopes steeply to the east down to the level and has step-like cavities in it everywhere with stones still perpendicular on it, as if it had had a balustrade, especially above the steep wall in the west. At its eastern end where it joins the level ground it shows regularly hewn cavities of prism shape, which look like water-troughs for the cattle or like stone graves. The main rock shows the same features. The step-like cavities were perhaps not only used for climbing, but also to measure the level of the water to regulate the outflow.

Both towers and the other buildings in connection with the sluices, except such walls or railings as may have existed of the smaller block, are preserved intact. The hewn stones are so arranged that long stones are everywhere and then three crosswise which give the otherwise parallel layers great cohesion. This is particularly the case with the inner filling of the wall, as can be observed in all very large buildings a section of
which comes to be exposed. The square blocks in the dam are also held together by little blocks of lead about 10 cm. high and about 10 cm.³ in the section. These little rods of lead were placed in holes specially made for them about 2-5 cm. deep and the next block above was placed over with the corresponding cavity filled with the top half of the little rod. The Sabaeans only used mortar in the stone work of the dam as a top covering to prevent damage being done by the rain-water.

The northern system of sluices consists of three walls of which the southern and largest  

a kind of railing of masonry. The whole wall is coped with excellent cement.

Almost exactly S.E. about 11 paces from the S.W. end of the part, 114 paces long already described (B) runs to the S.E. a wall 36 paces long and 21 broad at its N.W. end, the S.E. end of which is narrow and rounded. This wall is exactly the height of the long wall. At the present time there is on it a modern sjara (stone-house) built by the emir 'Abd al-Rahum which probably existed in Aramae's time and certainly in Halévy's.

Between the two walls, four paces from either,
walls thus formed, like the three rocks on the
south form two channels of exit, both of which
however, it is worth noting, flow into one
and the same main channel, which runs almost exactly
east for about 1,000 yards to a large building for
distributing water. This canal ran between two
parallel dama of the same style and construction
as the dam proper, but the bed, which is paved
with cemented stones, runs above the plain, especially
on the south side some 20–25 feet. The dam
proper, barely higher than the two walls of this
canal, joins the east side of the most southern
wall, 32 paces long.

The Northern Sluice-system

S.S.W. of Mabna al-Haftarji (see below) lies
Haften al-Kafal, a later building erected on the
remains of old water-works, which formed the end
of the main channel, already mentioned in con-
nection with the northern sluices. It lies 32; about
exactly the same level as the dam and several
yards above the surrounding country. It consists
of several walls, some of hewn stone and some
of ordinary stones and cement, which sent the
water out in eight different directions. The aqueduct
runs practically westwards up to the northern
sluices of the dam. Although perfectly preserved
the bed of the canal has been in many places
filled up with blown sand.

Similar distributing works existed throughout the
whole plain of Marib. Glaser saw traces of aqui-
ducts (with double dama) at different places. In
the bed of the Dheene not far below the dam
he saw a remarkable erection of stone not unlike
a weir. Unfortunately the inscription on it which
might have given us definite information had
been removed some years before. Canals seem to
have led the water from the great distributing
centres to the smaller ones (ma’mir) from which
it was taken direct to the palm gardens and fields.
The most of the ma’miri are in the form of cubes
or shallow prisms and are rarely more than 6 feet
high and 12 to 15 feet long. As a rule a canal
leads out of them from the centre, usually walked
on one side. Nothing is left of the canals which
connected the ma’miri with the larger distributing
centres and on the other side with the fields. Deep
farrows torn out of the ground by the periodic
deluges of rain and, like the greater part of the
plain, becoming gradually filled with desert sand
are now the characteristic feature of the once
flourishing plain of Sahe’.

The great barrier of the dam between the two
Bakka mountains seems however not to have suf-
ficed for the strain upon it. A second dam called
Mabna al-Haftarji was therefore built N.N.E.
of the dam and west of Marib which seems to have been intended to regulate the water of the Wadi 'I-Sa'ila (cf. Glaser, *Reise nach Marib*, p. 49 sq.), which carried the waters of the north Balaq hill, the Djabal Halla and the Khaghab hills into the plain of Marib and joined the Wadi Dheneé below the village of Marib. This barrage consists of three walls of black porous stones, running very irregularly which are held together by mortar and arranged in 3 strata which perhaps point to 3 periods of building. The first of these walls (A) which dammed the river-bed begins last on the right-bank of the Sa'ila and runs 240 paces E.N.E. where it joins a prism-shaped erection (a) 7 paces broad, 12 long and about 15 feet high, which lies N.W. to S.E. 7 feet N.E. stands a second similar building (b) parallel to the first and continued to the S.E. in a narrower wall (c) 36 paces in length. The space between these two buildings must have been an outlet. With a very small space between, the second mortared wall (B) runs N.W. from the second building (b) and with many windings turns N. and N.W. where it joins the rocks. Its length is 265 paces, the space between it and the second building is 10 paces (b). 21 paces N.E. of the second building are two others (d, e) which give an outlet to the N.E. The southern of the two is only partly preserved. It points to the S.E. end of the 36 paces long wall (c); perhaps the two were once connected or there was a sluice between. From the building (d) which forms the northern boundary of the second outlet two walls run: the one (third) wall (C) runs with many windings almost parallel to the second great wall (D) and like it runs up to the northern hills; it is 182 paces long. The other building (F) runs in a curve to the north, 36 paces in length, to a third outlet, exactly opposite the second, which however consists of buildings (g, h, i) 8 paces from each other, with the ground between them covered by a layer of stone masonry. The outlet is to the N.E. On the S.E. is a wall 12 feet long now partly collapsed. Glaser copied 10 Subaru texts at al-Haghari, which came from other ruins and show that these works belong to a later period, like the late tombstone built into the wall here (Glaser, No. 599).

The various constructions date, as we learn from the inscriptions, from different periods. The southern system of sluices was erected as early as the Makarrib period. Samih Allah, son of Dhimit-alaya, Mukarrib of Saba', according to the inscription Glaser, No. 513—514, made here an inlet in the barrage at Rahib, which was extended two generations later by the unknown author of the inscription Glaser, No. 418—419 (cf. N. Rodökamakis, *Atlaskische Texte*, t. 7: *Studien*, ii. 97, 99 sp.; Glaser, *Studien*, i. 70 sq.; *Reise nach Marib*, p. 59 sq.; Hommel, *Ethnologie*, p. 666). Where the barrage at Rahib was is not certain. Perhaps we should assume with Rodokamakis, *Studien*, ii. 100 sq. that it was built on the rib of rock (e) between A and B. About a generation later than the Rahib barrage is the similar con-
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walls thus formed, like the three rocks on the south form two channels of exit, both of which however, it is worth noting, flow into one and the same main channel, which runs almost exactly east for about 1,000 yards to a large building for distributing water. This canal ran between two parallel dams of the same style and construction as the dam proper but the bed, which is paved with cemented stones, runs above the plain, especially on the south side some 20–25 feet. The dam proper, barely higher than the two walls of this canal, joins the east side of the most southern wall, 38 paces long.

**The Northern Sluice-system**

---

**O** Places with especially important inscriptions: 1 Gl. 554, 618; 2 Gl. 551; 3 Gl. 541.

**O** Places with inscriptions.

a a little lower than b.

The canal, which led the water to the lower šup, about 1,000 yards away, comes up to b and d.

d a large intervening wall standing by itself.

S.S.W. of Mahbūl al-Ḫashṣādī (see below) lies Ḫūṣn al-ʾAṣfāl, a later building erected on the remains of old water-works, which formed the end of the main channel, already mentioned in connection with the northern sluices. It lies at about exactly the same level as the dam and several yards above the surrounding country. It consists of several walls, some of hewn stone and some of ordinary stones and cement, which sent the water out in eight different directions. The aqueduct runs practically westwards up to the northern sluices of the dam. Although perfectly preserved the bed of the canal has in many places filled up with blown sand.

Similar distributing works existed throughout the whole plain of Marīb. Glaser saw traces of aqueducts (with double dams) at different places. In the bed of the Dhaurn, not far below the dam he saw a remarkable erection of stone not unlike a weir. Unfortunately the inscription on it which might have given us definite information has been removed some years before. Canals seem to have led the water from the great distributing centres to the smaller ones (manūṣūh) from which it was taken direct to the palm gardens and fields. The most of the manūṣūh are in the form of cubes or shallow prisms and are rarely more than 6 feet high and 12 to 15 feet long. As a rule a canal leads out of them from the centre, usually walled on one side. Nothing is left of the canals which connected the manūṣūh with the larger distributing centres and on the other side with the fields. Deep furrows turn out of the ground by the periodic deluges of rain and, like the greater part of the plain, becoming gradually filled with desert sand are now the characteristic feature of the once flourishing plain of Saba'.

The great barrier of the dam between the two Balh mountains seems however not to have suffered for the strain upon it. A second dam called Mahbūl al-Ḫashṣādī was therefore built N.N.E.
of the dam and west of Ṣairib which seems to have been intended to regulate the water of the Wadi Ḥaṣṣa'la (cf. Glaser, Reise nach Ṣairib, p. 49 sqq.), which carried the waters of the north Balkh hill, the Djabal Haiian and the Khazab hilfs into the plain of Ṣairib and joined the Wadi Ḥeṭ̂̇´̄m below the village of Ṣairib. This barrage consists of three walls of black porous stones, running very irregularly which are held together by mortar and arranged in 5 strata which perhaps point to 3 periods of building. The first of these walls (A) which dammed the river-bed begins just on the right bank of the Ṣa'ila and runs 240 paces E. N. E. where it joins a prism-shaped erection (e) 7 paces broad, 12 long and about 15 feet high, which lies N. W. to S. E. 7 feet N. E. stands a second similar building (b) parallel to the first and continued to the S. E. in a narrower wall (c) 36 paces in length. The space between these two buildings must have been an outlet. With a very small space between, the second mortared wall (b) runs N. W. from the second building (b) and with many windings turns N. and N. W. where it joins the rocks. Its length is 268 paces, the space between it and the second building 10 paces (b, 21 paces N. E. of the second building are two others (d, e) which give an outlet to the N. E. The southern of the two is only partly preserved. It points to the S. E. end of the 36 paces long wall (c); perhaps the two were once connected or there was a sluice between. From the building (d) which forms the northern boundary of the second outlet two walls run: the one (third) wall (C) runs with many windings almost parallel to the second great wall (B) and like it runs up to the northern hills; it is 182 paces long. The other building (f) runs in a curve to the north, 50 paces in length, to a third outlet exactly opposite the second, which however consists of buildings (a, A) 8 paces from each other, with the ground between them covered by a layer of stone masonry. The outlet is to the N. E. On the S. E. is a wall 12 feet long now partly collapsed. Glaser copied to Sabean texts at al-Ḥujjarī which came from other ruins and show that these works belong to a later period, like the late tombstone built into the wall here (Glaser, No. 509).

Mehna el-Ḥujjarī

The various constructions date, as we learn from the inscriptions, from different periods. The southern system of sluices was erected as early as the Mukarrab period. Sultanūn-Ṣallā, son of Uḥmūn-Ṣallā, Mukarrab of Saba', according to the inscription Glaser, No. 513–514, made here an outlet in the barrage at Rahāb, which was extended two generations later by the unknown author of the inscription Glaser, No. 418–419 (cf. N. Rhodokakakis, Altsabaische Texte, i. 77; Studien, ii. 97; 99 sqq.; Glaser, Skene, i. 79 sqq.; Reise nach Ṣairib, p. 39 sqq.; Hummel, Ethnologie, p. 666). Where the barrage at Rahāb was is not certain. Perhaps we should assume with Rhodokakakis, Studien, ii. 100 sqq. that it was built on the rib of rock (e) between A and B. About a generation later than the Rahāb barrage is the similar con-
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truction at Ḥababîb, which was probably built at the junction (ṣ) of the Marià al-Dimm. The Mukanīrī Vījī amāra Bayān, son of Sama‘īl-‘alayh Yasmîn, built a water-course for it, as his father had done for the Ṭabk (according to Glaser, No. 523, 524 = Aranđ, No. 12, 13 = Hālevî, No. 673; cf. Rhodokiankâ, Studien, i. 102 sq.; Glaser, op. cit.). The northern sluice-works are much later; according to Glasser (Relief nach Mārib, p. 66–68), they did not get their present form till the time of king Shannan Yavari (c. 300 A.D.) and may perhaps even be not older than the fifth century A.D. The oldest parts of the works are partly covered by silt (p. 68) to the period 1000–700 B.C.; which is probably rather too early.

The great system of dams did not long exist in this form. This we know from two great prismatic monuments, which are inscribed on all four sides and tell us of the later history of the dam. The one with the inscription Glasser, No. 554 is 7 feet long, 30 inches broad, and a foot thick, the second, even larger, bears the inscription Glasser, No. 618. Both lay close beside the junction of the northern wall of the northern sluice with the rocks of the Ṭabk (according to Glaser, No. 554, king Shârâbîl Yâfar in 449 A.D. had a thorough renovation of the works carried out. But these lasted barely a year, for in 450 A.D. the waters broke through the dam so that the works had again to be completely restored. But the collapse of the great system was not to be prevented. From Glasser, No. 618 we learn that under the rule of the Abyssinian viceroy Abraha (542 A.D.) another breach occurred in the dam. Once more restoration work on a large scale averted the threatened disaster, but the final catastrophe must have occurred not long afterwards, which transformed the fertile plain of Saba' into a barren desert, alluded to in the Kûrîn (Sûra xxiv. 14 sq.; cf. Glasser, Zwei Inschriften aus dem Dombruch von Mârib, p. 13 sqq.; Reihe nach Mârib, p. 60, 64, 144 sqq.).

This can be seen by Glasser in the action of wind and rain which gradually wore down and weakened the east side. Another main cause of destruction must have been the silt which so filled the reservoir in course of decades that the water level over the dam. A mention of the bursting of the dam in the Kûrîn (pád al-‘amîr) and the importance of the event for the town of Mârib and the country round it has resulted in Muslim tradition devoting attention to this catastrophe and its consequences, so that all sorts of scraps of information about the dam were collected. Nevertheless it is remarkable how little even authorities on South Arabia like al-Ḥamadànî (Sīâ, p. 80 and 876, viii., in H. H. Müller, Burgon and Schlierer, ii. 938 sq., 1031, 1038; cf. N. Rhodokiankâ, Studien, i. 105 sq.; al-Bakî, Mûg’d, l. 402) really knew about the dam. Al-Ḥamadànî only says that the dam was built against a wall which was built on to the side walls of the reservoir, of great blocks of stone linked together with iron. The arrangement for distributing the water from the farms were still there as if their builder had only finished yesterday. Al-Ḥamadànî saw the building which had survived on one of the two sides (i.e. on one bank) namely the one which rose out of the water intact (i.e. the sluices). The breach had only affected the barrage but even this portion remained intact which was adjoined by the gardens on the left and was 15 ells in breadth at the base.

Thus we are to interpret these statements of al-Ḥamadànî, we learn from the description of the reservoir of Kŭhâtî in Abyssinia (Deutsche Akad.-Expedition, ii. 150 and pl. 23). There a central wall is flanked by two side walls, one of which is at right angles to a third. That the stones were bound together with iron is evident from Glaser’s description. When Vâkît (Muqām, iv. 352), who pays very little attention to the dam itself, tells us that it lies among three hills, the reference is probably to the massif of the Ṭabk (al-Ḥamadànî, iii. 368 sq.), that the barrage was one pāsan in length and breadth and contained 30 round openings, each of 3 feet in diameter, through which the water was led to the four large fields by the advice of learned men.

The importance of the dam for the prosperity of the country is evident from the descriptions of the Arab historians and geographers, who in this connection usually quote the reference in the Kûrîn to the two gardens of the Sabaeans, while, according to al-Ḥamadànî, this irrigated area included not only the plain of Saba' but stretched to the borders of the desert of Sandī; Glasser (Reihe nach Mârib, p. 52) held the view that the water accumulated by the dam would suffice to irrigate amply all the land on the borders of the desert as far as Hadramât and transform it into a vast garden. It is therefore perhaps not to be regarded as an exaggeration when al-‘Mun‘îl (Murrûf al-Ḍabkâh, p. 366 sq.) describes the land of Saba' with its wealth of gardens and fields, broad meadows and extensive irrigation system as the most fertile part of Yemen, the beauty of which had become proverbial throughout the world. According to him, a man on horseback would take more than a month to cross the rich cultivated country and any one travelling on foot or on horse used not fear the sun from atop of the land to the other, as he could always travel in the shade, so rich was the vegetation (cf. A. v. Kremer, Sägen, p. 10, note 1). According to Ibn Rosta, p. 114, who also waxes eloquent over the fertility of the land of Saba', a basket on the head of a man walking between the fruit trees would very soon have filled itself with fruit without one pulling or gathering them.

Under such circumstances it was natural that the catastrophe of the bursting of the dam, known as sīla‘ al-Birûn throughout the Muslim world, should have the most far-reaching effects. The migration of the Hûmir tribes to the north is con-
connected with the catastrophe and the Banu Ghassín took this event as the starting point of an era of their own (Zam udheib; al-Mas'ûdî, Kitâb ut-Tâhâb, p. 202). There is hardly any historical event of pre-Islamic history, that has become embittered with so much that is fanciful and related in so many different versions, as the history of the bursting of the dam. Al-Mas'ûdî alone (Mu'adjdî al-Qâhirî, iii. 370 sq.) dared attribute it to natural causes; he thought that the water had worn away the foundations of the dam and in time undermined them without its being noticed. When the masonry of the dam and the barrage had become so weakened that they could no longer resist the force of the water, the waters when unusually big broke through and flooded the plain. But even al-Mas'ûdî sees in the catastrophe a punishment for the arrogance of the Sabaeans and gives a good deal of space in his history to the legendary version of this event (op. cit, v. 573 sq.), which in the main agrees with that of Yâkût. Mu'adjdî, p. 345—348. Ibn al-Mudjâwîr al-Mishrîn (according to Sprenger, Post-und Reservenut, p. 153 sq.) tells the history of the destruction of the dam in quite a different way from the older historians. According to al-Mas'ûdî the story is briefly as follows: the king 'Amr b. 'Amir who lived in Mârib was warned of the imminent catastrophe by his brother 'Imrân, who was a soothsayer and by his wife Zarifat al-Khair, also skilled in prophecy. 'Imrân foretold that the people would be scattered in different directions and told his brother Zarifat on the other hand dreamed of a great cloud which covered her country and sent forth thunder and lightning. It burst and burned everything upon which it fell. All this pointed to a terrible inundation and Zarifat was confirmed in her idea by other signs that the catastrophe was imminent. She warned 'Amr and urged him to see to the dam. If he should leave the dam then tearing out holes with its fore paws and throwing out big stones with his hind feet, the misfortune was inevitable and imminent. 'Amr went to the dam and actually saw a mouse which turned over with its feet a stone which 50 men could not have moved from the position. 'Amr himself then dreamed of an inundation by the dam and now decided to realise his possessions and leave the country with his family which he was able to do surreptitiously without arousing suspicions. Soon afterwards the collapse came, which destroyed the whole country, even high lying fields and places a considerable distance off.

While there are considerable differences in detail in the different versions of the story—the collapse took place for example, according to Yâkût not under 'Amr but under his brother 'Imrân—there is still greater disagreement about the date. Hzâma al-Isfahânî, for example, puts it 400 years before Israîl, i.e. in the third century A.C. According to Ibn Khaldûn, the catastrophe took place under Hzâma b. Thîbân âs'ad (with A. v. Kremer, Sêrû, p. 120 sq., and note 4) is to be identified with Abdurrahân âs'ad and according to Glaser (Schte, p. 542) reigned from 385—420. Among Eastern scholars Gossellin goes farthest back in putting the date at 374 B.C., while Reiske thinks it took place 30—40 B.C. and Schultens puts it at 30—40 A.D. Peroon 553 years before Muhammad and Silvestre de Sacy 210 or 170 A.D. Yâkût, iv. 383 comes nearest the truth; he says it took place in the period of Abyssinian rule. As the term 'unpost i.e. 542 B.C., according to the inscription Glaser, No. 848, may be the last disastrous breach in the dam as occurring between 542 and 570 A.D. An exact date unfortunately cannot be obtained as the necessary data are lacking. Besides, the stories of the bursting of the dam in Mas'ûdî, p. 393 sq. and Ibn Rosch, p. 114 sq. which speak of the land being twice devastated by the waters of the dam, may contain a memory of the actual course of events, and the final collapse of the dam may have taken place after the catastrophe of 542 A.D. when the dam was carried away for the first time.

The various attempts to explain the etymology of Mârib are not satisfactory. When, for example, Yâkût, Mu'adjdî, iv. 382 sees in Mârib a place-name from Arabic = 'Alujum or from arÂUBU, this clearly shows what difficulties the explanation of this name gave the philologists. His further statement however that Mârib was the name of the Sabaeans kings is worthy of note (cf. H. Fleischer, Alsufludat hist. antiquitates, p. 114), especially as in Naqshba al-Himyarî a gloss is preserved according to which Mârib in Himyaritic means 'lord' (cf. Blau in Z. D. M. G., xxv. 391, note 7). Dîrjîl Zaidînî, Kitâb al-'Arabîjî al-Islâmî, p. 142 explains Mârib as a loanword from the Aramaic, a compound of 'àbî and sabî. E. Osland, Z. D. M. G., xix. 162 takes Mârib to be connected with the root of the Sabæan proper name DÂTÎ and of which Riyûb and Bûlûb correspond in Arabic. J. H. Mordtmann, who deals in Z. D. M. G., xxx. 322 sq. at length with the etymology of Mârihis, points to the DÂTÎ and form DÂTÎ of the inscriptions which he connects with the Arabic ra's, 'domus crassus, magnus gulis'.

D. H. Müller does not accept this derivation (Burgum und Schlîser, ii. 968 sq.). Al-Bakri, Mu'adjdî, ii. 502 says, following al-Hamdânî, that Mârib was the name of a tribe of the 'Ad after whom the town is called and in fact al-Hamdânî in Ibn Khaldûn, viii. (Müller, Burgum und Schlîser, ii. 960, 1040) says that Mârib and Mârîb are the names of two Arab tribes. In the older Sabæan inscriptions the town is called DÂTÎ to which the Greeks added an a to give it a Greek form. Eurototheus and Antimachus (Strabo, xvi. 706, 778) call the town Maslûsû. The later inscriptions mention it under the name DÂTÎ in which we have, with Khodîkanî, the later contracted form, from which comes the name of the Muslim tradition. The Sabæan capital is however known to the classical authors and Arab geographers by another name, viz. Dâbî (Agatharchides, p. 100 in Geogr. Gr., min., i. 188 and in Steph. Byz., s. Dâbî and Tâdaw, cf. Tâdaw in the Art. Saba, N. B. H. B., ii. A., col. 3516) and Saba' Tâdaw (col. 1391 sq.) is seen in contrast to J. H. Mordtmann (Schoihe Deutsche, p. 3: note 1), E. Glaser (Schte, 4, 15) Südarabische Sprachfragen, p. 10) and A. Sprenger (Die alte Geographie Arab., p. 219) that in this double name of the Sabæan capital not an error but a belief that Sabâ, while not the usual, was no wrong name for the capital.

Against this Glaser, Schte, 4, 15, rightly emphasized that the capital of the Sabæan kingdom Maryâb or Mârib was never known as Saba', Saba' was—so far as the inscriptions are concerned—
cerned—never anything but the name of the land or kingdom of the tribe which had the hegemony in this land, to which the name Saba’ has remained attached to the present day. This is quite clear from the inscriptions. Thus, in the first inscriptions of Glaser, N° 418—419, 1000 A and 1000 B (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Altkabardin Texte, i. 99 sq. 79), Almaqah (the principal deity of Saba’) and Saba’ is the formula by which the Sabaean, first a theocratic and then monarchic, state is known. That the predominant tribe Saba’ is however never described as a tribe in the older period is clear evidence of its hegemony as Rhodokanakis points out (Handbuch der altkabardin Altertumskunde, i. 121). It was different in the later periods. For example, in the inscription Glaser, N° 542, set up by king Shamun Yuha’ish, king of Saba’ and Dhu’r Ridad, of the tribe of Saba’, the reference is always to the “lords of the town of Märib and its valleys” (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Altkabardin Texte, ii. 14), as a definite sphere of influence which had been allotted to them in the government of Märib and the administration of its territories. Deliberately contrasted with them as citizens of the town and the highly cultivated areas round it are the “Beduins of Märib” (cf. E. Glasier, Die Abessinier in Arabien und Afrika, p. 128 sqq.), who probably lived around the town (for references as regards Saba’, cf. M. Hartmann, Die arabischen Frage, p. 385—389). The idea that Saba’ was a town, which we find in the classical authors, which was criticized as early as C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, p. 279, is therefore to be put down to a misunderstanding rather than to be taken seriously. This is also true of the identification of Märib with Saba’ among the Arab geographers (cf. the references collected by Jomard in Mengin, Histoire sommaire de l’Egypte, p. 347—344). Yaqût for example (Mushtariq, p. 259) identifies Märib with Saba’ as does Abu ‘I-Fida’ (Geographie, p. 130 and Historia universi, p. 114); but the latter expressly points out that Märib was known as the town of Saba’ and it was also said that Märib was the name of the king’s palace while the town was called Saba’. It is in keeping with this that we find al-Suhaib in Yaqût, Musjam, iv. 382 referring to Märib as the name of a castle of the Azd. In al-Karwint and in the Dkhian-and the town is called Saba’. Ibn Rostafa, who includes Märib in Hadramaut and mentions it under the name Madhbat Saba’ or Saba’, mentions the ruins of a second large town with wonderful buildings, which was close to Saba’ and which the people of Saba’ considered to have been the town of Saba’. Saba’, they said, was two towns, which lay opposite one another and were a day’s journey in length. As there are a number of buildings which belonged to Märib on the right bank of the Wadi Dasime, it is intelligible why the mistake should have been made of imagining two towns running parallel to one another, especially as the two are still considerable ruins adjoining the Haram Billas, the “Am’Ar” and the “pillars of Bilqa” as we have seen. The alleged length of a day’s journey is of course much exaggerated and indeed the description in Ibn Rostafa generally shows how little was known in later times of the ancient Märib. The association of the origin of the town of Märib with Saba’ b. Yashid probably led to the name of this legendary ruler being transferred to the town or Saba’ as a tribe being identified with Märib, as Agatharchides had already done. The varying form in which the name is handed down, sometimes town of Saba’ and sometimes Saba’ alone, makes this development very probable. Besides al-Hamdun (Sijma, p. 7, s) identifies the Saba’ of Ptolemy with Märib and always calls the town Märib.

The earliest history of the town is unfortunately wrapped in obscurity. The mention of kings of Märib in the comparatively late inscription, Glaser, N° 302, shows, it is true, that the town was still independent in the time of the older Sabaean Mükarrab — for these “kings of Märib” are their contemporaries — but gives no clue to the date of its foundation. It probably arose about the same time as the old royal city of Strwah. The great inscription Glaser, N° 418—419, shows Märib already in possession of the Sabaean Mükarrab and not long afterwards it became the capital; this at least seems evident from the great inscription Glaser, N° 481, where we are told that the founder of the inscription “brought as far as Maryah the peace between Saba’ and Kataban”. This we can only interpret with Rhodokanakis (Studien, ii. 24) as meaning that the general (he is called Tuba’barka, son of Dhu’yam сдела, of the clan of Dhu’amar) returned to the capital of Saba’ after the conclusion of peace. Not long after the foundation of the great Sabaean kingdom, of which the inscription Glaser, N° 1000 A B relates, it must have replaced Strwah, the oldest capital of the Sabaean kingdom; indeed there seems to be evidence that this had already taken place in the reign of the king who set up the two great Strwah inscriptions Glaser, N° 1000 A B, Karibul-Watar, founder of the great Sabaean kingdom. For when we are told in Glaser, N° 1000 B, 1 sq. (N. Rhodokanakis, Altkabardin Texte, i. 23) that he had built the upper part of his palace Shum (Sijma) which is probably identical with the famous citadel Sulm at Märib, it may be assumed that this Mükarrab resided here. The great building which went back to the older generation of Sabaean Mükarrab, must have then transformed Märib and the country round it into the flourishing oasis which made the town the centre of a great kingdom. The Mükarrab Sumbu-alaya Yasnaf and his father Yid-bi-lu Dharis as well as Yit’jam’amara Bayin also did much for the development of the town and the country around it.

We do not know exactly when Märib ceased to be the capital of the Sabaean kingdom. Glaser (Zwei Inschrifiiber den Dammsbruch von Märib, p. 29) supposes that the capital was removed to Zaafar (near Yasnaf) at latest towards the end of the third century A.D., but probably as early as the first century A.D., since the Periplus marit Immrnikv, § 33 already knows Zaafar as the capital.

Indeed the evidence of the Periplus which is supplemented by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vii. 104, who knows Saphar as a royal residence, can hardly be interpreted otherwise than meaning that Zaafar was already the residence of the Sabaean kings about 60 A.D. With the transfer of the capital to Zaafar, the cause of which Glaser finds in the attacks of the Axamites on the independence of the Sabaean kingdom, while M. Hartmann (Dis arabisches Fragent,
p. 460) supposes the reason to have been the victory of the Hamdanids over Himmur (cf. C.H.H., 347; and M. Hartmann, op. cit., p. 146 sq.), Mürab’s army had passed away; the decline probably did not set in at once but: Glauser must be right in assuming that Mürab was now neglected and this is how the dam, so important for the cultivation of the land, fell into disrepair. Isolated references in Muslim sources show that the town had however not yet lost all its importance. Al-Bakri, Muqṣid, i. 308 (cf. A. v. Kremer, Sega, p. 138) knows Mürab as one of the treasures of the Himyars, and according to the Himyar kaṣaḍa, verse 56 (A. v. Kremer, Sega, p. xii., note 1 and p. 69), Shammar Yarīsh (c. 381 A.D.) kept his prisoners in Mürab. The two breaches in the dam which were in place in 450 A.D. and under Abyssinian rule in 542 A.D., must have done grave injury to the prosperity of the town. In the last period of its brilliant history Mürab was for a short time (certainly in 542 A.D.) the capital of the governor of the Ethiopian king Ramsīl Zāhilanā, Abraha, and even had a Christian church (cf. Glauser, Zwei Inschriften über den Dombruch von Mürab, p. 47). The final catastrophe sealed the fate of the town. Its inhabitants left the sore tried town and migrated to the Hijāz.

Mürab was resettled in the Muslim period. The favourable situation of the place and perhaps the rich deposits of salt in the neighbourhood (3 days’ journey east of Mürab at Sāfīr, mentioned in the time of the Prophet, who appointed Abīd Mīlūlṭi-al-Ashārī governor of Mürab; E. Glauser, Reise nach Mürab, p. 26; al-Bakri, Muqṣid, ii. 502; al-Hamdānī, Sīfa, p. 87, 102, 155; 201; A. Sprenger, Postw. Reisereisen, p. 139) also kept the place from being quite forgotten. Ibn Khordādbih (B.G.A., vi. 138) and al-Mukaddasī (B.G.A., i. 89) mention the village of Mürab; al-Hamdānī, Sīfa, p. 199 says the savannah of Mürab is a speciality of the Yemen. Al-Idrisī, Geographie, p. 149 calls Mürab a barji (according to Ibn al-Majdījawīr in A. Sprenger, Postw. Reisereisen, p. 140), Mürab (c. 630 A.H.) had a market and a mosque and was of some importance as a resting-place for the night and fruit could be obtained there at any time of the year. Since Yākūt, Muqṣid, iv. 436, also says, the district of Mürab is rich in palms, it seems to have in part at least regained its old fertility.

The present little kingdom of Mürab owes its foundation to the gharīb Ḥūsain from al-Zāhir in al-Djāfwa, who took a vigorous part in the expulsion of the Turks from the Yemen in 1640. He was the first to assume the title of emir. His dominion extended over the whole land from Raghwān in the southern Djāfwa to Bībājān, which he divided among his four sons. Only one of these, Khālid, to whom Mürab fell, could exert effective authority; the others never gained possession of their inheritances although their descendants still play a certain part in Bābāj, Harīb and Raghwān.

do to doubt the essential correctness of this story, as there is no particular bias in it and it contains all sorts of details which do not look like inventions, so that it is exaggerated scepticism when Lammens supposes that the "mother of Ibrahim", after whom the maghara was called, was some Jewess. On the other hand, in view of the fact that all the marriages of Muhammad after the Hijra were childless, it would have been surprising if evil-minded people had not cast suspicions on the paternity of Ibrahim, and that this actually happened is evident from some traditions the object of which is to defend Maryam from this suspicion.

On the other hand, it is not so easy to justify the part which Qur'anic exegesis makes Maryam play in the exposition of Surah lixi. In this Surah, the Prophet speaks in a very indignant tone against one of his wives, because she has betrayed a secret to another, which he had imparted to her under a promise of the strictest secrecy. At the same time Allah blames him, because in order to please his wives, he has bound himself by oath to refrain from something which is not definitely stated and because he does not use the right granted him by Allah to release himself from his oath. In addition, there is a word of warning to the two women who had disobeyed him and a threat to all his wives that he might divorce them in order to marry more pious ones (cf. xxxviii. 28 sq.). According to the usual explanation, the two wives are Hafsa and 'A'ishah and the revelation is said to have been provoked by the fact that Hafsa, on returning unexpectedly to her house, found 'A'ishah and the Prophet in an intimate tête-à-tête and that on a day which by rotation belonged to her (or 'A'ishah). In his embarrassment he pledged himself by oath to have no more intercourse with the Cord girl. But after Hafsa's breach of faith, Allah tells him to release himself from his oath. This explanation fits very well in some respects and that the promise of continuity is connected with marital complications is illuminating. That there are hadiths, which explain his quarrel with his wives quite differently, does not mean very much, for they are no doubt invented to drive out of circulation the popular, less edifying version. But, on closer examination, there is one flaw which makes the latter uncertain, for it does not answer the question how Muhammad could call the situation in which Hafsa caught him and Maryam a secret that he trusted to her.
Rhagid (van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 304, note 7) was the reference to Rhagid [rather Raghid] al-Din in Le Strange, *Palestine* is shown to be wrong); his statement seems to be correct, however, that the citadel was built out of material from ancient ruins. The Byzantines occupied al-Markab and other fortresses in the vicinity under the general Kantakuzenos in 1104 (Anna Commnen, *Alexiad*, ed. Relliefscheid, lii. 138: τι τη Άργο-πολεστιανον [= Στιφλα] τη καλυβουσμον Μαρκζαντ [- = al-Markab], τη Γιβαζιλαν [Qibala] και Άλατα τον). When in 511 (1117-1118) the Crusaders approached the fortress, its lord Ibn Mu\' \#raf surrendered it on condition that he and his family were allowed to remain in it; but after a few days the Franks expelled him and allotted al-Ma\'\#raf to him in exchange for al-Markab; Franks and Armenians were settled in the latter. The first recorded lord of the fortress was Kainal Mansas, the constable of the prince of Antioch. After the earthquake of 1170, from which the fortress must have suffered damage, Bertrand of al-Markab, perhaps out of fear of Saladin's threats, handed it over on Feb. 1, 1186, to the Knights of St. John. In July 1186 Saladin passed below the watch tower (now Burd al-Sahli), which from ancient times had commanded the road along the coast (cf. Dussaud, *Topcge*, p. 127, note 5) below the fortress and was connected with it by a wall which protected a subterranean passage, but did not dare to attack Markab any more than Tarifs (q.v.). Prince Isaac of Cyprus, a descendant of the Comnenoi (not the Emperor Isaac Comnenos as van Berchem, op. cit., p. 298 sqq., note 5 says), was taken prisoner by Eichard de Coeur-de-Lion on May 31, 1191, and imprisoned in Markab till his death (Neophytus, in *Renoul hist. cxxvi, hist. greco*, ii. 562 with note, ii. 489: ιε κατεληκαν καλυβουσμον Μαρκζαντ). Sul\#an al-Malik al-Zahir Gh\#azi of Halab whose lands adjoined those of the Knights of St. John sent in 601 (1204-1205) troops against the fortress, who were said to have just succeeded in destroying the towers of the walls when their leader fell and they again retired without accomplishing their object. In 628 (1231) and 638 (1240-1241) the Knights were again at war with Yusuf, Sul\#an of Halab. From this period (1221) dates the very full description of the strong fortress by Willbrand of Oldenburg. Built on a high hill and surrounded by a double wall and many towers, it was regarded in the period when the power of the Crusaders was beginning to decline, as maximum totius terrae illae solutum; the bishop of Valencia (Bni\#\#a) had moved into the fortress by 1242 out of fear of the Muslims. King Henry of Andalusia in 1217-1218 gave funds for the maintenance of the Crusaders which had given him an honourable reception (Rohricht, *Regesta Hierosolym.*, p. 243, No. 998). The straits to which the humiliating treaties with Bila\#ars had reduced the Knights Orders is lamented by the Grand Master Hugo Revel in 1268 in a letter in which he says that the possession of its last two fortresses, Cratium and Margatum (= H\#n al-Akr\#d and al-Markab), was only granted the Order on payment of oppressive taxes (Rohricht, *Regesta Hierosolym.*, Additamentum, Genoponti 1924, p. 91, No. 1358d). After the loss of H\#n al-Akr\#d, the Templars and the Knights of St. John in 669 (1271) by a treaty which they concluded in Arqa with Sa\#f al-Din Balab\#an al-Daw\#ad\#ar ("the secretary") al-Rumi, the Sul\#an's plenipotentiary, had to cede half of the coastline (\#afi\#) of Antar\#s\#a, al-Markab and Bni\#\#a and bind themselves not to build any new defences (Mufa\#dal b. Ahi l-Padi\#il, *Gesch. d. Mamlukensitaten*, ed. Blechert, in *Patrol. Orient.*, xii. 536). After a raid by the Franks (Oct. 1279) the Emperor Sa\#f al-Din Balab\#an al-Tbild\#\#khi, the governor of H\#n al-Akr\#d for Qala\#\#an, in the beginning of 1281 sent troops against al-Markab, but they were driven back with heavy losses (Mufa\#dal, op. cit., xiv. 484, and the sources quoted in van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 301, note 5). In the treaty between Qala\#\#an and the Templars of 651 (1282) al-Markab is mentioned among the districts half of which were to be ceded (Mufa\#dal, op. cit., xiv. 445; van Berchem, op. cit., p. 302, note 2). The pilgrims Burchardus de Monte Sion in 1283 mentions the "Cestrum Margab fratrum hospitiorum sancti Johannis"; it was still at this date the see of the bishop of Valencia (*Peregrinatores*, ed. Laurent, p. 30, 170).

On 10th Safar 684 (April 17, 1285) Qala\#\#an appeared before al-Markab and began the attack as soon as the siege artillery arrived. On the 10th Rabi\# I (May 25) the Emir Fakhr al-Din Mu\#raf received the surrender of the fortress. On account of its strategic value for defence against possible attacks from the sea, it was not destroyed but included in the "royal province of the fortunate conquist", the capital of which till 688, when Tarbulus was taken, was the Castle of the Kurds, still governed by Sa\#f al-Din Balab\#an al-Tbild\#\#khi al-Manfuri. Qala\#\#an in 684 ordered him to repair the defences of the citadel as an inscription found in situ shows (van Berchem, *Inscriptions de Syrie*, p. 71 sq.). Among those present at the capture of the fortress were the 12 years old Abu l-Fida\#, who was then on his first campaign with his father, and the historian Ibn 'Abd al-Rah\#m, the continuator of Ibn Wasi\#l's chronicle. The best account of the taking of al-Markab is in Qala\#\#an's biography entitled *Ta\#zir al-Siyaha wa l-\#U\#b al-Sirat al-Sul\#\#an al-Malik al-Manfuri* (Paris, MS. ar., No. 1704, fol. 149 sqq., ed. and transl. in van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 310-320).

In the vi\#h (xvii) century al-Markab belonged to the province of Tarbulus (Ummari, *Tarif*, transl. by R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., lxx. (1916), 36; Khalil al-Zah\#ri, *Zahirat ka\#\#f al-Manmuri*, ed. Rava\#\#se, p. 48; Ka\#\#kashandi, *Sul\#an al-Daw\#ad\#ar*, ed. Cairo, iv. 145 sqg); at this time it was used as a state prison (van Berchem, p. 305, note 2).

Its harbour is mentioned in documents of 1193 and 1399 (van Berchem, p. 309, note 3); it was presumably at the mouth of the Wadi 'Al al-Kh\#\#be (in Walpe: al-Mina). As al-Markab lies on the outer spur of the Ana\#y range it has often wrongly been included among the fortresses of the Isma\#li (\#ella al-Duma) (so Umari, op. cit., in the Berlin and Gotha MS. but not in the others; Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., lxx., 36, note 7).

So far as we can judge from the brief notes by visitors, it was not till about the middle of the xiv century that it began to fall into ruins. About 1885 at the request of the ka\#\#manik\#\#an of the ka\# of al-Markab the seat of the government was transferred from the ruined Kal\#\#at al-Markab to Bni\#\#a (M. Hartmann, Z. D. P. V., xxii., p. 163, No. 27).

*Bibliography: V\#\#\#i, Mu\#raf, ed. W\#\#ttenfeld, iv. 500; Sa\#f al-Din, *Marj\#\#id al-I\#\#\#il*,
MARRAKESH

(Marrakesh, popular pronunciation Marrakesh), a town in Morocco, and one of the residences of the Sultan.

The town Marrakesh, adopted by the administration of the protectorate, is of recent origin in French. During the year 1890 the town was always known as Maroc (Morocco) in French. The kingdom of Morocco, distinct in origin from those of Fès and Sûs, finally gave its name to the whole empire. At one time it only consisted of the country south of the wide Umra Râbî' as far as the range of the Great Atlas.

Marrakesh is situated in 30° 37'35" N. Lat. and 7° 59'42" East Long. (Greenw.). Its mean height above sea-level is about 1,510 feet. The town is 150 miles south of Casablanca. It is through the latter that almost all the traffic with the coast passes at the present day. It used to go via Safi which is the nearest port (100 miles). Sidi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah in 1765 tried to supplant it by Mogador (115 miles), where he built a town and harbour through which it ended in the eighteenth century most of the trade between Marrakesh and Europe passed.

Although Marrakesh is only 235 miles from Fès as the crow flies, it is over 330 by Casablanca-Rahat-Meknès which is the only road that has been used for over a century, the direct road by the Tadla having been rendered impracticable by the traditional insecurity of the country.

The temperature which is very mild in winter is very hot in summer. The average maxima of 20° in the month of August 1927 have nothing unusual and imply extreme temperatures reaching or passing 50° on certain days. Rainfall is low (284.5 mm. in 1927, against 706.5 in Rabat and 1,007.3 in Tangier). But water fed by the snows of the Atlas is found at no great depth. It is collected by a system of small subterranean galleries (khatâfa, plur. khatâfi) which bring it to the surface by taking advantage of the very slight slope of the surface. This method of obtaining water, which is described in the 18th century by Idris, has enabled the vast gardens which surround the town to be created. The Almohads and the dynasties which succeeded them also built aqueducts and reservoirs to supply the town with water from the springs and streams of the mountains.

Contrary to what was until quite recently believed, Marrakesh is by far the most thickly populated town of the empire. The census of March 7, 1926 gives 149,263 as the total population, 3,652 Europeans, 132,893 Muslims, 12,718 Jews.

The probable growth of the population is, as yet, insufficient to explain the difference between the present day figures and the old estimates, almost all far below the truth and varying greatly among themselves: from 20,000 (given by Diego de Torres in 1585 and Hôst in 1768), 25,000 (Saint Olos, 1693), 30,000 (Ali Bey el-Absassi, 1804), 40 to 50,000 (Gateil, 1864 and Eug. Aubin, 1902), 50,000 (Lambert, 1868), 60,000 (Bonnier, 1868), 80 to 100,000 (Washington, 1830) up to the obviously exaggerated figure of 270,000 given by Jackson in 1811.

About 40 miles N. of the Atlas, the vast silhouette of which, covered by snow for eight months of the year, is in the background, Marrakesh is built in a vast plain called the Hâwz which slopes very gently towards the wide Tânsîf, which runs 3 miles north of the town. The extreme uniformity of the plain is broken only in the N.W. by two rocky hills called Gilîts (1,700 feet) and Kudiyat al-Abîd. In 1912 at the time of the French occupation, there was built a fort which commands Marrakesh.

The modern European town called the Gueliz lies between this hill and the walls of the old town. The wide Istit, a left bank tributary of the Tânsîf, a stream often dried up but transformed into a raging torrent after storms, runs along the walls of the town on the east. To the north of Marrakesh as far as the Tânsîf and to the east stretches a great forest of palm-trees, the only one in Morocco north of the Atlas. It covers an area of 13,000 hectares and possesses over 100,000 palm-trees, but the dates there only ripen very imperfectly.

The town is very large. The walls which run all round it measure at least 7 miles in length. The town in the strict sense does not occupy the whole of this vast area. The part built up forms a long strip which starting from the  réussi of Sidi bel Abdâs in the north runs towards the kâbba which stands at the southern end of the town. On the two sides lie great gardens and estates among which we find in the neighbourhood of the chief gates inside the walls, isolated quarters grouped into so many villages around their stib and their mosque.

The town consists mainly of little low houses of reddish clay, often in ruins, among which are scattered huge and magnificent dwellings without particularly imposing exteriors built either by the visiers of the old mahzen (e.g. the bârîya, now
the Résidence Générale, the old palace of the Bé (Mâdi, vizier of Mawâl al-Hassan) or by the great Ṣaʿida, chief of the tribes of the country round. This narrow and overhung streets in the central area broaden towards the outskirts into sandy and dusty squares and crossroads. The colour, the picturesque architecture, the palm-trees, the branches of which appear over the walls of the gardens, the presence of a large negro population, all combine to give the town the appearance of a Saharan zar of vast dimensions.

The centre of the life of the city is the Djemma al-Fna, a vast, irregular, ill defined open space, surrounded until quite recently by wretched buildings and-reed hats, overshadowed by the high minaret of the Kutubiya Mosque. Its name comes, according to the author of the Taʾrîkh al-Sanâdas, from the ruins of a mosque which Ahmad al-Mansûr had undertaken to build there. As he had planned it on a wonderful scale, it had been given the name of mosque of prosperity (al-ḥadd); but his plans being upset by a series of unfortunate events, the project was unable to finish the building before his death and it was therefore given the name of mosque of the ruin (djemma al-fenda). This origin having been forgotten; an attempt was later made to explain the name of the square from the fact that the heads of rebels used to be exposed there (mosque or place of assembly of ruin, of death). It was there also that executions took place. Lying on the western edge of the principal agglomeration of buildings at its most thickly populated part, close to the sâk, connected with the principal gates by direct and comparatively quiet roads, Djemma al-Fna is the point of convergence of the roads. At all hours swarming with people, it is occupied in the morning with a market of small traders: barbers, cobblers, vendors of fruit and vegetables, of medicines, of fried grasshoppers, of tea and of soap (parira); in the evening, it is filled with acrobats and jugglers (Awliâd Sidi Ahmad b. Mâsû of Tazrâ-wlî), sœcers, story-tellers, fire-eaters, snake-charmers and ḥāsh dancers. The audience consists mainly of people from the country who have come into town on business and want to enjoy the distractions of the town for a few hours before going home. These visitors are always very numerous in Marrakesh. Besides the regular inhabitants there is a floating population the number of which has been put at 20,000 to 25,000. For Marrakesh is the great market for supplying not only the Haws but also the mountain country, the Sts and especially the extreme south, Dâdèn, Dar'â (Draâ) and the Anti-Atlas. A portion of this traffic will probably be diverted via Agadir when this port is opened to trade. Marrakesh used to be the starting-point for caravans going through the Sahara to trade with Timbuktu. They brought back chiefly Soudanese slaves for whom Marrakesh was an important market. The conquest of the Soudan by France has put an end to this traffic.

To the north of the Djemma al-Fna begin the siks which are very large. As in Fas and in the other large towns, the traders and artisans are grouped by trades under the authority of the muhayyib (mâsû), a kind of provost of the merchants. The most important siks are those of the cloth merchants (musâriyya), of the sellers of slippers, of pottery, of basket work, of the embroderers of harness, of the dyers and of the smiths. An important Thursday sîk (al-hamâl) is held outside and inside the walls around the old gate of Fas which has taken the name of the market (Bâb al-Khamis). This sîk was already in existence in the sixth century.

There is no industry to speak of in Marrakesh. The most important is the making of leather (tanning). The manufacture of slippers occupies 1,500 workmen who produce over 2,000 pairs each working day. There are the only articles manufactured in the town that are exported. They are sold as far away as Egypt and West Africa. The war interrupted communications and did great damage to this industry. For the rest, Marrakesh is mainly an agricultural market. The whole town is a vast fenda in which are warehoused the products of the country, almonds, caraway seeds, goat-skins, oils, barley, wool, to be exchanged either for imported goods (sugar, tea, cloth) or for other agricultural produce (wheat, oil, which the tribes of the mountains and of the extreme south for example do not have).

The town is divided into 32 quarters: Zâwiya A-Bâbbâsiya, Sidi Ben Slimân, Asfâl, Rîyâd al-Arzîs, Sidi Abî ʿAmîr, Bîb Dukkâla (divid ded into two quarters), Sidi Abî al-Arzîs, Rabât Azâbî, Daʾbîhî, Kammârîya, Rîyâd al-Zîthîn al-djâdîlî, Dîjâma al-Mundhirî, ben Shouqra, Kâsîr, Mâwâlî, Rîyâd al-Zâhab al-ṣâlih, Arâs Mawâlî Mûsâ Khîtû, Arâs Mawâlî Mûsâ Şûfûra, Bûb Halîkîn, Sidi Mûmûn, Ben Şâbîb, Sidi Aïlyûbû, Bûb Zakrî, Kâsîr ben Modjâr, Bîb al-Dabâbîhû, Hârâst al-Shûrâ, Mawâkîf, Arahîm, the bâsha containing the royal palaces (again subdivided into several sections: al-Bâtu, Kašabat al-nîbâjû), Berrima, Bûb Aḥâmârî, Masakin Sidi ʿAmâra and the mellâb or Jewish quarter. We may further mention outside the walls near the Bîb Dukkâla, a quarter called al-Hara where the lepers live. Until recent years the gates of the town were closed during the night. The superintendents of the quarters (mûshaḍḍûn) have watchmen (ʿarâs) under their orders. The old custom still survives of firing a salvo at midnight on the Djemma al-Fna as a curfew.

Marrakesh being an imperial town, the sulûn who only stays there at long intervals is represented in his absence by a ḥâlîf, a prince of the imperial family (usually the son or brother of the sovergn). The role of this khâlîf is purely representative. His main duty is to preside at the ceremonies during the ritual celebrations. The governor of the town is a bâsha, assisted by a delegate (nâhî) and several khâlfûs. One of the latter supervises the prisons and the administration of justice. Another has the title of bâsha of the kašā. He governs the southern part of the town which includes the imperial palace and the Jewish quarter. Formerly the bâsha of the kašâ was independent of the bâsha of the town and served to counter-balance the power of the latter. He commanded the gûšî, an armed contingent furnished by the warlike tribes (Uâlîya, Aḥ Imîlûr etc.) settled in the vicinity of the town by the sulûns on the domain lands. At the present day the gûšî is under the control of the bâsha of the town and the bâsha of the kašâ only retains of his former powers certain rights of precedence and honorary privileges.

Muslim law is administered in Marrakesh by three kâds: one is established at the mosque of Ibn Yûsûf; the other at the mosque of al-Mwâshû and the third at the mosque of the kašâ. The latter's competence does not extend beyond the limits of
his quarter. That of the others extends over the whole town and even over the tribes of the area governed from it who have no local ḳāḥī. Marrakesh is not numbered like Rabat and Tetuan among the ḫaṭifiable towns, i.e. it has not, like them, an old established citizen population, not of rural origin, with a bourgeois whose tone is given by the descendants of the Moors driven from Spain. In the sixteenth century however, Marrakesh did receive a colony of Moriscos large enough to give one quarter the name of Ḫaṭifa, a town of Andalusia from which they came. The foundation of the population consists of people of the tribes for the most part Berber or Arabs already mixed with Berber blood. Shūḥ is much spoken in Marrakesh, although the language of the tribes around the town (Rḥāmāa, ʿUṭdaya) is Arabic. The movements of the tribes, the coming and going of caravans, the importation of slaves from the Sudan have resulted in a constant process of mixing in the population and the old Maṣūṃidian race which must with Almoravids have been the primitive population of Marrakesh is only found in combination with amounts difficult to measure of Arab, Saharan and negro blood. Even to-day this process is going on. The newcomers come less from the valleys of the Atlas than from the Sūs, the Dra, and the Anti-Atlas, from the extreme south which is poor and overpopulated. The greater number of these immigrants soon become merged in the population of the town but the Eżemāt al-ʿaw-l ṣaḥyl had been seen by L. Masson in 1923–1924 (Paris 1925) yielded some very curious information about the survival in Marrakesh of vigorous groups of provincial, specialising in particular trades: the makers of silver jewellery (at least those who are not Jews) owe their name of ḫaṭifiable to the fact that they originally came from Tāqūf Mūsi in Sūs; the Meṛfīa are charcoal-burners and green-grocers, the Ḥibhīya, salters; the people of the Togha, gatherers of dates and ḫaṭifiable, i.e. diggers of wells, who specialise in water-channels (ḫaṭifiable); the Tūfilla, porters and paviors; the Warrāṭa, water-carriers and of Ṭatta (Anti-Atlas), restaurers of the Dra, water-carriers and ḫaṭifiable, etc. This division is not the result of specialisation but arises from the fact that artisans once settled in Marrakesh have sent for their compatriots when they required assistance. Thus groups grew up, sometimes quite considerable. The list of the corporations of Marrakesh gives a total of about 10,000 artisans. These corporations have lost much of their power under the pressure of the Makhten. Some of them however still retain a certain social importance: in the first place that of the shoemakers which is the largest (3,500 members); then come the tailors (439), the cloth (237) and silk (100) merchants, the ḥabūşi wholesalers, then some groups of skilled artisans, highly esteemed but of less influence, embroiderers of saddles, makers of mosaics, carpenters, sculptors of plaster etc.

Religion and intellectual life. Mosques are numerous in Marrakesh. Some of them will be the subjects of brief archaeological studies. Those which play the most important part in the religious life of the town are the mosque of al-Mwaṭi, the mosque of Allā豁 Yūnī, both close to the sāki, that of Sīdī b. Abdāb, and that of the Ḫaṭifa. Some come the Ḫaṭifa, the mosque of the Bāb Dukāla, of the Bāb Atlān, of Berrima, and the Dījma Ibrāhīm ʿl-Saḥāḥ. There are also many little mosques in the various faubourgs. But although it can claim illustrious men of learning, Marrakesh is not like Fās, a centre of learning and of teaching. The Almoravids built schools and libraries there, brought the most illustrious scholars, philosophers and physicians from Spain, like Ibn ʿṬafīl, Abd al-Mawān Ibn Zūhūr (Avenzoar) and Abu ʿl-Walīd Ibn Rāghūd (Averroes) who died at Marrakesh in 595 (1198). These great traditions did not survive the dynasty. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, in the time of Leo Africanus, the library of the Almohad palace was used as a poultry house and the madrasa built by the Marinids was in ruins. At the present day in the town of the Kutubiyah there is not a single bookshop. A certain number of Ḫaṭifa still live in the madrasa (Ibn Yūnās, Ibn ʿṢaḥāḥ, Sīdī b. Abdāb, Berrima, Ḫaṭifa) but the teaching of Marrakesh has neither the prestige nor the traditions which still give some lustre to the teaching at al-Karaṣṣiyah in Fās, much decayed as it is. Although they attempt to imitate the customs of Fās (they celebrate notably the "festival of the sulām of the ḫaṭifiable" [cf. ʾkhīnī every spring] the students are far from holding in Marrakesh the position their comrades enjoyed in Fās.

The devotion of the people of Marrakesh expends itself particularly on the cult of saints, not at all orthodox but dear to the Berber. Their town has always been famous for the great number of sāḥī who are buried in its cemeteries and who justify the saying: *Marrakesh, tomb of the saints*. But in the time of Mawlān Ṣamḥīl, the Shāhīb Abd al-Ḥasan b. al-Ṣawādī, by order of the prince organised, in imitation of the old established cult of the Ṣabīṭ al-Riḍāā (the seven saints of the Ṛagrā, around the Djabal al-Hadjīd, among the Ṣaḥāma) a pilgrimage to the Sabīṭ al-Riḍāā of Marrakesh including visits to seven sanctuaries and various demonstrations of piety. The following are the names of the seven saints in the order in which they ought to be visited: 1) Sīdī Yūnī b. Allā豁 ʿl-Saḥāḥ, a leper, d. 593 (1196–1197), buried outside the Bāb Aghmāt on the spot where he had lived; 2) the Ṣaḥāḥ Yāḥyā, 476–544 (1083–1149), ʿl-Saḥāḥ of Cuţa, then of Granada, a learned theologian, author of the Ḩabīb, a celebrated collection of traditions, buried beside the Bāb Aitla; 3) Sīdī b. Abdāb al-Saḥā, patron saint of Marrakesh and the most venerated of the saints of the region 524–601 (1130–1204). He came to Marrakesh when the town was being besieged by the Almohads and settled there, at first in a hermitage on the Djabal Gilla where a ʾsawāṣ was dedicated to him and can still be seen. But the principal pilgrim is to his tomb at the northern end of the town where Abdāb Fāris b. Ahmad al-Maṣūṭī built a ʾsawāṣ and an important mosque at the beginning of the sixteenth century; 4) Sīdī Muḥammād b. Suṭmān al-Dījālī, d. in 876 (1465) at Afaγhāl on the hospital, a celebrated Saṭṭ, leader of the Dījālī brotherhood. His body was brought to Marrakesh in 930 (1523) by Ahmad al-ʾArāf, the Saṭṭān; 5) Sīdī ʾAbd al-ʾAnī al-Talibī, a pupil of al-Dījālī, d. in 914 (1508); 6) Sīdī ʾAbd Allāh b. Ḥaṭiṣāb, popularly called Mawi ḫīl, d. in 935 (1528); 7) Sīdī ʾAbd al-Raḥmān al-Suḥailī, called the Imām al-Suḥailī, a native of the district of Malaga, d. 581 (1185) and buried outside the Bāb al-Rabb.
It is quite an arbitrary choice that these seven individuals have been chosen as the Sah'ayn Rijāl. Others could equally well have been chosen, as the town of Marrakesh and the cemeteries which stretch before it, contain a very large number of other venerated tombs. The principal are mentioned in the article by H. de Castries, *Les Sept Patrons de Marrakesh* (Hespéris, 1924). Legend of course plays a great part in the cults of the various saints. We may mention for example the sayings and songs which perpetuate the memory of Laiulū 'Uda, mother of the Sulṭan Ahmad al-Mansūr, a real personage much transformed by the popular imagination. The various trade corporations have chosen patron saints. Thus Sidi Ya'qūb is the patron of the tanners, Sidi bel 'Abdān of the soap-makers and lacemakers, Sidi Mas'ūd "slave" of Sidi Muhammad b. Slimān is the patron of the masons, Sidi 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Tabba of the dyers, etc. The majority of the artisans are also affiliated to the religious brotherhoods. In Massignon's investigation will be found details of the attraction which some of the latter have for certain trades.

The Jews. At the foundation of Marrakesh, the Jews had no permission to settle in the town. They came there to trade from Aghmāt Allān where they lived. Al-Idrīsī relates that under 'Ali b. Yūṣuf they had not even the right to spend the night in Marrakesh and that those, who were caught within the walls after sunset, were in great danger of losing their lives and property. They settled there at a later date. At the beginning of the xvith century there was, according to Marmol, a ghetto of over 3,000 houses. It lay near the silk on the site now occupied by the mosque of al-Maṣūm. When this mosque was built by Sulṭān ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghālibī, the more scrupulous refused to pray there for some time on the pretext that it occupied the site of a Jewish cemetery. It was ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghālibī who, about 1560, settled the Jews on the site they still occupy, along the wall of the kašba to the east, where the stables of the palace had been. In the beginning of the xvith century, there was here, according to the French traveller Mocquet, "like a separate town, surrounded by a good wall and having only one gate guarded by the Moors; here live the Jews who are over 4,000 in number and pay tribute". A century later, there were about 6,000 Jews and many synagogues. The Jewish quarter, called mellāḥ after the example of the Jewish quarter of Fās (the name mellāḥ is attested for Marrakesh as early as the end of the xvith century), has 1,000 inhabitants at the present day. As regards policing, it is under the authority of the shaikh of the kašba but otherwise is administered by an elected Jewish council. Questions of personal law are judged by a rabbinical tribunal of three members nominated and paid by the Makhten. The Jews of Marrakesh are beginning to leave the bounds of the mellāḥ. For the most part they wear the ritual costume: gaberdine, skullcap and black slippers, but the younger generation shows a tendency to emancipate itself from this dress. They have little influence on the corporations of Marrakesh and are not allowed to settle in the niks. They are limited to certain trades (jewellers, tinsmiths and embroiderers of silk) and share with the people of Fās the wholesale trade. They trade particularly with the Shīāb of the mountains.

History. The Roman occupation never extended so far as the region of Marrakesh. It is quite without probability that some writers, following the Spanish historian Marmol, have sought at Aghmāt or at Marrakesh the site of Bucanum Emerum (Bucanum Emerum, Βουκανος Εμερων of Ptolemy), a town of Tingitans, the site of which is now unknown. The earliest historians agree that the place where Marrakesh was built by the Almohads was on a barren, marshy plain where only a few bushes grew. The name Marrakesh given no clue to the origin of the town. The etymologies given by the Arab authors are quite fanciful: according to al-Marrākushi, it was the name of a negro slave who occupied and set up as a brigand there. Another writer explains it by a punning interpretation: "the meaning of the name in the language of the Maṣūdīs is "go away quickly"! The place was actually a place of ambush for brigands". It was, it appears, in 449 (1057—1058) that the Almohads advanced from Sās north of the Atlas and took Aghmāt Warika. It was there that they settled at first. But after the campaign of 452 (1060) in the course of which they conquered the country of Fāsr, Meknes and of the Lawität and Fās, they wanted to make their position more permanent and independent by creating a kind of camp, which could be used as a base for their further campaigns and would threaten the Maṣūdīs of the mountains and could be used as a connecting link between the south from which they came and the kingdom of Fās. Yūṣuf b. Tāḥṣīn therefore purchased from its owner an estate on the frontier between two Maṣūdī tribes, the Hālīlim and the Hāmmar, and pitched his camp there. So far was he from thinking of founding a great capital, a thing for which this Saharan nomad felt no need, that at first he lived in a tent here, beside which he built a mosque to pray in and a little kašba in which to keep his treasures and his weapons; but he did not build a surrounding wall. The native Maṣūdīs built themselves dwellings surrounded by palisades of branches beside the Almoravid camp. The town grew rapidly to a considerable size, if it is true, that in the reign of ʿAlī b. Yūṣuf it had at least 100,000 hearths, but it did not lose its rural character until Ibn Tūmāt appeared and the threat of the Almohad movement revived by force forced ʿAlī b. Yūṣuf to defend his town and surround it by a rampart which was built in eight months, probably in 520 (1126). Some historians give the date 526 (1132) but it is certain that the walls were already built in 524 (1130) when the Almohads attacked Marrakesh for the first time. Marrakesh, the creation and capital of the Almoravids, was to be the last of their strongholds to yield. When Ibn Tūmāt had established his power over the tribes of the mountains he tried to attack Marrakesh; he then sent an Almohad army under the command of Shāḥīd al-Baghtīrī, who, after defeating the Almoravids in the vicinity of Aghmāt, pursued them to the gates of Marrakesh. The Almohads could not enter the town but established themselves before its walls. After 40 days' siege, ʿAlī b. Yūṣuf received reinforcements and made a successful sortie which forced the attackers to retreat. This was the battle of al-Baṣīra (524 = May 1130) from the name of a large garden, Bahirat al-Rakālī, near which it was fought. It lay to the east of the town before the Bab Dabābh and the Bab Allān. Al-Baghtīrī was slain and Marrakesh repented for 17 years. Ibn Tūmāt died a few months
later. It is hardly likely that 'Abd al-Mu'min should have made his ascension, as the Kifīrīs say, a new attempt to take Marrakesh. The memoirs of al-Baidāḥī, which give such full details of all the events of this period, make no mention of it. They show on the contrary the Almoravid armies busied at first in conquering the country before occupying the capital, taking Tadla, Sale, Taza, Ouan, Timcen and Fās and only returning to lay siege to Marrakesh after the whole country had been occupied and the capital alone held out as the last stronghold of the dynastic dynasty. It was in the summer of 1146 that 'Abd al-Mu'min laid siege to Marrakesh. He made his headquarters at Giltis and, seeing that the siege would be a long one, at once had houses built in which to install himself and his army. The siege lasted eleven months. An unsuccessful sortie by the Almoravid seems to have hastened the fall of the town. Disguised by lack of success and by famine, a number of the besieged went over to the enemy, 'Abd al-Mu'min had scaling-ladders made and distributed them among the tribes. The assault was made and, according to Ibn al-Athīr, the defection of the Christian soldiers facilitated its success.

The Almoravid Sulṭān, Isāḥ, a young boy who had sought refuge in the fortress, was slain, along with a large number of the Almoravids. This event took place in 541 in the month of Shawwāl (March 6—April 3, 1147), according to the majority of the historians.

The Almohad dynasty which came from the south naturally took Marrakesh as its capital. It was here that 'Abd al-Mu'min and his successors usually resided when they were not in the country. The town prospered exceedingly under their rule. They gave it many important public buildings: the ḥāba, mosques, schools, a hospital, aqueducts and magnificent gardens. During this period of prosperity, there were very few events of particular interest in the history of Marrakesh. In 547 (1152—1153) according to Ibn Khaldūn, in 549 (1154—1156) according to al-Baidāḥī and the Kifīrīs, the Banū Aṃghīr, brothers of the Mahfīl Ibn Tīmār, entered the town and tried to mislead the inhabitants against 'Abd al-Mu'min who was away at Sale. The rising was speedily put down and ended in the massacre of the rebels and their accomplices. But on the decline of the dynasty, i.e., after the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212) and the death of al-Nāṣir, son of al-Mansūr, Marrakesh became the scene of the struggle between the royal family descended from 'Abd al-Mu'min and the Almohad shāhīds descended from the companions of Ibn Tīmār who, quelling traditions of the latter, claimed the right to grant investiture to the shāhīds and to keep them in tutelage. Abū Muhammad 'Abd al-Walīd, brother of al-Mansūr, was imprisoned in Sept. 624 (1224). His successor al-Adīl was drowned in a bath in the palace (Oct. 624 = 1227) and the Almohad shāhīds appointed as his successor the young Yahyā b. al-Nāṣir, while Abu l-'Ula Idrīs al-Ma'mūn, brother of al-Adīl, was proclaimed in Spain. The whole country was soon in the throes of revolution. Yahyā, bearing the defection of the Almoravids, fled to Tīmār (April—May 626 = 1229). Disorder reigned in Marrakesh, where a governor named al-Mu'mūn was finally appointed. But four months later, Yahyā returned to Marrakesh with fresh troops, but al-Mu'mūn's governor to death and after staying seven days in the town was forced to go to Gilita to fight a battle (Feb. 1230), for al-Mu'mūn had arrived from Spain to take possession of his kingdom. Ferdinand III, king of Castile, had given in return for various concessions, a body of 12,000 Christian horsemen with whose assistance al-Mu'mūn defeated Yahyā and his followers, entered Marrakesh and installed an anti-Almohad regime there, marked not only by a terrible massacre of the shahīds and their families but by a new orientation in religious matters quite opposed to that of the preceding reigns. On his arrival in Marrakesh, al-Mu'mūn mounted the pulpit of the mosque of the ḥāba, recited the kifīrīs, solemnly cursed the memory of Ibn Tīmār and announced a whole series of measures, some of which are given by the Kifīrīs and Ibn Khaldūn and which show he intended to do everything on opposite lines to his predecessors. His innovations revived the discontent so that two years later (1232) while al-Mu'mūn and his militiam presented at Ceuta, Yahyā again occupied Marrakesh and plundered it. Al-Mu'mūn at once turned back to the rescue of his capital but died on the way (Oct. 1234 = 629 a. H.). His widow, al-Ḥabīb, succeeded in getting her son al-Raghd, aged 14, proclaimed by the leaders of the army, including the command of the Christian mercenaries. In return she gave them Marrakesh to plunder if they could reconquer it. But the people of the town, learning of this clause in the bargain, made their own terms before opening their gates to the new sultan. The latter had to grant them the awāda and pay the Christian general and his companions the sum they might have expected from the plunder of the capital — according to the Kifīrīs, 500,000 dinars.

In 633 (1235—1236) a rebellion of the Khōlij drove al-Raghd out of Marrakesh and he took refuge in Sidījlīma while Yahyā recaptured Marrakesh. Al-Raghd however succeeded in retaking it and Yahyā finally was assassinated. It was in the reign of the Almohad al-Sulṭān (1242—1249) that the Marinids who had arrived in the east of the country in 1216, seized the greater part of the kingdom of Fās. His successor ʿUmar al-Murtuẓa, proclaimed in 646 (1248), found himself in 658 (1260) reduced to the solitary kingdom of Marrakesh, to the south of the Ḫum Raḥib. In 660 (1261—1262), the Marinid Abū Yusuf Yaḥyā b. 'Abd al-Ḥaṣā laid siege to Giltis which he threatened the town. Al-Murtuẓa sent his cousin, the Sayf al-ʿUla ʿIdrīs, renowned Abū Dabūl, to fight him. The emir ʿAbd Allah b. Abū Yusuf was slain in the battle and his followers lost heart, abandoned his plans on Marrakesh and returned to Fās at the end of Raḥib 661 (beg. June 1262).

From this time one feels that the dynasty is lost, although peace was made, which moreover showed the humiliation of the Almohads who consented to pay tribute; but they were to destroy themselves. Falling into disfavour with his cousin al-Murtuẓa, Abū Dabūl, this great-grandson of 'Abd al-Mu'mūn, in the preceding year had defended Marrakesh against the Marinid sultān, sought refuge with the latter and obtained from him the assistance necessary to overthrow al-Murtuẓa on condition that he shared the spoils. Victorious and proclaimed sultān in October 1266, Abū Dabūl forgot his promises. Abū Yusuf Yaḥyā came in person to remind him of them. He laid siege to Marrakesh in 1267 but Abū Dabūl had a stroke of good fortune for
the Mamlūk had to raise the siege to go on and defend the kingdom of Fās against an attack by the sultan of Tlemcen, Yaghmurīn. The campaign being over, Abū Yūsuf Yaḥyā returned to Marrakesh. He entered it in Muḥarram 668 (Sept. 1269). The gīrāsīd tells us that he gave the usūl to the inhabitants and to the surrounding tribes, whom he overwhelmed with benefits and ruled with justice and remained seven months to pacify and organize the country. By accepting Mamlūk rule, however, Marrakesh lost for two and a half centuries its position as a capital. The new dynasty made Fās its capital.

Its inhabitants, however, did not neglect Marrakesh especially during this period (end of the thirteenth and first half of the fourteenth century). The chronicles record many sojourns made by them there but its great days were over. The town began to lose its inhabitants. Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿĀlī was the only Mamlūk to undertake building of any importance at Marrakesh (a mosque and a madrasa). In the absence of the sovereign, the government of the town and district was entrusted to powerful governors as befitted a large town remote from the central authority. For nearly 20 years, from 668 to 687 (1269-1288), this office was held by Muhammad b. Abī Ṭufail, a chief greatly devoted to the Mamlūks, says Ibn Khalīdīn, and allied by marriage to the family of their ruler. But in February 1288, fearing treachery from Muhammad b. Ḥabīb, Abī Ṭufail imprisoned and gave his office to Muhammad b. Ḥabīb, ʿAmīr al-Qurṭubī, a client and confidant of the royal family, to whom the sultan further entrusted his son Abū ʿAmīr. Abū Yaḥyā had not left Marrakesh six months when the young prince Abū ʿAmīr rebelled there and proclaimed himself sovereign at the instigation of the governor Ibn Ṭūlūn (Nov. 1288). Abī Ṭufail hastened to Marrakesh which he took after several days siege. The young Abū ʿAmīr had time to escape and seek refuge in the mountains among the Masmāṭ tribes, after plundering the treasury.

The custom of giving the governorship of Marrakesh to a prince of the ruling family was kept up. Towards the end of May 1307, under the walls of Tlemcen, sultan Abū Tāhir gave his cousin Yūsuf, son of Muhammad b. Abī Ḥādī, b. ʿAbd al-Hādī, the governorship of Marrakesh and the provinces depending on it. By the end of the year, Yūsuf rebelled and proclaimed himself independent at Marrakesh after putting to death the governor of the town, al-Hājīdī, Masʿud. Defeated by the imperial troops on the banks of the Lūm Rāḥ, the rebel fled to the mountains, plundering Marrakesh on his way (Jan. 1308). The punishment inflicted on the rebels was severe. Yūsuf b. Abī Ḥādī, handed over by a dhākhīn with whom he had taken refuge, was put to death and the heads of 600 of his followers went to adorn the battlements of the town. Abū Saʿdī al-Ulūmī stayed at Marrakesh on several occasions. He did much rebuilding from 1320 (1320). Peace and prosperous prosperity seem to have reigned there under the rule of Abū ʿl-Ḥasan until this prince, as a result of reverses suffered in his struggle with the Hafsīdīs, found his own son, the ambitious Abī ʿInān, rebelling against him. During the troubles which now broke out, Ibn Khalīdīn tells us, the town was seriously threatened with being sacked by the Masmāṭ of the mountains led by ʿAbd Allāh al-Sạwīr. Abī ʿInān was able to consolidate his power and avert this danger. The struggle between father and son ended in the region of Marrakesh. Abū ʿl-Ḥasan, defeated at the end of Safar 757 (May 1350) near the town, sought refuge in the mountains with the sultan of the Hafsīdīs and died there just after becoming reconciled to his son and designating him his successor (June 1353).

During the course of the fourteenth century, the sultan of the Hafsīdīs played a very important part in the country. The position of the tribe on an almost inaccessible mountain, from which it commanded Marrakesh, gave its chiefs comparative independence and predominating influence among the other Masmāṭ. Abī ʿInān took the offensive against the emir ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz who had given asylum to the fugitive Abū ʿl-Ḥasan. He retained him in the command of his tribe, which he gave a few years later to his brother ʿAmīr. In 1353, the latter, becoming chief of all the Masmāṭ tribes and sufficiently powerful to keep under his thumb the governor of Marrakesh al-Muʿāzamīd, son of Abū ʿInān, very soon succeeded in making himself completely independent. He received and for a time held as hostages two rebel Mamlūk princes Abū ʿl-Ḥādī, son of the Sultan Abū Sālim, and ʿAbd al-Rahmān, son of Sultan Abī ʿAlī. Quarrelling with his protectors Abū ʿl-Ḥādī whom he had made governor of Marrakesh, he retired into his mountains and for several years defied the armies of the sultan. He was in the end captured and put to death in 1370.

After the death of Sultan Abī ʿAlī, the pretender Abū ʿl-Abbās, son of Abū Sālim, had himself proclaimed in Fās with the help of his cousin ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abū Ḥallīsīn, himself a pretender to the throne. The latter as a reward for his services was given the independent governorship of Marrakesh and the country round it (June 1374). The empire was thus completely broken up. The two rulers soon began to quarrel but then signed a treaty of peace in 1378. There was a new rupture and a new truce two years later after Marrakesh had been besieged for two months without result. Abū ʿl-Abbās in the end took Marrakesh in Dhu al-Qaʿdah 784 (July-Aug. 1380), and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was slain. Abū ʿAlī, however, dispossessed in 1384 and exiled to Gardama, succeeded in reconquering his kingdom in 1387 and sent to Marrakesh as governor his son al-Mustajir. This event is the last recorded by Ibn Khalīdīn. From this time his record ceases and throughout the 15th century we are incredibly poor in information about the history of Marrakesh. The town appears to have continued to form a large governorship in the hands of princes of the royal family. The only information at all definite that we have comes from a Portuguese historian who records that during the three years which followed the capture of Ceuta by the Portuguese (1415—1418), Morocco was a prey to the struggles among the pretenders. While Abū Saʿdī al-Ulūmī was ruling in Fās, Majūlī biʿAllī, king of Marrakesh, was fighting against another Masmāṭ prince called Fāris. The "kingdom" or governorship of Marrakesh does not seem to have completely broken the links which bound it to the kingdom of Fās for the governors of Marrakesh supplied contingents to the army which tried to retake Ceuta. But they very soon ceased to take part in the holy war in the north of Morocco and their name is not found among the opponents of the Portuguese.
Marrakesh by 1430 seems to have become de facto if not de jure independent but we do not know within fifty years at what date theHinta emirs established their power; they were descended from a brother of A'mir b. Muhammad. They were "kings" of Marrakesh when in 1508 the Portuguese established themselves at Safi, taking advantage of the anarchy prevailing, for the power of the Hintas emirs hardly extended beyond the environs of their capital and they could not effectively protect their tribes against the attacks of the Christians. By 1512 the Portuguese governors of Safi had succeeded in extending their power over the tribes near Marrakesh (Awlad Mi'si) and the town lived in fear of the border raids which on several occasions brought the Portuguese cavalry and their Arab allies into the district. The king of Marrakesh, overawed, entered into negotiations in 1514 but the terms were nothing less than his paying tribute as vassal and the building of a Portuguese fortress at Marrakesh. Agreement could not be reached. The occupation of Marrakesh remained the dream of the Portuguese soldiers. An attack on the town led by the governors of Safi and Azemmour failed (April 23, 1515). This was the period when in reaction against the anarchy and foreign invasions the Sa'dian sharifs began to come to the front in Sâs. Ahmad al-A'rajd, who appeared in 1513 to the north of the Atlas, had himself recognised as leader of the holy war and accepted as such by the local chiefs, even by 'Abd al-Nâzir, king of Marrakesh. In the month of April 1514, it is recorded that he was in Marrakesh with the king. At the end of 1521, al-A'rajd established himself peacefully in Marrakesh which he found partly depopulated by famine and married the daughter of the king Muhammad b. Nâzir called Bu Shen'tu. The latter in 1524 having tried to kick against the treads of his too powerful son-in-law, al-A'rajd and his brother Muhammad al-Shaikh, seized the ǧâshâ, which seems still then to have been held by Bu Shen'tu. They disposed of the latter by having him assassinated in the following year (1525). Marrakesh became the Sa'dian capital. The king of Fâs, Ahmad al-Wâttaśi, tried unsuccessfully to take it in June 1527. It remained in the hands of al-A'rajd till 1554, when it was seized by his brother Muhammad al-Shaikh, up till then king of Sâs. After the insurrection of Muhammad al-Shaikh in 1557, al-A'rajd as put to death at Marrakesh with seven of his sons and grandsons, so as to secure the crown for Mawlây 'Abd Allâh al-Ǧâhilû. The whole of the latter part of the century was for Marrakesh a period of great prosperity. 'Abd Allâh al-Ǧâhilû built a series of important public works: arrangement of the palace and of the provision storehouses in the ǧâshâ; in the town, the madrasa Ibn Ǧâsus and the al-Wattâin mosque etc. Ahmad al-Mansûr finished his brother's work by building in the ǧâshâ from 1578 to 1594 the famous al-Badr palace. The sultan, enriched by several years of peace and good government, and by the gold brought from the conquest of the Sûdân (1591-1592), lived almost continually in Marrakesh, to which he restored a splendour and a prosperity that it had not enjoyed since the end of the 15th century. But the death of al-Mansûr opened a period of trouble and civil war "sufficient to turn white the hair of an infant at the breast" to use the expression of the historian al-Ifrînî. While Abî Fâris, son of al-Manşûr, was proclaimed at Marrakesh, another son, Zîdân, was chosen sulânî at Fâs. A third brother, al-Shaikhî, came and took Fâs, then sent against Marrakesh an army led by his son 'Abd Allâh, who seized the town in Dec. 22, 1606. But Zîdân, who sought refuge first in Tetouan, then made his way to Sâs, via Tafûlât and coming suddenly to Marrakesh, had himself proclaimed there while 'Abd Allâh b. al-Shaikhî while escaping with his troops was attacked in the midst of the gardens (qânaw Rukbûr) and completely defeated (Feb. 25, 1607). In October of the same year, 'Abd Allâh returned after defeating Zîdân's troops on the Wâdî Tafûlât (Oct. 2, 1607), fought a second battle with them at Râs al-A'īn (a spring in Tânsif), regained possession of the town and revenged himself in a series of massacres and punishments so terrible that a portion of the population having sought refuge in the Giffâr, proclaimed 'Abd Allâh, Muhammad, great-grandson of Ahmad al-A'rajd. 'Abd Allâh was forced to fly (Jan. 25, 1608). Zîdân, recalled by a section of the populace, regained possession of his capital in a few days. The struggle between Zîdân and his brother al-Shaikhî, in the year following, centred round the possession of Fâs. Zîdân failed in his plans to retake it and henceforth Fâs, given over completely to anarchy, remained separate from the kingdom of Marrakesh. On these happenings, a marabout from Tafûlât, named Abî Maḥsûlî, attempted to intervene (1611) to put an end to the fighting among the pretenders, which was inflicting great suffering on the people. His intervention only made matters worse. He took Marrakesh on May 20, 1612. Zîdân took refuge in Safi and succeeded in again gaining possession of his capital with the help of an influential marabout in Sâs, called Yâhîa b. 'Abd Allâh. After a battle near Giffâr, Zîdân withdrew into Marrakesh on Nov. 30, 1613. But Yâhîa, succumbing to ambition, rebelled himself at the end of 1618, against the ruler whose cause he had once so well sustained. Zîdân had again to take refuge in Safi. He was soon able to return to Marrakesh, taking advantage of the discord that had broken out in the enemy ranks; 'Abd al-Malik (1627-1631), son and successor of Zîdân, has left only the memory of his cruelty and debauchery. He was murdered in May 1631. The remonades, who killed him, also disposed of his brother and successor al-Wâdi in 1636. A third brother, Muḥammad al-Shaikhî al-Aṣghar, succeeded him but had only a semblance of power. He managed however to reign till 1655, but his son Ahmad al-Abîâs was completely in the hands of the Shabũnû, an Arab tribe who assassinated him and gave the throne to 'Abd al-Karim, called Kârtîm b. Ḫâlidî, in 1659. "The latter", says al-Ifrînî, "ruled under his sway all the kingdom of Marrakesh and conducted himself in an admirable fashion with regard to his subjects". His son Abî Bakr succeeded him in 1668 but only reigned two months until the coming of the Filâtî Sulânî al-Râghînî, already lord of Fâs, who took Marrakesh on July 31, 1668. Called to Marrakesh by the rebellion of his nephew Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Râghînî met his death there in the gardens of al-Sâghilî, his head having been injured by a branch of an orange tree against which his horse threw him when it stumbled. Mawlây Ismîl had some difficulty in getting himself proclaimed at Marrakesh, which preferred
his nephew, Ahmad b. Muhammad. Ismaili forced his way in on the go SAFAR 1083 (June 4, 1672). In the following year, Marrakesh again welcomed Ahmad b. Muhammad. After a siege of two years (March 1675—June 1677), Ismaili reoccupied Marrakesh and plundered it. He passed through it again in 1694 (1683) on his way to Sis to fight Ahmad b. Muhammad who was still in rebellion. Marrakesh was no longer the capital. Mawlay Ismaili took an interest in it and destroyed the palaces of the kasba to use the materials for his works in Meknes. In 1114 (Feb. 1703), a son of Mawlay Ismaili, Muhammad al-'Ali, rebelled against his father, seized Marrakesh and plundered it. Zidan, brother of the rebel, was given the task of suppressing the rising, which he did, plundering the town once more.

Anarchy again broke out after the death of Ismaili. Its centre was Meknes. Mawlay al-Mustadji, proclaimed by the 'Abd in 1738, was disowned by them in 1740 and replaced by his brother 'Abd Allah. He sought refuge in Marrakesh. His brother al-Nasir remained his khaliifa in Marrakesh till 1743, while al-Mustadji vainly tried to reconquer his kingdom. Marrakesh finally surrendered in 1746 to Mawlay 'Abd Allah who sent his son Siddi Muhammad there as khaliifa. The government and the reign of the latter (1757—1799) formed one of the happiest periods in the history of Marrakesh. Siddi Muhammad completely restored the town, made it his usual residence, received many European embassies there, including a French one led by the Comte de Breugnon in 1767, and developed its trade. Peace was not disturbed during his long reign except for a riot raised by a marabout pretender named 'Umar, who at the head of a few malcontents tried to attack the palace in order to plunder the public treasury. He was at once seized and put to death (between 1766 and 1772, according to the sources). On the death of Siddi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah, the situation remained very unsettled for several years. After taking the oath of allegiance to Mawlay Yazid (May 3, 1799) the people of Marrakesh took in his brother Mawlay Mustajir and proclaimed him. On hearing this, Yazid abandoned the siege of Ceuta, returned to Marrakesh, plundered it and committed all kinds of atrocities (1792). Mustajir, supported by the 'Abd and the Dukkala, marched on Marrakesh. Yazid, wounded in the battle, died a few days later in the palace (Feb. 1792). Marrakesh remained faithful to the party of Mawlay Mustajir, but very soon the Rhamna abandoned him to proclaim Mawlay Hussein, brother of Mustajir. He established himself in the kasba (1209 = 1794—1795). While the partisans of the two princes were exhaustively themselves in fighting, Mawlay Silman, sultan of Fès, avoided taking sides in the struggle. The plague rid him at one blow of both his rivals (July 1799) who had in any case to submit some time before. The last years of the reign of Mawlay Silman were overcast by troubles in all parts of the empire. Defeated at the very gates of Marrakesh, he was taken prisoner by the rebel Shirda. He died at Marrakesh on Nov. 25, 1822. Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahman (1824—1859) did much for the reforestation of Agdz and restored the religious buildings. His son Muhammad completed his work by repairing tanks and aqueducts. These two reigns were a period of tranquillity of Marrakesh. 1862 however, while Siddi Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman was fighting the Spaniards at Tetuan the Rhamna rebelled, plundered the Siik al-Khamis and closely blockaded the town, cutting off communications and supplies, until the Sulajr, having made peace with Spain, came to relieve the town (June 1862). Mawlay al-Hasan hardly ever lived in Marrakesh but he stopped there on several occasions, notably in October 1875, to punish the Rhamna and the Bil 'Isha, who had rebelled, and in 1880 and 1885, to prepare his expeditions into Sis.

During the last years of the reign of Mawlay 'Abd al-'Aziz (1894—1905), it was at Marrakesh that the opposition to the European tastes and experiments of the Sulajr made itself most strongly felt. The xenophobia culminated in the murder of a French doctor named Manchamp (March 19, 1907), and the spirit of separatism in the proclamation as suljan of Mawlay 'Abd al-Hajj, brother of 'Abd al-'Aziz and governor of the provinces of the south (Aug. 24, 1907). But 'Abd al-Hajj becoming ruler of the whole empire (Aug. 24, 1907) and having signed the treaty of March 24, 1912 establishing the protectorate of France and of Spain over Morocco, the anti-foreign movement broke out again in the south. The Mauritanian marabout al-Hiba had himself proclaimed and established himself in Marrakesh. He only held out there for a brief period. His troops having been defeated at Sidi Bil 'Ummâna on Sept. 6, 1912, the French troops occupied Marrakesh the next day.

Relations with Europe. Five minor friars sent by Sr. Francis were put to death at Marrakesh on Jan. 16, 1230, for having attempted to convert Muslims and having insulted the Prophet Muhammad in their discourses. Their martyrdom attracted the attention of the Holy See to Marrakesh. A mission and a bishopric were established by Honorius III in 1225 to give the consolations of religion to the Christians domiciled in Morocco: merchants, slaves and mercenaries in the suljan's army. In the Almoravid period, the suljans had Christian mercenaries recruited from prisoners reduced to slavery or from the Mozarab population of Spain whom they had from time to time deported to Morocco by entire villages. In 1222, Abu 'l-Cla Idris al-Ma'mun having won his kingdom with the help of Christian troops lent by the king of Castile found himself bound to take up quite a new attitude to the Christians. He granted them various privileges, including permission to build a church in Marrakesh and worship openly there. This was called Notre Dame and stood in the kasba, probably opposite the mosque of al-Manqat: it was destroyed during the rising in 1232. But the Christian solliydi continued to enjoy the right to worship, at least privately, and the bishopric of Marrakesh filled by an episcopal commendatory bishop at Seville, existed so long as there was an organised Christian solliydi in Morocco, i.e. to the end of the sixteenth century. The title of Bishop of Marrakesh was borne till the end of the sixteenth century by the suffragans of Seville (cf. Father A. Lopez, Los obispos de Marruecos desde el siglo XIII, in Archivo Ibérico-Americano, IV, xili, 1920). A Spanish Franciscan, the prior Juan de Prado, who came to re-establish the mission, was put to death in 1631 at Marrakesh. A few years later (1652), a monastery was re-established beside the prison for slaves in the kasba. It was destroyed in 1659 and 1660 after the death of the last Sulajr. Henceforth the Franciscans were obliged to live in the kasba.
where - they had down to the end of the xviiith century a little chapel and a monastery. As to the Christian merchants, they had not much reason to go to Marrakesh in the middle ages. Trade with Europe was conducted at Cants from which the Muslim merchants carried European goods into the interior of the country. In the xvith century, 'Abd Allâh al-Ghâlîb had a fenda or "bunded warehouse" built in the sâbah where the Christian merchants were allowed to live; but the majority of those who came to Marrakesh preferred to settle in the Jewish quarter. It was here also that foreign ambassadors usually lodged, at least when they were not made to encamp in one of the gardens of the palace of the sultan.

Monuments. The present enceinte of Marrakesh is a wall of clay about 20 feet high, flanked with rectangular bastions at intervals of 250 to 300 feet. Bab Aghmâêt, Bab Allûn, Bab Darâbghâr, which still exist more or less rebuilt, are mentioned in the account of the attack on Marrakesh by the Almohads in 524 (1130). Bab Tântân, Bab al-Makhzen, mentioned at the same time, have disappeared. Bab al-Atâîbâ (no longer in existence: it stood on the site of the melâbâgh) and Bab Dukkala (still in existence) figure in the story of the capture of the town by the Almohads (1147). The plan of the wall has therefore never changed. It has been rebuilt in places from time to time, as the clay crumbled away, but it may be assumed that a number of pieces of the wall, especially on the west and south-west, are original, as well as at least three gates all now built up, to which they owe their survival, but have lost their name. According to Abu 'I-Fâdî (xvith century), there were in Marrakesh seventeen gates; twenty-four at the beginning of the xvith century according to Leo Africanus. It would be very difficult to draw up an accurate list, for some have been removed, others opened, since these dates or the names have been altered. Ibn Faîl 'Abd Allâh al-Umari (beginning of the xvith century) adds to the names already mentioned those of Bab Nîsa, Bab Mulâsh, Bab Mesru, Bab al-Râhah all four of which have disappeared, Bab Taghût, Bab Fûs (now Bab al-Khâsib), Bab al-Râb which still exist. The only other constant changes, which have been made in the walls of Marrakesh since they were built, have been the building of the kashba in the south and in the north the creation of the quarter of Sidi el-'Abîsâ. The tâbîya, which as late as the xvith century stood outside the walls beyond the Bab Taghût, was taken into the town with all its dependencies.

The Kâsha. The little kasha and the palace of Dâr al-'Ummâ built by 'Uthâf b. Tâshfin, lay north of the present "Mosque of the Booksellers" or Koutoubia. 'Ali b. 'Uthâf added in the same quarter other palaces called Sîr al-Hajjâr, or Kâsîr al-Hajjâr because they were built with stones from the Gillec, while all the other buildings in the town were of brick or clay. It was here that the first Almohads took up their quarters, according to Ibn Battûta. The obscure passage of the irîshârî, Abd Ya'kâb b. 'Uthâf seems to have begun the building of a "fort" in the south of the town but it was Ya'qûb al-Mânsûr who built the first kasha (1189-97); that is to say he joined to the southern wall of the town a new walled area within which he built palaces, a mosque, and a regular town. Nothing remains of the Almohad palaces, but one can from pieces of wall and other vestiges follow the old wall, at least on the north and the east side. There also the line of the wall has hardly changed. The magnificent gateway of carved stone by which the kasha is now entered, must be one of al-Mânsûr's building. Its modern name of bab Aghmâêt (the Negro's Gate) is not found in any old text. It probably corresponds to bab al-Kuhl (Gate of the Negroes), often mentioned by the historians.

Ibn Faîl 'Abd Allâh al-Umari, in the xivih century, Leo Africanus and Marmol in the xvith, have left us fairly detailed descriptions of the kasha, in spite of a few obscure passages. In the Almohad period, the kasha was divided into three quite distinct parts. One wall in the northwest, around the mosque of al-Mânsûr which still exists, contained the police offices, the headquarters of the Almohad tribes and the barracks of the Christian soldiery. From this one entered through the Bab al-Tublî, a second enclosure in which around a huge open space, the "Cerequera" of Marmol (aiyâr), were grouped the guardhouses, the offices of the Master of the army, a guest-house, a madrasa with its library and a large building called al-kâsîb (the porticoes), the "Acequife" of Marmol, occupied by the principal members of the Almohad organisation, the "Ten", the "Fifty" and the "Pâ". The royal palace, sometimes called the Alhambra of Marrakesh, in imitation of that of Granada, was entered from the Aïsârâg and occupied the whole area east of the kasha. The palaces of al-Mânsûr were still in existence at the beginning of the xviih century when the Sa'dians took possession. 'Abd Allâh al-Ghâlîb incorporated them in the new palaces which he was building. Ahmad al-Mânsûr added in the gardens to the north, the famous al-Badi palace celebrated for its size and splendour. Only a few almost shapeless ruins remain of it, but its plan is perfectly clear. Mawly Ismâ'il had it destroyed in order to use its materials, the kasha remained so completely in ruins that Sidi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh when he became governor of Marrakesh in 1770-1746, was obliged to live in a tent until his new buildings were finished. It is to him that we owe an important part of the present palace with its inner garden, "Arâs al-Nil. Other works were later undertaken by Mawly Slâmân and his successors. Some large unfinished buildings date only from Mawly 'Abd al-Hafiz. A number of gates, in addition to the Bab Aghmâêt give admittance to the kasha: these are Bab Berrima and Bab al-Ahmar in the east, Bab Igâlî and Bab Kâsîr in the west. The palace has vast gardens belonging to it: Dînân al-Afîsya, Agdîl, Dînân Rîdwan, Ma'mûna, Manâra, the latter, two miles west of the town, contained in the xviith century a pleasure house of the sulûm. The palace of Dâr al-Balîsâ, situated in the Agdîl, took the place of a Sa'diian palace. It was rebuilt by Sidi Mohamed b. 'Abd Allâh and has since been restored. As to the gardens of the Agdîl, they seem to have been created in the xivith century by 'Abd al-Ma'âmin.

Mosques. Nothing remains of the early Almoravid mosques, in the building of one of which 'Uthâf b. Tâshfin himself worked along with the masons as a sign of humility. But the cathedral mosque of "Ali b. 'Uthâf, where Ibn Tûmâr had an interview with the sulûm, although several times rebuilt, still retains its name. The Almohads, on taking possession of Marrakesh, destroyed all the mosques on the pretext that they were wrongly
orientated. The mosque of 'Alī b. Yūsuf was only partly destroyed and was rebuilt, 'Abd Allāh al-Ghālīb restored it in the middle of the xviiith century. The present buildings and the minaret date from Mawlay Sīmān (1792—1822).

Kutubiya. When the Almohads entered Marrakesh, 'Abd al-Mu'min built the first Kutubiyya of which some traces still remain and it has been possible to reconstruct its plan. As it was wrongly orientated he built a new mosque, the present Kutubiyya, in prolongation of the first but with a slightly different orientation. It takes its name from the two booksellers' shops which used to be around its entrance. It is a very large building with seventeen naves, which with its decoration in carved plaster, its stalactite cupolas, the moulding of its timberwork, its capitals and magnificent pulpit (minbar) of inlaid work, is the most important and the most perfectly preserved work of Almohad art. The minaret, begun by 'Abd al-Mu'min, was only finished in the reign of his grandson al-Mu'ayyad (1195). It is 230 feet high and its powerful silhouette dominates the whole town and the palm groves. It is the prototype of the Giralda of Seville and of the tower of Hāsān at Rabat. It is decorated with arcatures the effects of which were formerly heightened by paintings still visible in places, with a band of ceramic work around the top.

The mosque of the Ḫaṣba or mosque of al-Mansūr is the work of Yaʿqūb al-Mansūr. It was begun in 1189—95 and built in a great splendour. It has been profoundly altered, first by 'Abd Allāh al-Ghālīb the Sa'diān, then in the middle of the xviiith century by Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, then more recently by Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahmān (1822—1859). The minaret of brick is intact and magnificently ornamented with green ceramics. The lamp holder supports a gūmūr of three bowls of gilt copper, which occupies a considerable place in the legends of Marrakesh. They are said to be of pure gold and to be enchanted so that no one could take them away without bringing on himself the most terrible misfortunes. This legend is wrongly connected with the gūmūr of the Kutubiyya.

Among the religious monuments of Marrakesh of archaeological interest, may also be mentioned the minarets of the mosque of Ibn Sābab (dated 731 = 1331) and of the sanctuary of Mawla ʿAṣūr, built in the Marinid period in the Almohad tradition, and two Sa'diān mosques: the mosque of al-Muwaṣīn or mosque of the Sharifs, which owes its origin to ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghālīb, and that of Bāb Dukkāla, built in 965 (1557—58) by Līlā al-Maʿṣūd, the mother of the Sultan 'Abd al-Mansūr.

Madrasas. An Almohad madrasa, built "to teach the children of the king and the children of his family in it," formed part of the buildings of Yaʿqūb al-Mansūr. This royal school was presumably different from what later were the Marinid madrasas. It stood on the same plot in front of the palace and now stands still in existence in the time of Leo Africanus. The Marinid Abu 'l-Ḥasan in 1347 built another madrasa, also described by Leo. It lay north of the mosque of the Ḫaṣba, where traces of it can still be seen. The madrasa of Ibn Yūsuf is not, as is usually said, a restoration of the Marinid madrasa. It was a new building by 'Abd Allāh al-Ghālīb, dated by an inscription of 972 (1564—1565), the only surviving example of a Sa'diān madrasa.

Sa'diān tombs. The two first founders of the dynasty rest beside the tomb of Sīdī Muḥammad b. Sīmān al-Dirāḍī in the Ryūdī al-ʿArwī quarter. Their successors from 1557 were buried to the south of the mosque of the Ḫaṣba. There was a cemetery there, probably as early as the Almohad period, which still has tombs of the xviith century. The magnificent kūbās which cover the tombs of the Sa'diān dynasty must have been built at two different periods. The one on the east under which is the tomb of Muḥammad al-Shāhīk seems to have been built by 'Abd Allāh al-Ghālīb. The other, with three chambers, seems to have been erected by ʿAbd al-Mansūr (d. 1603) to hold his tomb.


with many new instruments for the Mongol Khán Hulajga (1259) and the observatory of Samarakand, where Ulugh Beg employed the astronomers of his time. Following him in many points but also stimulated by European astronomy Djal Singh in India built the great observatories, the remains of which still arouse admiration in Delhi, Djaipur, Ujjain, Benares and Mathura.


MARATHYA (n., plur. marathēs), translated variously by elegy or dirge, is a poem in Arabic (and other languages following Arabic tradition) in memory of a deceased person. The word elegy is hardly applicable in most cases as such poems differ somewhat from the style of Greek and Latin poems bearing this name; some notable exceptions exist and the finest example of a real elegy is perhaps the poem of a woman named Barra al-Khānīyiya preserved in the Kitāb al-T Estherain, and still unpublished. It was the custom of the ancient Arabs after the usual naʿb or lamentation of women [q.v.] that a member of the family, gifted as a poet, should commemorate the noble qualities and deeds of the departed in a poem by enumerating them. These poems as a rule do not contain the tażība or amatory introduction like ordinary ḍajīdas and in many cases have a peculiarity in their diction, the introduction of a kind of internal rhyme resembling raʿf, called tarqī. This has been fully discussed by Khodakarmina in his analysis of the poetry of al-Khānīya, but is found in many other marathiya. Many poets, remembering the widespread, nay universal, belief of the ancient Arabs in futurity, embellish their poems with descriptions to show that nothing can escape inevitable fate. A typical example is the long poem by Abī Dhuʿāb (Dīwān, No. 11; Muḥafṣafāyatī, No. 126) in which three vivid pictures are drawn of the impossibility of escaping death, both for man and beast. This tradition has been followed by Arabic poets from the times of paganism to the present day, and the quantity of poems produced for example upon the death of the Egyptian statesman Zagrīlt Pāhkā proves that the taste for them has not abated. The collected poems of al-Zahawi, the most prominent living poet of
famous was Sari al-Sakatī [q.v.], who in his turn became the master of Dhu.Na'id. The story that Ma'rawī was a client of the Shībī Ismā'il, 'Alt b. Mūsā al-Ridā, before whom he made profession of Islam and induced his parents to do the same, deserves no credence. Among the sayings attributed to him are the following: *Love is not to be learned from men; it is a gift of God and comes from His grace*. *The saints are known by three signs: their care is for God, their business is in God, and their flight is unto God*. "Sa'dīn consists in grasping the realities (̣ hådā'î ̣ b) and re-nouncing that which is in the hands of created beings". Ma'rawī was venerated as a saint, and his tomb at Bāghdād on the west bank of the Tigris is still a great resort for pilgrims. Kūshsirī relates that the people used to go there in order to pray for rain, saying: "The tomb of Ma'rawī is an approved remedy (tīyāt muğaffarán)."


(R. A. Nicholson)

**MARÚF RÚṣAFTI,** one of the best of contemporary Arab poets, born in Bāghdād of a Kurd father and a Beduin mother in 1292 (1875). His šāfīiyya have been collected into a Dirāwī and edited by Māhīyī al-Dīn al-Khājaī, Bārīt 1910, following quite an original classification 1. Kāma'ī, 2. Ḥaṣīf ̣ yāt ̣ ̣, 3. Ta'likhī, 4. Waṣfīya, Rūṣāfti Buff has devoted an excellent study to him (in al-Adab al-Abbāsī f. 1 Irāk al-Arâfī, Cairo, Ṣa'īla 1922, p. 67–96).

(L. Māshīqīn)

**MĀRŪT.** [See Harūt and Mārūt.]

**MARW.** [See Marw.]

**MARWA.** [See Molavia.]

**MARWA N. AL-HAKAM,** the father of the Marwānīd Caliphs, was born at Mecca or at Taif, probably several years before the Hijra. Tradition, by placing his birth 2, 4, or 5 years later than the beginning of this era, aims at depriving him of a right to the title of "Companion" by showing that he could not have effectively accompanied the Prophet, as he must have followed his father who was exiled to Taif. Further, it endeavours in its hostility to give him the epithet of ṭārīf in al-Ṭārīf, "the banished son of the banished man". After becoming Caliph, his grand-uncle Uthmān adopted him as his secretary and under this title he is said to have governed in his name. Seriously wounded on the "Day of al-Dār," at the siege of the palace of Uthmān, he took part later in the battle of the Camel in which he received fresh wounds. All his life his health suffered from these terrible shocks. Mu'āwiya I used him alternately with Sa'id b. al-'As [q.v.], his cousin, to govern Medina and the Hijāz. He showed in this function a capacity and vigour, far above the ordinary.

Finally dismissed from office, he passed into obscurity during the latter years of Mu'āwiya, who dreaded his ambition. When Ḥusayn b. 'Ali refused
to recognize the Caliph Yazid, Marwân advised Walîd b. 'Uthâma, his successor at Medina, to employ force against the rebel. The revolt of the people of Medina caused him to be expelled with all his followers from this town. He returned to it in the train of Muslim b. 'Uqba [q. v.], whose military operations he was supporting. Put to flight once more after the death of Yazid I, he took up his residence in Syria and attended the court of the Caliph Mu'awiyah II. After the disappearance of this prince, Marwân, despairing of the fortunes of the Omayyads, was disposed to recognize Ibn al-Zubair, when Ubaydallâh b. Ziyâd persuaded him to set up himself as candidate. Acclaimed at the assembly of Djâbiya, he defeated the Ka'ats under Dhu'ayb b. Ka'is [q. v.] at Marsî Râhî [q. v.]. The submission of the whole of Syria was the first result of this victory.

The reign of Marwân may be epitomized as an uninterrupted series of battles. Immediately after his official installation at Damascus he was forced to take up the gauntlet. He laid it down only to die in his capital. His chief task was the conquest of Egypt. A rapid campaign gave him possession of it, while his lieutenant repelled a raid into Palestine by Ibn al-Zubair. At Djâbiya he was compelled to recognize as his eventual successors, Khâlid the son of Yazid I and the Omayyad 'Abd al-Rahmân [q. v.]. After laborious negotiations, he was able to end them to the advantage of his own sons 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd al-'Azîz, the latter being nominated by him governor of Egypt. This was the last success of his adventurous career. Worn out, the septuagenarian caliph died at Damascus on the 27th Ramadân 65 (5th May 685). He is said to have been murdered by the wife of Yazid I, the mother of the Sufyânî Khâlid, whom he had married after Marsî Râhî.

The estimates of the length of his reign vary between 8 and 11 months, according as they count the first recognition of him at Djâbiya or the second — the exact date is not known — more ceremonial one at Damascus. We do not know his exact age any more definitely. The two extremes 61 and 81 years reveal the inconsistency of tradition. The 63 years sometimes given to Marwân is merely a lucky number which has been much abused to give the ages of the older caliphs. It has the advantage that it takes us back to the year 2, often said to be the year of his birth. Our texts describe him as an old man, sha'iâh hábir, when he ascended the throne and contrast him with the kálâ, middle-aged man, Ibn al-Zubair who, however, was nearly sixty. There must therefore have been an appreciable difference of age between the two competitors. Marwân, therefore, seems to us to have been over seventy. The last five years of his life, filled with rebellions, his two exiles, his share in the campaign against Medina, and in those of Syria and Egypt to reconquer these provinces of his empire finally wore out the constitution of this vigorous old man, who had never been completely cured of the effects of his terrible wounds he received in his youth. This long been wizened old man — these physical characteristics earned him the nickname kâhit bâti — was destined to fall a victim to the great epidemic that swept over the East. In 65 H. the plague reached Syria from the 'Iraq; it had begun by carrying off Mu'awiyah II, the decrepit predecessor of Marwân, as well as Walîd b. 'Uthâma, a relative of both; it ended by laying low the first of the Marwânî caliphs.

Marwân showed himself a statesman worthy of the highest rank. A contemporary of the great Mu'awiyah, he had under the Umayyads to accept — without ever resigning himself to it — the lot of a brilliant second. He attained the caliphate, ever the object of his wishes, at the moment he had ceased to care about it. He allowed himself to be raised to the throne, rather than mounted it himself. But once at the top he regained that power of lucid decision and spirit of initiative which had earned Mu'awiyah's appreciation, though he feared his ambition. The new ruler remained on the throne just long enough to save the Omayyad fortunes from an imminent collapse and to save the future of the younger branch of this dynasty which bears his name. The work was continued by his favourite son 'Abd al-Malik. He early recognised the merits of this, the elder, man, and with a brutality and absence of scruple which was thoroughly Arab, he put him in the place of the young Khâlid b. Yazid I, who was less well fitted for the difficulties of the restoration. This is sufficient to characterize his place among the Syrian caliphs. It will explain the hatred of 'Abd al-Malik and 'Alî historians, a hatred adopted by Muslim tradition. In energy and knowledge of the art of government, Marwân, recalled his illustrious relative Mu'awiyah. He would have equalled him, if to these eminent qualities he had been able to add that variety of political knowledge, a mixture of cunning and homonimy, so appreciated by the Arabs, which they call bi'îm. He became Caliph in most critical circumstances and had to display firmness above all things, to put down rebellions, and to defend himself against the ambition and resentment of his relatives, frustrated in their attempts on the throne, or spoiled by him of their rights to it. If it had been given to him to live longer, we may well believe that he would have rivaled the first of the Omayyad Caliphs in nobility of soul.


(H. LAMMERS)

MARWÂN II b. MUHAMMAD, the last of the Omayyad caliphs in Damascus. He was the grandson of the caliph Marwân b. al-Hakam. As governor of Mesopotamia and Armenia his
father Muḥammad for several years directed the campaigns against the Byzantines. His mother was a Kuṭubī slave-girl. Mālūm b. ‘Abd al-Malik (q.v.) was one of those who followed Muḥammad after Marwān to war; it is not till 715 (733–734) that we find Marwān coming to the front as governor of Armenia and Aḥdarbiyān. In this position, which he held for 12 years, he fought with success against the peoples of the Caucasus and thus acquired military experience which enabled him to reorganize the Muslim army. In place of divisions consisting of the different tribes he created regular, paid troops under professional commanders; the men levied for military service were divided up into smaller divisions (kaṭābāt) which possessed much greater mobility and strength than the long Arab battle-lines. After the death in 726 (744) of Yazīd III the succession passed to his brother Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd; the latter however was only recognized in the southern part of Syria. Under the pretext of protecting the interests of the sons of the murdered Walīd II, Marwān crossed the Euphrates into Syria where the Kalbīs at once joined him. At Ammān b. Dārār between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon he encountered the Kalbīs under Sulaymān, a son of the caliph Hārūn. In spite of his years of experience in war with the Byzantines the latter was no match for Marwān. He was defeated and fled to Damascus, where he put to death the two sons of Walīd II. He then went with his father, the nominal caliph Ibrāhīm to Palmyra, the capital of the Kalbīs, whereupon Marwān entered Damascus and received the homage of the people (Ṣafār 26, 127 = Dec. 744). After arranging matters in the capital he made his headquarters in Harrān, where he could rely upon the support of the Kalbīs who were devoted to him. The result was a rising of the Kalbīs in Syria. Marwān soon succeeded in restoring order but when in the following year he was preparing a campaign against the Ibrāhīmīyya, his older brother, he made the mistake of levying Syrian troops also who were to join the rest of the army on the march. On reaching al-Ruṣāfā where Sulaymān b. Hārūn lived, the Syrians deserted from Marwān and proclaimed Sulaymān commander of the faithful. When Sulaymān occupied Kinnasrīn, Marwān had to come back. A battle took place near the town, Sulaymān was defeated and fled first to Ḥims and then to al-Kifā. After a siege of several months Ḥims was forced to surrender; Marwān raised its wall to the ground and also those of Baalbek, Damascus, Jerusalem and other large towns of Syria. In the summer of 746 (747) peace was finally restored in Syria.

In the eastern provinces however complete anarchy reigns. The government of the Ibrāhīmīyya had been given by Yazīd III to a son of the caliph ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, named ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. The latter of course did not recognize the claims of Marwān to the caliphate and the ‘Allīd ‘Abd Allāh b. Mu‘āwiyah (q.v.) also rebelled in al-Kifā. Marwān appointed a new governor Nazīr b. Sa‘īd al-Harāshī to restore peace and security; the latter however soon fell in battle with ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Omar and only the approach of a danger that threatened the two sides, the Ibrāhīmīyya movement brought the two opponents to terms. The Khārijīs a little later seized the town of al-Mawṣil: ‘Abd Allāh, the son of the caliph, was defeated and had to retreat. In the late summer of 747 (748) however the Khārijīs leader al-Daḥḥāk b. Kays al-Shaḥrānī [q.v.] fell in battle with Marwān himself and in the following year the power of these dangerous rebels was finally broken after one of Marwān’s generals Yazīd b. ‘Omar b. Huṣayn had taken the Ibrāhīmīyya from them.

Soon afterwards however a cloud that boded evil appeared in another direction. ‘Alī b. Sāliḥ al-Laythī, governor of Ḫorassān, had long before warned the caliph of the seditionary activities of the ‘Abbāsīds and arrogantly appealed for assistance to render their cunning agitation harmless. Marwān however had his hands full and could devote no attention to the distant east. In Ramādān 129 (June 747) the long prepared rebellion broke out in Ḫorassān. Apart from a few isolated successes, the government troops were defeated by the rebels and after the fall of al-Kīfā, Abu b. ‘Abd Allāh who with his brother Abu Dārā had taken command of the ‘Abbāsīd party had himself proclaimed caliph on the 12th Rabī‘ I, 132 (Nov. 28, 749). In Hujjādād II of the same year (Jan. 750) Marwān was defeated on the upper Zāh. He then fled from one place to another till he was overtaken at Būṣīr in the district of ‘Uqaybayn in Upper Egypt. Here the last Damascus caliph of the Omayyad dynasty fell fighting bravely (end of 132 = Aug. 750).


K. V. Zettersten

MARWĀNĪDS, Muḥammad b. Dynasty in Diyar Bakr, founded by the Kūtāb chief Bādh, who had begun his career as a shepherd and then took to brigandage. With the help of a body of similarly inclined, he seized the town of Ardabīl in Armenia with other strongholds on the Armenian frontier. After the death of the Būyid Aṣlād al-Dawla (372 = 983), he invaded the province of Diyar Bakr and captured Amid, Mālīk b. Ṭāhir and Naṣḥīn. The armies, which were sent against him, were defeated and Marwānī also passed into his hands. But when he tried to seize the capital, Baghdād (Ṣafār 373 = July–Aug. 983), he suffered a complete defeat and had to abandon al-Mawṣil. After vain attempts to retake this town, he took the field again in 380 (990–991) but was defeated by the Ḥamdānids, the lords of al-Mawṣil, and fell in the battle. Abū ‘Ali al-Ḥasan b. Marwān, his sister’s son, then married his widow and thus came into possession of the lands conquered by Bādh and continued the war against the Ḥamdānids whom he twice defeated. After the murder of Abū ‘Ali in 387 (997–998) in Amid, his brother Māmāḥid al-Dawla Abu b. ‘Al-‘Ādhrī succeeded him. The third brother ‘Alī b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Dawla Abu b. ‘Al-‘Ādhrī continued his efforts and at first attempted to dispute his authority but without
success. In 402 (1011-1012) Abu 'l-Manṣūr was poisoned by one of his generals, whereupon Abu Naṣr was recognised as lord of Diyar Bakr. During his rule of fifty years, peace and quiet as a rule prevailed, and poets and learned men found a welcome hospitality at his court. In 433 (1041-1042) the Ghuzz [q.v.] who had invaded Mesopotamia in the previous year, raided Djaṣrat Ibn 'Omar; but Sulaimān, son of Abu Naṣr, succeeded in drawing and capturing their leader whereupon the others dispersed; they soon returned however and continued their plundering, although Abu Naṣr released their chief and gave them a considerable sum to induce them to withdraw. They then occupied al-Mawsil, which was completely sacked while the emir slept, Karwāsh b. al-Muʿakkallad (q.v.) saved himself by flight. In 453 (1064) he finally succeeded in driving out the Ghuzz whereupon they withdrew to Diyar Bakr and thence to Adharbājān. When the Saḥluḫ Sultan Toghrūl Beg in 448 (1056-7) advanced against Djaṣrat Ibn 'Omar, Abu Naṣr gained him over by gifts and a friendly relationship was established between them. Abu Naṣr died in 453 (1061-1062) aged over 80. He was succeeded by his son Nāṣir al-Dawla Naṣr, who had however to go through a hard struggle with his brother Sād. The former was victorious in Mālāfārān, while the latter had to be satisfied with Amid. In 463 (1070-1071) Naṣr submitted to the Saḥluḫ Sultan Alp Arslan. After Naṣr's death (472-1080) his son Manṣūr was recognised as his successor. Soon afterwards the Saḥluḫs overthrew the Marwānid dynasty. In 478 (1085-1086) Ibn Djaṣrat, Malik-Shah's vizier, and his son Zām al-Ru'uz' Abu 'l-Kāsim conquered the towns of Amid, Mālāfārān and Djaṣrat Ibn 'Omar and then brought the whole province of Diyar Bakr under the rule of the Saḥluḫs. Manṣūr, the last Marwānid, died in Manṣūr in 489 (Dec. 1095-Jan. 1096) in Djaṣrat Ibn 'Omar.


K. V. H. Leitertstein

MĀRYĀ, a tribe in the Western zone of Erīṭra. They are— for the most part— shepherds and inhabit the middle valley of the 'Anābā river in the district of Karān. Their tribe is formed by two sections of nobles: Māryā Ṣayīth “the Red Māryā” and Māryā Ṣallūm “the Black Māryā”; and the families of the vassals. The “Red” Māryā have been traditionally in a lower position than the “Black” and they were obliged to pay on certain occasions special gifts to the “Black” as, for instance, when the chief of the “Black” died. The vassals were practically divided between the Red and the Black as every family of them lived under the patronage of the chief of a noble family. Both the paramount chiefs of the noble sections had some particular rights over all the vassals of the noble families of their sections as they had, for instance, the power to order that every vassal may give to them the same gift as to his individual patron or to oblige the patrons to pay, as a duty to the highest representative of the tribe, the tenth part of every gift or duty of their vassals.

The Māryā claim to be descendants of a warrior, Māryā, born from Saho stock, who emigrated with seventeen soldiers to the borders of the ‘Anābā and was received there as a guest by the natives. But, afterwards, the sons of Māryā had so greatly increased that they were able to occupy the whole land and to subdue the native tribes who became their vassals. These natives, who are called tigrān on account of their origin, were really Abyssinians and Bedja. However, the Māryā and their vassals to-day speak only the Tigrā language; and the Saho, as the Bedja, has been wholly forgotten. The Māryā were Christians but, about half a century ago, they were converted to Islam. Even their clan (as the ‘Aš ‘Ad Te-mīkāw, a section of the “Red”) and their ancestors till recent generations bore Christian names. In any case, Islamic law has gradually gained great influence, among the Māryā; and this has been from many points of view a real profit to the population, as the laws of Islam may moderate in a good way the ancient rough customs which strongly oppressed the privileges of the nobles and their monopoly on the vassals. As a matter of fact, in the hereditary law, the prevalent right of the first born son and the exclusion of the daughters from the succession of their father's estates became gradually disused on account of the Islamic influences. In the same way, the custom of declaring slaves those vassals who could not pay their debts to the nobles and the great differences, in the penal law, as to the punishment of crimes perpetrated by the nobles or by the vassals, had already been diminished after the conversion of the Māryā to the Islam. When the occupation of Erritrea by Italy caused the complete abrogation of those rules.


Enrico Cercelli

MARYAM, Mary. The Arabic form of the name is identical with Mary and Māryā which are used in the Syriac and in the Greek Bibles in the New as well as in the Old Testament. In the latter it corresponds to the Hebrew 'Maryam'. This name, like other ones with the same suffix, such as 'Amram, Bīlīm, points to the region between Palestine and Northwestern Arabia as its home. According to Muslim interpretation the name means "the pious" (al-jāhid; cf. the commentaries on sūra iii. 31). It occurs frequently in the Kurān in the combination [Iṣā] Ibn Maryam "Jesus" the son of Mary" (sūra ii. 81, 252 sq. iii. 31 sq.; iv. 136, 169; v. 19, 50, 76, 82, 106, 12, 114, 116; ix. 31; xix. 35; xxiii. 52; xxxiii. 57; lii. 27; lix. 6, 14), no father being mentioned, because, according to Muslim tradition also, Iṣā had no earthly father. In the majority of these passages Iṣā is clearly regarded as the higher of the two. Yet Maryam's place is important from a dogmatical as well as from a historical point of view.

Maryam is mentioned in the Kurān, from the oldest parts down to the later Madīnēn sūras. To the first Makkān period belongs sūra xxiii. 52: *And we made the son of Maryam and his
mother a sign; and we made them abide in an elevated place, full of quiet and watered with springs." Here is possibly the first allusion in the Kur'an to the virgin birth. This idea is accentuated in sura xix. 20, where Maryam gives the spirit (i.e. the angel) who announces to her the birth of a male child, this reply: "How should I have a male child, no human man having touched me?" In sura lxxxvi. 12 the conception is ascribed to this divine spirit (cf. Luke i. 34, 37). Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.

The virgin birth is also mentioned in sura lxxxvi. 12 (Madinah): "And Maryam kept him that kept her body pure. Then we breathed into it from our spirit. She acknowledged the truth of the words of her Lord and of his book and she belonged to the obedient."

A third mention of the announcement and the virgin birth is in sura iii. 37: "When the angels said, O Maryam, verily Allah has elected and purified thee and exalted thee above the women of all created beings. O Maryam, be obedient unto thy Lord and prostrate thyself and bow down with those who bow down." (cf. Luke i. 28). Maryam is indeed reckoned as one of the four best women that ever existed, together with Asiya (q.v.), Khadija (q.v.) and Fatima (q.v.) (Ahmad b. Hanbal, Munmad, i. 135), and the chief of the women of Paradise (Ibn Hanbal, ii. 64, 80).

According to tradition the announcement took place in the following way: Djibril appeared to Mary in the shape of a beardless youth with a shining face and curling hair, announcing to her the birth of a male child. She expressed her amazement, but, on the angel's reassuring answer, she complied with the will of God.

Then upon the angel blew his breath into the fold of her shirt, which she had put off. When the angel had withdrawn, she put on the shirt and was made pregnant. The announcement took place in the cavern of the well of Silwût, whereafter Maryam had gone, as usual, to fill her pitcher; she was then 10 or 13 years of age; and it was the longest day of the year. In Christian tradition also the voice of the angel was heard by Maryam for the first time when she had gone to fill her pitcher. According to a different tradition Isha's spirit entered Maryam through her mouth (Tabari, Ta'rif, vi. 22).

A second important dogmatical feature is that Maryam belongs to the Trinity according to the Kur'an. A glimpse of this conception is given in sura v. 79: "al-Musth, the son of Maryam, is an Apostle only, who was preceded by other Apostles, and his mother an upright woman; and both were wont to take food." This verse is apparently meant as a refutation of the Christians who venerated Isha and his mother as divine persons, elevated above human needs. With this verse may be compared sura iv. 169: "People of the book, beware of exaggeration in your religion and say of Allah nothing but the truth. Isha b. Maryam is only the Apostle of Allah and His word, which He conveyed unto Maryam, and a spirit that came forth from Him. Believe, therefore, on Allah and His Apostles and say not 'three'. Beware of this, this will be better for you. Allah is but one God" etc.

Clercer is sura v. 116: "And when Allah said, O 'Isa b. Maryam, hast thou said to the people, 'Take me and my mother as two Gods besides Allah? He answered: Far be it, that I should say to what I am not entitled. If I should have said it, Thou wouldst know it." etc.

The commentaries also describe the Trinity as consisting of Allah, Isha and Maryam. Al-Baghdari, however, admits that in sura iv. 169 there could be an allusion to the Christian doctrine of one God in three hypostases: Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

The question how Muhammad had come to conceive of Maryam as one of the persons of the Trinity, has often been asked. Maracci has made a reference to Epiphanius, Ado. Haeres. Haeres. lxviii. 325, where this author speaks of women in Arabia who venerated "Mary as God, and offered to her cakes, from which the heresy is often called that of the Collyridians. Sale, in his Preiminary Discourse, p. 45, mentions the Mariamites, who worshipped a Trinity consisting of God, Christ and Mary, referring to a passage in the work of al-Makki. It may, however, be that Muhammad's conception was not influenced by any sect, but by the veneration of which Mary was the object in the Church itself. Or it may be an inference due to the identification of Isha with the Holy Ghost (cf. sura iv. 169 as translated above), which made a vacant place in the Trinity, which Mary seemed entitled to occupy. A different explanation is attempted by Sayou, l.c., p. 61 (see Bibliography).

A comparatively large place is occupied in the Kur'an by the story of Maryam and Isha. Many of the features narrated agree, partly or wholly, with narrations in the apocryphal Gospels. Sura xxiii. 52 (see above) mentions the elevated place that was prepared for Isha and his mother. It is not clear which tradition is here alluded to. According to S. Luke i. 39, Mary went to the mountains to visit Elisabeth. In the Protevangelium Jacobi (chap. xxii; Syrian text, p. 20) it is Elisabeth who flees together with John to a mountain, which opens to protect them against their persecutors. The Muslim commentaries mention Jerusalem, Damascus, Ramla, Egypt as being possibly meant by the "elevated place". Maracci thinks of Paradise.

In two passages of the Kur'an there is a fuller narrative of Isha's birth and what is connected with it, viz. in sura xix. (which bears the title of Maryam), vs. 1-35, and in sura iii. 31-42.

Sura xix. opens with the story of Zakariya and Yahya (vs. 1-15); on this follows the story of Maryam and Isha (vs. 16-34). Sura iii. 31-42 contains a. the birth of Maryam; b. the announcement of Yahya (vs. 33-36); c. the announcement of Isha (vs. 37-41). The comparison of sura xix. with sura iii. makes it probable that Muhammad became acquainted with the story of the birth of Maryam later than with those of Yahya and Isha.

a. The birth of Maryam. This story goes back to a Christian tradition corresponding closely with that which is contained in the Protevangelium Jacobi and De notissimiar Moriam. Maryam's father is called Irmân in the Kur'an, Joachim in Christian tradition; Isha, 'Hasíd (Isha, ii. 144) is also acquainted with the name Joachim. It has been supposed that the name of Irmân, which apparently corresponds with the Biblical 'Amram, the father of Moses, as well as the fact that Maryam is called
a sister of Härūn (sūra xix. 29), is due to a confusion
between the two Biblical Maryams. Sale, Gerock
and others think such a confusion improbable.
At any rate Muslim tradition assures us that there
is a distance of 1,500 years between the Biblical
'Amram and the father of Mary.
Imrān's wife, 'Isa's grandmother, is not mentioned
by name in the Qur'ān. In Christian as well as in
Muslim tradition she is called Ḥānna. It is only
in Muslim tradition that her genealogy is worked
out. She is a daughter of Fāṭūhah and a sister of
Iṣḥābā', the Biblical Elisabeth.

---

According to a different genealogy Iṣḥābā' and
Maryam were sisters, daughters of Imrān and
Ḥānna (Mas'ūdī, Murūgī, i. 120 7f.; Ṭabarī,
Tafsīr, iii. 144):

---

Then the Qur'ān relates how she invaded on behalf of Maryam and her posterity Allah's protection
from Satan. On this verse is based the well-known haddāz: "Every child that is born,

The Qur'ān further relates (vs. 32) that the child grows up in a chamber in the temple (miṣyār; cf.
the sārās in Proter. Jēn., vi.; Syr. text, p. 5 7f.) under the divine grace and under Zakari-
yā's care. According to Muslim tradition, Imrān had died before the birth of Maryam, and Zakari-
yā's claimed authority over her on account of his being her uncle; the rabbis did not recognise
his claim; his right was proved by an ordeal,

consisting in the parties throwing their pens
or arrows in a river; the only one that floated
was that of Zakariyā'. Sūra iii. 39 refers to this.

Christian tradition knows of an ordeal only in
the case of Joseph, who, because a dove comes
forth from his staff, is recognised as Maryam's guardian.

As often as Zakariyā' enters Maryam's miṣyār, he
finds her being provided with food in a miracu-

alous way (vs. 32). This feature also belongs to
Christian tradition (Proter. Jacobi, chap. v.;
Syr. text, p. 7). The person of Joseph is not
mentioned in the Qur'ān. In Muslim tradition he
takes care of Maryam, his cousin, because Zakari-
yā's is no longer able to do so, on account of
old age. Maryam stays however in the temple,
which she leaves during her monthly period only.
According to Christian tradition, Joseph takes her
into his house when she attains to womanhood, lest
she should defile the temple.

6. The annunciation of Yaḥyā. See this art., and ZAKARIYĀ'.

---

The more detailed narrative is that of sūra xix. 16 app.
Maryam retires to "a place situated eastward", where
she hides herself behind a curtain. The

commentaries do not know whether a place to the

east of Jerusalem is meant, or the eastern part
of her house, to which she returns every month. It is said that this is the origin of the
biblical phrase of the Christians.

In vs. 17-21 the story of the annunciation is given
(cf. above), followed by that of 'Isa's birth, which,

according to some Muslim traditions, followed the

conception either immediately or very soon. The

dates of child birth came upon Maryam when she

was near the trunk of a palm. "She said, would

I liken to God I had died before this, and had become

a thing forgotten, and lost in oblivion. And he

was beneath her [i.e. the child, or Iṣḥābā',


or the palm] called to her crying, Be not grieved;

God has provided a rivulet under the sky and

shake the trunk of the palm and it shall let fall ripe

dates upon thee, ready gathered. And eat and
drink and calm thy mind". This story may,

perhaps, be considered as a parallel to the Christian

tradition in which it is related that, during the

flight to Egypt, the baby Jesus ordered a palm in

the desert to bow down in order to refresh Mary

by its dates; whereupon the palm obeyed and

stayed with her head at Mary's feet, till the child

ordered it to stand upright again and to open a

vein between its roots in order to quench the

thirst of the holy family (Apocryphal Gospel of

Matthew, xx. 26). The Qur'ān goes on (vs. 26):

"And when thou seest any man, say, I have

vowed a fast unto the Merciful; so I may not

speak to any man to-day!" The commentators

say, this was meant to avoid importunate questions.

This feature is not in Christian tradition; yet in

the Protocanonical Jacobi it is to be found (chap. xii.;

Syr. text, p. 17) that Mary, who was then 12 years
of age, hid herself from the Israelites. According
to Muslim tradition, she stayed in a cavern during
forty days. "Then she brought him", continues

the Qur'ān (xix. 28), to her people, carrying

them. They said, O Mary, now thou hast done

strange thing. O sister of Härūn, thy father

was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a

harlot. Then she pointed to the child". Then the

child begins to speak, one of the well-known:
MARRYAM — MARZUBAN

miracles ascribed to Ṭāhir. The "very shameful calumny" which the Israelites brought forth against Maryam, is also mentioned in Surah iv. 155.

As to the words "O sister of Hārūn" (cf. above), it may be added that, according to the commentators, this Ṭāhir was not Moses' brother, but one of Maryam's contemporaries, who was either a wicked man, with whom she is compared in this respect, or her pious brother.

A legend about loaves of bread which Maryam gave to the Magi, is mentioned by al-Mas'ūdī, iv. 79 ff.

The flight to Egypt is not mentioned in the Qur'ān, unless the "elevated place" (ṣūra xxii. 52; cf. above) should be an allusion to it. According to Muslim tradition which is acquainted with it, the abode lasts 12 years. After the death of Herod the holy family returns to Naṣrā.

After his alleged death Ṭāhir consolates his mother from heaven. According to others it was Mary Magdalen. The stories of the Transitus Mariæ have not obtained a place in Muslim tradition. Instead of these, there is a narrative of how Maryam went to Rome in order to preach before Mārtī (Nero), accompanied by John (the disciple) and Shīm'ī, the coppersmith. When Shīm'ī and Tādūs (Thaddaean?) were crucified with their heads downward, Maryam died with John. When they were persecuted the earth opened and withdrew them from their persecutors. This miracle was the cause of Martin's conversion.


MARZUBAN, Arab. form of the title of provincial governors in the Sasanian empire, especially the "wardens of the mace", the "wardens of the muschel". The word is derived from marz which still means in Persian a frontier district (Horn, Grundriss der neupersischen Etyologie, p. 218) and is found in Pehlevi in the form marzgan (in the Kūr-nāmeh; cf. H. S. Nyberg, Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi, i., Upsala 1928, p. 54) which suggests a north Iranian origin (cf. Leitz, Z. T. L., iv. 255, 295), as we find alongside of the marzgan in Persian (Horn, loc. cit.). The title is not found, however, before the Sasanian period and in the great inscription of Paikuli, the wardens are called ṣīyajkh (Arm. șiyanxag), also a north Iranian title (Hersfeld, Paikuli, Berlin 1924, p. 155; cf. also Marquart, Erasm. u. P., 167 sqq.). In Syriac we find the forms marwānī and marwānūnī (Payne-Smith) and the Armenian has mazōpe and mazōpan (Hubschmann, Armenische Grammatik, p. 193). Persian finally has kept the word as marwān, marwānūn or marwānūn (cf. e.g. the Barāhīn-i Ḵāra'.

It is from Arab sources that we are more particularly informed of the duties of the marwūn. Al-Ya'qūbī (Ṭābrīzī, ed. Houtsmul, i. 201) says that it was the title of the ruler of Babylonia, while the four great divisions of the empire were governed by pādshāhīn. The historians al-Tābarī and al-Baladhurī tell us that the different marwānūn encountered by the Arabs in their conquests (cf. the list of provinces ruled by a marwānūn, drawn up by Baladhurī, and given by Nöldeke in Gesch. d. Perser und Araber, Leyden 1879, p. 446). In this period we find these governors acting independently of any higher authority and concluding treaties and treaties. They sometimes retained their offices after the Arab conquest. Under the Sasanians the marwānūn were far from having such an independent position. We sometimes find them acting as generals under the command of the pābūd (e.g. Jusuf Stylites, cf. Wright, p. 61).

Although the title gradually fell into disuse, Muslim Persia still retained the word, used in its original sense of "warden of the marches". It is frequently found in literature (cf. Sa'īdī, Houshān, ed. Graf, p. 73). On the other hand after the Sasanian period, marwānūn and its variants became a proper name (in Arabic sometimes al-Marrwān) among Muslims and also among Persians (cf. the names of the copyists of Pahlavi manuscripts; cf. especially Justī, Iranisches Namenbuch, s.v. Marvān).

Bibliography: A. Christensen, L'Empire des Sassanides, Copenhagen 1907, p. 43 sqq.

(J. H. KRAMER)

MARZUBAN B. RUFIAM, a prince of the Bāvand dynasty of Ṭabāristān [q.v.] regarded as the original author of the Marzūbān-nāma, a work in Persian prose containing a series of short stories and fables of a moral and didactic character. This book is known in two versions in elegant Persian of the 16th century, the author of one of which was Sa'd al-Din al-Warrānī; he dedicated it to Abu l-Kāsim Rābī al-Din, vizier of Uzbecks b. Muhammad b. Ilī. A. Athīb of Aḥlāfādī from 1210 to 1225. These dates give us probable limits for the composition of the book. The other version is the work of Muhammad b. Ghāzī al-Malāyawī, secretary and later vizier of Rūm al-Din Sulaimān-shāh, Saldān b. Rūm, who reigned from 1192 to 1204. It is called Rawjat al-ʿUṣāl and differs a good deal in form and contents from the other, which is called the Marzūbān-nāma.

In the preface by Sa'd al-Din al-Warrānī we are told that the original work had been written in the language of Ṭabāristān and the ancient Persī, the popular language, but that thanks to him this valuable work had been given a new life after 400 years (p. 6 and 32 of Mirzā Muhammad Karimī's edition). In the first chapter Marzūbān b. Shārīn, descendant of Kāyīs, brother of the Sasanian king Anuširvān, is mentioned as māz-
The Kauṣānī-nāma in which Firuzi was used (cf. Nöldeke, Geschichte des Artachīr i Pāpāzān, Göttingen 1879, p. 27) and the source of a poem like *Wu 1-nāmān*, a text which no longer pleased the taste of the literary connoisseurs of the 13th century.

The Marzubān-nāma was published by Mirzā Muhammad Kašwini in 1908 (G.M.S., viii.) from a manuscript in the British Museum (Or. 6476) with the help of two other MSS. in the same collection, one in the Bibliothèque Nationale and another sent from Persia. The Paris manuscript had already been used for the publication of extracts from the *Marzubān-nāma* in Ch. Schefer's *Christo- 

mathe anverse*, Paris 1885, p. 172–199. The Kauṣānī-nāma is represented by a manuscript in Leyden (cf. M. Th. Houtum, *Eine unbekannte Bearbeitung des Marzuban-nāme*, Z. D. M. G., iii. 359–392) and another in Paris. Mirzā Muhammad has given extracts from it in the preface to his edition. There is also an Arabic version of the same work from the pen of Ibn *Arabābāh*, based on a Turkish version of Sād al-Wawīnī's recension; this Arabic text was lithographed at Cairo in 1278.

**Bibliography:** The philological data have been collected by Mirzā Muhammad Kāhn in the preface of his edition; Schefer's observations (p. 194–211) are to be utilised with caution. Cf. also: H. Ethe, *Neuereiche Literatur*, in *Grundriss d. iran. Phil.*, iii. 328 sqq. and E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, ii. 115, 489.

(J. H. KRAMER)

MAS'A. [See SA'AV.]

MASAGAN. [See MAZAGHĀN.]

MASCARA, a town in Algeria (department of Oran), 50 miles S.W. of Mostaganem and 60 S.E. of Oran. Its position is 35° 26' N. Lat. and 8° E. of Greenwich. It lies on the southern slope of the Ben Shīgbān range, called by the Arabs *Shārib al-Rūd* and is built on the edge of a ravine at the bottom of which runs the Wild Sidi Tadjīman on the other side of which the N.W. lies the native faubourg of Bih 'All. Mascara commands the plain of Eghris, which measures 25 to 30 miles from W. to E. and 12 miles from N. to S. and is one of the most fertile regions of Algeria. The natives have grown cereals here from the earliest times and the Europeans have introduced tobacco and created vineyards, the produce of which is celebrated. It is the market for a region, becoming more and more prosperous, and by the census of 1926 had 30,669 inhabitants of whom 16,630 were natives.

Mascara of considerable antiquity. According to Baki (Mastil, transl. de Slane, rev. by Fagnan, p. 160), it included among its inhabitants people who came from THIR (Thirat) some of whom went and settled at Igbān, a day's journey S.E., when this town was founded by Yāhū b. Muḥammad, son of Sāḥib the Irānī, in 335 (949–950 A.D.). Ibn Hawkal (Description de l'Afrique, transl. de Slane, *Journ. As.,* 1842 and *Irkūz* (transl. of Goeppe, p. 96) mention Mascara as a large and watered village rich in fruits. The Almohads seem to have built a fortress there. The Ziyānīs of Tlemcen kept a governor and a garrison there. Leo Africanus (bk. iv, ed. Schefer, vol. iii., p. 34) notes the importance of the market which was held at Mascara "one of the towns of the Beni Rasi" (Bani Ṛashīf) where one could buy, along with cereals in large quantities, cloth and articles of
harness manufactured in the country. The rulers of Tlemcen drew considerable revenues from it: 40,000 pistoles, according to Marmol (Africa, vol. ii., p. 441). The Turks established themselves at Mascara in the xviiith century and placed a garrison there. In 1701 they made it the capital of the beylik of the west, which had hitherto been Mastina in Dahr. The boys lived there till Oran was reoccupied by the Algerians in 1792. During this period, Mascara, which had hitherto only been an insignificant place, began to look like a regular town. The boys built two mosques and a madrasa, a wall and a kasba and brought in a water-supply. The manufacture of burnOUSE and deeks, celebrated throughout the Regency, enriched the inhabitants. This prosperity began to decline after the boys left Mascara and especially after the risings, which broke out in the province of the west in the beginning of the xixth century. The Darâkân Ben Sherfi seized the town in 1805 and held it for a time. In 1827, it was attacked by the marabout Muhammad al-Tijânî. Supported by the Hâshim he gained possession of the faubourg of Bâb 'Ali but was killed by the Turks when preparing to storm the town itself. At the end of Turkish rule, 'Abd al-Kâdir [p. v.] who had been proclaimed Sultan by the tribes of the plain of Egâtis, established his seat of government at Mascara, but barely lived there. An expedition, in the month of December 1836 led by Marshal Clauzel, occupied Mascara which the French abandoned next day, after burning down part of it. The emir returned to the town and held it till May 30, 1841, when a column under Bugeaud occupied it finally for the French. Mascara, then half in ruins, had only a population of 2,860 inhabitants.


MASJID (A.), Mosque.

I. (Joh. Pedersen)

A. Origin.
B. Foundation of mosques after Muhammad’s death.
C. The mosque as a religious centre.
D. The building and its equipment.
E. The mosque as a state institution.
F. The mosque as a school.
G. Administration.
H. The staff.

II. (R. A. Kern)

The mosque in the Dutch Indies.

III. (E. Diez)

Architecture.

A. Origin of the Mosque.

The word "masjid" is found in Aramaic, the earliest occurrence being in the Jewish Elephantine Papyri (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, Nr. 335; Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Cent. B.C., ii., pp. 443, also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Ins. Semit., ii., 161, 176, 185, 188, 195, 215; cf. Schwalby, Z.D.M.G., III., 1898, p. 134; Littbarski, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigraph., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Interpositions, p. 238). The word formed from "masjid" to "prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papyri, where it is named by ḫalid and ḫalid, (cf. the Lexicon) is like the Amharic ḫalid derived from the Arabic, while the Ethiopic ḫalid "temple, church" is perhaps a genuine formation from the verb (which is certainly borrowed from the Aramaic: cf. Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge z. sem. Sprachw., p. 36). The Arabic masjid may have been formed independently from the corresponding verb, which also undoubtedly comes from the Aramaic; probably the above-mentioned Aramaic substantive was simply taken over, although no links can be shown between the Nabatean inscriptions and the Korân.

The word in any case can hardly have been formed by Muhammad himself from its specific connection with divine service ("place where one "ṣalâ" or prostrates oneself").

1. The Meccan period.

The word is used in the Korân especially of the Meccan sanctuary (al-ḥaram al-masjid, Sûra ii. 140, 141, 145, 187, 192, 214: v. 7; vi. 34; ix. 7, 19, 28; xvii. 1; xxii. 25; xviii. 27; according to later sources, this was the usage in the Meccan period (cf. Ya'qûbi, ed. Houtsma, i., 285, 35). According to tradition, the term al- ḥaram al-masjid (Sûra vii. 1) means the Jerusalem sanctuary (according to Schrieke, 111, vi. 1 nq.; cf. Horovitz, ibid., ix. 150; the reference is rather to a place of prayer in heaven); and in the legend of the Seven Sleepers masjid means a tomb-sanctuary probably Christian, certainly pre-Muhammadan (Sûra xvii. 20). The word is also applied to pre-Islamic sanctuaries, which belong to God and where God is invoked, although Muhammad was not always able to recognize the particular cult associated with them. It is undoubtedly with this general meaning that the word is used in this verse of the Korân: "If God had not taken men under his protection, then monasteries, churches and places of prayer (qubûs) and masjids would have been destroyed" (Sûra xxiv. 41). The word is also used in a hadith of an Abyâd church (Buhârî, 72, bâh 48, 54; Muslim, Masjid, Tr. 3) and in another of Jewish and Christian tomb-sanctuaries (Buhârî, 72, bâh 55; Muslim, Masjid, Tr. 3). Even Ibn Khaldûn can still use the word in the general meaning of a temple or place of worship of any religion (Muḥammad, fasc 4, 6 at the end). There is therefore no question of a word of specifically Muslim creation. This is in entire agreement with Muhammad’s original attitude to earlier religions. Just as Abraham was a Muslim, so David had a masjid: (Tabarî, i., 2408, 7.)

To the Prophet the Meccan sanctuary always remained the principal mosque, known as Baṣr Allah even before the time of the Prophet. It was a grave charge brought against the Kharijî in the Meccan period that they drove the believers out of al-masjid al-ḥaram (Sûra ii. 214; v. 3; vii. 34; xxii. 25; xviii. 25), which was considered by all the more unjust as they worshipped the true lord of the sanctuary. To the true God belonged al-masjid (Sûra lxxii. 18, Meccan); it is therefore an absurdity for the godless to prevent the wor-
ship of God in “God’s own mosques” (Sūra ii. 108). The result was that it was revealed in the year 9: “It is not right for polytheists to frequent the mosques of God” (Sūra ix. 17 sq.) and the opponents of the new religion were therefore excluded from the sanctuary. The Sūra agrees with the Kūrān, that the sanctity of "Masjid al-harām" to which Muḥammad had been used from childhood was always regarded by him as indisputable. Like other Maccans, he and his followers regularly made the ṭawfī around the Ka’ba and kissed the Black Stone (6: g. Ibn Hishām, p. 183, 13 sqq., 239, 4, 251, 1); it is frequently stated that he used to sit in the masjid like his fellow-citizens, alone or with a follower or disputing with an opponent (Ibn Hishām, p. 233, 16; 254, 11; 252, 14; 259, 260, 204, 18 sq). It is related that he used to perform the saḥāl between the Yaman corner and the Black Stone, apparently from the narrator’s context: very frequently (Ibn Hishām, p. 190, 9 sqq.). After his conversion, Umar is said to have arranged that believers performed the saḥāl un molested beside the Ka’ba (Ibn Hishām, p. 224, 15 sqq., 17 sqq.), strongly Muḥammad felt himself attached to the Arab sanctuary is evident from the fact that he took part in the traditional rites there before the Hijr (Sūra viii, 2); in the year 1, one of his followers, Sā‘d b. Mu‘āsh, took part in the pilgrimage ceremonies and in the year 2 he himself sacrificed on the 10th of ‘Lūl al-Hijrīa on the maṣṣāla of the Banū Salīlīn. He therefore, here as elsewhere, retained ancient customs where his new teaching did not directly exclude them. But when an independent religion developed out of his preaching, a new type of divine service had to be evolved.

In Mecca, the original Muslim community had no special place of worship. The Prophet used to perform the saḥāl in secret, in the narrow alleys of Mecca with his first male follower ‘Abī and with the other earliest Companions also (Ibn Hishām, p. 159, 166, 23 sqq.). The references are usually to the solitary saḥāl of the Prophet, sometimes beside the Ka’ba (Ibn Hishām, p. 190, 9 sqq.), sometimes in his own house (Ibn Hishām, p. 203, 9 sqq.). That the believers often prayed together may be taken for granted; they would do so in a house (cf. Ibn Hishām, p. 202). Occasionally also Umar is said to have conducted the ritual prayer with others beside the Ka’ba (Ibn Hishām, p. 224) because ‘Umar was able to defy the Kūrāsh. When the Prophet recited in the mosque the revelation, later abrogated, recognising al-‘Uzza and Manākī, according to the legend, not only the believers but also the polytheists present took part in the misjif (Tabarī, i. 1192 sq.). Abū Bakr is said to have had a private place of prayer (masjīd) in Mecca in his courtyard beside the gate; the Kūrāsh, we are told, objected to this because women and children could see it and might be led astray by the emotion aroused (Ibn Hishām, p. 240; Bihārī, Sūrat, B. 36; Kafṣāla, B. 14 sq. etc., see Al-Mālikī, B. 22).

In the days of reign by Muḥammad a sanctuary was not a fundamental necessity. Every place was the same to God and humanity in the presence of God, of which the ritual prayer was the expression, could be shown anywhere; hence the saying of the Prophet that he had been given the whole world as a masjid, while earlier prophets could only pray in churches and synagogues (Wākīdī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 403; Carpus Juvius de Zois b. ‘Ali, ed. Grīfini, p. 50 and clxxix; Bihārī, Sūrat, B. 56; Taṣawwum, B. 1; Modern Masjīdī, Tr. 1) and also the saying: “Whenever the hour of prayer overtakes thee, thou shalt perform the saḥāl and that is a masjīd” (Muslim, Masjīdī, Tr. 1), that he nevertheless remained firmly attached to the traditional sanctuary of the Ka’ba, produced a confusion of thought which is very marked in Sūra ii. 136 sq. When in Medina he was able to do as he pleased, it must have been natural for him to create a place where he could be undisturbed with his followers and where they could perform the ritual saḥāl together.

2. The Foundation of the Mosque in Medina.

According to one tradition the Prophet came riding into Medina on his camel with Abū Bakr as ṭāhīr surrounded by the Banū Nadījīh. The camel stopped on Abū Ayyūb’s farm. Here (according to Anas) the Prophet performed the saḥāl, and immediately afterwards ordered the mosque to be built and purchased the piece of land from two orphan, Sahl and SAHIH, who were under the guardianship of Mu‘āsh’s b. ‘Abīd, for 10 dinars, after declining to accept it as a gift; he lived with Abū Ayyūb until the mosque and his houses were completed. During this period he performed the saḥāl in courtyards or other open spaces (Buhārī, Sūrat, B. 48; Muslim, Masjīdī, Tr. 1; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, iii. 212 above; Ibn Hishām, p. 336; Tabarī, i. 1258 sqq.; Mas‘ūdī, Murādī, iv. 140 sqq.). According to this tradition, the building of the mosque was intended by the Prophet from the first and the choice of the site was left to the whim of his mount. According to another tradition the Prophet took up his abode with Abū Ayyūb, but during the first period of his stay in Medina he conducted the saḥāl in the house of Abū Umāma As-Sād, who had a private masjid, in which he used to conduct the saḥāl with his neighbours. The Prophet later expressed the desire to purchase the adjoining piece of ground and he bought it from the two orphans, who, according to this tradition, were wards of As-Sād (Balādhurī, Fīrah al-Baladīra, ed. de Goeje, p. 6; cf. Wüstenfeld, Gesch. d. Stadt Medina, p. 60). The site was covered with graves, ruins (khurārī; also barhī, Tabarī, i. 1259, 15; 1260, 17; cf. Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, iii. 212, 7, perhaps due to an old misreading) and palm-trees and was used as a place for keeping camels (and smaller domestic animals, Buhārī, Wūfū”, B. 66). The site was cleared, the palms cut down and the walls built. The building material was bricks baked in the sun (tablī) (Ibn Hishām, p. 337; Buhārī, Sūrat, B. 62, 65; according to one tradition they were baked at the well of Fātima, Wüstenfeld, Stadt Medina, p. 31); in places it was a courtyard surrounded by a brick wall, on stone foundation with three entrances: the gateway were of stone. On the ṭūbā side (i.e. the north wall) at first left open, the stems of the palm-trees which had been cut down were soon set up as columns and a roof was put over them of palm-leaves and clay. On the east side two butt of similar materials were built for the Prophet’s wives Sawālī and A’ishah; their entrances opened on to the court and were covered with carpets: they were later increased so that there were nine.
little houses for the Prophet's wives. When the ḥabla was moved to the south, the arches on the north wall remained; under this arch a small room was built for the Prophet's monks. The arch was very small. It was really only a court yard with a wall round it; the ḥabla was already mentioned as a shed for the Prophet's monks. However, this is not certain, and it is possible that the Prophet may have intended to have it as a simple shed for the monks.

According to the sources, the Prophet's intention was to build a mosque at once in Medina; according to a later tradition he also commanded the name of God to build a house for God (Khamis, i. 387 infra), but this story is coloured by later conditions.

It has been made quite clear, notably by G. J. Caetani (Annali dell' Izzia, i. 432, 437 et seq.) and later by E. L. H. L. A. W. M. D. G. (cf. Annali dell' Izzia, i. 440), that the earliest madrasj had nothing of the character of a proper mosque. Much can be quoted from this view for the Hadith and Sirat (cf. Annali dell' Izzia, i. 440). The first mosque to be received by the Prophet in the month of Safar was the famous Madrasj in Medina, which was not completed until 22 years later. This mosque was the first to be erected in Medina, and was the place where the Prophet delivered his sermons, and where the bodies of the deceased were kept for burial.

3. Other Mosques in the Time of the Prophet.

The mosque of the Prophet in Medina was not the only one founded by Muslims in their lifetime and according to tradition not even the first, which is said to have been the mosque of Kuḥā. In this village, which belonged to the territory of Medina (see Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, p. 120), the Prophet on his Hajj stopped with the family of 'Amr b. 'Awf, the length of his stay was variously given: 3, 5, 8, 14 or 22 days. According to one tradition, he found a mosque there on his arrival, which had been built by the first emigrants and the Ansār and he performed the salāt there with them (see Wüstenfeld, p. 360). According to another tradition, the Prophet himself founded the mosque on a site, which belonged to his host Kuḥā, and was used as a mihrāb for drying dates or according to others,
to a woman named Labha, who tithered her ass there (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 131; Ibn Hījām, p. 333; Ṣahābi, 1. 1260, 2; Ibn Sa’d, 1. 1; Masʿūdī, Murūdī, iv. 139; Dīyārbarī, Khamsit, i. 381; al-Sīra al-Hadībiyya, Cairo 1320, ii. 38 sq.). Out of this tradition arose a legend based on the story of the foundation of the principal mosque in Medina: The Prophet makes (first Abū Bakr and 'Umar without success, then) 'All mount a camel and at the place to which it goes builds the mosque with stone brought from the Harra; he himself laid the first stone, and Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān the next ones (Khamsit, i. 384). The Prophet is said to have henceforth visited the mosque of 'Kubah' every Saturday, either riding or walking and the pillar is still shown beside which he conducted the service (Bukhārī, Fadl al-Saḥīf Masjīd Makka na 'l-Medina, bāb 2, 4; Muslim, Haddīqī, i. 94; Khamsit, i. 382; Baidhūrī, p. 5). We are occasionally told that he performed his salāt on the Sabbath in the mosque at 'Kubah' when he went to the Banū Najīr in Rabī‘ of the year 4 (Wāḥīdī-Wellhausen, p. 161).

It is obvious that the customs and ideas of the later community have shaped the legend of this mosque. The only question is whether the old tradition that the mosque was founded either by the Prophet himself or even before his arrival by his followers is also a later invention. We thus come to the question whether the Prophet founded or recognized any other mosques at all than that of Medina. L. Gæteaal, in keeping with his view of the origin of the mosque, is inclined to deny it; pointing to the fact that there was later an obvious tendency to connect mosques everywhere with the Prophet and that Sūra 108 strongly condemns the erection of an "opposition mosque" (M. al-Dīrāṣr). The Kur‘ān passage is as follows: "Those who have built themselves a masjīd for opposition (ābab) and unbelief and division among the believers and for a refuge for him who in the past fought against God and his Prophet; and they swear: we intended only good. God is witness that they are liars! Thou shalt not stand up in it, for verily a masjīd which is founded on piety from the first day of its existence has more right that thou shouldst stand in it; in it are men who desire to purify themselves and God loveth those who purify themselves" (Sūra ix. 108—109). According to tradition this was revealed in the year 9; when the Prophet was on the march to Tabūk, the Banū Sālim said to him that they had built a mosque to make it easier for their feeble and elderly people, and they begged the Prophet to perform his salāt in it and thus give it his approval. The Prophet postponed it till his return, but then this revelation was announced, because the mosque had been founded by Munāṣirūn at the instigation of Abū 'Amir al-Rāhilī, who fought against the Prophet. According to one tradition (so Ibn 'Umar, Zaid) the "mosque founded on piety" was that of Medina from which the people wished to emanipulate themselves; according to another (Ibn 'Abbas) the reference was to that of 'Kubah'; Abū 'Amir and his followers were not comfortable among the Banū 'Amir b. 'Aww and therefore built a new mosque. According to some traditions it was in Ubī Awwā. The Prophet however had it burned down (Ṭabarī, i. 1704 sq.; Ibn Hījām, p. 337).
for the roof (Baladānūrī, p. 346 sq., 350; B. G. A., 2434 sq., 2451 sq.; 187 sq.; Yākūt, Muğām al-Baladānī, l. 642, 6 sq.; Tābarī, l. 2377, 1 sq. It was similar in Kūfā which was founded in 17 by Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās. In the centre was the mosque and beside it the Dār al-Imāra was laid out. The mosque at first was simply an open quadrangle, gahar, marked off by a trench round it. The space was large enough for 40,000 persons. It seems that reeds were also used for building the walls here and later Saʿd used tāsām. On the south side (and only here) there was an arbour, ṣultān, built (cf. Baladānūrī, p. 348, 1 sq.; Yākūt). The Dār al-Imāra beside the mosque was later by Umar's orders combined with the mosque (Tābarī, l. 2481, 1 sq., 1 sq., 2485, 1 sq., 2487 sq., 2494, 1 sq.; Yākūt, Muğām, iv. 323, 1 sq.; Yūnān, Muğām, p. 275, 1 sq.; Annals dell' Islam, ill. 846 sqq.). The plan was therefore an exact reproduction of that of the mosque in Medina (as is expressly emphasised in Tābarī, l. 2489, 1 sqq.); the importance of the mosque was also changed in its position and the commander lived close beside it. There was no difference in al-Farasa, which, although there was already an older town here, was laid out as an entirely new camp in the year 21, after the conquest of Alexandria. The mosque was laid out in a garden where 'Amr had planted his standard. It was 50 dârā long and 30 broad. Eighty men fixed its ṣbāla, which however was turned too far to the east, and was therefore altered later by Kūra b. Shahrīr. The court was quite small, surrounded by a wall and had trees growing on it; a simple roof is mentioned; it must be identical with the above mentioned ṣultān or ṣuṣa. 'Amr b. Abī Ṣaʿd lived just beside the mosque and around it the Abl al-Ḳiyam. Like the house of the Prophet, the general's house lay on the east side with only a road between them. There were two doors in each wall except the southern one (Yākūt, Muğām, ill. 386 sq.; Māqātī, Kāhiyyāt, i. Cairo 1326, 4 sqq.; Ibn Duknāk, K. al-İntizar, Cairo 1893, 59 sqq.; Suyūṭī, Ḥasan al-Maḥdārī, l. 63 sqq.; ill. 135 sqq.; cf. Annals dell' Islam, ill. 554, 557, 563 sqq.).

We find similar arrangements made in al-Mawṣil twenty years earlier (Baladānūrī, p. 331 sqq.).

In other cases the Muslims established themselves in old towns either conquered or surrendered by treaty; by the treaty they received a site for their mosque (e.g. Baladānūrī, p. 216, 14, 147 sq.). But the distinction between towns which were conquered and those which were surrendered soon disappeared and the position is as a rule not clear. Examples of old towns in which the Muslims established themselves are al-Madī'in, Damās and Jerusalem. — In al-Madī'in Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās after the conquest in 16 distributed the houses among the Muslims and Khāqān's Āwān was made into a mosque, after Saʿd had conducted the Salat al-Fath in it (Tābarī, l. 2443, 15 sq., 2451, 1 sqq.). In Damās which was occupied in 14 or 15 by capitulation, according to tradition, the Church of St. John was divided so that the eastern half became Muslim from which Muslim tradition created the legend that the city was taken partly by conquest and partly by agreement (Baladānūrī, p. 125; Yākūt, Muğām, ii. 591; Ibn Duknāk, Kāhiyyāt, i. 262; Y. A., ser. 9, iv. 376, 351, 404). As a matter of fact however, the Muslims seem to have laid out their own mosque here just beside the church (cf. Damās); and close beside it again was the Khaqānas, the commander-in-chief's palace, from which a direct entrance to the maqṣūra was later made (B. G. A., ill. 159). Conditions here were therefore once more the same as in Medina. But the possibility of an arrangement such as is recorded by tradition cannot be rejected, for there is good evidence of it elsewhere; in Hims for example, the Muslims and Christians shared a building in common as a mosque and church, and it is evident from al-Īṣāṣī and Ibn Hawkāz that this was still the case in the time of their common authority, al-Balūkī (399 = 991) (B. G. A., l. 61, 1 sq.; ill. 111, 1 sq.; ill. 156, 1 sq.), and a similar arrangement is recorded for Dāhil in Armenia (B. G. A., l. 188, 2 sqq.; ill. 244, 1 sq.; ill. 317, 1 sq).

There were special conditions in Jerusalem. The Muslims recognised the sanctuary there, as is evident from the earlier Kībā and from Sīna xviii. 1 (in the traditional interpretation). It must therefore have been natural for the conquerors, when the town capitulated, to seek out the recognised holy place. Indeed we are told that 'Umar in the year 17 built a mosque in Jerusalem on the site of the temple of Solomon (F. Bantgen, Fragmente syr. u. arab. Hist., p. 17, 110, following Ḥabīd ibn ʿAbd al-Malik, metropolitan of Baṣra after 700 a.d.; cf. for the viiith century Theophanes quoted by Le Strange, Palaestina under the Moslems, 1890, p. 91 note) That the Khaqānas al-Ṣaʿīda (q. v.), which the Mosque of 'Umar replaced, stands on the old site of the Temple is undoubted. How he found the site is variously recorded (cf. al-Īṣāṣī). The building was, like other mosques of the time of 'Umar, very simple. Arculf who visited Jerusalem about 670 says "The Saracens attend a quadrangular house of prayer (domus orationis, i.e. musjid) which they have built with little art with boards and large beams on the remains of some ruins, on the famous site where the Temple was once built in all its splendour" (Histoire Hierosolymitana, ed. F. Geyer, 1898, p. 226 sqq.; transl. P. Mickle, in Das Land der Bibel, ii/3, 1917, p. 19 sqq.). It is of interest to note that this simple mosque, like the others, was cast in the form of a rectangle; in spite of its simple character it could hold 3,000 people, according to Arculf.

As late as the reign of Muʿawiya we find a new town, Kāira, being laid out on the old plan as a military camp with a mosque and Dār al-Imāra in the centre (Yākūt, Muğām, iv. 213, 1 sqq.). As Baladānūrī, for example, shows, the Muslim conquerors even at a later date always built a mosque in the centre of a newly conquered town, at first a simple one in each town, and it was a direct reproduction of the simple mosque of the Prophet in Medina. It was the exception to adapt already existing buildings in towns. But soon many additional mosques were added.

2. Tribal mosques and Sectarian mosques.

There were mosques not only in the towns. When the tribes pledged themselves to the Prophet to adopt Islam, they had also to perform the salāt. It is not clear how far they took part in Muslim worship, but if they concerned themselves with Islam at all, they must have had a Muslim place of meeting. Probably even before Islam they had, like the Meccans, their maqṣūra or naṣrā or dār ʿibnā, where they discussed matters of general importance (cf. Limmens, Moğūn, p. 205; Zibād
As the mosque was only distinguished from such places by the fact that it was also used for the common *Ṣabāb*, it was natural for tribal mosques to come into existence. Thus we are told that as early as the year 5 the tribe of Sa'd b. Ḳabr founded mosques and used *ṣabāb* (Ibn Sa'd, *t.f.* 44, n, not mentioned in Ibn Ḥṣām, p. 943 s.v.; Ṭabarī, ii. 1722); it is also recorded of the Banū Ḫudaym that they lived near Mecca that they built mosques in the year 8 and introduced the *ṣabāb* (Ṭabāqāt-Wellhausen, p. 65). How far one can rely on such stories in a particular case is however uncertain. A later writer, like al-Diyarbakri, says of the Banū Ḥudaym that they *ṣarāfūn na-bārā* masjidjī (Ṭabāqāt Khāsimī, ii. 132, cf. Annals of Islam, ii. 221); in the early sources this is not found. Nor is the story, told by Ibn Sa'd at all probable, that envoy's from the Banū Ḫanīfa received orders to destroy their churches, sprinkle the ground with water and build a mosque (Ibn Sa'd, *t.f.* 56, s.v. Ṭabarī, p. 943 n; Ṭabarī, i. 1737; and Baladhurī, p. 86 s.v. say nothing about it). But that there were tribal mosques at a very early date is nevertheless quite certain. The mosque at Kūba* was the mosque of the tribe of Amr b. Ṭawfīq* (Ibn Sa'd, *t.f.* 6, 6, and cf. above) and according to one tradition, the Banū Ḥathem b. Ṭawfīq were jealous of it and built an opposition mosque (Baladhurī, p. 3; Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, i. 21 infra). A Companion, who had taken part in the battle of Badr, Ṭabāk b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the *ṣabāb* of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (Buḫṣaṣ, Ṣafāt, bāb 46; Muslim, Masjidjī, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the *ṣabāb* of the Banū Zurāj (Buḫṣaṣ, Liḥlabād, bāb 50–58) and in the *ṣabāb* of Balad Ṣalīma during the prayers, there was revealed to him Ṣira ii. 139, which ordered the new *ṣabāb* to be made. Therefore it was called Masjidjī Liḥlabādīn (Wṣṭenfeld, Medina, p. 62).

The tribal mosque was a sign that the independence of the tribe was still retained under Islam. Indeed we hear everywhere of tribal mosques, for example around Medina that of the Banū Kuraṣa, of the Banū Ḥarīrī, of the Banū Ṣafar, of the Banū Ṭallūf, of the Banū Ḥāṣim, of the Banū Zurāj, etc. It is said to have been the first in which the *Ṣabāb* was publicly read, that of the Banū Salīma etc. (see Wṣṭenfeld, Gesch. d. Stadt Medina, p. 29, 37 s.v., 44, 50, 57, 136 s.v.; the *ṣabīb* of the two Kūba* belonged to the Banū Sa'd, b. Ghamūn b. Kāb* b. Balad (Wṣṭenfeld, Medina, p. 41). This was then the position in Medina: the tribes had usually their own mosques and one mosque was the chief mosque. This was probably the position within the Prophet's lifetime; for in the earliest campaigns of conquest, mosques were built on this principle. Umar is said to have written to Abī Miṣṣ in Baṣra telling him to build a mosque in *Ṣabāb* and mosques for the tribes, and on Fridays the people were to come to the chief mosque. Similarly he wrote to Sa'd b. Abī Waḳṣ in Kufa and to *Amr b. ʿAṣ in Miṣr, on the other hand in Syria where they had settled in old towns, they were not to build tribal mosques (Makrīṣī, *Ḳaṣīf*, iv. Cairo 1336, p. 4 ) infra. It is actually recorded that the tribes in each *Ṣabāb* had their own mosques around the mosque of *Amr in al-Fuṣṣī (cf. Ibn Ǧaḍnūn, p. 62 infra s.v.) and even much later a tribal mosque like that of the Rāḫilā was still in existence (Makrīṣī, *Ḳaṣīf*, iv. 64, s.v.). Even in the chief mosque, the tribes had their own places (Umd, p. 9, s.v.). We have similar evidence from the *Ṭaʾf*. In Baṣra for example there was a Masjidjī Banū ʿUṭbah (Baladhurī, p. 356, n), one of the Banū Ṭabāk (B. G. A., vii. 201, s.v.), one of the Banū Ṭaʿ (ibid., v. 191, s.v.) and one of the Amār (cf. Goldziher, Muḥammadīnātīn, Sūtrān, i. 77, note 5); in Kufa we find quite a number such as that of the Amār (Ṭabarī, ii. 284, s.v.); of the Banū al-Ḳān (ibid., i. 657, s.v.), of the Banū Dhūmūn (ibid., p. 670, n), of the Banū Makhrūr (ibid., p. 734, s.v.), of the Banū Ḥiṣāl (ibid., i. 1657, s.v.), of the Banū ʿAdī (ibid., p. 1703, s.v.); of the Banū Ḥuṣain and Banū Ḥujayjī (ibid., p. 532, s.v.); of the Dhujarān (ibid., p. 535, s.v.); of the Banū Ḥaṣām (ibid., iii. 2500, s.v.); and the Banū Anṣār even had several masjidūn (Baladhurī, p. 278, s.v., also p. 284 and Goldziher, loc. cit.).

During the wars these tribal mosques were the natural rallying points for the various tribes; the mosque was a masjid, where councils were held (Ṭabarī, ii. 532, s.v.), and the people were taught from its minbar (ibid., p. 284); battles often centred for this reason round these mosques (e.g. Ṭabarī, i. 130, 148, s.v.). “The people of your mosque”, abī masjidūḏ (ibid., p. 532, s.v.) became identical with “your party”. Gradually as, new sects arose, they naturally had mosques of their own, just as Musallāma before them is said to have had his own mosque (Baladhurī, p. 90, s.v.), and Ibn Ḥanbal, Muṣnad, i. 404 infra). Thus we read later of the mosques of the Ḥanbalis in Baghdaḍ, in which there was continual riot and confusion (Liḥlabād, bāb 60–58) and in the *ṣabīb* of the Banū Ḩāṣim the *ṣabāb* was called Masjidjī Liḥlabādīn (ibid., ii. 135, s.v.). Sometimes it happened that different parties in a town shared the chief mosque (B. G. A., iii. 102, s.v.), but as a rule it was otherwise. In particular the Sunni and Shīʿī as a rule had separate mosques (cf. Mez, Die Reichsweiten des Islam, p. 63). Sometimes it even happened that Ḥanafis and Shīʿīs had separate mosques (Abū al-Muṭṭaṣim, *Ṣafar*, i. 459, cf. B. G. A., iii. 323, s.v.). These separate mosques were a great source of disruption in Islam and we can understand that a time came when the learned discussed whether such mosques should be permitted at all. But the question whether one might talk of the Masjidjī Banū Ḥaṣām was answered by saying that in the time of the Prophet, the Masjidjī Banū Zurāj was recognised (Buḫṣaṣ, Ṣafāt, bāb 41; Liḥlabād, bāb 60–58) and Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xi. 20 after the middle of the page).

3. Adaptation to Islam of Older Sanctuaries; Memorial Mosques.

According to the early historians, the towns, which made treaties with the Muslims, received permission to retain their churches (Baladhurī, p. 121, in the middle; Ṭabarī, i. 2405, 2407) while in the conquered towns the churches fell to the Muslims without any preamble (cf. Baladhurī, p. 120 infra). Sometimes also it is recorded that certain number of churches were received from the Christians, e.g. fifteen in Damasci according to one tradition (ibid., p. 124, s.v.); otherwise p. 121; cf. J. A. S. E., vii. 403). It is rather doubtful whether the process was such a regular one; in any case the Muslims in course of time appropriated
many churches to themselves. With the mass-conversions to Islam, this was a natural result. The churches taken over by the Muslims were occasionally used as dwellings (cf. Tabari, i. 2405, 2407); at a later date it also happened that they were used as government offices, as in Egypt in 146 (Makrizi, iv. 35; cf. for Kufa, Baladhuri, p. 286). The obvious thing, however, was to transform the churches into mosques. It is related of 'Amr b. al-As that he performed the salat in a church (Makrizi, iv. 6) and Zaid b. All says regarding churches and synagogues, Perform thy salat in them; it will not harm them." (Corpus juris di Zaid b. All, ed. G. T. Grifflini, No. 364). It is not clear whether the reference in these cases is to conquered sanctuaries; it is evident, in any case, that the saying is intended to remove any misgivings about the use of captured churches and synagogues as mosques. The most important example of this kind was in Damascus where al-Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik in 86 (705) took the church of St. John from the Christians and had it rebuilt; he is said to have offered the Christians another church in its stead (see the references above, B. 1; and also J. A., 9 Ser., vii. 369 sqq.; Quatremere, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 262 sqq. and the article DAMASCUS). He is said to have transformed into mosques ten churches in all in Damascus. It must have been particularly in the villages, with the gradual conversion of the people to Islam, that the churches were transformed into mosques. In the Egyptian village there were no mosques in the earlier generations of Islam (Makrizi, iv. 28 sq., 30). But when al-Ma'mun was fighting the Copts, many churches were turned into mosques (ibid., p. 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo that they were converted churches. According to one tradition, the 'Rashtik mosque was an unfinished Jacobite church, which was surrounded by Jewish and Christian graves (Makrizi, iv. 63, 64) and in the immediately vicinity of the 'Asikum turned a Jacobite and a Nestorian Church into mosques (ibid., p. 65). When Djiwbar built a palace in al-Khira, a dir was taken in and transformed into a mosque (ibid., p. 265); similar changes took place at later dates (ibid., p. 240) and synagogues also were transformed in this way (Masha'di Ibn al-Barr, ibid., p. 265). The chief mosque in Palermo was previously a church (Yekhi, Ma'asir, i. 719). After the Crusades several churches were turned into mosques in Palestine (Sauvage, Hist. de Jérusalem et d'Hébron, 1879, p. 77; Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i. 7, 40).

Other sanctuaries than those of the people of the scriptures were turned into mosques. For example the Masjid al-Shams between Hilla and Kerbela was the successor of an old temple of Shamash (see Goldscheider, Mab. Stud. ii. 331 sq.). Not far from Isfākbar was a Masjid Sulaimān which was an old "fire-temple," the pictures on the walls of which could still be seen in the time of Mas'ud and al-Mahdi (8th century) (Mash'adī, Muraqquâb, iv. 77: B. G. A., iii. 444.) In Isfākbar itself there was a djâmi, which was a converted fire-temple (ibid., p. 436). In Maṣṣa, the ancient Mopsuestia, the Masjid in 140 bought a mosque on the site of an ancient temple (Baladhuri, p. 165 sqq.) and the chief mosque in Dhibh was originally a temple (Ibn Batuta, iii. 151); as to 'Aṣif al-Taghī, Jāmi, ibid. 10. Thus in Islam also the old rule holds that sacred places survive changes of religious opinion. It was especially
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easy in cases where Christian sanctuaries were associated with Biblical personalities who were also recognised by Islam: e.g., the Church of St. John in Damascus and many holy places in Palestine. One example is the mosque of Job in Shaikh Sa'd, associated with Sūra xxi, 83-88, viii. 40; here in Silvia's time (fourth century) there was a church of Job (Masjid, l. 91; Badeker, Fasîlî, 1879, 1910, p. 147).

But Islam itself has created historical associations which were bound soon to lead to the building of new mosques. Even in the lifetime of the Prophet, the Banî Sâlim are said to have asked him to perform the salât in their masjid to give it his authority (see above A 3). At the request of 'Iṣâh b. Malik the Prophet performed the salât along with Abî Bakr in his house and thereby consecrated it as a musâlla, because he could not get to the tribal mosque in the rainy season (Bukhârî, Sa'îd, bâb 47; Tâhâfudz, bâb 30; Muslim, Masjid, l. 46; a similar story in Bukhârî, Kâfî, bâb 47, Tâhâfudz, bâb 33 which is perhaps identical in origin). After the death of the Prophet, his memory became so precious that the places where he had prayed obtained a special importance and his followers, who liked to imitate him in everything, preferred to perform their salât in such places. But this tendency was only an intensification of what had existed in his lifetime; and so it is not easy to decide how far the above stories reflect later conditions. Mosques very quickly arose on the road between Mecca and Medina at places where, according to the testimony of his companions, the Prophet had prayed (Bukhârî, Sa'îd, bâb 89; Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 421 sqq.); the same was the case with the road which the Prophet had taken to Tabûk in the year 9 (Ibn Hishâm, p. 907; Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 394; there were 19 in all, which are listed in Anwâr dell' Islam, ii. 246 sqq.). Indeed wherever he had taken the field, mosques were built; for example on the road to Baṣra, where according to tradition Abû Bakr had built a mosque (Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 39, also Wûstefeld, Medina, p. 135). The mosque of al-Fadlî was built on the spot where the Prophet had prayed in a leather tent during the war with the Banî Nadir in the year 4 (Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 165; Wûstefeld, Medina, p. 137). He is said to have himself built a little mosque in Khâibar during the campaign of the year 7 (Dîyâr bârî, Târîkh al-Kâmî, ii. 49 sqq.; cf. Anwâr dell' Islam, ii. 19). Outside 'I'd a mosque was built on a hillock, because the Prophet had performed the salât there during the siege in the year 8, between the tents of his two wives, Umâ Salâma and Zainab (Ibn Hishâm, p. 872; Niẓâmî, Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 399); in Liyya the Prophet is said to have himself built a mosque while on the campaign against Taif (Ibn Hishâm, p. 872; Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 368 sqq.). Mosques arose in and around Medina, "because Muhammad prayed here" (Wûstefeld, Gesch. d. Stadt Medina, 1908, 31, 38, 134 sqq.). It is obvious that in most of these cases later conditions are put back to the time of the Prophet; in connection with the "war of the Ditch" we are told that: "he prayed everywhere where mosques now stand" (Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 208). Since, for example, the Masjid al-Fadlî is also called Masjid al-Shams (Wûstefeld, Medina, p. 132) we have perhaps here actually an ancient sanctuary.
Mosques became associated with the Prophet in many ways. In Medina, for example, there was the Masjid al-Qibla where footprints of the Prophet’s mule were shown in a stone, the Masjid al-Ijāba where the Prophet’s appeal was answered, the Masjid al-Fath which marks the victory over the Meccans, etc. (see Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 136 sqq.). In Mecca there was naturally a large number of places sacred through associations with the Prophet and therefore used as places of prayer. The most honoured site, next to the chief mosque, is said to have been the house of Khadija, also called Mawlid al-Sa‘idja Fātima, because the daughter of the Prophet was born there. This house, in which the Prophet lived till the Hijra, was taken over by ‘Uqail, ‘Ali’s brother, and bought by him through Mu‘awiya and turned into a mosque (Chronikhe d. Stadt Mecca, ed. Wüstenfeld, l. 425; iii. 435, 440). Next comes the house in which the Prophet held his first secret meetings. This was bought by al-Khaizurra, mother of Ḥafīn al-Rashid, on her pilgrimage in 171 and turned into a mosque (Chron. Mecca, iii. 112, 440). She also purchased the Prophet’s birthplace, Masjid al-Nabī, and made it into a mosque (ibid., l. 422; iii. 439). If Mu‘awiya really bought the Prophet’s house from his cousin, it was probably the right one; but the demand for places associated with the Prophet became stronger and stronger and we therefore find more and more places referred not only to the Prophet, but also to his Companions. Such are the birthplaces of Hama, ‘Umar and ‘Ali (Chron. Mecca, iii. 445), the house of Māriya, the mother of the Prophet’s son, Ibrāhim (ibid., l. 447, 460) who also had a mosque at Medina (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 133). There were also a Masjid Khadija (ibid., l. 324) and a Masjid ‘A ‘ba (ibid., iii. 454), a Masjid of the “granted appeal” in a narrow valley near Mecca, where the Prophet performed the ḥajj (ibid., l. 455), a Masjid al-Dijān, where the Dijān overheard his preaching (ibid., l. 424; iii. 453), a Masjid al-Ra‘ya, where he planted his standard at the conquest (ibid., l. 438; iii. 439, 453), a Masjid al-Ra‘ya where the first homage of the Medinians was received (ibid., l. 448; iii. 444). In the Masjid al-Khalīf in Mina is shown the mark of the Prophet’s head in a stone into which visitors also put their heads (ibid., l. 438). Persons in the Bible are also connected with mosques, Adam, Abraham and Isma‘il with the Kâba, beside which the Masām ibrahīm is shown and in ‘Arâfa there is still a Masjid Ibrahim (ibid., l. 415, 435) and another in al-Zahrī near Mecca (Ibn Djami‘r, Ribâ‘, 1907, p. 112). To these memorial mosques others were later added, e.g. the Masjid Abū Bakr, Masjid Bilāl, the Mosque of the Splitting of the Moon (by the Prophet) etc. (Ibn Djami‘r, Ribâ‘, p. 114 sqq.; B.G.A., iii. 102 sqq.; Suouck Harrongne, Mecca, II. 27; al-Batanî, al-Ribâ‘ al-Hadjīya, 2, Cairo 1339, p. 52 sqq.).

In al-Hijāz the Muslims thus acquired a series of mosques which became important from their association with the Prophet, his family and his Companions, and made Muslim history live. On the other hand, in lands formerly Christian, they took over sanctuaries which were associated with the Biblical history which they had assimilated (see Le Strange, Palestine, passim). Other mosques soon became associated with Biblical and Muslim story. The mosque founded by ‘Umar on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem was, as already pointed out, identified as al-Masjid al-Aqṣā mentioned in Surâ xxvi. 1 and therefore connected with the Prophet’s night journey and the journey to Paradise. The rock is said to have greeted the Prophet on this occasion and marks in a stone covering a hole are explained as Muhammad’s footprints (sometimes also as those of Idris; cf. Le Strange, Palestine, p. 136; al-Batinî, Ribâ‘, p. 165; Schedeler, Palestine, 1910, p. 52 sqq.; cf. Ya‘qûbî, ed. Houssain, ii. 311). The name al-Masjid al-Aqṣâ was used throughout the early period for the whole Ḥaram area in Jerusalem, later partly for it, and partly for the burials in its southern part (B.G.A., vi. 100; Sauvage, Hist. Jérusalem, p. 95, 121; cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 95 sqq.). Then there were the mosques which had specifically Muslim associations, like the Masjid of ‘Umar on the Mount of Olives where he encamped at the conquest (B.G.A., iii. 172).

In Egypt not only was an old Christian sanctuary called Maḥbad Mûsâ (Makrizi, iv. 259), but we are also told, for example, that the Mosque of Ibn Ţīlûn was built where Mûsâ talked with his Lord (Makrizi, iv. 36); according to al-Khûṣî there were in Egypt four Masjids of Mûsâ (Ibn Duqmâk, ed. Vollers, p. 92); there was a Masjid Ya‘qûb wa-Ya‘qûb (B.G.A., ii. 200) and a Joseph’s church, certainly dating from the Christian period (Makrizi, iv. 315). There was also a Mosque of Abraham in Muslim Ibu al-Khaṣb (Ibn Djami‘r, p. 58). The chief mosque of San‘a was built by Sheb, son of Noah (B.G.A., vii. 110). The old temple near Iṣṭakhr is mentioned above was connected with Salamân (Mas‘î, al-Nawâfi‘, iv. 77; Ya‘qûbî, i. 299). In the mosque of Kûf there were not only Ibrâhim but one thousand other prophets and one thousand saints, described as nasîf, are said to have offered their prayers; here was the tree Ya‘qûn (Surâ xxxvii. 146); here died Yaghîl and Ya‘qûb, etc. (Ya‘qûbî, iii. 325; also Ibn Djami‘r, p. 211 sqq.) and in this mosque there was a chapel of Abraham, Noah and Idris (Ibn Djami‘r, p. 212); a large number of mosques were used associated with Companions of the Prophet. What emphasis was laid on such an association is seen, for example, from the story according to which ‘Umar declined to perform the ḥajj in the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem, lest the church should afterwards be claimed as a mosque.

4. Tomb Mosques.

A special class of memorial mosques consisted of those which were associated with a tomb. The graves of ancestors and of saints had been sanctuaries from ancient times and they were gradually adopted into Islam. In addition there were the graves of sick men, the Sünûr (Sura xviii. 20) but it is not clear if this was recognised. As early as the year 6, the companions of Abû Bakr are said to have built a mosque at the place where he died and was buried (Ya‘qûbî-Wellhausen, p. 262). The Prophet is also said to have visited regularly at al-Ba‘kî in Medina the tombs of the martyrs who fell at Uḥd and paid reverence to them (Ibn).
Whatever the exact amount of truth in the story, there is no doubt that the story of the tomb-mosque of Abu Bakr is ante-dated. The accounts of the death of the Prophet and of the period immediately following reveal no special interest in his tomb. But very soon the general trend of development stimulated an interest in graves which led to the erection of sanctuaries at them. The probable date of this tendency is more marked in al-Wākidī, who died in 207 (823), than in Ibn Isbāhān, who died in 154 (768).

The collections of Ḥadīth made in the third century contain discussions on this fact which show that the problem was whether the tombs could be used as places of worship and in this connection whether mosques could be built over the tombs. The hadiths answer both questions in the negative, which is certainly was in the spirit of the Prophet. It is said that “Salāt at the graves (h 'lamābihār) is maṣbūh” (Buḥkārī, Saḥīh, bāb 52); “sit not upon graves and perform not salāt towards them” (Muslim, Dārīqāt, tr. 33); “hold the salāt in your houses, but do not use them as tombs” (Muslim, Saḥāb al-Musāfiri, tr. 28). On the other hand, it is acknowledged that Abu Ārub performed the salāt at the cemetery (Buḥkārī, Saḥīh, bāb 48). We are also told that tombs cannot be used as masjīdiyya (Buḥkārī, Saḥīh, bāb 48; Dārīqāt, bāb 62). On his deathbed the Prophet is said to have cursed the Jews and the Christians because they used the tombs of their prophets as masjīdāt. Ḥadīth explains this by saying that the tomb of the Prophet was not at first accessible (Buḥkārī, Saḥīh, bāb 48, 55; Dārīqāt, bāb 62; Amīn, bāb 50; Muslim, Māṣīḥāt, tr. 3), as a matter of fact its precise location was not exactly known (Dārīqāt, bāb 96). The attacks in Ḥadīth insist that tomb-mosques are a reprehensible Jewish practice: “When a pious man dies, they build a masjidīūn on his tomb” (Buḥkārī, Saḥīh, bāb 48, 54; Muslim, Dārīqāt, bāb 71). Although this view of tomb-mosques is still held in certain limited circles (cf. Ibn Tāmīya, the Wāḥshiyya, the old pre-Islamic custom still also became a Muslim one. The expositors of Ḥadīth like al-NAwawī, (on Muslim, Māṣīḥāt, tr. 3, lith, Dīlūg, 130-142, p. 201) and al-Āshkallānī, (Cālqūt, 1329, p. 354) explain the above passages to mean that only an exaggerated ta'zīm of the dead is forbidden so that tombs should not be used as a khilār; otherwise it is quite commendable to spend time in a mosque in proximity to a devout man.

The name given to a tomb-mosque is often ṭakūra, a word which is used of a tent (Buḥkārī, Dārīqāt, bāb 62; Ḥadīth, bāb 64; Fard al-Khmār, bāb 19; al-Ḍīqiyya, bāb 15; Tārāfa, Dīlūg, vii. 1). But later came the dome which usually covers tombs and thus became the general name for the sanctuary of a saint (cf. Ibn Dījrān, Rībā, p. 114, 115; cf. Dānt, Ṣallāḥ, -); Muṣāḥāt also means a little chapel and a saint's tomb (v. Berchem, Corpus Inscrip. Arab., ii, no. 72, 73, etc.; cf. index). The custom of making a ṭakūra at the tomb of a saint was firmly rooted in Byzantine territory, where sepulchral churches always had a dome (Herrog-Hauch, Rostomayolu, 2, p. 284). The usual name however for a tomb-sanctuary was masjīhad; this is applied to places where saints are worshipped, among Muslim tombs particularly to those of the friends and relations of the Prophet (v. Berchem, Corpus Inscrip. Arab., 1, p. 32; 63; 417; 544; Maṣūrī, [iv. p. 265], 397 agg.) but also to tombs of other recognised saints, e.g. Maṣūrī, Māṣīḥāt in Maṣūrī (Ibn Dījar, Rībā, p. 236) etc.

The transformation of the tombs of the Prophet and his near relatives into sanctuaries seems to have been a gradual process. Muḥammad, Abū Bakr and 'Umar are said to have been buried in the house of 'Ā'ishah; Fatimah and 'Ali lived beside it. 'Ā'ishah had a wall built between her room and the tombs to prevent visitors carrying off earth from the tomb of the Prophet. The houses of the Prophet’s wives remained as they were until the al-Walid rebuilt them. He thought it scandalous that Ḥasan b. Ḥasan b. 'Ali should live in Fatimah's house and 'Umar's family close beside 'Ā'ishah's home in the house of Ḥazāna. He acquired the houses, had all the houses of the Prophet's wives torn down and erected new buildings. The tombs were enclosed by a pentagonal wall; the whole area was called al-ṣamā' il 'ṣurūt, the garden; it was not till later that a dome was built over it (Wüstenfeld, Medien, p. 66, 72-73, 78, 79, 80). In the cemetery of Medina, al-Brā'ī, a whole series of Masjīhdāt came to be built where tombs of the family and of the Companions of the Prophet were located (ibid., p. 140, 99; Ibn Dījar, Rībā, p. 105, 99). It is often disputed whether a tomb belonged to one or the other (e.g. Tabarī, iii. 2430, 899). Such tomb-mosques were sacred (maṣūباح) (Ibn Dījar, Rībā, p. 114, 15, 15); they were visited ʿl-ṭawbah. The name al-Rawṣa of the Prophet's tomb became later applied to other sanctuaries (Ibn Dījar, Rībā, p. 46, 16, 52, 17). Separate limbs were revered in some mosques, like the head of al-Ḥusayn in Cairo, which was brought there in 491 from 'Aṣkalānī (Allī Fāhī Mālākā, al-Makkah, al-Riṣāla al-Ḍīljīdā, iv, 91, 99; cf. Sauvage, Hist. Jérini. Hibr., p. 16); his head was also revered for some time in the Masjuẖb al-Būt in Damascus (according to Ibn Shāhīr, J. A., 9th ser., vii. 385).

Gradually a vast number of Muslim tombs of saints came into existence; and to these were added all the pre-Islamic sanctuaries which were adopted by Islam. No distinction can therefore be drawn between tomb-mosques and other memorial mosques. It was often impossible to prove that the tomb in question ever really existed. In the Masjīhd 'Ali for example, 'Ali's tomb is honoured but Ibn Dījar leaves it in doubt whether he is really buried there (Rībā, p. 272) and many located his grave in the place at Ḫāṭ and elsewhere (Maṣūẖ, Maṣwī, iv, 259; v. 68; B. G. A., ii. 165). In 'Ain al-Baqar near Akkā there was also a Masjīhd 'Ali (Yāfī, 379) and also in the Mosque of the Umayyads (Ibn Dījar, p. 267); on this question cf. B. G. A., iv, 46. Names frequently became confused and transferred. In Mecca between Ṣaffā and Marwā there was a Kaḥba, which was associated with 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb but Ibn Dījar says that it should be connected with 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azzī (Rībā, p. 115, 116); in Dījar there was a Masjīhd Abī Hurrāra, where the memory of this Companion of the Prophet was honoured; it is said to have been originally the grave of another Abī Hurrāra (Maṣūẖ, i, 335, 99). Wherever Shī'īs ruled, there arose numerous tomb-mosques of the Abī al-Būt. In Egypt Ibn Dījar gives a list of 14 temples and five women of the Prophet's
family, who were honoured there (Rihla, p. 46 sq.). Islam was always creating new tombs of saints who had been distinguished for learning or asceticism or miracle-working, e.g. the tomb of al-Shafi'i in Cairo and Abu al-Badawi in Taht. There were mosques, chiefly old established sanctuaries, of Biblical and semi-Biblical personages like Rubai (Reuben) and Asiya the wife of Pharaoh (ibid., p. 46). In and around Damascus were a number of mosques, which were built on the tombs of prophets and unnamed saints (Ibn Dhubair, Rihla, p. 273 sqq.). In Palestine could be seen a vast number of tombs of Biblical personages (cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, Index, and Condel in Palestine explorer, Fund, quarterly Statements, 1871, p. 80 sqq.), usually mosques with a kabba.

After the sanctuaries of persons mentioned in the Bible came those of people mentioned in the Quran. For example, outside the Djami' in Akka was shown the tomb-mosque of the prophet Shishak (Nasir-i Khusrav, Sefer-Namkeb, ed. Schefer, p. 15, = 49), and in Syria that of his son (Ibn Dhubair, p. 46); that of Hudey was also shown near Akka (Sefer-Namkeb, p. 16, 5 = 52), farther east that of Sha'a'il and of his daughter (ibid., p. 16, 18 = 55); the tomb of Hudey was also pointed out in Damascus and in Hadramat (Yakin, ii. 596 sqq.); then we have peculiarly Muslim saints like Dhu 'l-Kif, the son of Job (ibid., p. 16, 4 = 52). Then there are the sanctuaries of saints who are only superstitially Muslim but really have their origins in old popular superstitions, like al-Khwariz who had a mausoleum in Damascus (Yakin, ii. 596 sqq.), or a saint like 'Akka, founder of the town of Akka, whose tomb Nasir-i Khusrav visited outside the town (Sefer-Namkeb, p. 15, 5 from below = 51). Such tombs were much visited by pious pilgrims and are therefore frequently mentioned in literature (on Masakhid of the kinds mentioned here in the Irsh, see R.G.A., iii. 130; for Mawil etc., ibid., p. 146). In this way ancient sanctuaries were turned into mosques and it is often quite a matter of chance under what names they are adopted by Islam (cf. Goldziher, Muh. Studien, ii. 325 sqq.).

It therefore sometimes happens that the same saint is honoured in several mosques. Abu Hurairah, who is buried in Medina, is honoured not only in the above-mentioned tomb-mosque in Djits but also at various places in Palestine, in al-Ramla and in Yubah south of Tabariya (Khulil ed-Tahliri, Zewakht Kuch al-Maslahi, ed. P. Rassamie, p. 42, 1 from below; Sefer-Namkeb of Nasir-i Khusrav, ed. by Ch. Schefer, p. 17, 1 from below = 59; Yakin, ii. 512 sqq.; iv. 1007, 11; cf. Symonds Oriental Fast, Supple., ii. (1928), 31). The tomb of the Prophet Jona is revered not only in the ancient Niniveh but also in Palestine.

Just as the kabba under which the saint lay and the mosque adjoining it were sanctified by him as vice-versa a kabba and a mosque could become a place of a deceased person to become considered a saint. It was therefore the custom for the mighty not only to give this distinction to their fathers but also to prepare such buildings for themselves even in their own lifetime. This was particularly the custom of the Mandiluk sultans, perhaps stimulated by the fact that they did not found dynasties in which power passed from father to son. Such buildings are called kabba (van Berchem, C.T.A., i., No. 82 sqq., 95, 96, 126, 138 etc.), exceptionally

sawiya (ibid., No. 98), frequently furusa (ibid., No. 38, 63, 88, 105, 116 etc.); the formula is also found as 'this kabba is a turba' (No. 67); the latter word acquired the same meaning as masjid, partly saint's grave and partly sacred site (cf. Ibn Dhubair, Rihla, p. 114, 160); but this word does not seem to be used of ordinary tomb-mosques, although the distinction between these and mosques in honour of saints often disappeared. In these kabbas the regular recitation of the Qur'an was often arranged and the tomb was provided with a kiswa. The mausoleum might be built in connection with a great mosque and be separated from it by a grille (Yakin, iv. 509, 429).

5. Mosques deliberately founded.

In the early period the building of mosques was a social obligation of the ruler as representative of the community and the tribes. Very soon a number of mosques came into existence, provided by individuals. In addition to tribal mosques, as already mentioned, there were also sectarian mosques and prominent leaders built mosques which were the centres of their activity, for example the Madjdi 'Adi b. Hadiim (Tabari, ii. 130), the Madjdi Sinak in Kaf (Ibn Dhu. 1653), the Madjdi al-Ash'ath etc. As old sanctuaries entered Islam, the mosque received more of the character of a sanctuary and the building of a mosque became a pious work; there arose a hadith, according to which the Prophet said: "for him who builds a mosque, God will build a home in Paradise"; some add "if he desires to see the face of God" (Corpus juris di Zaid b. 'Ali, ed. Grifin, No. 370; Bahijah, Sahih, b. 65; Muslim, Madjdi, tr. 4; Zakdi, tr. 3; Makri, iv. 36). Like other sanctuaries, mosques were sometimes built as a result of a revelation in a dream. A story of this kind the year 557 is given by al-Sayhudi fore Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 91 sqq.) and a similar one in a mosque in Damascus (J. A., Ser. 9, viii. 384); a mosque was also built out of gratitude for seeing the Prophet (al-Madras al-Shafiyya, Makri, iv. 209). It was of course particularly an obligation on the mighty to build mosques. Even in the earliest period the governors took care that new mosques were built to keep pace with the spread of Islam (cf. Baladhuri, p. 178 sqq.). About the year 1000 the governor of Medina, Badr b. Husamwah, is said to have built 3000 mosques and hostels (Meir. Die Renaissance des Isisams, 1922, p. 24). The collections of inscriptions, as well as the geographical and topographical works, reveal how the number of mosques increased in this way.

In Egypt, al-Hakim in the year 403 had a census taken of the mosques of Cairo and there were eight hundred (Makri, iv. 264); al-Kufi (d. 454 = 1062) also counted the mosques and his figure is put at 30,000 or 36,000 (Yakin, iii. 901; Ibn Dhu'aym, ed. Völ. ers, p. 92; Makri, iv. 264) which seems quite a fantastic figure (there is probably a mis taking before the i.e. 1036). Ibn al-Mutawwadi (d. 739) according to Makri counted 480, and Ibn Dhu'aym (above) gives in addition to the incomplete list of djami's a list of 472 mosques, not including madrasas, khanaqahs etc.; the figure given by Makri is smaller. The fantastic figure of 30,000 for Baghdad is found as early as Ya'qub (R.G.A., vii. 250). It is also an exaggeration when Ibn Dhu'aym was told in
Alessandria that there were 12,000 or 8,000 mosques there (p. 43). In Bassra where Ziyād built 7 mosques (B.G.A., v. 191), the number also increased rapidly, so that in 700 AD (B.G.A., vii. 361). In Damascus, Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571 = 1176) counted 241 within and 148 outside the city (F.λ. Ser. 9, vii. 383). In Palermo Ibn Hawkal counted over 300 and in a village above it 200 mosques. In some streets there were as many as 20 mosques within a bowshot of one another; this multiplicity is condemned: everyone wanted to build a mosque for himself (Ya‘qūt, i. 719; iii. 409, 410). As a matter of fact, one can almost say that things tended this way; Ya‘qūt mentions in Baghdad a mosque for the Anbari officials of the tax-office (B.G.A., viii. 245) and several distinguished scholars practically had their own mosques. It occasionally happened that devout private individuals founded mosques. In 672 Tālāl al-Din built a mosque and a separate chamber in which he performed the ṣalāt alone and meditated (Ma‘ṣūrī, iv. 90). The mosques thus founded were very often called after their founders, and memorial and tomb mosques after the person to be commemorated. Sometimes a mosque is called after some devout man who lived in it (Ma‘ṣūrī, iv. 97, 265 ᵇ.γ.: ), and a madrasa might be called after its head or a teacher (ibid., iv. 235; Ya‘qūt, Uṣūl, vii. 82). Lastly a mosque might take its name from its situation or from some feature of the building.

6. Al-Muṣallā.

In addition to the mosques proper, al-Ma‘ṣūrī mentions for Cairo 8 places for prayer (muṣallā) mainly at the cemetery (iv. 334 ᵇ.γ.). The word muṣallā may mean any place of prayer, therefore also mosque (cf. Sīra, ii. 119; cf. Ma‘ṣūrī, Khiṭṭat, iv. 25, 87: ; Ibn, ed. Bums, p. 91, 17; Ya‘qūt, Mu‘awwana, iv. 326, 2-3) or a particular place of prayer within a mosque (Tabari, i. 2408, 86; Bukhārī, Gāhib, bāb 17; Sa‘īd, bāb 91). In Palestine, there were many open places of prayer, provided only with a miḥrāb and marked off, but quite in the open (cf. for Tiberias, Sa‘īr Nāmeh, trans. Schofer, p. 56). It is recorded of the Prophet that he used to go out at the two festivals (al-Fitr and al-‘Aṣgha) to the place of prayer (al-muṣallā) of the Banū Salman. A lance which the Negus had presented to al-Zahrah was carried in front of him and planted before the Prophet as entreaty. Standing in front of it, he conducted the salāt, and then preached a sermon without a minbar; the rows were in front of him (Tabari, i. 1281, 58 ᵇ.γ.; Bukhārī, Tafsīr, bāb 6; Sa‘īd, bāb 90; Nu‘aym, bāb 6). He also went out to the muṣallā for the salāt al-ṣīrafi‘ (Muslim, Iṣbaḥa, tr. 1). This Muṣallā was an open space and Muhammedan is even said to have forbidden a building on it (Wüstefeld, Medina, p. 127 ᵇ.γ.). This custom of performing the salāt on a muṣallā outside the town on the two festivals became mu‘ālasa. There is evidence of the custom for several towns. In Medina however, a mosque was later built on the muṣallā (ibid., p. 128 ᵇ.γ.) which also happened in other places. An early innovation was the introduction of a minbar by Marwān (ibid., p. 128; Bukhārī, Iṣbaḥa, bāb 6). When Sa‘īd b. Abī Waqqās built a mosque in Kīra’s Tāwārīkh al-Madīna, at the festival in the year 16 it was expressly stated that

C. The Mosque as the Centre for Divine Service.

1. Sanctity of the Mosque.

The history of the mosque in the early centuries of Islam shows an increase in its sanctity which was intensified by the adoption of the traditions of the church and especially by the permutation of the cult of saints. The sanctity already associated with tombs taken over by Islam was naturally very soon transferred to the larger and more imposing mosques. The expression Ba‘is Alilah “house of God”, which at first was only used of the Ka‘ba came now be applied to any mosque (Corpus inscr. d. Zentral. All., No. 48, cf. 136, 985; Chem. Mekka, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 164; cf. Corpus Inscrip. Arab., i., No. 10, t. 16; Ibn al-Hādhāli, K. al-Makkah, i. 20, 233, 25, 73, ii. 45; 56; Ba‘is Rubin, ibid., i. 25, 73, ii. 56). The alteration in the original conception is illustrated by the fact that the Munā‘ir-al-Malik al-Zahrah Bahars declined to build a mosque on a place for tending camels because it was unseemly, while the mosque of the Prophet had actually been built on such a place (Ma‘ṣūrī, iv. 91; Abū Dāwūd, Sa‘īd, bāb 22).

In the house of God the Miḥrāb and the Minbar (see below) enjoyed particular sanctity, as did the tomb, especially in Medina (Bukhārī, Fadl al-Salāt fi Masjid al-Madīna wa ʾl-Madina, bāb 5). The visitors sought baraka, partly by touching the tomb or the railing round it, partly by praying
in its vicinity; at such places "prayer is heard" (Chron. Mecca, iii. 441, 442). In the Masjid al-Ka'bah in Mina, the visitor laid his head on the print of the Prophet's head, and thus obtained the (ibid., iii. 438). A mosque could be built on a site, the sanctity of which had been shown by the finding of hidden treasure (Mašqiri, iv. 75). There were often places of peculiar sanctity in mosques. In the mosques at Khaḍī and Medina, the spots where the Prophet used to stand while praying were held to be particularly blessed (Baladhurī, p. 57; Bukhārī, Saūdī, bâb 91; Wasmend, Medina, p. 65, cf. 82, 109). In other mosques, places where a saint had sat or where a divine phenomenon had taken place e.g. in the Mosque of 'Amr and in the Ashr Mosque (Mašqiri, iii. 19, 52) or the Mosque in Jerusalem (Mašqiri, B. G. A., iii, 170) were specially visited. From visitors made samāfī [q.v.] between such places in the mosque (Mašqiri, iv. 20) just as in other religions we find parents dedicating their children to the service of a sanctuary, so we find a Muslim woman vowing her child or child yet unborn to the mosque (Bukhārī, Saūdī, bâb 74; Mašqiri, iv. 20). The fact that mosques, like other sanctuaries, were sometimes found after a revelation received in a stream has already been mentioned (ibid. 5). This increase in sanctity had as a natural result that one could no longer enter a mosque at random as had been the case in the time of the Prophet. In the early Umayyad period, Christians were still allowed to enter the mosque without molestation (cf. Lammens, Me'sūma, p. 13 sq.; Goldscher, in W. Z. K. M., vel. 100 sq.). Mu'āwiyah used to sit with his Christian physician, Ibn Uthlîh, in the mosque of Damascus (Ibn Abū Usbîbhī, i. 117). According to Ahmad b. Ḥanball, the Aḥl al-Khidr (or Aḥl al-Aḥṣā) and their servants, but not polytheists, were allowed to enter the mosque of Medina (Mašmârī, iii. 339, 392). At a later date entrance was forbidden to Christians and this regulation is credited to 'Umar (Lammens, op. cit., p. 13, note 6). A strict teacher of morality like Ibn al-Hajjâj thought it unseemly that the monks who wore the mât for the mosques should be allowed to lay them in the mosque (Mašbâhî, ii. 57). Conditions were not always the same. In Hebron, Jews and Christians were admitted as payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 664 (1265) 'Abbas ibn Abū Bakr forbade it (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i. 27). According to some traditions, a person in a state of ritual impurity could not enter the mosque (Abu Dâwûd, Taḥkîrâ, bâb 62; Ibn Mâjdî, Taḥkîrâ, bâb 123) and in any case only the pure could acquire merit by visiting the mosque (Muslim, Masjidî, tr. 564; Corpus iuris di Zaid b. Abi, Nî, Nî, 48), and in a later period it is specially mentioned that the word al-masjid cannot be undertaken in the mosque itself (Mašbâhî, ii. 47 infra) nor could shaving (ibid., p. 58 sq.). It is always necessary to be careful not to spit in a mosque, although some traditions which are obviously closer to the old state of affairs say, "not in the direction of the kiblah, only to the left!" (Bukhārī, Saūdī, bâb 33 sq.). The custom of taking off one's sandals in the mosque is found as early as the time of 'Abū 'UbdAllâh (second century A.D., ibid., p. 272, 65 sq.) and according to al-Maḥbûl (see below) is also mentioned by Abu Dâwûd. Al-Ṭabarî puts the custom back to the time of 'Umar (1. 2408). That it is based on an old custom observed in sanctuaries is obvious (cf. on the history of the custodii, F. Camont, Feuilles de Droit-Éthique, 1926, p. 60 sq.). The custom however seems not to have been always observed. In the viiiith century in the Mosque of the Umayyads the shoes were taken off only in the maṣṣāf, because the floor was covered with mats; but in 827 an Egyptian superintendent ordered that the mosque should only be entered with bare feet (F. A., ser. g., v. 211, 217). The visitor entering should place his right foot first and utter certain prayers with blessings on the Prophet and his family (which Muḥammad is said to have done!) and when he is inside perform two rakâ' (Bukhārī, Saūdī, bâb 47; Tāḥkîrâ, bâb 25; Muslim, Saūdī, al-Maṣṣāf, tr. 12 sq., Taḥkîrâ, i. 2454, 2532). Certain regulations for decent conduct came into being, the object of which was to preserve the dignity of the house of divine service. Public announcements about stray animals were not to be made, as the Beduins did in their houses of assembly, and one should not call out aloud and thereby disturb the meditations of the worshippers (Bukhārī, Saūdī, bâb 83; Muslim, Masjidî, tr. 13; more fully in Mašmârī, i. 19 sqq.). One should put on fine clothes for the Friday service, rub oneself with oil and perfume oneself (Bukhārī, Dinâm, bâb 3, 6, 7, 19) as was also done with Phú for the Ḥâjjâjī (Bukhārī, Ḥâjjâjî, bâb 143). A question which interested the teachers of morality was that of the admission of women to the mosques. That many did not desire their presence is evident from the hadith that one cannot prevent them as there is no ārdā connection with it, but they must not be performed (Muslim, Saūdī, bâb 29; Bukhārī, Dinâm, bâb 13; cf. Chron. Mecca, iv. 168). Other hadiths say they should leave the mosques before the men (al-Nāṣârî, Saūdī, bâb 77; cf. Abû Dâwûd, Saūdī, bâb 14, 48). Sometimes a special part of the mosque was railed off for them; for example, the governor of Mecca in 256 had ropes tied between the columns to make a separate place for women (Chron. Mecca, ii. 197 infra). According to some, women must not enter the mosque during their menstruation (Abu Dâwûd, Taḥkîrâ, bâb 92, 103; Ibn Mâjdî, Taḥkîrâ, bâb 117, 127). In Medina at the present day, at one time a wooden grille shut off a place for women (al-Batūnî, al-Muṣlihîn, p. 240). At one time the women stood at the back of the mosque here (Yâlûl, Udâbî, vi. 400). In Jerusalem there were special maṣṣāf for them (B. G. A., i. 100). Ibn al-Hajjâj would prefer to exclude them altogether and give 'Arabs as his authority for this.

Although the mosque became sacred, it could not quite cast off its old character as a place of public assembly and in consequence the mosque was visited for many other purposes than that of divine service. Not only in the time of the Umayyads was considerable business done in the mosques (Taḥkîrâ, ii. 1118; cf. Lammens, Zaidî, p. 98) which is quite in keeping with the hadith (Bukhārî, Saūdī, bâb 70 sq.) which, actually found it necessary to forbid the sale of wine in the mosque (ibid., bâb 73), but a writer in the viiith century, Ibn al-Hajjâj, records with disapproval that business was done in the mosques: women sit in the mosques and sell thread, in Mecca hawkers even call their wares in the mosque. The list given by
this author gives one the impression of a regular market-place (Ma'thad, ii. 34). Strangers could always sit down in a mosque and talk with one another (see E.C.E., iii. 205); they had the right to spend the night in the mosque; according to some, however, only if there was no other shelter available (Ma'thad, ii. 35 infra, 49 supra; see below D. 1b). It naturally came about that people also ate in the mosque; this was quite common, and regular banquets were even given in them (e.g. Makriti, iv. 67, 121; cf.: in Hadith: Ibn Majah, At'ima, b. 24, 29; Aḥmad b. Ḥa扎实, ii. 106, 106, 2030, from below). Ibn al-Haḍjīdji laments that in al-Aksa people even threw the remains of their repast in the mosque; animals were brought in, and beggars and water-carriers called aloud in them etc. (Ma'thad, i. 53 supra). It is even mentioned as a sign of the special piety of al-Shirazi (d. 476 = 1083) that he often brought food into the mosque and consumed it there with his pipe (Wüstenfeld, Der Indam Schafi, iii. 298). Gradually the mosques acquired greater numbers of residents (see D. 2b). In the Al-Arba Mosque it was the custom with many to spend the summer nights there because it was cool and pleasant (Makriti, iv. 54). This was the state of affairs about 800 a.d. Similar conditions still prevail in the mosques.

2. The Mosque as a Place of Prayer. Friday Mosques.

As places for divine service, the mosques are primarily "houses of which God has permitted that they be erected and that His name be mentioned in them" (Šura, xxiv. 36), i.e. for His service demanded by the law, for ceremonies of worship (Manahi), for assemblies for prayer (Disna), and other religious duties (cf. Chron. Mekh., ii. 164). The mosques were mawāla (Makriti, iv. 117, 140). In Medina after a journey, the Prophet went at once to the mosque and performed two rak'a's, a custom which was imitated by others and became the rule (Bukhari, Salat, bāb 59); Muslim, Šaḥi al-Maṣājid, tr. 11; Ṣa'ādī al-Muḥaddihin, p. 412, 436). In this respect the mosque served exactly the same public in worship similar to that of the Ka'ba in Mecca at an earlier date and the Rabba sanctuaries in Ẓafar. The daily salāta, which in themselves could be performed anywhere, became especially meritorious when they were performed in mosques, because they expressed adherence to the community. A salāta al-aṭlāma, we are told, is twenty or twenty-five times as meritorious as the salāt of an individual at home or in his shop (Muslim, Maṣājid, tr. 42; Bukhari, Ši'rū, bāb 87; Bukhari, bāb 49). There are even hadiths which condemn private salāta: "Those who perform the Šafr in their houses abandon the sunna of the Prophet" (Muslim, Maṣājid, tr. 44; cf. 48; Bukhari, Ši'rū, bāb 52). If much rain falls, the believers may, however, worship in their houses (Bukhari, Qiyama, bāb 14). In this connection a blind man was given a special rak'a; it is particularly hard to leave the mosque after the as-Siyam (Muslim, Maṣājid, tr. 45). It is therefore very meritorious to go to the mosque; for every step one advances into the mosque, he receives forgiveness of sins, God protects him at the last judgment and the angels also assist him (Muslim, Maṣājid, bāb 49; 51; Bukhari, Ši'rū, bāb 87; Ṣa'ādī, bāb 30, 37; Qiyama, bāb 4, 18, 31; Corpus inus et Zaid b. Ali, No. 48, 156, 983). This holds especially of the Friday salāt (Salat al-Qa'im), which can only be performed in the mosque and is obligatory upon every free male Muslim who has reached years of discretion (cf. Junboll, Handbuch, p. 86; Goldi, Sommario del Diritto Maltsiuti, i. 105 supra). According to Ibn Hāshim (p. 290) this salāt, which is distinguished by the khutba, was observed in Medina even before the Hijra. This is hardly probable and besides is not in agreement with other hadiths (see Bukhari, Qiyama, bāb 11) but the origin of this divine service, referred to in Šura ix. 9, is obscure. The assemblies of the Jews and Christians on a particular day must have formed the model (cf. Bukhari, Qiyama, bāb 11). Its importance in the earlier period lay in the fact that all elements of the Muslim camp, who usually went to the tribal and particular mosques, assembled for it in the chief mosque under the leadership of the general. The chief mosque, which for this reason was particularly large, was given a significant name. They talk of al-Masjid al-Qa'im (Tabari, i. 2494: ii. 734, 1701, 1702, Kifā: Baladhuri, p. 5; Tabari, Taṣrif, xi. 21, centrum; ibid. also al-Masjid al-Qa'im, Medina; cf. al-Masjid al-Bahr, B. G. A., vii. 245) or Masjid al-Qa'im (Yākuti, iii. 806, al-Fusṭāṭi, also Tabari, i. 1119; Ibn Kutabah, Ma'dar, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 106); Masjid al-Qa'im (Makriti, iv. 4); Masjid Qa'im (Baladhuri, p. 289, Madinah; Yākuti, l. 643, 647, Baṣra); then Masjid al-Qa'im (Yākuti, iii. 899, iv. 885; B. G. A., ii. 298, 343, 387; viii. 110). As an abbreviation we find also al-Qa'im (Yākuti, i. 400; Ibn Baṭṭa, iv. 543; cf. Masjid al-Qa'im, Baladhuri, p. 348) and especially Qa'im. As the khutba was the distinguishing feature, we also find Masjid al-Kutba (Makriti, iv. 44, 64, 87), Qa'im al-Kutba (Ṭahari, iv. 55) or Masjid al-Mihrab (B. G. A., i. 316 for Qa'im, i. 8).

Linguistic usage varied somewhat in course of time with conditions. In the time of Umar there was properly in every town only one Masjid Qa'im for the Friday service. But when the community became no longer a military camp and Islam replaced the previous religion of the people, a need for a number of mosques for the Friday service was bound to arise. This demanded mosques for the Friday service in the country, in the villages on the one hand and several Friday mosques in the towns on the other. This meant in both cases an innovation, compared with old conditions, and thus there arose some degree of uncertainty. The Friday service had to be conducted by the ruler of the community, but there was only one governor in each province; on the other hand, the demands of the time could hardly be resisted and, besides, the Christian converts to Islam had been used to a solemn weekly service. As to the villages (al-Qa'im), Amir b. al-Aṣ in Egypt forbade their inhabitants to celebrate the Friday service for the reason just mentioned (Makriti, iv. 7). At a later period then the khutba was delivered exceptionally, without minbar and only with staff, until Marwan in 132 introduced the minbar into the Egyptian Salat al-Sab to place it in the qabba (Tabari, i. 2451). Of a mosque in which a minbar had been placed, we are told that a minbar is called ṣa'ya Qa'im (Bukhari, Qa'im, bāb 15; cf. Madina Qa'im, B. G. A., ii. 321), an idea which was regarded by Bukhari (d. 256 = 870).
as quite obvious. In introducing minbars into the Egyptian villages, Muraw was apparently following the example of other regions. In the fourteenth century, Ibn Hawkal mentions a number of minbars in the district of Iskakh (B.G.A., ii. 182 sq.), and a few in the vicinity of Marw (ibid., p. 316) and in Transoxiana (ibid., p. 378; cf. p. 384), and al-Makdisi does the same for other districts of Persia (B.G.A., iii. 309, 317) and he definitely says that the Turks of Palestine are gharr minabar (ibid., p. 176; cf. l. 58); Balkhwar (p. 331) also uses the same minbar for a village mosque built in 235; in general, when speaking of the great mosque, there is talk of manabar and not of guriyim (cf. B.G.A., i. 63). Later however the term Madjdi (gurj) is used for a Friday mosque (Ibn Tubair, p. 217). The conditions of primitive Islam are reflected in the teaching of the Hanafis, who only permit the Friday service in large towns (cf. al-Mawardi, al-Mahasin al-Sultaniya, ed. Enger, p. 177).

As to the towns, the Sharifs on the other hand have retained the original conditions, since they permit the Friday service in only one mosque in each town (cf. Jaw'ma and cf. cihat, p. 178 sq.), but with the reservation that the mosque is able to hold the community. The distinction between the two rites was of importance in Egypt. When in 569 Shâh al-Din became supreme in Egypt, he appointed a Sharif's chief khatif and the Friday service was therefore held only in the Hâkim mosque, as the largest; but in 665 (1266) al-Malik al-Dhâhir Ri'âz gave the Hanafi preference and many mosques were therefore used as Friday mosques (Makrizi, iv. 52 sq.). in-Suyuti, from al-Muqaddas, i. 140; Quotsaouters, Histi, Salt, Maml. (ii. 39 sq.). During the Cuzzbell period and to some extent in the A'bdâli period, the number of gurijim in the towns were still very small. The geographers of the third and fourth centuries in their descriptions of towns as a rule mention only the gurjim (Ibn al-Fakhr, c. 290 (903), sometimes says mansur gurjim wa-minabar, B.G.A., v. 304-306, also minbar simply, p. 305. In keeping with the oldest scheme of town planning, it was very often in the middle of the town surrounded by the business quarters (B.G.A., ii. 298, 325; iii. 274 sq., 275, 280, 314, 316, 375, 376, 415, 426, 427 etc.; Makrizi, Khurasan, ed. Schefe, p. 35, 41, 50) and the dar al-tamara was still frequently in the immediate vicinity of the chief mosque (B.G.A., ii. 298, 314; iii. 426).

Istakhri mentions as an innovation in Islam that al-Majduli built a gurjim in al-Wasi in 1240, although there was already one on the east bank (B.G.A., i. 82 sq.; cf. iii. 118; viii. 358). Ibn Tubair (Ribba, p. 211 sq.) mentions only one gurjim in Kufa, called Mansur al-Kuфа by Ibn al-Fakhr, although he also mentions other mosques (B.G.A., v. 173; cf. 174, 183 and iii. 116). In Bagdad where Yahâk (278 = 891) already mentions 7,000 mosques (B.G.A., viii. 351), al-Majduli (375 = 985) gives 3 gurijim (B.G.A., iii. 117). In Samarra', among many mosques, there was one gurjim (Ibn al-Fakhr, vii. 258, 259), which was later replaced by another (ibid., p. 260 sq.); al-Mutawakkil also built one outside the original town (ibid., p. 256; see also T. Schwarb, Die Abdarinstudien (1939, p. 32). In Baghdad, Yahâk (278 = 891) mentions only one gurjim for the eastern town and one for the western (B.G.A., vii. 240, 245, 251, 253; the almost contemporary Ibn Rosti just mentions the old western town and its gurjim, ibid., p. 109) although he gives the fantastic figures of 13,000 mosques in the east town (ibid., p. 254) and 30,000 in the west (or in the whole region, ibid., p. 250). After 820 there was added the gurjim of the eastern palace of the caliphs (Mez, Renan, p. 385 quoting al-Kharm al-Baghdadî, Tadhkira Baghda'dî, a private gurjim of Hârîn al-Râshîd in the Bustan Ummal Musulmi is mentioned by Ibn al-Khi, Tadhkira al-Hâmîma, ed. Liperti, p. 433 infra). These 3 gurijim are mentioned about 340 (951) by Istakhri (B.G.A., i. 84), who also mentions one in the suburb of Qalwâd, Ibn Hawkal in 367 (977) mentions the latter and also the gurjim al-Bârî (B.G.A., i. 164 sq., of 329; Mez, loc. cit.), a fifth was added in 379, a sixth in 383 (Mez, p. 389); thus al-Khâshî al-Baghdadî in 450 (1058) gives 4 for West Baghdad, 2 for the east town (cf. Le Strange, Bagdâdî, p. 324). Ibn Tubair in 581 (1185) gives in the east town 3, and 11 gurijim (Ribba, p. 225 sq.) for the whole of the Bagdad region. For Cairo, Istakhri gives two gurijim: the 'Amr al-Mu'in mosque (B.G.A., i. 49) besides that in al-Karbâa, which was mentioned as a separate town (cf. Ibn Rosti, p. 290 = 903, B.G.A., vii. 116 sq.). al-Makdisi, who writes that 395 (985) shortly after the Fatimid conquest, mentions the 'Amr and al-Mu'in mosques, the new mosque in al-Khâria (al-A'zûr), also one in al-Djama, in Djem al-Karbâa (B.G.A., ii. 198-200, 209; the gurjim in al-Djama, also gurjim Mikyân al-Makrizi, ih. 75), is mentioned in an inscription of the year 485; see van Berchem, Corpus, i, N9 39). As these places were all originally separate towns, the principle was not abandoned that each town had only one gurjim. The Fatimids however extended the use of Friday mosques and, in addition to those already mentioned, used the gurjim al-Jâkîn, al-Mâkîn and al-Râshida (Makrizi, iv. 2 sq.) and Jaub al-Khusrâw in 439 (1047) mentions in one passage the gurijim of Cairo, in another seven for Miṣr and eleven in all (cf. Schefe, p. 134 sq., 147). This was altered in 569 by Shâh al-Din (see above) but the kingdom, being still regarded as separate towns, retained their own Friday mosques (cf. for the year 607 in al-Karâa: Makrizi, Khurasan, p. 125).

After the Friday service in Egypt and Syria was freed from restriction, the number of gurijim increased very much. Ibn Dundzlit (about 900) gives a list of only eight gurijim in Cairo (cf. Volter, p. 59-75), but this list is apparently only a fragment (in all he mentions something over twenty in the part of his book that has survived); al-Makrizi (d. 843 = 1442) gives 130 gurijim (iv. 2 sq.) and in Damascus, where Ibn al-Jâzir still spoke of 'the gurjim', al-Makrizi (d. 1521) gives twenty gurijim (7 sq., ii. 317 sq.), and according to Ibn Bâji'âta, there were in all the villages in the region of Damascus marjât al-gurjim (i. 256). The word gurjim in Makrizi always means a mosque in which the Friday service was held (ibid., 76, 115 sq.), but by his time this meant any mosque of some importance. He himself criticizes the fact that since 799 the jât al-gurjîa was performed in al-A'zûr, although another gurjim stood close beside it (ibid., 76; cf. also 86).

The great spread of Friday mosques was reflected in the language. While inscriptions of the eighth century still call quite large mosques marjât, in
3. Other religious activities in the mosque.

"The mentioning of the name of God" in the mosques, was not confined only to the official ritual ceremonies. Even in the time of the Prophet, we are told that he lodged Thāqīfī delegates in the mosque so that they could see the rows of worshippers and hear the nightly recitation (Waḥāki-Welshhausen, p. 382). Although this story (which is not given in Ibn Hishām, p. 916) may simply be a reflection of later conditions, the recitation of the Qur'ān must have come to be considered an edifying and pious work at quite an early date. In the time of Maḥdi, the Qur'ān was recited in the mosques on Fridays in the daytime, in the early morning and recited till the 17th of the month (B.G.A., iii. 348), and the same author tells us that in the Mosque of 'Amar in Egypt the "asimūt al-kūrā" sat in circles every evening and recited (Ibid., p. 205). In the time of Ibn Dūbair, there were recitations of the Qur'ān in the Umayyad mosque after the ṣaḥābah and every afternoon after the ṣaḥābah (Khdā, p. 271 sq.). Besides the recitation of the Qur'ān there were praises of God, etc., that is chanted as dāhir, and which was particularly cultivated by Ṣifārīn. This form of worship also took place in the mosque. The 'Alī al-Tawāfīd wa' t-Mawṣīfīn formed nāfūsīs al-dāhir, who assembled in the mosques (al-Makkī, Ḳūṭ al-Kulṭī, i. 152). In the Mosque of the Fatimids and other mosques of Damascus, dāhir was held during the morning on Friday (Māqīdī, p. 49). In the Maqīd al-Abāṣī the Hanafis held dāhir, and recited at the same time from a book (B.G.A., iii. 182). In Egypt, Ahmad b. 'Uṯmān and Khānūnāwī allowed twelve merchants to set up in the mosque near the minaret to praise God, and during the night four of them took turns to praise God with recitations of the Qur'ān and with pious kāfālas. From the time of Ṣaḥīh al-Dīn an orthodox 'āṣīdā was recited by the mu'addhinīn in the night (Ibid., p. 49). Ibn al-Hādīdī claims that the recitation of the Qur'ān alone should take place in a mosque for the special purpose (masnūn masjīd) as otherwise pious visitors are disturbed (Māqīdī, ii. 53, 67). Mosques and particularly mausoleums had as a rule regularly appointed reciters of the Qur'ān. In addition there was, e.g. in Hebron and in a mosque in Damascus, a shāhiq who had to recite Būkhārī (or also Muslim) for three months (Sauvaget, Hist. Juris. Hbū, p. 17; J.A., ser. 9, iii. 261). In Tunis, al-Būkhārī was read daily in a hospital (Zarkašī, travel, Fugān, Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantiæ, 1834, p. 188).

Sermons were not only delivered at the salāt al-salaat. In the 'Irāq, even in al-Maḥdi's time, one was preached every morning, according to the wāza of Ibn 'Abbās (B.G.A., iii. 150), it was said. Ibn Dūbair, in the Niyāmīyya in Baghdis, heard the šāhīq recite a Friday sermon after the 'ṣalāt on the mimbar. His sermon was accomplished with the skilled recitation of the kūrās who sat on chairs; they were over twenty in number (Ibn Dūbair, p. 219-222). In the same way, the calls of the mu'addhinīn to prayer to the Friday khutba were delivered to a musical accompaniment (see below, II. 4). The unofficial sermons, which moreover were not delivered in mosques alone, were usually delivered by a special class, the kashfīs (plur. of kashfī), (on these cf. Goldsichier, Muh. Stud., ii. 161 sqq.; Mes. Die Renaissance des Islams, p. 314 sqq., and the article kusīq). The kusīq, who delivered edifying addresses and told popular stories, were early admitted to the mosques.

Tamin al-Dūrī is said to have been the first of these in Medina in the caliphate of 'Umar before the latter's decease, he used to deliver his sermons at the Friday salāt and under 'Umar he was allowed to talk twice a week in the mosque; in the reign of 'Alī and of Mu'sāiyya the kusīq were employed to curse the other side (Maḥīzī, iv. 16 sqq.). In the Mosque of 'Amr in Cairo by the year 38 or 39, a kashfī was appointed, named Sulīmān b. Ṭīr al-Tūfīdī, who was also kāfī (Ibid., iv. 17 wrongly: Sulaimān; Kīndī, Government and Judges, ed. Guest, p. 303 sqq.). There are other occurrences of the combination of the two names (Ibn Ḥudaijār [d. 83], Kīndī, p. 317; Khārīr b. Ṣu'ānī in the year 120, ibid., p. 348; cf. Ḥusayn al-Muḥammadī, i. 134, Dībārī, according to Thawbah b. Ni'am, Ḳātī, i. 136 infra; ʿĪbārī, Ḳīdūrī, Ḳāfī al-Kārī [d. 304], Kīndī, p. 427; see also Maḥīzī, iv. 15) which shows that the office of kashfī was quite an official one. There is also evidence of the employment of kusīq in the mosque of the Irāq in the 'Abbāsīd period (Yākūt, Usūlī, iv. 268; v. 446). The kusīq read from the Qur'ān standing and then delivered an explanatory and edifying discourse, the object of which was to instil the fear of God into the people (Maḥīzī, iv. 18). Under the Fātimids also, kusīq were appointed to the mosques; for example, in 405 the Imam undertook to officiate in the mosque of 'Amr (Maḥīzī, iv. 18 infra) and the rulers had also a kāfī in the palace. The kāfīs were called ṣāḥib al-karāzī, because they delivered their discourses on the kūrās (al-Makkī, Ḳūṭ al-Kulṭī, i. 152; Ibn al-Hādīdī, Māqīdī, i. 159; cf. Maḥīzī, iv. 121). Their discourse was called dāhir or wa'īr wa'īrī, whence the kāfī was also called mu'addhin. (B.G.A., iii. 205) or wa'īr. Specimens of their discourses are given by Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi (al-Tūbī al-farīd, Cairo 1321, i. p. 294 sqq.). It was not only the appointed officials who delivered such discourses in the mosque. Ascetics made
public appearances in various mosques and collected
interested benedictions around them (cf. e.g. Makrizi, iv. 135). In the Djami al-Karafa, a whole society,
the Banu Djarbati, delivered wa's discourses on a
curfet for three months on end; their servant
collected money in a begging-bowl during the
discourse and the shahid distributed some of it
among the poor (ibid., iv. 121).

The qaswa was completely taken over by popular
Sufiim and later writers would hardly reckon,
as al-Makki does, the "story-tellers" among the
mutakallimin (Kitt al-Kulliyy, i. 152). The whole
system degenerated to trickery and charlatanry of
all kinds, as may be seen in the Maqasima literature
(cf. thron Vak't, Ufad, iv. 167 sqq. and see also
Maz and Goldstahler, op. cit. ). Al-Makriy therefore
distinguishes between al-khawas al-khatiba, the
regular and seemingly dignified discourse in the mosque,
and al-khawas al-'amma, which consisted in the
people gathering round all kinds of speakers, which is
mahbur (Makrizi, iv. 17). Others also have
recorded their objections to the khawas Ibn al-
Hashid uttering a warning against them and wants to
forbid their activities in the mosque completely,
having his deliver "weak" narratives (Madhabh, l. 150 sqq.; ibid. 153, 50). He says Ibn 'Umar, Mazik
and Abi Alwood rejected them and "Ali ejected them
from the masjid of Basra. It is
of little significance that al-Makrizi in 254 forbade
them to sit in the mosques and forbade people
to gather round them, for he issued a similar
interdict against the fakahah and the reasons were
evidently political (Tabari, ii. 2165); it was for
political reasons also, but with a very different
motivation, that 'Abd al-Daula forbade their appearing
publicly in Bagdad shortly before 400, because
they increased the tension between Summis and
Shi'is (Maz, op. cit., p. 319). As late as 580 the
wara' was still flourished in the mosques of Bagdad,
as is evident from the bihe of Ibn Djibari
(p. 219 sqq., 224), and in the ninth century there
was in the Azhar mosque a maqallia al-'amal as
well as a fakahah al-supir (Makrizi, iv. 54).

When Ibn al-Hajjji denounces speaking aloud
in the mosques, it is in the interest of the pious
visitors who are engaged in religious worries and
meditation. Pitha q. v. retirement to a
mosque for a period, was adopted into Islam from
the older religions.

The word 'abk means in the Karan the
ceremonial worship of the object of the cult (Suru vii.
134: xx. 93, 97; xxii. 53, 74; cf. Hadijismayid, ed. Horovitz, p. 86, 13) and also the
ritual stay in the sanctuary, which was done for
example in the Meccan temple (Suru ii. 119; xxii.
25). In this connection it is laid down in the
Koran that in the month of Ramadan believers
must not touch their wives "while ye pass in the
mosque" (khaf'un fil-masjid, Surra ii. 183), an expression which shows, firstly
that there were already a number of mosques in the
lifetime of the Prophet and secondly that these
had already to some extent taken over the character
of the temple. The connection with the early period is
evident from a hadith, according to which the
Prophet decides that 'Umar must carry out
worship in one night in the Masjid al-Dirham made in the Hijaliya (Bukhari, I'tikaf,
hb. 3, 15 sqq.; Fawo al-Kuran, hbb. 19; Makrizi,
hb. 341, 344; see 'I-Nuhab, hbb. 29). It is
completely in keeping with this that the Prophet,
according to the hadith, used to spend ten days
of the month of Ramadan in the Fath in the mosque of
Medina (Bukhari, I'tikaf, hbb. 1; Fawo al-Kuran al-Kadw, hbb. 3), and in the year in which he
died as many as twenty days (Ibid., I'tikaf, hbb. 17).
During this period the mosque was full of
booths of palm branches and leaves in which the
shahids lived (Ibid., hbb. 13; cf. 6, 7). The Prophet
only went to his house for some very special
reason (Ibid., hbb. 3). This custom was associated with
the asceticism of the monks. The faithful
were vexed, when on one occasion he received
Safiya in his booth and chaffed for an hour
with her (Bukhari, Fawo al-Kuran, hbb. 4:
I'tikaf, hbb. 8, 11, 12). According to another
tradition, his I'tikaf was broken on another occasion
by his wives putting up their tents beside him and
he postponed his I'tikaf till Shawwal (Bukhari,
I'tikaf, hbb. 6, 7, 14, 18). According to Zaid b.
'Ali, the I'tikaf can only be observed in a chief
mosque (djami) (Corpus juri di Zaid b. 'Ali,
N1. 447). During the early period, it was one of
the initiatory rites for new converts. In the
year 14. 'Umar ordered the retreat (al-siyum) in
the mosques during the month of Ramadan
for the people of Medina and the provinces (Tabari,
i. 2377). The custom persisted and has always been
an important one among ascetics. "The man
who retires for a time to the mosque devotes
himself in turn to salat, recitation of the Kur'an,
meditation, dhikr etc." says Ibn al-Hajjji (Madhabh,
i. 50). There were pious people, who spent their
whole time in a mosque (shahada filhi; Makrizi,
i. 97). of one we were told that he spent
his time in the mosque of the of Amr
(Fathas, ibid., p. 44). Al-Samhudi says that during
the month of Ramadan, he spent day and night
in the mosque (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 93). Sa'd
al-Din (4. 644) spent the month of Ramadan
in the Mosque of the Unayzah without speaking
(Ibn Abi Usbaha, ii. 192). Nocturnal vigils in
the mosque very early became an established
practice in Islam. According to Hadith, the Prophet
frequently held nocturnal salats in the mosque with
the believers (Bukhari, Djami'a, hbb. 29) and by
his orders 'Abd Allah b. Unais al-Ansari came from
the desert for twenty-three successive nights to pass
the night in his mosque in rites of worship (Ibn
Knatila, Masa'if, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 142 sqq.);
Out of this developed the tahajjuda [v. q. v.], particularly recommended in the law and notably the tarawih
salats [v. q. v.]. In Dimi on these occasions
women singers actually took part (Ibn
Bartria, iii. 155).

During the nights of the month of Ramadan
there were festivities in the mosques and on other
occasions also, such as the New Year, sometimes
at the new moon, and in the middle of the month.
The mosque on these occasions was illuminated;
it was eating and drinking; incense was burned
and dhikr and tarwih performed.

The Friday Salat was particularly solemn in
Ramadan, and in the Hijri period, the calliph
himself delivered the khutbah (see Makrizi, ii.
345 sqq.; Ibn Taghirib, ii/1, ed. Juyubill, p. 482-
486 and ii/1, ed. Pepper, p. 331—333). The
mosques associated with a saint had and still
have their special festivals on its mausoleum [q. v.];
they also are celebrated with dhikr, tarwih etc.
(cf. Lane, Manners and Customs, ch. xxiv, 449).
The saint's festivals are usually local and there
are generally differences in the local customs. In the Maghrib for example in certain places the month of Ramadhan is opened with a blast of trumpets from the masjid (Masjidul, ii, 69).

The mosque thus on the whole took over the role of the temple. The rulers from Umars onwards dedicated gifts to the Kaaba (B. G. A., v. 20 sq. and GI., s.v. Shawala), and as in other sanctuaries we find women vowing children to the service of the mosque (Bukhari, Sahih, bab 74; Makrizi, iv. 20). The word 'was performed, as at the Kaaba, in mosques with saints' tombs as is still done, e.g. in Hebron. Muddasir bin Dun recognized a pre-Islamic custom in this (Sauvart, Hist. des M. et de Tiberias, p. 5). Especially important business was done here. In times of trouble the people went to the mosque to pray for help, for example during drought, for which there is a special salat (which however usually takes place on the musalla), in misfortunes of all kinds (e.g. Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 19-20; Makrizi, iv. 57); in time of plague and pestilence, processions, weeping and praying with Kur'ans uplifted, were held in the mosques or on the musalla, in which even Jews and Christians sometimes took part (Ibn Taghrifin, ii/ii, ed. Popper, p. 67; Ibn Battuta, i, 243 sq.; cf. Quatremere, Hist. Sult. Man., ii/ii, 35, 40; ii/ii, 199) or for a period a sacred book like Bukhari's Sahih was recited (Quatremere, op. cit., ii/ii, 35; al-Djabarti, Merovii Historiae Mahometicae, French transl., ii, 43). In the courtyards of the mosques in Jerusalem and Damascus in the time of Ibn Assar sul-lemena penance was done on the day of 'Arafa (6th Safar), an ancient custom which had already been introduced into Egypt in the year 27 by Abul al-Anz b. Marwan (jazir after the 'Aqiq, cf. Kiudi, Wustet, p. 50). Certain mosques were visited by barren women (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 135). An oath is particularly binding if it is taken in a mosque (cf. Joh. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, p. 144); this is particularly true of the Kaaba, where written covenants were also drawn up to make them more binding (ibid., p. 143 sqq.; Chrom. Mecca, i, 160 sqq.). It is in keeping with this idea of an oath that Jews who had adopted Islam in Cairo had to take oaths in a synagogue which had become a mosque (Makrizi, iv, 265). The contract of matrimony ( dokładnie) is also often concluded in a mosque (San-tillana, Il Mushtasir, ii, 548; Madhkhali, ii, 72 infra; Sanouk Hurongraca, Mecca, iii, 163 sqq.), and the particular form of divorce which is concluded by the Nasi (q.v.) takes place in the mosque (Bukhari, Sahih, bab 44; cf. Joh. Pedersen, Der Eid etc., p. 114).

It is disputed whether a corpse may be brought into the mosque and the salat al-dinawr performed there. According to one hadith, the bier of Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas was taken into the mosque at the request of the Prophet's widow and the salat held there. Many disapproved of this, but 'Abd al-Malik pointed out that the Prophet had done this with the body of Sayf b. Bajik (Mshinid, tr. 341, cf. also Ibn Sa'd, i, 14 sqq.). The discussion on this point is not unconnected with the discussions regarding the worship of tombs. In theory this is permitted by al-Shafi'i, while the others forbid it (see Juynib, Handbuch, p. 170; I. Ghali, Il Mushtasir, i, 151). The matter does not seem to be quite clear, for Kuth al-Din says that only Abul Hanifa forbids it, but he himself thought that it might be allowable on the authority of a statement by Abul Yussuf (Chrom. Mecca, iii, 208-210). In any case, it was a very general practice to allow it, as Kuth al-Din also points out. Qutb conducted the funeral salat for Abul Bakr in the Mosque of the Prophet and Umars own dead body was brought there; later it became a general custom to perform the ceremony in Medina close to the Prophet's tomb and in Mecca at the door of the Kaaba; some even made a seventeenth salat with the corpse around the Kaaba. This was for a time forbidden by Marwan b. Abul-Hakam and later by Umara b. Abul-Aziz (Kuth al-Din, ii, 36; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 77). The custom was very early introduced into the Mosque of 'Amr (Makrizi, iv, 7, sqq.). That later scholars often went wrong about the prohibition is not at all remarkable; for it is not at all in keeping with the ever increasing tendency to found mosques at tombs. Even Ibn al-Hajjaj, who was anxious to maintain the prohibition, is not quite sure and really only forbids the loud calling of the sura (Mshinid, ii, 50 sqq., 64, 81). When a son of Sulaiman al-Ma'ayyad died and was buried in the eastern kubba of the 'Umayyad mosque, the khaqan delivered a khutba and conducted the salat thereafter and the sura recited for a week at the grave, while the amirs paid their visits to the grave (Makrizi, iv, 246, sqq.). In Persia, it was the custom for the familia of the deceased to sit in the mosque for three days after the death and receive visits of condolence (B. G. A., iii, 440 infra).

4. Mosques as Objects of Pilgrimage.

As soon as the mosque became a regular sanctuary it became the object of pious visits. This holds especially of the memorial mosques associated with the Prophet and other saints. Among them three soon became special objects of pilgrimage. In a hadith the Prophet says: One should only mount into the saddle to visit three mosques: al-Masjid al-Haram, the Mosque of the Prophet and al-Masjid al-Aqsa (Bukhari, Passal Salat fi Masjad Masjid Miska wa/i-Medina, bab 16; Dziakini, i, 351, bab 25; Ibrani, bab 67; Muslim, Haddi, tr. 93; Chrom. Mecca, i, 303). This hadith reflects a practice which only became established at the end of the 'Umayyad period. The pilgrimage to Mecca had been made a duty by the prescription of the Haddi in the Kur'an. The pilgrimage to Jerusalem was a Christian custom which could very easily be continued, on account of the significance of al-Masjid al-Aqsa in the Kur'an. This custom became particularly important when Abul al-Malik made it a substitute for the pilgrimage to Mecca (Ya'qub, ed. Houtsoum, ii, 311). Although this competition did not last long, the significance of Jerusalem was thereby greatly increased. Pilgrimage to Medina developed out of the increasing reverence for the Prophet. In the year 144 Abul Dja'far Mansur on his hadj visited the three sanctuaries (Talutari, iii, 129) and this became a very usual custom. Mecca and Medina however still held the preference. Although those of Mecca and Jerusalem were recognized as the two oldest (the one is said to be 40 years older than the other; Muslim, Masjid, tr. 1; Chrom. Mecca, i, 301), the Prophet however is reputed to have said: A salat in this
mosque is more meritorious than 1,000 salâts in others, even the al-Masjid al-Haranî" (Buhttîrî, Fosî al-Salât fi Masjid Makka wa 'l-Madîna, bâb 1; Muslim, Hudâjî, tr. 89; Chron. Makka, i. 305). The ḥadîth is aimed directly against Jerusalem and therefore probably dates from the Omayyad period. According to some, it was pronounced because someone had commended performing the salât in Jerusalem, which the Prophet was against (Muslim, loc. cit.; Wâkidî-Wellhausen, p. 349). The three mosques however retained their pride of place (Ibn Khaïdâm, Masjidîm,tfoot 6; Ibn al-Haḍîjjî, Maṣbâḥal, ii, 35), and as late as 662 (1264) we find Balîbîs founding ṣawâfî for pilgrims who wished to go on foot to Jerusalem (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i, 1, 248).

Although these three mosques officially held a special position, others also are highly recommended, e.g. the mosque in Kûbâl (see Al-Maṣâma). A salât in this mosque is said to be as valuable as an 'umra or two visits to the mosque in Jerusalem (Uyaybâoki, Ahamî, i. 381 et al.). Attempts were also made to raise the mosque of Kûba to the level of the three. It is said to have had some one who wanted to make a pilgrimage from Kûfa to Jerusalem that he should stick by the mosque of his native town, it was "one of the four mosques" and two rakâ'îs in it were equal to ten in others (B. G. A., v. 173 et al.; Yâkût, Muṣjam, iv, 325); in another tradition, salâts in the provincial mosques are said to be of general worth as much as the pilgrimage (Maktrî, iv, 4), and traditions arose about the special blessings associated at definite times with different holy places of Islam (B. G. A., iii, 183) and especially about their superior merits (B. G. A., v. 174). The Meccan sanctuary, however, always retained first place, which was marked by the Ḥaḍîjî. It was imitated by al-Mutsawakkîl in Sâmarra'; he built a Kûbâ as well as a Miṣâ and an 'Arafa there and made his amirs perform their ḥaḍîjî there (B. G. A., iii, 122).

D. Equipment of the Mosque.

I. The Development of the Edifice.

Except in the case of Mecca the earliest mosques as described above (B. 1) were at first simply open spaces marked off by a ṣawâfî. The space was sometimes, as in al-Fasqî, planted with trees and usually covered with pebbles; e.g. in Medîna (Muslim, Ḥaḍîjî, tr. 95; Balâdhûrî, p. 6) and al-Fasqî (Maktrî, iv. 8; Ibn Dukma, iv. 6; Ibn Tağhîû, l. 77) which was later introduced in Byzantium and Kûfa the courtyards of which were otherwise dusty (Balâdhûrî, p. 277, 345). These conditions could only last as long as the Arabs retained their ancient customs as a closed corporation in their simple camps. The utilisation of churches was the first sign of a change and was rapidly followed by a mingling with the rest of the population and the resulting assimilation with other cultures.

Umâr made alterations in the mosques in Medîna and in Mecca also. He extended the Mosque of the Prophet by taking in the house of 'Abbâs; but like the Prophet, he still built of lâhîn, palm-trunks and leaves and extended the booths (Buhttîrî, Ṣalâtî, bâb 62; Balâdhûrî, p. 6). In Mecca also his work was confined to extending the area occupied by the mosque. He built the surrounding houses and took them down and then surrounded the area with a wall to the height of a man; the Ka'ba was thus given its fâna' like the mosque in Medîna (Balâdhûrî, p. 46; Chron. Makka, i. 306 et al.; Wâstenfeld, Medîna, p. 68 et al.). Umâr also extended these two mosques but introduced an important innovation in using hewn stone and plaster (qâfir) for the walls and pillars. For the roof he used tent (ṣâfi). The booths, which had been extended by Umâr, were replaced by him by pillared halls (rausîha, sing. rausîh) and the walls were covered with plaster (Buhttîrî, Ṣalâtî, bâb 62; Balâdhûrî, p. 65; Wâstenfeld, Medîna, p. 70 et al.). Sa'd b. Abî Wâkidî is said to have already taken similar steps to relieve the old simplicity of the barely equipped mosque in Kûfa. The ṣawâfî consisted of pillars of marble adorned in the form of Byzantine churches (Tabbîrî, l. 2495; Yâkût, iv, 324).

This was little in keeping with the simple architecture of the original town, for Byâra and Kûfa had originally been built of reeds and only after several great fires were they built of lâhîn (see above 661). Ibn Kutaibî, Mâṣfûrî, ed. Wâstenfeld, p. 270). As to Kûfa, Sa'd by 'Umâr's orders extended the mosque until it became divided with the Dûr al-Imâra. A Persian named Rusbeh b. Bûrûdûm was the architect for this. He used bricks (datîr) for the building, which he brought from Persian buildings and in the mosque he used pillars which had been taken from churches in the region of Hîrî belonging to the Persian kings; these columns were not erected at the sides but only against the Ka'ba wall. The original plan of the mosque was therefore still retained although the pillared hall, which is identical with the ṣawâfî already mentioned in 200 dîbîr broad, replaced the simple booth and the materials were better in every way (Tabbîrî, l. 2491 et al., 2494). Already under the early Caliphs we can therefore note the beginning of the adoption of a more advanced architecture.

These tendencies were very much developed under the Omâyâds. Even as early as the reign of Mu'âwiya, the mosque of Kûfâ was rebuilt by the governor Ziyâd. He commissioned a pagan architect, who had worked for 'Abbâs, to do the work. The latter had pillars brought from al-Âhwâs, bound them together with lead and iron clamps to a height of 20 dîbîr and put a roof on them. Similar halls, built of columns (here like the old booth in Medîna called ṣawâfî; Tabbîrî, l. 2493; but also ṣawâfî, pls. ërâdî; Tabbîrî, l. 235 et al.) were added by him on the north, east, and western wall. Each pillar cost him 12,000 dirhems. The mosque could now hold 80,000 instead of 40,000 (l. 2492 et al., cf. 2494; 72; Yâkût, Muṣjam, iv. 324; 9; Balâdhûrî, p. 276). Al-Haḍîjîdî added to the mosque (Yâkût, iv, 345 et al.), Ziyâd did similar work in Baýra. Here also he extended the mosque and built it of stone (or brick) and plaster and with pillars from al-Âhwâs, which were coated with lead. We are told that he made al-ṣawâfî al-mashâdîma, i.e. the ṣawâfî hall, with 5 columns. This seems to show that the other sides also were as in Kûfa, pillared halls. He erected the Dûr al-Imâra close to the kibla side. This was taken down by al-Haḍîjîdî, rebuilt by others, and finally added to the mosque by Hûrîr al-Rushîd (Balâdhûrî, p. 347, 348 supra, 349; Yâkût, l. 642, 243). In Mecca also in the same period.
similar buildings were erected. Ibn al-Zubair and al-Hādhāchī both extended the mosque, and Ibn al-Zubair was the first to put a roof on the walls; the columns were cut by 'Abd al-Malik and he made a roof of tappak (Chron. Mekka, i. 307, 309).

The Mosque of 'Amir was extended in 53 with Mus'awiyya's permission by his governor Maslama b. Mukhallad to the east and north; the walls were covered with plaster (niṣīra) and the roofs decorated; it is evident from this that here also the original booth of the south side was altered to a covered hall during the early Omayyad period.

A further extension was made in 79 in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik (Maqrizī, iv. 7, 8; Ibn Daʾūd, b. 62). Thus we find that during the early Omayyad period and in part even earlier the original simple and primitive mosques were some extended, some altered. The alteration consisted in the old simple booth of the Mosque of the Prophet being gradually enlarged and transformed into a pillared hall with the assistance of the craft of architects possessing a higher degree of civilization. In this way what has essentially been an open place of assembly developed imperceptibly into a court, surrounded by pillared halls. Very soon a fountain was put in the centre of the court and we now have the usual type of mosque. The same plan is found in the peristyle of the houses and in the nihra of a basilica like that of Tyre (Herzog-Hauch, Realencyclopädie, x. 780).

The great builders of the Omayyads, 'Abd al-Malik and his son al-Walid I, made even more rapid progress. The former entirely removed the original mosque in Jerusalem and his Byzantine architects erected the Dome of the Rock, a Byzantine building (cf. Sauvain, Jérusalem Héron, p. 57 sqq.). Al-Walid likewise paid equal attention to the oldest form of mosque when, in Damascus, he had the church of St. John transformed by Byzantine architects into the Mosque of the Omayyads. As al-Malakiyya distinctly states, they wanted to rival the splendours of the Christian churches (B. G. A., iii. 159). The new mosques, which were founded in this period, were therefore not only not longer simple, but they were built with the help of Christians and other trained craftsmen with the use of material already existing in older buildings. Al-Hādhāchī, for example, used materials from the surrounding towns when building his foundation of Wāṣīt (Tabari, iii. 321; Baladhurī, p. 290). Columns from churches were now used quite regularly (e.g. in Damascus: Mas′ūdī, Murādī, iii. 408; Ramān, B. G. A., i. 165; cf. Baladhurī, p. 143 sqq.; for Egypt see Maqrizī, iv. 36, 124 sqq.). Sometimes remains of the older style remained alongside of the new. In Irāq, al-Malakiyya found in the chief wooden mosque columns of the time of Abū Muslim along with round columns of brick of the time of 'Amr b. al-Laqith (B. G. A., iii. 316). The building activities of al-Walid extended to al-Furūṭ, Mecca and Medina (cf. B. G. A., v. 106 sqq.) where no fundamental alterations were made, but complete renovations were carried out. With these rulers, the building of mosques reaches the level of the older architecture and gains a place in the history of art. There is also literary evidence for the transfer of a style from one region to another. In Ḥajrīn, for example, there was a ḥāshar (B. G. A., iii. 436 sqq.; cf. for Shirāz, p. 430). Al-Walid also rebuilt the Mosque of the Prophet, in part in the Damascus style (B. G. A., iii. 80; Kāzimi, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 71).

This revolution naturally did not take place without opposition any more than the other innovations, which Islam adopted in the countries with a higher culture which it conquered. After the Mosque of the Prophet had been beautified by Christian architects with marble, mosaics, shells, gold etc. and al-Walid in 93 was inspecting the work, an old man said: "We used to build in the style of Mosques; you build in the style of Churches" (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 74). The discussions on this point are reflected in hadiths. When 'Omar enlarged the Mosque of the Prophet, he is reported to have said: "Give the people shelter from the rain, but take care to make them red or yellow lest you lead the people astray", while Ibn 'Abbas said: "You shall adorn them with gold as the Jews and Christians do." (Bukhārī, Sunna, b. 62). Ibn 'Abbas here takes up the Omayyad attitude and 'Omar that of old-fashioned people, according to whom any extension or improvement of the gūla was only permissible for strictly practical reasons. The conservative viewpoint is predominant in Ḥadīth. It is said that extravagant adornment of the mosques is a sign of the end of the world; the works of al-Walid were only tolerated from fear of the jinn (Ibn Ḥanbal, Mawsūā, iii. 134, 145, 155, 206, 283; al-Nakā, 'Masjid, b. 2; Ibn Mūja, Masjid, bāb 2). The lack of confidence in pious conservatives in the great mosques finds expression in a hadith according to which the Prophet (acc. to the story of Amas) said: "A time will come over my umma when they will vie with one another in the beauty of their mosques; then they will visit them but little" (al-Asqalānī, Fath al-Bārī, i. 302). In the Fihār, we even find divergence from the oldest quadrangular form of the mosque condemned (Guldī, al-Muhtasar, i. 71). Among the types which arose later was the "suspended" (wuṣūlāt) i.e. a mosque situated in an upper storey (e.g. in Damascus, J. A., ser. ix., vol. v. 409, 415, 424, 447, 430).

2. Details of the Equipment of the Mosque

a. The Minaret (see also Masāra).

The earliest primitive mosques had no minaret. When the ʿaṣḥāb al-khawāṣṣ was introduced, Bīlāl is said to have summoned the faithful in Melita to the early sallāt from the roof of the highest house in the vicinity of the mosque (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 348; Wüstenfeld, p. 75); on the day of the conquest of Mecca, the Prophet instructed Bīlāl to utter the call to prayer from the Kaʿba, according to al-ʿArrāṣī, from the roof (Chron. Mekka, i. 192; cf. Ibn Ḥishām, p. 822). During the early days of Islam, the muʿāththīn did not however utter his summons from an elevated position (cf. below G 2 d). It is doubtful in the first place when the minaret was introduced, and in the second whether it was adopted into Islam, expressly for the call to prayer.

The Omayyad caliph al-Walid (86–96) undoubtedly had considerable importance for the history of the minaret, although even earlier in 703 ʿUthmān b. Ṭālahūn in Kairwan had been built by Ḥassān b. Nuʿmān with a minaret (so according to Uskūn. Sīrat al-Ḥusayn, 189, p. 9). There was also a minaret in the
The mosque has 3 minarets. At the present day, the mosque has 3 minarets. As was the case in the time of Ibn Dhubair, who mentions two on the west and one in the north (Rihla, p. 266), but Ibn Batūtā also says there were three and adds that one was in the west, another in the east and another in the north (l. 203), which agrees with present day conditions. One of the earliest authorities, Ibn al-Qalḥānā, d. 289 = 903, however, mentions only 2 minarets (mlāhīha) and says that in the days of the Greeks it was a watch-tower (mādran), which belonged to the church of St. John and was left standing by al-Walid (B. G. A., iii. 108). Al-Maqrizī, d. 375 = 985, mentions only one minaret, which was above the Bab al-Farrādī, when he calls it a mawāra mubāหa (B. G. A., iii. 159) he may perhaps mean a renovated minaret (cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 229) and besides, his description does not exclude the existence of other minarets. The tradition that the minaret of the Omayyad mosque was taken over from the predecessors of the Muslims long survived; for Yūnās, who mentions the east and west minarets, says that the western belonged to a fire-temple and a flame used to be visible on it (Mudāja, ii. 596) and according to Ibn Batūtā, the east and west minarets had been built by the Byzantines while only the north one was built by the Muslims (l. 203, aq.; a story also given by Abū ʾI-Bayrātī, d. 1093 = 1594) quoting Ibn ʿAsikir (d. 571 = 1171), see J. A., ser. 9, vii. 423; Quatremère, Hist. Sali. Musul., ii. 273). In Mecca also, al-Walid built turrets (jumāfīrah; Chren. Mutka, i. 310), sometimes minarets (as is evident from ibid., p. 310, 311). They were later increased so that Ktb al-Din mentions 7 minarets (ibid., iii. 424--426). According to al-Samhūdī, he also built in Medina 4 towers but Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik, in the year 97 had the southwestern tower taken down, because the shadow of the maʿīthahuma from it fell upon hπ., whereas he was in the house of Marwān b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamid. While al-Samhūdī says that there were no minarets in Medina before al-Walid, he asserts on the other hand that ʿOmar had already built towers in the four corners of the mosque (Wustenfeld, Madina, p. 75; cf. Ibn Batūtā, l. 272). In the time of Ibn Dhubair (in 580) there were still only 3 minarets there (Rihla, p. 195). It was not until 706 that ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz rebuilt the fourth minaret (Wustenfeld, op. cit., p. 76). After the time of al-Walid, minarets became more and more numerous. In Ramlā his brother Ḥishām built a beautiful minaret (B. G. A., iii. 165, 8). For the mosque in Jerusalem Ibn ʿAbd al-Rahūmībī about 400 mentions 4 minarets (Ibīd., Cairo, 1334, iv. 274, aq.) which Maqrīzī al-Din claims to go back to the time of al-Malik (Sauvage, Hist. Jérus., et Hébron, p. 135). Ibn Ḥawqal (367 = 977) expressly notes of the Dāmī (dā̄mī) in Fāraṭa in Khurasan that it did not have a minaret (B. G. A., iii. 321) and he seems to consider it impossible to build two minarets (ibid., p. 13, aq.). Apart from the isolated reference by al-Samhūdī to ʿOmar’s building activities, to which very little importance can be attached, it is probable from this evidence that al-Walid was the first to introduce the minaret into Syria and the Ḥijāz. That he introduced it into Iṣlām itself, is however not certain. According to al-Baladhūrī (d. 279 = 892), Ẓiyād b. Ḥaṣan, where he was governor in 45, built the minaret of shīne, when he built the mosque of brick (p. 348). This seems to suggest that there was already a minaret there. According to the Egyptian historians, Maṣlama b. Muqāakhir in al-Fuṣūlī multāwīa b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s orders in 53 built a tower at each corner of the mosque of ʿAmr (pawūna), which had not been done before (Maqrīzī, iv. 7, 44; Ibn Tabgrībīrī, l. 77). The staircase leading up to the minaret was originally outside the mosque, but was later put inside. Maṣlama is said to have introduced the minaret into other mosques in al-Fuṣūlī (i.e. in all except those of Tujīb and Khwālan; cf. Maqrīzī, iv. 44; Ibn Tabgrībīrī, loc. cit.). How old this story is, cannot be ascertained, but the view often put forward that al-Walid was the first to introduce the minaret (cf. Schwally, in Z. D. M. G., iii. 1898, p. 143--149), is in any case not certain. There are three names in common use for the minaret. Maḍṣūna or mīṭḥana, "place of the ashāb call", which is in general use in Egypt and Syria at the present day, is frequently found in literature and inscriptions (B. G. A., iii. 225, 35; v. 108, 5; Maqrīzī, iv. 19; 30; 41; 121; 130; 5; Ibn Asīfī, ii. 204, a form below; v. Berchem, Corpus, i., n. 25, 63, 88, 89, 90 and others from the 9th century onwards). Sawūna, especially used in North Africa (Maqrīzī, Les Monuments arabes de Tlemcān, 1903, p. 45), is frequently found (Ibn Dhubair, Rihla, p. 91, 100, 145, 195, 266; Ibn Batūtā, l. 203, 272; ii. 2, 12, 13; Maqrīzī, iv. 7, 47; Ibn Tabgrībīrī, l. 77). This word means also cloister or cell and in the older literature is used as the equivalent of datr (Sūra xxiii. 41; Ibn al-Haṣān, p. 115; Buḫkātī, Al-Amlī & l-Sāḥib, p. 7; Maḍījī, p. 35; Abīyās, p. 48; B. G. A., i. 154; Maqrīzī, iv. 389; Ibn al-Farīdī, Tāʾyīna, p. 561). Manārī is the most usual word in literature (Maqrīzī, iv. 7, 63; cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i., n. 63, K. al-Maṣḥūlī, i. 63, 67). This word has the same meaning as Sūr. ʿarba`a but is probably an analogou, independent formation. The word means light, position in which a light is put (Imnūr, Dīwān, 148, 37; Abū Dhubair, Dīwān, ed. Bell, i. 60; B. G. A., vii. 132); also lighthouse (B. G. A., iii. 177; Kindl, Wustl, p. 64; Ibn Dhubair, Rihla, p. 41). Manār (l.) also means a boundary stone or a signpost (Sīdīm; Lūṣān, vii. 99, a. from below; Kaīs al-Ruṣayyī, p. 37; 70; 8, Ibn Saʿīd, 115, 135; Fr. Mutka, Hist. Arab., ii. 22 and (2); or a watch tower (Ṭabarī, i. 864, 873). The boundary stones of the barna area, for example, are called Manār al-Ḥaram (B. G. A., ii. 25) and Alabrah was called Dhuʾ l-Manār, because he put up signposts (Lūṣān, vii. 105, 19; Dīwān, Ṣāḥīl, i. 410); obelisks are also called manārā (B. G. A., vii. 117, 118, 120). The derivation of the last named name, menārā from mithrā, is little likely and still less probable is a derivation from a Persian building for fire-worship (v. Berchem in E. Diez, Chron. arabs. und byz. Bödenkmls., i. (1908), 112, 129, who distinguishes rather ingeniously between menār "light" from nūr and manār = "fire-tower" from nūr). Probably there is only a single word in question and the signposts received their name from the watch-tower (note that alam also is used of the minaret: Ibn ʿArābī, Vit. Timurī, ed. Manger, 1767, iii. 704). There are a number of references to the existence on the coasts of a series of manārī and each manārī gave warning by light-signals of the movements of the enemy (B. G. A., iii. 177). According to al-Baladhūrī
(p. 129: manâzir), this was already the custom in 'Omar's time and was in all probability an inheritance from the Byzantines. Similar watch-towers (simanturion) were used inland in the Byzantine period e.g. in the eastern Ḥawrân, and the Persians had similar towers on their frontiers (manâzir: Tabari, i. 864, 878); a similar manâzir in the 'Irâk is described by Ibn Djbair (p. 210; cf. B. G. A., v. 175); in the Maghrib also, fort-like towers are called manâzir, e.g. in Tunis and Gabès (al-Tâkidîn in 706–708; J. A., ser. 4, xx. (1652), 99, 144). That these towers used fire-signals is very probable and Musli gives evidence of this custom for the Edom territory (Arabia Petraea, ii. 2, 232). In the valley (in the 7th century) are mentioned the same 'Umâri (Târikî bi-l-Maghrib al-'Ashrâf, Cairo 1312, p. 109 sq.) refers to the use of a series of heights and towers for light-signals, including the Ma'dhanat al-'Arîb, one of the minarets of the Omayyad mosque of Damascus (on the whole question see R. Hartmann, in Z. D. M. G., lxx. 1916, p. 486, 505; Meissner, iii. 323; ibl., i. 385 sq.). It is obvious that the tower of the mosque was given the name ma'dhâr from its resemblance to similar watch-towers and it is possible that its use for fire-signals was more general in earlier times. In Fâs the hours of prayer were indicated by lamps from the minarets (J. A., ser. 11, xiii. 1918, p. 411). This does not however answer the question why the minaret was introduced into Islam. From what has been said above it is probable that the minaret was introduced specially for the adhâb call.

According to Ibn Al-Fâkîh and others, it was incorporated in the Mosque of the Omayyad, simply because it was already there as a part of the church (cf. above); this agrees with de Vogüe's observation that the use of towers in churches and the public buildings in Syria in the 16th and 17th century was common (La Syrie centrale, i. 57). The tower in the mosque of Baṣra is thought to be an original church-tower (cf. Dies, Die Kunst der islamischen Völker, p. 19 sq.). This indicates that the minaret in Syria became part of the mosque in a purely architectural way. But after its introduction, it was soon used at a place in which the mu'adhdhin could stand which must have been an obvious thing to do. This did not happen at once however. From Tabari and others we can see that the call to prayer at such a later date could still be uttered in the street, and al-Farazdak (d. about 110 = 728) who refers to the existence of manâzir al-mu'adhdhin (Kâmil, p. 481; Aghâni, 2nd ed. Cairo, xix. 18) also speaks of mu'adhdhin on the city wall (Tabari, ii. 1302; Naqqash, p. 365; see J. Horovitz, in Isl., xiv. 1927, p. 853, 855) with which we may compare the tradition that the Prophet considered whether he ought to permit the call to prayer to be uttered on the fortifications of Madina (Calâ' al-dîmân al-Madîna; cf. Ibn Sîd., i. 7).

It is however by no means impossible that the minaret may have arisen elsewhere in a different way. If we can trust the account by Al-Makrîzî and others (see above), the minaret was introduced into Egypt by Mu'awîya's orders as a corner tower. Here it was at all times used in a way which recalls the dew-towers of ascetics. It was used for the adhâb, but not only for the five calls to prayer but also for vigils, in which the mu'adhdhin repeated litanies (Makrîzî, iv. 44 middle) and its architect, Maslama b. Mukhallad, used it for the fi'ilâb (ibid., p. 44). An ascetic who died in 409 lived in the manâzir of the Mosque of 'Amr (Yâkût, Uda'ib, iv. 274). This suggests the meaning of minaret expressed by the word wâdâ' (cf. also Makrîzî, iv. 7, 8) as a saint's cell. According to one source, rather late however, al-Walîd is said to have found a monk in the tower of the church of St. John who lived in the wâdâ' there (cf. J. A., ser. 9, vii. p. 189; Quartemière, Hist. Sainte. Maml. al-Fâs, 264). This use of the minaret was kept up during the golden age of Islam. Thus Ibn Djbair records that he saw in the west minaret of the mosque of the Abbasids called Minaret Maghribi and in the topmost chamber, where al-Ghazâlî had lived in fi'ilâb, there was now a sâhid (Râhî, p. 266, 349–407); Ibn Tumart also lived there (Yâkût, Ma'dhâm, ii. 556, 17 sq.) and 'Abd al-Latif also found another devotee living there (Ibn Abî Usâîla, ii. 204, 4 from below). According to al-Makrîzî, the Egyptian minaret was not introduced in a purely architectural way, but even from his account it appears most likely to be Syrian in origin.

If the minaret did not have a single origin, it is improbable that a single type of tower served as the model for it. Ziyâd is said to have built the minaret in Baṣra of stone. The quadrangular Syrian Omayyad type (B. G. A., iii. 182), which was taken over from the church-tower, was also of stone. In Egypt, on the other hand, according to al-Makrîzî, minarets for many centuries were only built of brick and the earliest stone minarets in this country were not built till shortly before 720 in al-Manṣûra and al-Âqaba (Makrîzî, iv. 234). In North Africa where the Omayyad, Syrian type was introduced, a round minaret of brick in 7 stories with pillars was built in Abâsîya south of Kairawân in 814 (800) (Yâkût, Ma'dhâm, iv. 119). Ibn al-Hâdi'dî condemns minarets of his time as being built too high. It is interesting to note as throwing a light on what was considered bid'â that he regards the round form as the old and genuine one (Ma'dhâm, ii. 61 below). — For literature see Fraenkel, Schwall, v. Berchem, R. Hartmann, Horovitz quoted above; Doutte, in R. Afr., iv. 1900, p. 339 sqq.; J. H. Gotthelf in J. Am. O. S., xxx. 1909–1910, p. 133–154. K. A. C. Creswell, in Burlington Magazine, xlviii. 1926, p. 134–140, 252–258, 290–296. 3. The Chambers.

The old mosque consisted of the courtyard and the open halls running along the walls; these were called al-mughâbbât (B. G. A., iii. 158, 165, 182) because they were roofed over. When we are told that in Palestine, except in Jericho, towers were placed between the mughâbat and the courtyard (ibid., p. 182), this seems to suggest that the halls were closed, which would be quite in keeping with the winter climate of this region.

The halls were particularly extensive on the fîlla side, because assemblies were held here. The space between two rows of pillars was called mood of arwûbah or ra'i (B. G. A., iii. 158, 159; Makrîzî, iv. 50, 11, 12, 49). Extension often took the form of increasing the number of the arwûbah. In some districts a sail-cloth was spread over the open space as a protection from the sun at the time of the service (B. G. A., iii. 205, 430).

The courtyard was called fâhû. The open space around the Ka'ba is called fâhû as well.
There were not at first enclosed chambers in the halls. A change in this respect came with the introduction of the maṣṭāra [q.v.] (on this word cf. Quatremere, Hist. Sult. Musul., i, p. 164, note 46). This was a box or compartment for the ruler built near the miḥrāb. Al-Samhūlī gives the history of the maṣṭāra in Medīna (Wustenfeld, Medīna, p. 71, n. 99). The traditions all agree that the maṣṭāra was intended to protect the ruler from hostile attacks. According to some men, 'Abū Ḥanīfa built a maṣṭāra of lakīn with windows so that the people could see the Imam of the community (ibid. and Makrī, iv, 7). According to another tradition, Marwān b. 'Abd al-Ḥakam, governor of Medīna, after an attempt had been made on him by a Yāmān in the year 44, was the first to build a maṣṭāra of dressed stone with a window (Baladhūrī, p. 6 below; Ṭabarist, ii, 70). Muḥāwīya is then said to have followed his example. Others again say that Muḥāwīya was the first to introduce this innovation. He is said to have introduced the maṣṭāra with the accompanying guard as early as the year 40 or not till 44 after the Ḥijrīdījī attempt (Ṭabarist, i, 3465, s. B. Ṭabarist, v, 109, s. 3; Makrī, iv, 12a, s. 89); according to one story because he had seen a dog on the minbar (Baladhūrī, ed. Schwally, p. 393 below; cf. on the whole question: H. Lammens, Maṣṭārah, p. 202 sq.). This much seems to be certain, that the maṣṭāra was at any rate introduced at the beginning of the Omayyad period and it was an arrangement so much in keeping with the increasing dignity of the ruler that, as Ibn Ḥalīlī says, it spread throughout all the lands of Islam (Maṣṭārah, Cairo 1322, p. 232 ap., foâl 37). The governors built themselves compartments in the principal mosques of the provinces, e. g., Ziyād in Kūfa and Basra (Baladhūrī, p. 377, 348) and probably Kurra b. Ṣhārīk in al-Fustāṭ (Makrī, iv, 12). In Medīna, we are told that 'Omar b. 'Abd al-ʿAzīz as governor (86–93) raised the maṣṭāra and built it of teak, but al-Muḥādī had it taken down in 160 and a new one built on the level of the ground (ibid., p. 7; Wustenfeld, ap, cit.; Baladhūrī, p. 7 centre). We are further told that in 161, al-Muḥādī prohibited the maṣṭāra of the provinces and al-Muʿāūdūn even wanted to clear all the boxes out of the masjidīd ġūlām, because their use was a sumur introduced by Muḥāwīya (Makrī, iv, 12; Yaʿqūbī, ed. Houtsma, ii, 571). By this attempt success did not occur. On the contrary, their numbers rapidly increased. In Cairo, for example, the Dājīmi al-ʿĀskār built in 1695 a maṣṭāra (Makrī, iv, 33 sq.) and the mosque of Ibn Ṭullūn had a maṣṭāra beside the miḥrāb which was accessible from the Dār al-lnsāra (ibid., p. 36, 37, 44; Ibn Ṭabaristi, ii, 8, 14). The maṣṭāra was found in the larger mosques. In the Dājīmi al-Kalīf, Muḥammad b. Kalīfūn in 718 built a maṣṭāra of iron for the Sulṭān’s ṣālī (Makrī, iv, 132). According to Ibn Ḥalīlī, the maṣṭāra was an innovation of Islam’s own. The question must however be left open, whether in its introduction and development there may not be some connection with the boxes of the Byzantine court, at least, for example, when the Tūrkā in the Ṭabārī Dājīmi in Brussa put the Sulṭān’s box over the door (R. Hartmann, Im neuen Anatolien, p. 27).

Although the maṣṭāra was introduced with the object of segregating the ruler and was therefore condemned by the strict as contrary to the spirit of Islam (e. g., Maṣṭārah, ii, 43 sq.), maṣṭāra were probably introduced for other purposes. Ibn Ḥalīlī mentions three in the Mosque of the Omayyads: the old one built by Muḥāwīya in the eastern part of the mosque, one in the centre, which contained the minbar, and one in the west where the Ḥanafīs taught and performed the ṣalāt. There were also other small rooms shut off by wooden lattices, which could be sometimes called maṣṭāra and sometimes ṣāwīya. As a rule, there were quite a number of ṣāwīya connected with the mosque which were used by students (Rīhī, p. 265 sq.). We find the same state of affairs in other mosques.

While the groups of the kūra, the students, lawyers etc. had originally to sit together in a common room, gradually the attempt was made to introduce separate rooms for some of them. Small compartments were either cut off in the main chamber or new rooms were built in subsidiary buildings. In the former case we get the already mentioned maṣṭārah or ṣāwīya. Ibn al-Ḥājīdī says that a madrasa was often made by the simple process of cutting off a part of a mosque by a balustrade (dahrnāmā) (Maṣṭārah, ii, 44). Thus in the halls of the Mosque of Amr there were several compartments for teaching, which are called maṣṭāra and ṣāwīya, in which studies were prosecuted (Makrī, iv, 26, 61, 91). In the Ashar Mosque a Maṣṭārah Fāruma was made in the time of the Omayyads, where she had appeared, and the emin in the following period made a large number of such maṣṭāra (Maṣṭārah, p. 125, 126). In the Aṣr Mosque about 300 A. H., there were three maṣṭāra for women (B. G. A., v, 100). These divisions might be a nuisance at the great Friday assemblies and this is why the numbers wanted to remove them in 161 from the maṣṭājah al-dījamāt (Ṭabarist, ii, 486).
and Ibn al-Hasnî condemned them as works of the *swâhîl* and numbered them with other embellishments with the *azkâr al-'idâlah* (Mâṣṣâlî, ii. 43 sq.).

The muʿādhdhîns not only lived in the minarets, where, at any rate in the Tâllâmîd period, they held vigils (Mâktrî, i. 48). They had rooms (gâzûf, sg. gâzûf) on the roof and these rooms in time came to be numerous (ibid., p. 13, 14). All kinds of rooms were put in subsidiary buildings, for the khâthî (ibid., p. 13), for judges, for studies, etc. In addition there were dwelling-houses, not only for the staff but also for others. As already mentioned, devout men used to take up their residence in the mosque for a considerable period, for *ibâdât*, and any one at any time could take up his quarters in the mosque; he could sleep there and make himself at home. It therefore came quite natural to the devout to reside permanently in the mosque. As ascetics often lived in the minaret (see above), a *sâhib* lived on the roof of the Aţzar mosque, others made themselves cells in the mosque, as a *shâkhî* in Naṣîrîd days (Ibn Djihaîrî, Alkhâfa, p. 240; cf. in Harrûn, p. 235) and as happened in Salâh al-Dîn's time in the mosque of the Omayyads (Ibn Abî Usâibî, ii. 182). It was however usual for very few to live in the side rooms of the mosque, as was the case for example, in the Mosque of the Omayyads (Ibn Djihaîrî, p. 269; Ibn Batûṭa, i. 206). In particularly holy mosques like that in Hebron, houses for al-*mawâlik* were built around the sacred place (Sauvare, Hist. Jumra, et Alhôr, p. 11 sq.) and also beside the Masjid Nabî at the ancient Ninevah (C. G. A., ii. 146). Kitchens were therefore erected with the necessary mills and ovens and cooked food (dîjâqer) and 14–15,000 loaves (râṣâqâr) were daily distributed to those who stayed there and to visitors (Sauvare, p. 20 sq.; cf. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Mâmîlî, i. 11, 235). Bread was also baked in the mosque of Ibn Tâlîn (Quatremère, op. cit., i. 123) and kitchens were also found in the mosques (for al-Aţzar, see Djihaîrî, Merveilles, iii. 238 sq.; Salââmîn Rasûl, Kans al-Djâhâër fi Ta'rîkh al-Ă('~)lî, p. 71 sqq., 107 sqq.). Those who lived in and beside the mosque were called *mawâlik* (cf. B. G. A., ii. 146; for Jerusalem, Nâzîrî Khosraw, p. 82, 91; for Mecca, Ibn Djihaîrî, p. 149; for Medina, Ibn Batûṭa, i. 279, where we learn that they were organized under a *fâddîm*, like the North Africans under an *amîr* in Damascus; Ibn Djihaîrî, p. 277 sq.). They were pious ascetics, students, and sometimes travellers. The students generally found accommodation in the madrâsât but large mosques like that of the Omayyads or al-Aţzar had always many students who lived in them. The name of the halls *rîwâyât*, plur. *arîwâyi* was later used for these students' lodgings (cf. V. Berchem, Corpus, i. 43, note 1; perhaps Maâktrî, iv. 54 sq.). Strangers always found accommodation in the mosques (cf. C. 1). In smaller towns it was the natural thing for the traveller to spend the night in the mosque and to get food there (Yâkût, iii. 385; al-Kûfî, Ta'rîkh al-Hamâma, ed. Lipperie, p. 252). Travellers like Nâzîrî Khosraw, Ibn Djihaîrî, Ibn Batûṭa, al-Âbdalî (J. A., ser. 5, iv. 185 sq., p. 174) were always received by the whole Muslim world from one mosque to the other (or madrâsîn or rişâ'. That the traveller could even leave his money for safe keeping in a mosque (Sâfar-al-mu'âm, p. 51). Large endowments were bequeathed for those who lived in the mosques (Ibn Djihaîrî, op. cit.; Ibn Taghribrîdî, vii. 105 sq.).

In later times the rulers often built a lodge or pavilion (*manâjara*) in or near the mosque (Mâktrî, ii. 345; v. 13; cf. on the word: Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Mâmîlî, i. 11, 15).

There was often a special room with a clock in the mosques; this also is probably an inheritance from the church, for Ibn Rosta (290 = 903) talks of similar arrangements in Constantinople (B. G. A., vii. 126 supra). Ibn Djihaîrî (p. 270) describes very fully the clock in the Mosque of the Omayyads (cf. J. A., ser. 9, vii. 205 sq.). It was made in the reign of Nâr al-Dîn by Fâkhr al-Dîn b. al-Sâdî (Ibn Abî Usâibî, ii. 182 sq.), an expert was kept to look after it: ibid., p. 191.

There was a clock in the Mustamîrîyn in Baghdad (Satre and Herzfeld, Arch. Restor., i. 170) and the Mosque of ‘Aţur also had a *gâzûf* (Mâktrî, iv. 13, 15). In the Mosque of Ibn Tâlîn it is still kept a sundial of the year 696 (1296–1297; cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i. No. 514) but the clocks were usually mechanical (see also Desy, Supplement, s.v. minjâma and on the clock generally E. Wiedemann, in Novis Acta der N. Leop. Carol. Akad., vol. C, Halle 1915). In the Maghrîb we also find mosque-clocks, e.g. in the Bilâdînî (J. A., ser. 11, xii. 357 sqq.).

The very varied uses to which the mosques were put resulted in their becoming storehouses for all sorts of things. In 668, the Mosque of the Omayyads was cleared of all such things; in the courtyard there were for example stores for machines of war and the *zîwâyât* of Zain al-Âbdîn was a regular *kâlb* (J. A., ser. 9, vol. vii. 225 sq.).

C. Mîhârî b. q. v.

Whether the Prophet considered it necessary to erect an indicator of the direction of prayer in Medina may be considered doubtful. According to Tradition, when the revelation of the alteration of the *kiblâ* came to him, he turned round in the middle of the prayer without further investigation (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 41, 63; Tâbâri, Ta'âfîr, x. 25 centre; Muslim, Mâṣṣâlî, u. 2). On the masjîd however and on journeys he used a spear, which was stuck in the ground right in front of him, but this *sârâ* (q. v.) was not intended so much to give the direction as to be a substitute for the wall, to mark the area of the worshipper; it could therefore also be an animal or something living thing (Bakîjârî, Sulât, B. 18, 80, 90–92; Muslim, Sulât, tr. 46; Zakânî on Mâṣṣâlî, p. 183; Abî Dîwâli, l. 69; A. Hanbal, Mâsâlî, ii. 106). At the present day the mîhârî is often called *kâlb* (and as early as Ibn Taghribrîdî, i. 355; Yâkût, i. 647).

In Al-Fusâlî ‘Aţur is said to have ascended the *kiblâ* very carefully with the help of many others (Maâktrî, iv. 6 supra; B. G. A., viii. 359; Ibn Taghribrîdî, i. 75 sq.). But we are not told how it was indicated, probably by a pole or something of the kind. The *kiblâ* was too far to the east, so that during the prayer the worshippers turned more to the south. At first they were probably content with the direction, roughly correct, in keeping with a hadith of Abî Hurairâ, according to which the *kiblâ* in general lies between east and west (Tâmirîîh, Minâkî al-Sulât, p. 139; Maâktrî, iv. 24). The first mosque in Isâbaa was built where Abî Mâsîah had performed the *salât*, and a brick placed in position...
by him was taken as the ḥibba (B. G. A., vii. 200). But later the problem was tackled seriously. Maḵrit mentions the different solutions of it in Egypt (iv. 21-33). Al-Ašhar had the ḥibba accurate; the maḥdir al-ghaḥba, i.e. that of the Mosque of ʿAmr and those of the mosques in Dīnār, Bībī, Alexandria, ʿAṣīr and Assūnī were too far to the east, that of the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn was founded by commission to be 14 daraḥ too far west, those of the villages too far west. The direction was ascertained from the stars. Many however followed the ḥibba of Syria. In the transformation of churches into mosques, frequent under Al-Maʿṣūm, their orientation from east to west was decisive. The door on the east side as a rule was made the miḥrab (Maḵrit, iv. 30).

The word miḥrab before and after the beginning of Islam meant in the first place a palace or a part of one. Imruʿul-Qays, p. 52, 35, South Ar.; Ṣafqāḏāšiyāt, p. 21, 17, Persia; Baḥtrān, Hāzīda, p. 404, 4; Kāṣṣal-Ruṣāyīt, p. 2, 59, 49, 8; also women's apartments. Omar b. Rabīʿa, p. 136, 8; 247; 5; Maḵrit, iv. 378, 4, a secondly a niche where a bust stood; e.g. before Imruʿul-Qays (Ibn Kuṭab, ʿUyān al-ʿAḥāb, p. 356) and for the Muslim period (Ḥuḡat al-ʾAḥāf, p. 90, 44; Baḥtrān, Ṣafqāḏās, p. 692), especially of a too small with an image, a Christian saint (ʿUmar b. Rabīʿa, p. 262, 9). Perhaps the part of the palace, called miḥrah in the above examples, is simply a niche with a throne in it (cf. exp. Ṣafqāḏāšiyāt, p. 21, 17). The same use of the word is found in the Kūrān. In Sūrā xxxvii. 20, it means the part of the palace where the king in it; xxxiv. 12, most important in the mosques where images are put, and iil. 32 sqq., xix. 12, a temple or rather a cell in a temple where one prays. At a still later date we find expressions like miḥrah al-madāḥah, apparently a name for the apse in the church behind the altar (J. A., ser. 9, vii. 189). Miḥraḥ has been derived from kaḥba "spear" and from South Arabic mikrah, Ethip. meḥarrī, "Temple" but the etymology is not certain (see on the whole question: Fequet, Fromodwörter, p. 234; Rhodock-Neukirch, in W. Z. K. M., xiii, 1905, p. 296-9; Prütstorfer, in Z. D. M. G., xxxi, 1907, p. 621 sqq.; Nöldeke, Neues Beiträge zu sm. Sprachen, p. 52, note 2; Lammen, in J. A., ser. xi, vi. 247; Becker, Islamstudien, ii. 492 sqq.; J. Hörvitz, in Ilt., 1947, p. 260 sqq.).

If the word miḥrah means the niche placed in the mosque in the direction of prayer, this concept quite well with the usual usage of the word. All are agreed that the miḥrah did not originally belong to the mosque and that it was taken over from the church and finds confirmation in Muslim literature (see Lammen, Zādd, p. 33, note 7; 94, note 1) and it is evident that the innovation found its way into the mosque by a purely architectural way. The miḥrah became the place where the imām stood during the salāt it is therefore be assumed that it was one of the principal niches in the church, which was taken over into the mosque, it may have contained the bishop's throne or the image of an important saint.

There is no unanimity as to the date when the miḥrah was introduced into the mosque. Muṣawīyya is occasionally mentioned (B. G. A., v. 109, 3) as a rule, however, and probably with greater right, al-Walīd. His governor ʿOmar b.

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz is said to have introduced it into Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 74; B. G. A., iii. 80, 17 however takes it for granted that ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz only revived it); similarly his governor Kurra b. Sharkī (90-96) is recorded to have introduced the prayer niche (miḥrah madāʾanṭum) into Egypt (Maḵrit, iv. 6, 12, 9; Ibn Dājmūk, iv. 62, 12 sqq.; Ibn Taghribīrā, i. 76; Sayyūtī, Ḥasan al-Maḥdiyya, ii. 135 sqq.). Only occasionally is Muṣawīyya's governor Maslama b. Muḥammad (77-82) or ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān (65-94) mentioned as having introduced this innovation (Maḵrit, iv. 6). It therefore seems that it is wrong when one of the maḥdir in the Mosque of the Omayyads is described as the oldest in Islam. But it is an anachronism to call it miḥrah al-ghaḥba and attribute it to Muṣawīyya (Ibn Dībāḥ, p. 265; Ibn Bāṭṭūtā, i. 203). The miḥrah is however said not yet to have come into general use in the second century (see Lammen, Zādd, p. 94, note 1) on the other hand, Ṭabari presupposes a miḥrah in the Muslim sense as early as David (Ṭabari, i. 2408, 7, 11; B. G. A., ii. 112, 26 sqq.); other prophets also had their miḥrahs in Jerusalem, ibid.

In the larger mosques there were usually several miḥrahs, used by the different madāʾanṭum; in the mosque of ʿAmr, for example (according to Ibn Taghribīrā, i. 79, in Hebron (Sauvage, Hist. Jérusalem, i. 17, in the mosque of the Omayyads (J. A., ser. 9, viii. 215 sqq.; Ibn Dībāḥ and Ibn Bāṭṭūtā as above). They might be of wood, but as a rule they were built of marble or put on pillars. They were often highly ornamented. In the miḥrah of al-Walīd, a looking-glass that had belonged to ʿAḥīṣa is said to have been placed (Karwīn, ii. 71). A Fāṭimid adorned a miḥrah in the mosque of ʿAmr and one in the Asbar mosque with a silver girdle which weighed 5,000 dirhams (Maḵrit, iv. 52).

The general objections to adorning mosques were also applied to the miḥrah. A ḫadhlū is said to have forbidden this as an inheritance from the churches; it is compared with the altars (see Lammen, Zādd, p. 33, note 7, 94, note 1), but even a puritan like Ibn Ḥaḍīl does not reject the miḥrah in principle; hence condemns its adornment (Madkhal, ii. 48). In fact the miḥrah was held in special respect as the most important part of the mosque which found expression in the erection of a ʿaḥba over it (e.g. Maḵrit, iv. 91; cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i, No. 79). The special importance of the miḥrah is shown from the fact that its position was occasionally revealed in dreams, e.g. in Kaʾrāwān (Yaqūt, iv. 233) and in the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn; here the Prophets appeared to Ahmad b. Ṭūlūn and showed him the miḥrah and the spot was surrounded by ants (Maḵrit, iv. 39). In the principal mosque of Sāmū there was a prophet's tomb under the miḥrah (B. G. A., iii. 110), which recalls Christian altars. As the most sacred part of the mosque, the miḥrah is compared not only with Christian altars, but the word is used of the sacred place of prayer in any sanctuary, e.g. in the pre-Christian temple, which stood on the site of the later mosque of the Omayyads (J. A., ser. 9, vi. 247, note 731). In Palestine, in keeping with this idea, very many miḥrahs are said to have been the miḥrahs of Biblical personalities (see Sauvage, Hist. Jér. et Hébr., p. 42, 76, 96 sqq., 102; Le Strange, Palestine, Index).
In contrast to the miḥrāb, the minbar was introduced in the time of the Prophet himself. The word, often pronounced minbar (cf. Brockeßmann, Grundwörter, I. 161), comes from the root m-n-b high; it could be derived from the Arabic quite easily with the meaning elevation, stand! But it is more probably a loanword from the Ethiopic (Schwally, Z. D. M. G., II., 1885, p. 145–148; Noldeke, Neue Rechtslexig., 8. SEM., Sprachw., 1910, p. 49). Its case is therefore somewhat similar to that of masjid. It means seat, chair (e. g. Chron. Metha, ii. 8; Ashäni, Cairo, xiv. 75) and is used, for example, for saddle (Tabari, Gisl.) and of a litter (Ashäni, xiii. 158; cf. Schwally). It is therefore identical with madžfa (Buhammad, Qumara, B. 23), with varī (Kamit, p. 20; Ashäni, iii. 3), ṣuvar or horat (Ibid., I. 214; cf. also Becker, Kassim, p. 8). The use of the word for the pulpit is in keeping with its history.

When the khāṭib (q.v.) spoke among the Arabs, he usually did so standing (cf. Musulmânul Syâr, ed. Iyyal, cxi. 1; Dīyārbakr, Bayâni, Cairo 1932, i. 129; ii. 143) frequently beating the ground with his hands and shouting (Ibid., i. 105; Lahid, 7, 15, 9, 45). He used not just to stand there but also on the steps of the pulpit (Bayâni, i. 27, 33; i. 141). The Prophet did both of these things. In ‘Arafah he sat on his camel during his khâṭa and on other occasions, when addressing the community during the early period, even as late as the day of the capture of Mecca, he stood (cf. Sīra Ixii. 11). The people sat on the ground around him (Buhammad, Qumara, B. 28; Tobâin, B. 6). In the mosque in Medina he had a particular place, as is mentioned in the stories of the introduction of the minbar. Sometimes, we are told, he stood beside a tree or a palm-tree (Buhammad, Manâshi, B. 25; ed. Kreil, ii. 400) as a rule however, beside a palm-trunk (Dīyārbakr, so Ibn Sa’d, i. 9, 10, 11, 12) and on a few occasions beside one of the pillars (Buhammad, Manâshi, B. 25; ed. Kreil, ii. 400; cf. Dīyārbakr, Khâns, 172). This is undoubtedly the original tradition: the Prophet stood beside one of the palm-trunks used as pillars in the mosque. For “beside” (usually ḥâna la; Buhammad, Bayâni, B. 32; Ibn Sa’d ibid.) “up” (Qumara, al.; already in Buhammad, Qumara, B. 26) is sometimes found later and for the column or trunk, we find a stump on which he sat.

Various passages record how the minbar was introduced, notably the following: Ibn Sa’d, i. 11, 8–10; Buhammad, Sâlih, B. 18, 64, 91; Qumara, B. 26; Bayâni, B. 32; Hikah, B. 3; Manâshi, B. 25; Muslim, Masjid, tr. 10; a. also Wimink, Handbuch...s. u. v. Füllit; Uth al-Idâba, i. 43 infra; 214; Wüsstenfeld, Medina, p. 62 sqq. a. Ibn Batuta, i. 275 sqq.; the whole material is in Dīyārbakr, Khâns, i. 139; b. 75 sqq. and Sirat al-Halâl, ii. 146 sqq. The details are variously given. The minbar, we are told, was built of palm wood or tamarisk from the woods near Medina; the builder was a Byzantine or a Copt and was called Bâkîr or Bâkh, but the names Bâkh (Ibid., i. 43); Maimûn, Ṣabîh, Kullâb, Mina, see Kâmans), are also given. He was a carpenter, but a slave of the wife of one of the Ansâr (or Buhammad, Hikah, B. 2) of the Muhâjirûn. Others say he belonged to al-‘Abbas. The suggestion is sometimes credited to the Prophet and sometimes to others. The palm-trunk is said to have whined like a camel or a child when the Prophet mounted his new seat but was calmed by stroking and kind words from the Prophet. Most stories take it for granted that the minbar was primarily intended for the khâṭa; in some it is added that the object was to enable the large assembly to hear him (Ibn Sa’d, i. 10, 11). We are told also that the Prophet performed the salat on it and, during the war of Ḥâshim, he came down from it. He also took care that the people could see his salat and follow him (Buhammad, Sâlih, B. 18; Qumara, B. 26). This last tradition however presupposes the later custom of standing upon the minbar (note that the same idea of the palm-trunk occurs in Qumara, B. 26).

In this connection it is interesting to note a tradition in Ibn al-Athîr, according to which the Companions asked the Prophet to take up a raised position as many wasfu were coming (Uth al-Idâba, i. 43). Another tradition is in keeping with this, according to which the Prophet, when he was visited by a man named Tâmir, stood on a horat and addressed him from it (Ibid., I. 214; cf. Lâmmes, Medinah, p. 204, note 5). Here he took a seat of honour on which the Qur’an sits. This is undoubtedly in keeping with the character of the minbar; while the raised seat was in general use among the northern Semites the Arabs usually sat on the ground, often leaning against a saddle. The raised seat was the special mark of the ruler or, what is the same thing, of the judge. We are told that Rabî’ b. Muhammad was the first to sit on a minbar or wasf when acting as judge (Ashäni, 2nd Cairo ed., iii. 3; Maqrizi, iv. 6 sqq.). Al-Ḥâjîdji, for example, when he addressed the people (hardly in the mosque) sat on a chair which belonged to him (Kurîr, Tubã, B. 959) and when he threatened and condemned his enemies, a wasf was erected for him (Ibid., p. 1199); in the same way a horat was placed for Yazid when he issued his orders for a battle (Ibid., p. 1107; see also Becker, Kassim, p. 8).

This tradition usually suggests that the minbar was introduced exclusively for the khâṭa, this seems to be a somewhat one-sided view. The minbar was primarily, as Becker was the first to point out, the throne of the mighty Prophet in his capacity as a ruler. In keeping with this is the tradition that it was introduced in the year 7, 8 or 9 (Tabari, i. 1591; Khâns, ii. 75; Uth al-Idâba, i. 23). The Prophet used it for the publication of important announcements, for example, the prohibition of wine. That he should also make his public speeches to the community from the new seat was only natural. His khâṭas however were not confined to the Friday services when he could still deliver a khâṭa without the minbar, e. g. at the festival on the musalla, where Marwân was the first to put up a minbar (Bâkhârî, Sâlih, B. 6) and beside the Ka’bah after the capture of Mecca ( Ibn Hishâm, p. 823).

The Prophet’s minbar is often called a wád from its material (Bâkhârî, Sâlih, B. 64; Qumara, B. 26). It consisted of two steps and a seat (Maqrizi: Khâns, ii. 75; Bâkhârî, Qumara, B. 23; wasf: Tabari, i. 1591). After the time of the Prophet, it was used in the same way by Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Othman (see below). Its significance as a throne is seen from the fact that in the year 50 Mu’awiyah wanted to take it to Syria with him; but he was not allowed to do so but he raised it by 6 steps. At a later date, ‘Abd al-
Malik and al-Walid are said to have wanted to take the Prophet's minbar to Damascus (Tabart, ii. 92 sq.; Khawārij, ii. 75; Yağıt, ed. Houtoua, ii. 285; B. G. A., v. 23 sq.; Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 63). In the time of the Prophet, it stood against the wall so that a sheep could just get past (Bukhārī, Sahih, p. 91). In the time of al-Maṣṣūni, in the centre of the Mughāfāt there was pointed out the position of the old minbar, above which Ma'ūn's lay was said to have built his new one (B. G. A., ii. 82; cf. ii. 26 and Kašwāt, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 71). According to somejudiths, it was over the hūṣat of the Prophet (Bukhārī, Sahih, fi Manāha, B. 5; Taqā'ī al-Madīna, B. 5, 12 and pass.). At a later date, new minbars were erected in the mosque (see Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 64, 96).

That the Omajjays should have a minbar of their own was natural; they sat on it, just as their predecessors had done (cf. Goldziher, Mekh. Stud., ii. 42). Ma'ūn's lay took it with him on his journey to Mecca (Chron. Mecca, i. 333); he also had it taken to the festivals on the musqāqā (Yağıt, ed. Houtoua, ii. 265), just as Marwān used to do in Medina (see above); it was therefore still portable and indispensable for the sovereign, when he wished to make a public appearance as such. In Ibn Dūfār's time, the minbar al-khūṣāt in Damascüs was in the central musqāqā (Riyāh, p. 265). According to Ibn Khādūn, Mu'āwiyah was the first in Muslim to use the throne (tārir, minbar, būhār, būrit) but he is clearly not referring to the minbar of the mosque (Muhammad, Cairo 1322, p. 205 sq.; fotl. 3, N. 37).

The minbar taken to Mecca by Ma'ūn's lay remained there till the time of al-Raṣḥid; when the latter visited Mecca on his hajj in the year 170 or 174 a minbar muḥāsirī with 9 steps was presented to him by the emir of Egypt and the old one was put up in 'Arafa. At a later date, al-Wāthīk made minbars for Mecca, 'Arafa and Mināf (Chron. Mecca, ii. 333; iii. 114). The Meccan minbar was a portable one. It usually stood beside the musqāqā but was put beside the Ka'ba during the khūṣāt (Ibn Dūfār, p. 95, 97; Chron. Mecca, iii. 429). According to al-Batānī, this custom was kept up until Sulaymūn Qaṣīmī (926-974) built a marble minbar, north of the musqāqā (al-Riyāh al-Hijāzīyya, p. 100).

It seems at first to have been defendable whether muḥāsirī should be put up in the provinces or not. According to al-Ḳātī, 'Amr had a minbar made in al-Fars but 'Omar ordered him to take it away: he was not to raise himself above the Muslims so that they would have to sit below his heels (Maṣāih, iv. 6 sq.; Ibn Taghtāribī, i, 76; Sayyūtī, Ḥikāya al-Muḥāṣirīn, i. 63; ii. 135). The idea obviously was that the throne belonged to the caliph alone. After 'Omar's death however, 'Amr is said to have used a minbar (Maṣāih, iv. 8, 27). It stood there till Kurra b. Shārik rebuilt the mosque. During the rebuilding it was put in the Khaṣāṣur, which was used as a mosque; only when the mosque was completed in the year 947, did Kurra put up a new minbar. Tradition however is uncertain. The minbar removed by Kurra, perhaps dated from 'Abd al-Ḳasīt b. Marwān, who had taken it from a church or had been presented with it by the Nubian King (Maṣāih, iv. 8; Ibn Taghtāribī, i. 78), Kurra's minbar remained till 379 when the Fātimid vizier Yağıt b. Kiliṣa replaced it by a gilded one. A large new minbar was placed in the mosque of 'Amr in 405 by al-Ḥākim (Maṣāih, iv. 8; Ibn Taghtāribī, i. 78 sq.).

We hear of no objections in other places to the minbar in the amṣār. In al-Madī'a it was early as the year 16 Sa'd erected a minbar in the mosque improvised in the Iwān of Qisrā (Tabart, i. 245, 9). In Baṣra, Abd Manṣūr put up a minbar in the middle of the mosque. This was however found inconvenient because the Imām had to cross from the minbar to the tārir "over the necks" of the (seated) believers. Ziyād then placed the minbar against the south wall (Yağıt, i. 642). On the other hand, we are told that 'Abd Allāh b. ʿAbīlās (governor of Baṣra 36-40) was the first to mount the minbar in Baṣra (Dhāhir, Bayān, i. 170). When Ziyād had to fly from Baṣra he saved the minbar which he put up in his Masjid al-Hadīm (Tabart, i. 344 sq.). The minbar was the symbol of the ruler and the mosque in which it was set up constituted him as representative of the ruler. It therefore formed a feature of the Masjid al-Djamā', where the community was officially addressed. In the year 64 therefore, there were minbars in all the provinces.

In this year homage was paid to Marwān b. al-Ḥakam not only in the capital but in other amṣār in the Ḥijāz, Mīr, ʿAlla, Dāstra, Isfahān, Khurasān, and other amṣār (B. G. A., viii. 397). Special mention is made of the fact that Tabariyya had no minbar.

In the first century and beginning of the second, we find the war in the smaller towns, delivering the khūṣāt standing, with the staff only. But in 132 the governor 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān had muḥāsirī put up in the kūsa of Egypt (Maṣāih, iv. 8, 17 sqq.; Ibn Taghtāribī, i. 350 sqq.). When the khūṣāt became purely a divine service and the ruler was no longer the khāṣṣīr (q.v.), the minbar became the pulpit of the spiritual preacher and eventually the Friday service was celebrated was given a minbar. At the same time, i.e. after al-Raṣḥid, the change was gradually completed and the preacher spoke, standing on the pulpit. Hadīth therefore came into existence, according to which the Prophet used to deliver two khūṣāts on Friday, standing "just as is done to-day" (Bekhārī, Dāmirra, p. 27, 30 and 'Omar, ibid., p. 2).

The minbar was thus now quite analogous to the Christian pulpit. It is very probable that this latter also influenced its form. We have already noted above, of a minbar in the mosque of 'Amr, that it was said to be of Christian origin. The same thing came to be said of the Prophet's minbar (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 65). Mu'āwiyah made the Medina minbar larger, while the one brought by him to Mecca had only 3 steps, and was of course portable. We again hear of portable minbars later, which did not exclude their being large (cf. above on the minbar of Mecca). Thus the minbar in al-Maghrib is said to have been portable. Ibn al-Ḥākim regards this (the oldest) custom as ḥadīt and therefore ascribes it to al-Hadīm (Maddihat al-Ḥadā'i, i. 47, 48 sqq.). The oldest minbars were all of wood. There is however one hadīth which says that the Prophet had a kūsrī of wood with iron legs made for the reception of Tamīm (Istād, i. 314, a from below; cf. Lammas, Mu'āwiyah, p. 273; note 3); it is however uncertain what relation this had to the minbar. A minbar of iron was made as early as the Omajjay period (Ibn Taghtāribī, i. 78, 8; al-minbar al-ḥadītī probably correct in
spite of Becker, *Kamil*, pp. 10; note; cf. 79, 9; see below); and also of stone (Goldscheider, *Muh. Stud.*, ii, 42, note 5 with a reference to Ibn Hadjar); later they were also built of bricks (Wiistenfeld, *Medina*, p. 64, 96). As a rule the minbar stood against the kibla wall beside the mihrab. Al-Mahdi had tried to reduce the muinābīr to their original small size (Tabari, iii, 496, 9; Makrizi, iv, 12, 15, 139), but he could not arrest the develop-
ment. In the larger mosques several muinābīr were even built. Ibn al-Fakhri about 500 a. H. already mentions 5 minbars in the mosque in Jerusalem (*B. G. A.*, v, 100, 8 sq.). In the Sultan Husan mosque in Cairo 4 were planned and 3 erected when a minaret fell down in 762 and diverted attention to other work (Makrizi, iv, 117, 18 sq.).

The importance, which the minbar already had in the time of the Prophet, caused special reverence to be paid to it and the sanctity of the mosque was concentrated round this and around the mihrab. The governor of Kufa Khālid b. Abdul Allāh al-Kari (105—120) received a letter of censure from the minbar (*Kamil*, p. 20, 15, 9). A false calumny was even taken on or beside the minbar of the Prophet and led to a violent argument between the government and the Muslims. Ibn Hanbal, *Ma'in*, ii, 329; cf. John Pederson, *D. E. A.*, pp. 144, 147). Legends grew up which represented the Prophet seeing into the future from the minbar (Bukhari, *Q. S.*, b. 29) and being able to follow the battle of Mu'ta from it (cf. Wāкиdī—Wellerhausen, p. 31; Ibn Ḥṣām, p. 796) and also telling how his prayers on the minbar were specially efficacious.

Just as the Ka'bah was covered (bāzā) so was the thing done to the minbar. ʿAbd al-Malik is said to have been the first to cover the minbar of the Prophet with a *hijāma* (*Kamil*, ii, 75, 9; see below). Mu'awiyah did the same thing when he had to give up his attempt to abolish it (*ibid.*, p. 75, 9; Tabari, ii, 92, 9). It was not quite the same thing when al-Hāmid covered the already mentioned minbar and covered it with gilt leather because it was covered with dust (read: hadgār) i.e., not (Ibn Ṭabarī, i, 79, 9; 9). Under the 'Abbāsid a new *kiswa* was sent every year for the minbar of the Prophet from Baghdad; the Sultāns later did not renew it so frequently (Wiistenfeld, *Medina*, p. 64). We find other references to the covering of the minbar on special occasions (Ibn Dūhair, p. 149, 9). Ibn al-Ḥātidī (*Madāḥ al-nizām*, ii, 74) demands that the imām should put a stop to the custom of putting carpets on the minbar. —

(On the question of the minbar see: C. H. Becker, *Die Kaaba in Kultur des altent Islam*, Niederdeutsch-Festschrift, i, 131—134 = *Islamstudien*, i, 450—


**a. Dākka.**

In the larger mosques there is usually found near the minbar a platform to which a staircase leads up. This platform (dākka, popularly often *dikka*) is used as a seat for the mu'nūdhaṭins when pronouncing the call to prayer in the mosque at the Friday service. This part of the equipment of a mosque is connected with the development of the service (cf. below under H.4 and C. H. Becker, *Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus*, iii, 1912, p. 374—399 = *Islamstudien*, i, 472—500; E. Mittwoch, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islamischen Gebets und Kultus*, Abb. Pr. Ak. W., 1913, Phil.

**f. Kurš, Kūrinān and Rekka.**

In the mosques there is usually a kūrinā, that is a wooden stand with a seat and a desk. The desk is for the Kurš, the seat for the *kūrinā* or reader, *jāhib*. Ibn Dūhair attended a divine service in Baghdad at which a celebrated preacher spoke from the minbar, but only after the *sīlah* sitting on *kūrinā* had recited portions of the *Kūrinā* (*)Niharī*, p. 219, 222). The *sīlah* is often identical with the *jāhib* sitting on a *kūrinā* made of teak (Ibn Dūhair, p. 200; Ṭūsī, *Udābā*, ii, 319; Makrizi, iv, 121).
sometimes he spoke from the minbar to which the wā'iq often had access (cf. Ibn Djbair; see Mzr, Renaissance des Islam, p. 320). The ḥusṣan are called al-Makki aṣhāb al-ḥarāṣī which is in keeping with this (Kitb al-Ḳublā, l. 152, quoting K. al-Makkiḥārī, l. 155). Several karāzī are often found in the mosque (cf. for the Mosque of ’Amr, Makrīzī, iv. 12). When the karāzī mentioned for the earlier period always had a desk cannot be definitely ascertained. The karāzī with dated inscriptions given by van Berchem in his Corpus all belong to the 8th century (N.B, 364, 302, 335, 359, 401). According to Lane, at the Friday service while the people are assembling, a ḥaṭīr on the karāzī recites the 21st Suūr up to the aṣghān (Manuscripts and Costumes, p. 86). The same custom is recorded by Ibn al-Hajjīdī and condemned because it has a disturbing effect (K. al-Makkiḥārī, iv. 44, middle).

The Kurūn very soon received its definite place in the mosque like the Bible in the church (cf. Buhkārī, Shfi, bāb 91: they prayed at a pillar beside al-muṣafāh). According to one tradition, ’Othmān had several copies of his Kurūn sent to the provinces (e.g. Noldeke-Schroeder, Gesch. d. Qur., ii. 112 sq); al-Hajjīdī, a little later, is said to have done the same thing (Makrīzī, iv. 17).

The mosques had many other copies beside the one kept on the kurūn. Al-Hākim put 814 muṣafāh in the Mosque of Ibn Tulūn, where the founder had already put boxes of Kurūns (Makrīzī, iv. 36, 40; cf. Ḥasan al-Muṣafāh, ii. 135) and in 403 he presented 1,289 copies to the Mosque of ’Amr, some of which were written in letters of gold (Makrīzī, iv. 12; Ḥasan al-Muṣafāh, ii. 135). Even earlier than this there were so many that the qādi al-Hārith b. Mlikūn (237-245) appointed a special qaṭān to look after them (al-Kindī, Wustā, p. 469); there are still a very large number in the Mosque of the Prophet (see Batānīnī, Rīḥā, p. 241 above). Of particular value was the Muṣafāh Aṣmā’, belonging to the Mosque of ’Amr, prepared by ’Abd al-Asr b. Marwān, later bought by a son and afterwards by his daughter Asmā’; her brother left it in 128 to the mosque and it was used for public readings (see its whole history in Makrīzī, iv. 17 sq). Besides it, another copy was for some time also used for reading, which was said to have lain beside ’Othmān, when he was killed and to have been stained with his blood, but this one was removed by the Fatimids (Ikhā, p. 19). In the time of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, a Kurūn for which the same claims were made was kept in Bāṣra (ii. 10). On New Year’s Day when the Fatimids caliphs used to go in procession through the town, the Caliph at the entrance to the Mosque of ’Amr took up in his hands a muṣafāh said to have been written by ’Ali and kissed it (Ibn Taghhrīrīh, t. 1, p. 422 middle); it was perhaps the Muṣafāh Aṣmā’. In Syria, Egypt, and the Hijāz, in the fourth century, there were Kurūns which were traced back to ’Othmān (B.G. A., iii. 143; cf. ii. 117). One of the Kurūns made for ’Othmān was shown in the Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus in the time of Ibn Djbair. It was brought there in the year 507 from Tiberias (Djahh, Thūrīs, Hāshahrād, 1537, ii. 25). Other Kurūns of ’Othmān were shown in Baghdad and Cordova (see Mzr, Renaissance des Islam, p. 327)

and Ibn Djbair saw another in the Mosque of the Prophet; it lay in a desk on a large stand, here called muṣafāh (Rīḥā, p. 193; cf. thereon Doyt, Supplement, s. v.). The Fāṭimīya Madrassa also had a Musaf of Uṯmān, bought by the Kādi al-Fāṣil for 30,000 dinārs (Makrīzī, iv. 197) and there is one in Fāsun (Archives Marocaines, xviii., 1922, p. 361). Valuable Kurūns like these had the character of relics and belonged to the kāfīnā of the mosque. They were often kept in a chest (ṣanāḥāk) (Ibn Djbair, qf. previously in Musafāh, Bukhārī, Shfi, bāb 95, Musul has al-muṣafāh, see al-Aṣkālānī, Fath al-bārī, i. 385), also called rāḥit (Ibn Djbair, p. 104). In the Kaʿba, Ibn Djbair saw two chests with Kurūns (p. 83); Ibn al-Fāṣil mentions 16 chests with Kurūns in the Jerusalem mosque. (B. G. A., ii. 100). In the mosques there were also ṣanāḥāk for other things, such as lamps (Makrīzī, iv. 53; Wustenfeld, Med., p. 82 = Ibn Djbair, p. 194), a rāḥit for alms (K. al-Makkiḥārī, ii. 44, infra), for the bāl al-māl or the property of the mosque (see below). There were also chests for rose-wreaths (Makrīzī, ii. 30) which were in charge of a special officer. In the Mosque of ’Amr there was a whole series of ṣanāḥāk (Makrīzī, iv. 9).

The Kurūns were not the only relics to be kept in the mosques. Bodies or parts of the bodies of saints (cf. B. G. A., ii. 4, 22) and other žikkar were kept and revered in mosques: the rod of Moses, (in Kūfa, Yūkū, iv. 325, cf. on Moses, see Golzdiher, Mut. Stud., ii. 361), the Prophet’s sandals (in Hebron, B. G. A., v. 101, also in Damascus, where the Msharīya Madrassa had his left and the Damāṃghīya his right sandal; T. A. ser. 9, iii. 271 sq, 402), his cloak (in Aḥḏūr, B. G. A., ii. 178), hair from his beard (in Jerusalem among other places, Batānīnī, Rīḥā, p. 165) and many other things (see Golzdiher, Mut. Stud., ii. 358 sqq.; Mzr, Renaissance des Islam, p. 325 sq). These relics were often kept in valuable reliquaries. The head of Huṣain was buried in a ḥaṭīr in his mosque in Cairo (Ibn Djbair, p. 45). There was a black stone like that in the Kaʿba in a mosque in Shahrastān (B. G. A., iii. 433).

On the other hand, pictures and images were excluded from the mosques, in deliberate contrast to the crucifixes and images of saints in churches, as is evident from Ḥāẓīr (Bukhārī, Saʿdī, bāb 94, 54), Ḥanāwī, bāb 71; Musul, Makriḥārī, iv. 3; cf. on the question Becker, Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmengeschichte, Z.A., xxvi. = Islamstudien, l. 445 sqq.). It is of interest to note that in the earliest period, Solvī b. Abī Wākāna has no scruples about leaving the wall-paintings in the Iwan of Kisa at Madīna standing, when it was turned into a mosque (Tabārī, ii. 4433, 4451). The case was somewhat different, when, before the chief mosque in Delhī which had been a Hindu temple, two old copper idols formed a kind of threshold (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, iii. 157) although even this is remarkable (cf. Soucek, Morgenland, Verspreide Geschichten, ii. 451 sqq. = Z.D.M.G., lix. 1907, p. 186 sqq.). In some circles the opposition to pictures extended to other relics also. Ibn Tahfīrīh condemned the reverence paid to the Prophet’s footprint, which was shown, as in Jerusalem, in a Damascus mosque also (Qaṣumiwine, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. ii. 245). g. Carpets.

Carpets were used to improve the appearance of the mosque. The custom of performing the
the Ka'ba and hung two lanterns on each of the walls of the mosque (ṣurū'īḥā; cf. Ibn Dübair, Riḥla, p. 149, 150, 155, 271; v. Berchem, Copt. Inschr. Arab., I, No. 506). Khalīd al-Ḳaṣrī had the mas'ād also illuminated during the pilgrimage and in 219 the torches called ʿamāṭῑḥ were placed here and ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ordered the people, who lived in the streets of Mecca, to put up lamps on the 1st Muharram for the convenience of those visiting the Ka'ba (Chron. Mekk., i. 200-202, cf. 348 sq.). In 253 Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad al-Maṣṣūrī erected a wooden pole in the centre of the ṣurū' and ʿamāṭῑḥ on ropes were hung from it. This was however very soon removed (ibid., ii. 190 sq.). About 100 years later, al-Maḏāki ordered the Ṭawfīq wood poles on which hung lanterns (ʿamāṭῑḥ) in which were placed candles for the kings of Egypt, Yemen, etc. (B. G. A., ill. 74). Ibn Dübair describes the glass ʿamāṭῑḥ which hung from hooks in the Meccan Haram (Riḥla, p. 103) and lamps (ṣurū'īḥā) which were lit in iron vessels (ibid., p. 103, cf. p. 143). Similar silver and gold ʿamāṭῑḥ were seen by him in Medina (ibid., p. 192 at the top; see also Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 83 sqq.). According to al-Ṭabīḥ (before 300), 1,600 lamps were lit every evening in Jerusalem (B. G. A., v. 100) and in the next century al-Maḏāki says that the people of Palestine always burn ʿamāṭῑḥ in their mosques, which were hung from chains as in Mecca (B. G. A., ill. 182). The illumination was thus very greatly increased. In the year 60, when Ibn Ziyād was searching for his enemies in the mosque of Kūf, the lamps were not sufficient, and large torches had to be used in searching the pillars (Ṭabāṭ, ii. 259 sq.). This, like what has already been said about Mecca, shows out of what modest beginnings this part of the mosque's equipment developed.

In the time of the ʿAbārāids, lamps and lanterns were part of the regular furniture of the mosque. Al-Maḍīnī is said to have taken a special interest in this. He ordered lamps to be put in all the mosques, partly to assist those who wanted to read and partly to prevent crime (Baihaqī, ed. Schwally, p. 473). For this purpose, the ʿamāṭῑḥ, already mentioned, hung on chains were used, as at the building of the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (Maṣūrī, iv. 38, 39), in the Azhar Mosque and elsewhere; they were often of silver (ibid., p. 56, 63). Golden ʿamāṭῑḥ were also used and were of course commissioned by Ibn al-Hāḍīl (Maḍīḥī, ii. 54) as ostentatious. At the same time, candles (ṣamūr or ʿamāṭῑ) were used in large numbers, the candlesticks (ṣawwār, sing. sawr) often being of silver (Ibn Dübair, Riḥla, p. 45, 131, 194; cf. Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 95, 100). About 400, large candelastra were made in Egypt, which from their shapes were called tanūrī, stoves. Al-Hākim presented the Mosque of 'Umar with a tanūrī made out of 100,000 dirhams of silver; the doors of the mosque had to be widened to admit it. He also gave two other lamps (Ṣayyīḏ, Ḥasan al-Muṣṭafī, ii. 136 infra; cf. Nūrī b. Khaṣraw, ed. Schefer, p. 51 [text]; p. 148 [tr.]; Ibn Taghhrībid, ed. Popper, ii, p. 105). In the Mosque of al-Hākim, in addition to lamps and candle-lanterns, he also had a silver tanūrī and he made similar gifts to the Azhar and other mosques: the lamps were of gold or silver (Maṣūrī, iv. 51, 56, 63; cf. Ibn Taghhrībid, ii, p. 105). The tanūrī and other lanterns could also be made of copper (see v. Berchem,
Corpus, i. N. 504, 503, 506, 507, 511), as, for example, the celebrated candelabrum of the Mosque of Mu'ayyad (Makrit, iv. 137) which was made for the mosque of Hassan but sold by it (ibid., p. 118).

This great interest in the lighting of the mosque was not entirely based on practical considerations. Light had a significance in the divine service and Islam here, as elsewhere, was taking over something from the Church. When, in 237, the caliph was on his deathbed, he asked that the sahâb should be performed over him with candles and incense (bei l-mumâr wa l-bu'dâh) exactly after the fashion of the Christians (Ibn Asâr, i. 165; cf. ii. 89). The dependence of Islam on Christianity is also seen in the story that 'Othman, when he was going to the evening sahâb in Medina, had a candle carried in front of him, which his enemies condemned as bid'a (Ya'qubi, ed. Houtsma, ii. 187). The Sahâb bias does not affect the significance of this story. A light was used particularly in the minârât, because it represented the holy cell, to which light belongs (cf. Str. xxiv. 35). Then, in Mecca, lamps were placed before the insâms in the minârât and there were considerable endowments for such minârât lamps (Ibn Djibair, Ri'ba, p. 103, 144). Light, as was everywhere the custom in ancient times, was necessary in mausoleums and the documents of endowment show that a large number of oil-lamps were used in this way (e.g. the document for al-Makk al-Ashraf's mausoleum, v. Berchem, Corpus, i. N. 252). But in the mosque generally the use of lights had a devotional significance and lamps might be endowed for particular individuals (cf. B.G.A., iii. 74, quoted above). The lamps so given by al-Hakim were therefore placed in the mosques with great ceremony, with blasts of trumpets and beating of drums (Ibn Taghribirdi, n. i. 105).

On ceremonial occasions a great illumination was therefore absolutely necessary. In the month of Ramadan, says Ibn Djibair, the carpets were renewed and the candles and lamps increased in number, so that the whole mosque was a blaze of light (Ri'ba, p. 143). On certain evenings trees of light were made with vast numbers of lamps and candles and the minarets were illuminated (ibid., p. 149-151, 154, 155). In the Mosque of the Prophet in the time of Sambhid, forty six lamps were burned around the sacred tomb, and three to four hundred lights in the whole mosque (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 100). On the ma'lûd al-nabi, says Kuf. al-Din, a procession went from the Ka'ba in Mecca to the birthplace of the Prophet with candles, lanterns (fumunât) and lamps (masluk), see Chron. Mecca, iii. 439). In the Haram of Jerusalem, according to Makrit al-Din, 750 lamps were lit by night and over 20,000 at festivals (Sauvage, Hist. Jérus. et Hébron, p. 138). In the dome of the Sahâba in 452 a chandelier and 500 lamps fell down (ibid., p. 69); at the taking of the town in 492 (1009) the Franks carried off 42 silver lamps, each of 3,600 dirhams, 23 lamps of gold and a tamûd of 40 risâ of silver (ibid., p. 71). It was similar and still is in Cairo and elsewhere in the Muslim world. For the intâlat al-wâli in the Mosque of 'Amr, 18,000 candles were made for the Mosque of 'Amr and every night eleven and a half thousand of good oil were used (Makrit, iv. 31 and more fully ii. 345 upp.). The four nights of illumination fell in the months of Rajab and Shaba, especially Nu'af.

Shâdâ (Quatremerre, Hist. Sult. Masm., ii. 131; cf. also Snouck-Hurgrunge, Mecca, ii. 77). Quite recently (1908) electric light has been introduced into the Mosque of the Prophet (al-Batani, Ri'ba, p. 245 sqq.).

On the question in general see Clermont-Ganneau, La lampe et l'olivier dans le Coran, in Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale, viii, 1924, p. 183-228; on the copper candelabra see A. Wingham, Report on the Analysis of various examples of Oriental Metal-Work etc. in the South Kensington Museum etc., London 1892; F. R. Martin, Alters Kupferarbeiten aus dem Orient, Stockholm 1902; on glass lamps see G. Schomann, Altorientalische Glass-Gefasse, Vienna 1898; V. Berchem, C.F.A., 527 sqq.; Max Herr Bey, La Mosquée du Sultan Hassan (Comité de Conservation des Monuments de l'Art Arab), 1899, p. 8 sqq.; see also the Bibliography in Int., xvii., 1928, p. 217 sqq.

j. Incense.

According to some traditions, even the Prophet had incense burned in the mosque (Tirmidhi, i. 116; see Lammens, Mo'awwia, p. 367, note 8) and in the time of 'Omar, his client 'Abd Allah is said to have perfumed the mosque by burning incense while he sat on the minbar. The same client is said to have carried the censer (midjam; cf. Lammens, loc. cit.) brought by 'Omar from Syria before 'Omar when he went to the sahâb in the month of Ramâdan (A. Fischer, Biographie von Grundherrnmenon etc., p. 55, note). According to this tradition, the use of incense was adopted into Islam very early as a palatable imitation of the custom of the Church. In keeping with this is the tradition that in al-Tabari as early as the governorship of 'Umar, the mu'adhdhin used to burn incense in the mosque ('Abd al-Hakam, p. 132; cf. Annali dell' Islam, iv. 365). The Sahâba Mosque had incense burned in it during the consecration ceremony (Sauvage, Hist. Jérus. et Hébron, p. 53).

Under the Omayyads, incense was one of the regular requirements of the mosque (fîh al-masjid: Tabari, ii. 1234, sq.; Mo'awwia is named as the first to perfume the Ka'ba with perfume (khulâb) and censer (tayyaba: B.G.A., v. 20, sq). It became the custom to anoint the sacred tombs with mask and fîh (Chron. Mecca, l. 150, sq.; Ibn Djibair, Ri'ba, p. 191, sq.) to bathe washed the Ka'ba with rose-water (Makrit, iv. 96, sq.). Incense, as well as candles, was used at burials (cf. de Goeje, Z.D.M.G., 1905, p. 403 sqq.); Lammens, Mo'awwia, p. 436, note 9). Al-Mu'awwia's desire to be buried with candles and incense (tâbûb) exactly like the Christians (Ibn Usâila, l. 105, sq.) shows that they were aware that the custom bore much the same relation to the Christian usage, as the mosque building did to the Church. The consumption of incense in the mosques gradually became very large, especially at festivals (see for the Fatimids: Ibn Taghribirdi, n. l. 484, sqq.; n. ii., ed. Popper, p. 106, sq.; Makrit, iv. 51); on vessels for holding incense see the Bibliography in Int., xvii., 1928, p. 217 sqq.

j. Water-Supply.

Nothing is said of a water-supply in connection with the oldest mosques. The Mosque of Mecca occupied a special position on account of the Zamzam well. In the early days of Islam, two basins (jarwâ) are said to have been supplied by it, one behind the wall, i.e. just at the side of the mosque for wudu and one between the wall.
and the ṭūdūn for drinking purposes; the latter was moved nearer the well by Ibn al-Zubair. In the time of Sulaymān b. Ṭabd al-Mallik, a grandson of ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭabdūs, for the first time a ṭūdūn was built a ḥubbā in connection with the Zemmām (Chron. Mehbūba, l. 299). At the same time the governor Khālid al-ʿAṣārī laid down lead-piping to bring water from the well at al-Thāqif (wandāq) to a running fountain (frūnīnā) between the Zemmām and the ṭūdūn, probably on the site of the earlier ṭūdūn. It was intended to supply drinking-water in place of the saltish water of Zemmām, but a branch was led on to a ṭūwāf at the Bāb al-Safā, which was used for ritual ablutions. The people, however, would not give up the Zemmām water and immediately after the coming to power of the ʿAbbasids, the provision for drinking-water was cut off, only the pipe leading to the ṭūwāf being retained (Ibid., l. 339 sq.). In Ibn Dūbabī's time, there was, in addition to the Zemmām, a supply of water in vessels and a bench for performing the ṭūdūn (Rihāla, p. 89). ʿAbd Allāh's plan, arrangements for ablutions at the entrance and a running fountain in the ṭūwāf, seems to have been the typical Omayyad one and to have been introduced from the north. Such fountains were usual in the north, not only in private houses, but also for example in the astūrīn (stūrīn) surrounded by pillars, which, from Eusebius' description, formed part of the church of Tyre (see Haucq in Herzog-Hauck, Realencyclo., s. v. kirche, u. chald. Wörterbuch, iv. 81); Fraenkel, Forstwirt., p. 124; ṭūsāt, found in al-ʾArṣārī, Chron. Mehbûba, i. 340 is probably due to a slip). At the same time, however, ṭūwāf or ṭūsāt or ṭūdūn (which probably comes from the Persian) (cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 287) or the old Arabic ṭūmū is also used. The arrangements for ablutions were called μαθηδί or μαθηδί, now usually μαθηβά, "place for ṭūdūn". This accommodation in Mecca just mentioned was later extended. Ibn Dūbabī mentions a building at al-Zāhār, 1 mile north of Mecca which contained μαθηδί and ṭūsāt for those performing the minor ṭūdūn (Rihāla, p. 111).

In Medina, Ibn Dūbabī mentions rooms for ṭūdūn at the western entrance to the mosque (Rihāla, p. 197, 13 sq.; cf. the plan in al-Batānī, Rihāla, facing p. 244). At the same time Ibn Zābaila mentions seven receptacles for water in the ṭūdūn in the year 199, probably for drinking-water; later (viii Cent.) a large basin surrounded by a railing is mentioned in the centre of the court. It was intended for drinking purposes but was used for bathing and was therefore removed. Baths and latrines were built anew by al-Nāṣir's mother (Wūstīnfeld, Medina, p. 99 sqq.).

In Damascus, where every house, as is still the case, was supplied with water, Yākūt (d. 626 = 1229) found no mosque, madrasa or kāh-nākāh which did not have water flowing into a ṭūwāf in the ṭūdūn (Yākūt, li. 590). Ibn Dūbābī describes the arrangements in the Mosque of the Omayyads. In the ṭūdūn, as is still the case, there were three ṭūsāt. The centre one rested on four marble columns, and below it was a basin with a spring of drinking-water surrounded by an iron grille. This was called ʿaṣṣāf al-maʾrūzī "water-cage". North of the ʿaṣṣāf was a Masjd al-Kullās in the ṭūwāf of which there was again a ṭūdūn of marble with a spring (Ibn Dūbabī, Rihāla, p. 267). There was also running water in an adjoining maṣrūba (p. 269), in the kāh-nākāh and madrasa (p. 271), and in a hall beside the living apartments there was again a ṭūdūn of marble (kāh-nāh) and spring, water in the ṭūwāf (p. 269). There were also ṭūwāf against the four outer walls of the mosque, whole houses being built up with lavatories and chambers (p. 273); a century earlier, we are told that at each entrance to the mosque there was a μαθηβά (B. G. A., iii. 159). The whole arrangements correspond exactly to those made by Khālid al-ʿAṣārī in Mecca in the Omayyad period and must therefore date from the Omayyads.

It was the same in other Syriac and Meṣopotāmian towns. In Sūmarī, al-Mutawakkil built in his new ḍāmī a frūnīnā with constant running water (B. G. A., vii. 265). In Nāṣrīn, the river was led through the ṭūdūn of the mosque into a ṭūdūn; there was also a ṭūwāf at the eastern entrance with two μαθηβά of the mosque (Ibn Dūbabī, Rihāla, p. 239). In Mesnyy in the mosque, which dated from the Omayyad period, there was a spring with a marble cupola over it (Ibid., p. 255). In Ḥāzān, there were in the ṭūdūn three ṭūsāt with ṭūdūn and drinking-water (Ibid., p. 246), in Ḥalb two (Ibid., p. 253). In Kīfā there were three ṭūwāf with Euphrates water in front of the ḍāmī (Ibid., p. 212) but in the mosque a μαθηβά a domed building with running water (Yākūt, iv. 325, 326, here called ṭūwāf; cf. B. G. A., v. 173; Ibn Dūbabī, p. 59, 267). It was the same in Amīd (Nāṣirī-Khwaraz, ed. Schefer, p. 28) and in Zarānd in Sīdīsīn (B. G. A., ii. 298 sq.). The principal mosques of the ʿIrāq had μαθηβά at the entrances, for which, according to a remarkable note by Mushīnī, rents were paid (B. G. A., iii. 129, read ʾaḥdāt; cf. μαθηβά: Ibn Dūbabī, p. 89). In Palestine also, in the Al-Masjd's time, there were conveniences for ablutions at the entrances to the ḍāmī (μαθηβά: B. G. A., iii. 182; Ṭālib: i., 58) and in Ṣāmānī in the fourth century, beside each mosque, there was water for drinking and for ṭūdūn (B. G. A., vi. 111). In Farsī also, it was the custom to have a μαθηβά in front of the mosque (B. G. A., iii. 318) and there was drinking-water in the mosque itself on a bench (kāh-nāh) in iron jars into which ice was put on Fridays (Ibid., p. 327). Not only at the Zemmām well but also in the mosques of the ʿIrāq, men appointed whose duty it was to distribute drinking-water (Tabari, iii. 2165). The regular custom, therefore, was to have at the entrance to, or in front of the mosque, to have at the entrance to, or in front of the mosque, was the exception for the μαθηβά to take place in the mosque itself.

In Egypt at first the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn was arranged similarly to the Syriac mosques. In the centre of the ṭūwāf there was a giūst dome, supported by sixteen marble columns and surrounded by a railing. This upper storey was supported by nineteen marble columns and below was a marble basin (kāh-nāh) with a running fountain (frūnīnā); the ṭūwāf was called from the dome (Māṣjīrī, iv. 37; the description is not quite clear). People complained that there were no arrangements for washing (μαθηβά) there. Ibn Tūlūn replied that
he had not made them because he had concluded the mosque would be polluted thereby. He therefore made a miṣiq'a with an apothecary’s shop behind the mosque (ibid., p. 38, 39; Ḥusain al-Muḥādara, ii. 139; Ibn Tağhrībadī, ii/1, 10). This suggests that previously in Egypt the washing arrangements had been directly connected with the mosque. After the fire of the year 376, the fawā'id was renovated by al-Āziz (Maḏrīzī, iv. 40) in 666 again by Mūsa ʿAmmār, whose inscription still exists (C.F.A.I., ii. 11, NP. 16). A new miṣiq'a was built in 792 beside the old one on the north, outside the mosque (Maḏrīzī, iv. 42).

The Mosque of ʿAmr first got a fawā'id in the time of al-Āziz. In 378–379 his vizier Yāḥyā b. Kallīs installed one in the cupola, already in existence for the baṭī al-mūd. Marble jars were put there for the water (probably drinking-water) (Maḏrīzī, iv. 9, 11; cf. Ḥusain al-Muḥādara, ii. 130; Yāḥyā, ii. 899). A new water basin was installed by ʿAbd al-Dīn beside his maqṣara in the mosque. The water was led to the fawā'id al-ṣikhiya from the Nīl. This was prohibited in the reign of Baḥr al-Bunduqdār (658–676) by the chief ʿAbd, because the building was being affected by it (Maḏrīzī, iv. 14; Ḥusain al-Muḥādara, ii. 143). The emir, who restored it, brought the water for the ṣikhiya from a well in the street (Maḏrīzī, iv. 15).

Like Ibn Ṭūlūn, the Fāṭimid rulers did not seem to have considered the miṣiq'a indispensible. For the Aṣbār Mosque had originally no miṣiq'a: as late as al-Hakim’s waḥif document for the provision of miṣiq'a, money is given only with the provision that something of the kind should be made (Maḏrīzī, iv. 51, 54). At a later date we hear of two miṣiq'a, one at the adjoining Akhūnghāwīya (ibid., p. 54). On the other hand, there was already a ṣikhiya in the centre of the court, but whether it had existed from the first is not known. It had disappeared, when traces of it were found in 827 in laying-out a new ʿibād (ibid., p. 54). The ṣikhiya of the Mosque of al-Hakim was not erected by the founder. Like that of the Mosque of ʿAmr, it was removed in 660 by the ʿAbd al-Talā al-Dīn but after the earthquake of 702, it was again rebuilt and provided with drinking-water from the Nile (ibid., p. 56, 57) and again renovated after 780 (ibid., p. 61). A small miṣiq'a, later replaced by another, was in the vicinity of the entrance (ibid., p. 61). Other Fāṭimid mosques had basins in the ṣāḥn, which were supplied from the Nile and from the Khalidī (ibid., p. 76, 81, 120).

The traditional plan was retained in the period following also. For example, we know that the emir Taḫṣṣṣ ṣ in 815 placed a birka in the centre of the ʿAlī’s Ḥaqqīn which was covered by a roof supported by marble pillars and supplied by the same pipe as the already existing miṣiq'a (Maḏrīzī, iv. 107, cf. 124, 138, 139 etc.). At the ceremonial dedication of mosques, it was the custom for the patron to fill the birka in the ṣāḥn with sugar, lemonade or other sweet things (e.g. al-Muṣayyaf, in 822: Maḏrīzī, iv. 139; Māḏrīzī, iv. 131; Māḏrīzī, iv. 224, 227; ibid., p. 256). The importance of the birka of the mosque, as a drinking-place, diminished as pious founders erected drinking fountains everywhere (cf. for Mecca: Chron. Mich., ii. 116–118; also B.G.A., iv. 221, s. v. ṣabā; p. 258, s. v. ṣabīl) and especially when it became the custom to build a sabil with a boy's school in part of the mosque (see below, E 4 end). A ṣanāfī for watering animals was also sometimes built in the vicinity of the mosque (Maḏrīzī, iv. 76). Sometimes also the birka of the ṣāḥn was used for washing. In the year 799 the emir ʿAlībūghā built arrangements for this in the Aṣbār mosque so that one could get water for ṣanāfī from taps at a birka put up in the ṣāḥn (Maḏrīzī, iv. 76). Maḏrīzī condems this addition, but only because there was already a miṣiq'a at the entrance and the ṣāḥn was too small for the new one (ibid.) and also not original, and it was only because the wall was damaged that the emir's gift was removed in 815 (ibid., p. 77).

The custom of using the water supply of the ṣāḥn for ṣanāfī survived in many places in Egypt. The arrangements were therefore usually called miṣiq'a al-ṣāḥn or ṣalād (which is not found in the inscriptions). If they had taps, they were called ṣanāfīya; according to Lane's suggestion because the Ḥanafis only permitted ablations with running water or from a cistern to ells broad and deep (Lexicon, s. v.; cf. Manners and Customs, Everyman's Library, p. 69; cf. on the question: Max Herr, Observations critiques sur les basins dans les Šāhns des Meqare, H. I. E., iii/7, 1896, p. 47–51; do., La Mosque du Sultan Ḥasan, p. 2; Herr wrongly dates the modern usage from the Turkish conquest in 1517). In quite recent times the miṣiq'a have often been moved outside to special buildings. Ibn al-Haḍḍāʾ condemns bringing water into the mosque, because the only object is for ablation and ablutions in the mosque are forbidden by *our* learned men (Maḏrīzī, iv. 47 sq.; 49): like shaving, ablutions should be performed outside the mosque in keeping with the Prophet's saying: ʿaffāl wa-ḥabībūn ʿallā abūbād maḥḍīlikum (ibid., ii. 58). It was in keeping with this principle that in earlier times the miṣiq'a was usually put at the entrance and the barbers took up their places before the entrance (cf. the name Fūḥ al-Musawiyin "The Barbers' Gate" for the main entrance to the Aṣbār mosque). Miṣiq'a were also to be found in hospitals; thus the "lower hospital" was given two in 346, one of which was for washing corpses (Ibn Duḥṣān, p. 99 infra).

E. The Mosque as a State Institution.

1. The Mosque as a Political Centre. Its Relation to the Ruler.

It was inherent in the character of Islam that religion and politics could not be separated. The same individual was ruler and chief administrator in the two fields, and the same building, the mosque, was the centre of gravity for both politics and religion. This relationship found expression in the fact that the mosque was placed in the centre of the camp, while the ruler's abode was built immediately adjacent to it, as in Medina (and in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, Damascus, Baṣra, Kūfah). We can see how this was achieved at or before the Kūfah-Tabari, ii. 230 sq., *ṣāḥn al-ibnāra: ibid., p. 523* with the growth of the mosque gradually became incorporated in it. In al-Fuṣṭāṭ and Damascus and was replaced by a new building. The tradition remained so strong that in Cairo, where the chief mosque Dżāmīʿ al-Asgar was being planned in 169, a Dār Ummār ʿMiṣr was built beside it with direct access to the mosque (Maḏrīzī, iv. 33
and when Ibn Tültün built his mosque, a building called the Dar al-imāra was erected on its south side, where the ruler, who now lived in another new palace, had rooms for changing his dress, etc., from which he could go straight into the maqṣūra (ibid., p. 42).

The Abābids at the foundation of Bagdād introduced a characteristic innovation, when they made the palace the centre of the city; the case was similar with Fātimid Cairo; but Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Malik in Ramla had already built the palace in front of the mosque (Baladhūrī, p. 143). Later rulers who no longer lived just beside the mosque, had special balconies or something similar built for themselves in or beside the mosque. Saʿīd al-Dīn built for himself a sünūfara under the great minaret of the mosque of ʿAmr (Makrizi, iv. 15; Ḥasan al-Maḥṭūṭa, ii. 137) and just to the south of the Aṣzar mosque the Fāṭimidars had a maqṣūra from which they could overlook the mosque (Makrizi, i. 343).

The caliph was the appointed leader of the state and the khalif of the Muslim community. The significance of the mosque for the state is therefore embodied in the minbar. The installation of the caliph consisted in his seating himself upon this, the seat of the Prophet in his sovereign capacity. When homage was first paid to Abū Bakr by those who had decided the choice of the Prophet’s successor, he sat on the minbar. ʿOmar delivered an address, the people paid homage to him and he delivered a khutba, by which he assumed the leadership of the Muslim Hākem, p. 1017; Tābarī, l. 1828 sq.; K. al-Qāmiṣ, ii. 751; Yāfṣīḥī, ii. 142); it was the same with ʿOmar and ʿOthmān (ibid., p. 157, 187).

The khutba, after the glorification of God and the Prophet, contained a reference to the caliph’s predecessor and a kind of formal introduction of himself by the new caliph. It was the same in the period of the Omayyads and ʿAbābids (see for al-Walīd: Tābarī, ii. 1177 sqq.; al-Amin: ibid., iii. 764; al-Mahdī: ibid., iii. 389, 451, 457; cf. on this question also Bukhārī, ʿĀbāb, l. 43). The minbar and the khutba associated with it was still more important than the imāmat at the sünūfara, it was minbar al-muṭla (Hamāma, ed. Freytag, p. 656, v. 4). According to a hadith, the Prophet carried the little ʿHasan up to the minbar and said, “This my son is a chiefman” etc. (Bukhārī, Manāḥīb, l. 25). This reflects the later custom by which the ruler said that homage was paid to his minbar, the maqṣūra; this also was done from the minbar (cf. khutba yaqīn al-ʿājīma, “al-Muṭla b-taṣkīf b-ayyāt al-ʿAbd, Tābarī, iii. 2131). The Fāṭimid caliph showed honour to a distinguished officer by allowing him to sit beside him on the minbar (Ḥun al-Maḥṭūṭa, ii. 91); in the same way Muʿṣīyi allowed Ibn ʿAbī al-ʿAbīs to sit beside him “al-farāsīrī” (Ibn Abī ʿUsābīa, i. 119) whether the reference is to the minbar is perhaps doubtful. The kātba could also be received by another on behalf of the caliph but it must be accepted on the minbar. Thus the governor of Mecca in 596 accepted on the minbar homage to ʿAbd Allāh b. Maʿṣūm and the deposition of Maḥammad b. Ḥarrūn (Tābarī, iii. 864 sq.; cf. for al-Mahdī: ibid., p. 399). There are other cases in which the solemn deposition of a ruler took place or on the minbar (Agāhī, 2nd ed. Cairo, i. 12; Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 15). Even at a much later date, when spontaneous acclamation by the populace was no longer of any importance, the ceremonial安装 on the minbar was still of importance (Makrizi, iv. 94). It had become only a formality but still an important one. Homage was paid to the ‘Abbasid caliphs in Egypt in the great maqṣūra of the palace or in a tent in which a caliph had been put up, and similarly to the sünūfara whose investiture was read out from the minbar (cf. Quattām, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/1, 117, 149 sqq., 183 sqq.). If one dreams that he was sitting on the minbar, it means that he would become sünūfara (ibid., i/1, 117).—The Abābids caliph had however long had his own throne after the old Persian fashion in his palace (al-Tādīf fi Aḥkām al-Muṭla, ed. Alparslan Zaki, Cairo 1914, p. 7 sqq.) and so had the Fāṭimidars (Ibn Taghtibrī, 2/157 and the Mamluks (Quattām, op. cit., i/1, 87; cf. 147). When later we find mention of the kātba (v. Berchem, Corpus, i, N° 333, sünūfara al-muṭla (Corpus. Mecca, iii. 133), sünūfara al-sünūfara (Makrizi, i. 157; cf. al-sanā’an, royal throne: B.G.A., ii. 282, 285; kātba similarly ibid. Ibn ‘Arabshāh, Vite Timuri, ed. Manger, ii. 486) or sünūfara al-muṭla (Quattām, op. cit., i/1, 61), the reference is no longer to the minbar. This does not mean that the ruler could no longer make public appearances in the mosques: thus in 648 Muḥammad Aibak regularly gave audiences in al-muḥādara al-ṣaḥāba (Quattām, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 17) and memorial services for Raibars were held a year after his death in several mosques, mudarris and khawāsin in Cairo (677 = 1278; ibid., i/1, 164 sq.).

The caliph spoke chiefly from the minbar of the capital, but when he made the pilgrimage he also spoke from the maqṣūra in Mecca and Medina (cf. e. g. Tābarī, ii. 1234; Yāfṣīḥī, ii. 341, 391; Chron. Mecca, i. 160). Otherwise in the provinces, the governor stood in the same relation to the minbars as the caliph in the capital. He was appointed “over sünūfara and sword” or he administered “justice among the people” and the sünūfara (Tābarī, iii. 860), he had “province and minbar” under him (ibid., ii. 611, al-muṣtaṣar wa l-khutba (B.G.A., i. 337). Speaking from the minbar was right which the caliph had delegated to him and it was done in the name of the caliph. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ therefore refused to allow people in the country to hold “khutba” except under the direction of the commander (Makrizi, iv. 7). This point of view was never quite abandoned. The khutba was delivered “in the name of” the caliph (ibid., p. 94) or “for” him (I: ibid., p. 66, 74, 198, Ibn Taghtibrī, ii/5, 85 infra; B.G.A., iii. 485 infra) and in the same way an emir delivered a khutba “for” a sünūfara (Makrizi, iv. 213, 214). The sünūfara did not have the “secular” and the caliph the “spiritual” power, but the sünūfara exercised as a Muslim ruler the actual power which the caliph possessed as the legitimate sovereign and had formally entrusted to him. During the struggle between the different pretenders, there was thus a confession of one’s politics if one performed the sünūfara with the one or the other governor (Tābarī, ii. 228, 234, 258; Chron. Mecca, ii. 168). The pretenders disputed as to whether the one or the other could put up his standard beside the minbar (Tābarī, iii. 2009).

Like the caliph, the governor also made his formal entry into office by ascending the minbar.
and delivering a khutba; this was the symbol of his authority (e.g. Tabari, ii. 91, 238, 242; Chron. Mekh., ii. 173; cf. Hist. Arab., ii. 660, v. 2—3; Dāhîj, Bayânî, iii, 135). After glorifying God and the Prophet, he announced his appointment or read the letter from the caliph and the remainder of his address, if there was a war going on, was exclusively political and often consisted of crude threats. The khutba was not inseparably connected with the Friday service. The commandant-in-chief could at any time issue a summons to the qādī and deliver his khutba with admonitions and orders (see Tabari, ii. as above and p. 260, 297, 300, 385, 1179) and it was the same when he left a province (ibid., p. 244); a governor, who could not preserve his authority with the khutba, was dismissed (ibid., p. 592).

Since war was inseparably associated with early Islam and the mosque was the public meeting-place of rulers and people, it often became the scene of warlike incidents. While the governor in his khutba was issuing orders and admonitions relating to the fighting, cheers and counter-cheers could be uttered (ibid., p. 238) and councils of war were held in the mosque (Tabari, i. 3451; ii. 258; Baladhuri, p. 267). Soon after his election 'Abd al-Malik asked from the minbar the word which would take the field against Ibn al-Zubair and al-Hāshid, shouted that he was ready to go (Chron. Mekh., ii. 20). After the battle of the Camel, 'Abd Allah sent the body to the mosque of Basra and 'Abd Allah led to another mosque (Tabari, i. 3178, 3783).

Rowdy scenes occasionally took place in mosques (Kindi, Wustenfeld, ii. 18): Ziyād was stoned on the minbar (Tabari, ii. 88); one could ride right into the mosques and shout to the governor sitting on the minbar (ibid., p. 683); fighting often took place in and beside the mosque (ibid., p. 960, 1701 spp.; Wustenfeld, Mediina, p. 13 spp.). Sometimes for this reason, the governor was surrounded by his bodyguard during the qādī or on the minbar or even clothed in full armour (al-Walid: Tabari, ii. 1934; Yakhibi, iii. 344; al-Hāshid: Tabari, ii. 274); Sabāt and sword were thus closely associated in reality.

It thus came to be the custom for the enemies of the ruler and his party to be curried in the mosques. This custom continued the old Arab custom of regular campaigns of obloquy between two tribes that can also be paralleled by the Byzantine ecclesiastical anathematism of heretics (cf. Becker, Introduktion, ii. 485; Geset. d. Islam., Kultur).

The first to introduce the official curse of the 'Aliids from the minbar of the Prophet is said to have been Khalid al-Kaari (Chron. Mekh., ii. 36). The reciprocal cursing of Omayyads and 'Aliids became general (cf. Tabari, ii. 12, 42; Aghlab, and edition Cairo, x. 102; Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 248; see also Lammens, Mekh, p. 180 n. 94). Like the blessing upon the ruler, it was uttered by the jāyîs (Mahmud, iv. 14); it was even recorded in inscriptions in the mosque (Ibn Taghribirdi, iii. ed. Popper, p. 63, 64; cf. also Mez, Renaissance, p. 61). As late as 284, al-Ma'tamid wanted to renew the anathematism of Mu'tamids from the minbar but abandoned the idea (Tabari, iii. 2164). Anthems were also pronounced on other occasions, for example, Saladin had al-Hāshid (Chron. Mekh., ii. 37) and al-Mu'tasim Ibn Tahir solemnly cursed from the minbar (Tabari, iii. 2028, 444) and other rulers had Mu'tamid heretics cursed from the pulpit (see Mez, op. cit., p. 198; cf. against Ibn Taimiya: Qu'atmera, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 250). Ibn Bat'a lists the tumultuous scene with thousands of armed men uttering threats in a mosque in Bagdad when a Shī'ī khūtba was on the minbar (ii. 58).

It was very natural to mention with a blessing upon the ruler in whose name the Friday Khutba was delivered. Ibn 'Abbās, when governor of Basra, is said to have been the first to pronounce such a daw' over 'Ali (Ibn Khaldûn, Mukhâtkamât, jâzil 37, end); it is not improbable that the custom arose out of the reciprocal obloquies of 'Aliids and Omayyads; the jāyîs, who had to curse the 'Aliids in the mosques, used to pray for the Omayyads (Maqârî, iv. 17). Under the 'Abbāsids, the curse became the usual form of expressing loyalty to the ruler (Ibn Taghribirdi, iii. 151). After the caliph, the name of the local ruler or governor was mentioned (ibid., p. 156, 161); even in Bagdad in 369 by order of the caliph al-Tâ'î, the actual ruler Alqâd al-Dawâr was mentioned in the daw'a (Ibn Miskawaîh, vi. 405; Cairo 1915, p. 396) and the Rûyâ, according to al-Makdisî, were generally mentioned in the khutba even in the remotest parts of the kingdom (this is evident from the above-mentioned expression khutba tâ'î, for which we also find alâ'ik; see: R. G. D. C. ii. 20; iii. 317; 338, 400, 472, 485; cf. Gloumary, s. v.). There is also evidence that prayers used to be uttered for the hearer (Maqârî, iv. 37; Kâlid al-Wusîrî, ed. Amédroz, p. 420). Under the Ma'mûlîk, the sultan's heir was mentioned (Quattûmera, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 105; iii. 3). Under the Fâtimids, it was even the custom to call salât upon the ruler from the minaret after the adhan al-fadîl (Maqârî, iv. 45); this also took place under the Ma'mûlîk (e.g. in 696 = 1207, when Li'din was elected; Quattûmera, Hist. Sult. Maml., iii. 45). The prayer for the sovereign in the khutba did not find unanimous approval among the learned (see Snouck Hurgronne, Versprode Geschriften, ii. 214 n. 31).

In general, the mosque, and particularly the minbar, was the place where official proclamations were made, of course as early as the time of the Prophet (Hikmah, Sulûk, bâb 71). 'Omar's blood-stained shirt was hung upon the minbar (Tabari, i. 3555); messages from the caliph were read from it (ibid., iii. 2084). Al-Walid announced from the minbar the death of distinguished governors (Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 242); the results of conflicts were announced in khutbas (Yusuf, i. 647; al-Salih al-fardî, ii. Cairo 1321, p. 149 n. 4). In the Fatimid and 'Abbâsid periods also proclamations, orders, edicts about taxation etc. by the ruler were announced in the principal mosque (Tabari, ii. 40; iii. 2165; Ibn Taghribirdi, ii. 68; Maqârî, Istîlas, ed. Buni, p. 87 supra; Quattûmera, Hist. Sult. Maml., iii. 39; iv. 44, 131); documents appointing the more important officials were also read upon the minbar (Kindi, ii. 58, 599, 603, 604, etc. pass.); Maqârî, ii. 244, i. 43, 85; frequently the people tramped into the mosque to hear an official announcement (Kindi, Walid, p. 144; cf. Derry, Geset. d. Mauren in Sfâbâla, i. 170).

After the position of the caliph had changed, tradition was so far retained that he still delivered the khutba in the principal mosque on special occasions,
particularly at festivals. Thus the Fātihmi al-'Azm
preached in the mosque of al-'Hākim on its com-
mition (Maṣṛīt, iv, 55) and in the month of Ramaḍān he preached in the three chief mosques
of Cairo, one after the other (ibid., p. 53; cf.
61 sq.). Ibn Taghitīrī, ii, 1482 sqq.: exceptionally
also in al-Rāghibī: Maṣṛīt, iv, 63). The Abbasid
caliph also used to preach at festivities (e.g. al-'Rāfī
Yaḥyā, Usdālī, ii, 549 sq.); it was widespread
when a zealous like al-Mustāfī (255) followed
the old custom and preached every Friday (Mas'ūdī,
Muraddī, vii, 2). Even the caliph falsūn in Egypt
preached occasionally (Maṣṛīt, iv, 942 Quatremère,
Ist. Sult. Musul., ii, 138 sq.). Although the mosque lost its old political importance in its later history, it has never quite lost its character as the place of assembly on occasions of public
importance. This is evident from al-Djâbârī's history
and even quite recently large meetings have been held in the mosques of Egypt on questions
of nationalistic politics.

3. The Mosque and public admnistration.

The actual work of government was very early transferred from the mosque into a special dâr al-ru'a
and negotiations were carried on and business frequenly done in the bâr al-muṣir (cf. Tabārī, ii, 230 sq.). But when
financial business had to be transacted at public meetings, the mosque was used for this in particular evidence from Egypt. Here the director of finance used to sit in the Mosque of 'Amr and auction the farming out of the domains, with a crier and several financial officers to assist him. Later the Dīwān was transferred to the Dārī aṣ-'Adm b. Ṭallīn but even after 300 a.h.
we find. Abū Bakr al-Māḏārīya's sitting on such
cases in the Mosque of 'Azm. Under the Fāṭimid
the visier Yaḥyā b. Killīs used first the dâr al-
munā of the Mosque of Ibn Ṭallīn (see above), later his own palace and afterwards the caliph's hār was used (Maṣṛīt, i, 171 sq.). In the same way, in the reign of Muḥammad, the Coptic church was used and the taxation commissio took up
their offices in them (Papyri Erknerus Raineri,
Führer durch die Ausstellung, No. 577); and Ibn Rosta (o. 290 = 903) says that the officials in charge of the measurement of the Nisāf, when they noticed the rising of the river, went at once to the chief mosque and announced it at one hārba after another, at the same time scattering flowers
on those seated there (B. G. A., vii, 116).

The connection with administration was also
seen in the fact that the treasure-chest, the hār al-muṣir (identical with the dâr al-ru'a) (Kindī, Walīṭ, p. 70, 117) was kept in the mosque. In al-Fustāčīs Uṣama b. Zakī, the director of finance, in 97 and 99 built in the Mosque of 'Amr a hārba on pillars in front of the minbar for the hār al-muṣir of Egypt. A drawbridge was placed between it and the roof. In the time of Ibn Rosta (o. 300) it was still possible to move about freely below the hārba but in 578-579 al-'Arsī put up a running fountain below it (B. G. A., vii, 116; Maṣṛīt, iv, 9, 11,
137; Haṣn al-Mujāhidī, i, 136; Yaḥyā, iii, 809). Al-Kindī records an attempt to steal the chest in 145 (Walīṭ, p. 112 sq.). In the disturbed years about 300, the wa't al-Nishārī closed the mosque between the times of sāfīl for the safety of the chest, which was also done in Ibn Rosta's time

(Kindī, Walīṭ, p. 266; B. G. A., vii, 116). New
approaches to the hār al-muṣir were made in 442 from the bār al-muṣir of the mosque and from the Dīwān
(Maṣṛīt, iv, 13).

In Khīfa, the bār al-akāmil, at least during the early period, were in the Dār al-umma (Jahārī,
ii, 2497, 2497 sq.); in the year 38 during the
fighting it was saved from Rāns and taken with the minbar to the Mosque of al-Ibādī (ibid., p.
3414 sq.). In Palestine, in the chief mosque of
each town, there was a similar arrangement to
that in the Mosque of 'Amr (B. G. A., i, 182). In
Damascus the hār al-muṣir was in the most
western of the three hārba's in the court of the Mosque of the Omayyads; it was of lead and rested on an 8 columns (B. G. A., ii, 157; Ibn Lāhitīrī, p. 264, 267; Ibn Bāṣār, i, 200 sq.) it is still
In the time of the two travellers mentioned,
the hārba only contained property of the mosque. Ibn Lāhitīrī saw a similar hārba in the chief mosque of Isra'īl and says that it came from the Byzantines (p. 240). In Ibn al-Qādī (as
by the time of the Byzantines had everywhere introduced (B. G. A., i, 184); in Isrā'īl, the centre of the court,
there was a building with marble columns and doors (B. G. A., i, 136) which perhaps points to a
similar statement of affairs and in Armenia it is recorded that the hār al-muṣir was kept in the Dārī
in the time of the Omayyads as in Mīr and elsewhere
(B. G. A., ii, 241). The hārba was usually of lead
and had an iron door. Ibn al-Ḫālidī considers it
highly illegal to shut off a dāwīn in a mosque, which is the same as forbidding entrance to it. This
shows that the custom still survived in his time.

Ibn Lāhitīrī's remark about Harrān suggests that here again we have an inheritance from Byza-
tantine. It was probably the building belonging to the pê̄sima (cf. above) that the Muslims put to a practical use in this way. For the Byzantines had the treasury (sēkēr) here and it is doubtful if the treasure-chambers of the church (šmēd xīvālı̇ahn) were built in this way (cf. Franz Dölger, in Byzantinisches Archiv, Heft 9, 1927, p. 26, 34).

The Mosque as a court of justice.

That the Prophet used to settle legal questions in his mosque was natural (see Bohārī, Aḥšāb b. "Abd Allāh 189 sq., cf. Šarī'ī, lâh 71, Ḫādīmī, lâh 4); but he could also deliver judgments in other places (ibid., pass. In Ḫalīdī, it is recorded that some qādīs of the earlier period (ṣūr, al-Sirāyī, Yāḥyā b. Ya'qūb, Marwān) sat in judgment beside the minbars, others (al-Hāsān, Zainab b. Abī Ams) on the open squares beside the mosques (Bohārī, Aḥšāb, lâh 15). The custom had all the better chance of survival, as churches were
used in the same way (Joshua Stylites, ed. Wight-
ch. 29; cf. Met, Renaissance, p. 223). Sitting
in judgment was primarily the business of the ruler
but he had to have assistants and Abī Bakr's qâdī is mentioned as assisting Ṭūmar (Tahārī,
l, 2135) and a number of judges appointed by
Omar are mentioned (B. G. A., vii, 237). In the reign of Ťūmar, 'Abd Allāh b. Marwān is said
to have been judge and financial administrator of Kūfā (Ibn Katalba, Marāfī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 128).
On the other hand, we are told that 'Abd Allāh
b. Nawfal, appointed by Marwan in 42, was the first kāhi in Islam (Tabarî, iii. 2477); it is recalled that in the year 132 the kāhi of Mecca administered justice in the mosque (ibid., p. 2505). In Basra, we are told that al-Aswad b. Sari' al-Tamâm immediately after the building of the mosque (i.e. in the year 14) worked in it as kāhi (Bahâdîrî, p. 346). In the early period 'Omar wanted to choose a kāhi, who had been already acting as a judge before Islam (Kindî, Wâli, p. 301 sq.; 92 a-Muhâsâra, ii. 86). Even the Christian poet al-Âdham was allowed to act as arzîl in the mosque of Kâfâ (see Lammens, Mu'tawî, p. 435 sq.).

In al-Fâṣî'î, as early as 23 or 24 A.H., by command of 'Omar, 'Amr b. al-Âst appointed a kāhi named 92 a-Muhâsâra, ii. 86; Kindî, Wâli, p. 300 sq. The kâhis held his sessions in the Mosque of 'Amr but not exclusively there. The kâhi 92 a-Muhâsâra, ii. 86; Kindî, Wâli held his sessions sometimes before his house, sometime in the mosque and for Christians on the steps leading up to the mosque (Kindî, Wâli, p. 351 sq.). A successor of his (177-184) invited Christians who had lawsuits into the mosque to be heard (ibid., p. 391); of another judge (205-211) it is recorded that he was not allowed to sit in the mosque (ibid., p. 428). It seems that the kâhi could himself choose where he would sit. A judge, officiating in the year 217, sat in winter in the great pillared hall turning his back towards the 92 a-Muhâsâra, ii. 86; Kindî, Wâli, p. 590, sat on Tuesday and Saturday in the mosque and laid down the law (Mâqûrî, ii. 246; iv. 16, 22; cf. Kindî, Wâli, p. 587, 589; cf. Cefner-Nahm, transl. Schefer, p. 149).

In 92 a-Muhâsâra, ii. 86; Kindî, Wâli, the judge of the east city used to sit in his chief mosque (B.G.A., viii. 245), in Damascus the kâhi in the fourth century had a special tâlî in the Mosque of the Omayyads (B.G.A., iii. 153), and the notaries (al-shâhîn) also sat in the Mosque of the Omayyads at the Bab al-Salâ (ibid., p. 17). In Nishâbûr, every Monday and Thursday, the madîjis al-khâmis was held in a special mosque (ibid., p. 328). In contrast of time the judge was given a madîji of his own (cf. 92 a-Muhâsâra, ii. 96) and in 279 al-Mu'tâjîl wanted to forbid the kâhis to hold sessions in the mosque (Ibn Taghribirdî, n1, 87 supra; perhaps however we should read 92 a-Muhâsâra, ii. 86; Kindî, Wâli, p. 612; cf. Ibn Taghribirdî, ed. Popper, n1, p. 69; Kalkandish, Sa'd al-Dîn, ii. 487; for 439 = 1046, see Na'jî; Khosrow, ed. Schefer, p. 31, text, p. 149, transl.). In Mecca, the dâr al-kâhi was in direct connection with the mosque (Ibn Dhubair, p. 104). In the eighth century Ibn Bâjûja attended a court presided over by an eminent jurist in a mosque (madrasa) in Sânâ' (ll. 55, 65; cf. also al-Mu'tâjîl, ii. 54 infra), and in Damascus the shâfi'i chief kâhi held his sessions in the 'Adîlîyya Madrasa (so Ibn Khallikân, Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii. 22; cf. also for Egypt: ibid., p. 87, n1, 253). The vice-kâhi sat in the 'Zâhîriyya Madrasa (Ibn Bâjûja, i. 218). The judgment might even be put into execution in the madrasa (ibid., p. 220). During the Mamlûk period in Egypt, we occasionally find a small mosque being used as a madâjid for judges (Mâqûrî, iv. 270; Ibn Dhuqânî, p. 98 supra). Ibn Khallîkân held legal settings in the Madrasa al-Sâlihiyya ('Thârîv, vii. 453).

A mutâ'a, mostly in the large mosques, was also frequently appointed; he sat at definite times in a ḥâla al-'tâs-falâ, e.g. in Cairo (al-Kawrînî, Hâṣ a-Muhâsâra, i. 162; Dhuqânî, al-Dîn, ibid., p. 187), in Tunis (Zarkâghî, Zarkâghî, transl. Fagnan, Rev. Mus. Sec. Arch. Constantine, vol. xxxi., 1895, p. 197, 204, 215, 248). In Baghdad Abû Bakr al-Dinawârî (d. 405) was the last to give fatâwa in the Mosque of al-Ma'mâr according to the madhâbah of Sufâyûn al-Thawri (Ibn Taghribirdî, ed. Popper, n1, p. 120).

F. The Mosque as an Educational Centre.

1. Islamic Studies in the Mosque to the end of the Fatimid period.

The new studies stimulated by Islam were from their nature associated with the mosque. The learning by heart and the understanding of the Qur'an formed the starting-point and next came the study of Hâdîth, by which the proper conduct for a Muslim had to be ascertained. The Prophet was often questioned on matters of belief and conduct, in or outside the mosque (Bukhârî, Jâmî, bâb 6, 52; 23, 24, 26, 46). After the death of the Prophet, his Companions were consulted in the same way and scientific study began with the collection and arrangements of hadîth as has been shown, notably by Goldziher. This process is reflected in the hadîth themselves. According to them, even the Prophet in his lifetime was asked about hadîth (ibid., bâb 4, 14, 331 tr. 9, 51, 53); the Prophet sits in a mosque surrounded by a ḥâla and instructs his hearers; the latter repeat the hadîth three times until they have learned them (ibid., bâb 8, 30, 35, 43). The necessity of al-ilm is strongly emphasised and the ḥâla al-tâs-falâ is recommended; a man is held up as a model because he undertook a month's journey for the sake of a single hadîth (ibid., bâb 19–22; cf. Goldziher, Mâqûrî, Mâqûrî, n2, 33 sq. = 175 sq.). Jewish influence is perhaps to be recognised when learning is compared with the drinking of water (Bukhârî, Jâmî, bâb 20; cf. Porozh, xviii. 4; Pêrçâ Abûkâ, i. 4, 11) and the teachers are called râbî Âbîyân (Bukhârî, Jâmî, bâb 10). A special class of students, Akl al-Ilm, was formed who spread the knowledge of traditions throughout Muslim lands (ibid., bâb 7). They collected people around them to instruct them in the most necessary principles of the sciences of Islam; 'Abd Allah held one of these mawâlî every Thursday, only once a week, in order not to tire the people (ibid., bâb 12). In this simple form of instruction which was indistinguishable from edifying admonitions lay the germ of Islamic studies. The teacher shâhâra his hearers; elsewhere it is called ṣâfâra or altâma and the knowledge imparted is
We hear of a mosque named Hurul in the Medina mosque in the 1st century A.D. (Ahn. ii. 48: iv. 162 sq.), Yazid b. Abi Halab sent by 'Omar b. 'Abd al-Aziz as mufti to Egypt (d. 128), is said to have been the first to teach in Egypt (Ahn. i. 131). He is mentioned as another as teacher of al-Latt (Kindt, Wulfs, p. 89) and the latter, upon whose pronouncements fatwas were issued, had his khalifa in the mosque (Hus. i. 134). 'Omar II had before this sent al-Nafi', the Mawla of Ibn 'Omar to Egypt to bring them the sunan (ibid., p. 130). He also sent an able reciter of the Qur'an to the Maghrib as kadi to teach the people fim'a (ibid., p. 131). Education was arranged for by the government by allowing suitable persons to give instruction in addition to their regular office. From the very first, education in Egypt was closely connected with litigation to right living. The first teachers in the mosques were the Fatwa, as a rule kadi, whose discourse dealt with the interpretation of the Qur'an and the proper conduct of divine service (cf. C 3). Their sunna was the direct continuation of the moral instruction given by the old companions (cf. Bukhari, 'ilm, bab 12). The instruction started in the mosque of Amr was continued for centuries. In the third century A.D., al-Shafi'i taught various subjects here every morning till his death (240) (Hus. i. 134: Yaqut, al-Dhakirin, vi. 383). It was after that time the study of Fikh marked clearly to the front and the great teachers used at the same time to give fatwas (cf. Hus. i. 182: 'Abd Allah al-Kazwini, d. 315: i. 185; 'Abd al-Rahman al-Razi, d. 339). In the year 358 (958), the Shafi'is and Malikis had each its own group in the mosque of Amr (Ibn Sa'd, ed. Laqluq, p. 24). The Malikis Musa bin 'Abd al-Nasir (d. 286) had so many hearers that the class occupied the area which 17 pillars included (Hus. i. 207). In the fourth century, al-Ma'sudi mentions the groups (buhuits) of Fakhr al-Din, Abu al-Abbas al-Latifi, who sat in the mosque (B. G. A., iii. 205; cf. for the 6th century 'Abd al-Samad Khurrawi, ed. Schefler, p. 50 (text), p. 148 (transl.). He also mentions that the followers of Abu Hanifa held meetings in the Masjids al-Akza with al-fakhr, which here must mean something like lectures, where they read out the famous and the fakhr used to sit in the mosques of Palestine generally, to teach between the al-unz (B. G. A., iii. 182). In the third century, Ibn al-Fakhri tells how the fakhr sat in the mosques of Sidjst, Bokh and Herat, while the people crowd around them (ibid., ii. 317). The fakhr which later lost its importance had also their study-circles in the mosques. For example al-Ma'sudi says that the Dawaliya had study-groups in Fars (iii. 439) and the Awzay had even a madrasa in the mosque of the Omayyads (ibid., p. 179).

Arabic philological studies were ardently prosecuted in the mosques. The interest of the early Arabs in rhetoric survived under Islam; the fakhr Sa'id b. al-Masayyab (d. 95) (cf. Tabari, ii. 1266) discussed Arabic poetry in his masjid in the mosque in Medina; but it was still thought remarkable that poems should be dealt with in a mosque (Ahn. iv. 148: iv. 162 sq.). In the year 256, al-Tabari by request dictated the poems of al-Tirmidhi beside the Bait al-Mal in the Mosque of 'Amr (Yaqut, al-Dhakirin, iv. 432 infra). In the chief mosque of Ta'izz, the Afdal al-Arabuya sat together and were visited by 'Abdul b. Salama (d. 167 or 169) while he made Husain al-Basri give lessons (ibid., iv. 135). In Granada we hear of a nabi who gathered many pupils around him in the dzma (Ma'kari, ii. 254). In Tunisia in the 9th-10th century, the Makama of al-Hariri were actually read in the Ljami Za'itina (Zakarti, trans. Fagnan, Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantine, 1894, p. 111). In Baghdad al-Kisqi gave his lectures in the mosque, which bears his name and the pupils used to take their place in the front of him after the morning salat (Yaqut, al-Dhakirin, iv. 243 sq.). About 200 A.H. we hear of lectures on ta'dir in the principal mosque of the same town (ibid., vii. 105). At the same time, the study of Hadith still retained its importance (Wustenfeld, Saby, iii. 362). The Mosque of al-Masjid remained the most distinguished school, the goal of all the learned (Yaqut, al-Dhakirin, iv. 246 sq.). When a traveller came to a new town, he could go to the dzma in the confidence that he could attend lectures on Hadith there (B. G. A., iii. 415, in Sais). In Mecca, for example, al-Shafi'i lectured (Yaqut, al-Dhakirin, vi. 391), in Medina Ibn Ishaq, who died in 234 (ibid., p. 400, 401). In Damascus we hear of some one who lectured on fiqh (Hus. i. 182) and of another, Abu Tahir al-Ikandari (d. 359) who lectured on Hadith in the same place (ibid., i. 185). Teachers went from one town to another. Makki b. Abi Talib came from Kairawan to Mekka, Mecca and Kursiba; in the last named place he put up in two riwaqs in the chief mosque, where he lectured on fim'a, afterwards in another mosque, and he was much sought after on account of his 'ilm (Yaqut, al-Dhakirin, vii. 174). At quite an early date we read of special apartments (which were certainly also lecture-rooms) for authorities on the Kur'an, for, according to al-Wakidi, 'Abd Allah b. Umm Makta'mi lived in Medina in the Door al-Kureit (Hus. al-Maktaba, ii. 142).

As is evident from the examples quoted, studies were not only prosecuted in the chief mosques but also in other mosques. In Egypt, not only
the Mosque of 'Amr but also the chief mosques of later date were important centres of study. As soon as the Mosque of Ibn Tulun was founded, a pupil of al-Shafi'i began to lecture in it in 861 Hijri (Hji 182, 16odiac, ii. 139). During the Fatimid period this was continued. In the year 301 (913), the Ashar Mosque was finished. Soon afterwards, the new Shi'i Kātib, 'Ali b. al-Nū'mān, lectured in it on Fikh according to his school; in 378 al-Azźī and his visier Ya'llī b. Killis founded 35 lectureships and in addition to their salaries, the lecturers were given quarters in a large house built beside the mosque (Makrizī, iv. 495; Sulaimān Ṭaṣūṣī, Kusā al-Dhimmāar fī Turāth al-Akbar, p. 52 sqq.). Immediately after the foundation of the Mosque of al-Hākim, the fāhidā gave lectures (kaṣālaṣṣa: Makrizī, iv. 55) in it. In the Fātimid Mosque of al-Aqmar, also founded in 319, teaching was carried on from the very first (ibid., p. 77).

We can therefore say definitely that mosques were from the beginning through the centuries educational institutions, that learned men occasionally used to live in mosques and that under the Fatimids and probably much earlier, there were special houses for the learned teachers. The mosque therefore corresponded to church, town hall and school and sometimes hostel. It was, then, a public place of assembly for the town. Nāṣrī Khosrow in 349 (1047) gives a vivid picture of the activity in the Mosque of 'Amr which was visited by 5,000 people daily, teachers, kūtān-reciters, students, strangers, who drew up bill of exchanges and contracts etc. (ed. Schefer, text, p. 50 and transl., p. 148). It was therefore an exception when the Saḥra Mosque was open only on Mondays and Fridays (Sauvage, Histoire de l'Islam, p. 54) which happened with very few other sanctuaries, also unusual for the mosque only to be opened for prayer, as sometimes happened out of consideration for the safety of the bai al-ma‘āl. The people demanded unrestricted access to the mosque at all times (cf. Makrizī, iv. 54).

2. Special Educational Institutions.

In the descriptions of the larger mosques the libraries are often mentioned. These collections were gradually brought together from gifts and bequests, and it was a common thing for a scholar to give his books for the use of the Muslims or Aḥl al-‘ilm (cf. al-Khāṣṣī, Ṭabarī: Ya’llī, Usulā, i. 252; cf. iv. 287). Many other libraries were semi-public; these often supplemented the libraries of the mosques, because they contained books in which the mosques were not much interested, notably on logic, falasfa, geometry, astronomy, music, medicine and alchemy; the latter were called al-Shī‘ī al-nilātī (Ibn Aḥī Uṣayba, i. 113, uses this already for the pre-Islamic period) or al-nilāt al-nilā‘ī (on them see: Goldziher, in Abh. Pr. Ab. W., 1915, Phil. Hist. Kl., No. 8, Berlin 1916). The academy, Beṣtal-i-Hikma, founded by al-Ma‘mūn (98-312) in Baghdad, deserves first mention. It recalls the older academy founded in al-Madīnah, to which Manṣūr had invited Gorgias b. Ḥabīl as head of the hospital; he also translated works from the Greek (Ibn Aḥī Uṣayba, i. 113 sqq.). In the new academy there was a large library, and it was extended by the translations which were made by men qualified in the above-mentioned fields; there was also an astronomical observatory attached to the institution in which there were also apartments for the scholars attached to it (Flügel, ed. Flügel, p. 243; cf. Ibn Aḥī ni-Kī, Ṭabarī al-Hikmat, p. 98). When the caliph al-Ma‘mūd (279-289) built himself a new palace, he had apartments and lecture-rooms in an adjoining building for men learned in every science, who received salaries to teach others (Makrizī, iv. 192, 2 sqq.; Fātir al-Ma‘mūd, ii. 142).

Private individuals of wealth continued benefactions on these lines. ‘Ali b. Yahiya, who died in 375 and was known as al-Manṣūrdjinn, had a palace with a library, which was visited by those in search of knowledge from all lands; they were able to study all branches of learning in this institution, called Khāsim al-Hikma, without fee; astronomy was especially cultivated (Ya’llī, Usulā, v. 467). Al-Manṣūrdjinn also presented a whole library to Fath b. Khāsim (ibid., p. 459, infra; on al-Sā‘ī’s library, see ibid., vii. 176, 1 sqq.). In Mawṣil, Dijfar b. Muhammad al-Mawṣil (d. 523) founded a dār al-I‘lām in a library in which students worked daily at all branches of knowledge which were even supplied with free paper. The founder lectured frequently on poetry in it (ibid., ii. 420). In the fourth century al-Ma‘landsf visited in Šahrā a large library founded by ‘Ajīd al-Dawla (362-372) to which people of standing had access. The books were arranged in cases and listed in catalogues, and the library (khāsim al-I‘lām) was administered by a director (mukattat), an assistant (khāsma) and an inspector (nafkisir) (B. G. A., iii. 449: cf. a little later: Ya’llī, Usulā, v. 446, 4 sqq.). In the fourth century, a certain Ibn Sawwār founded both in Boṣra and in Kā‘un-Humus a large dār al-I‘lām with stipends for the scholars who worked in it; in Boṣra a shaliq used to hold classes (mu‘barir) on Mu‘tasii al‘lām (B. G. A., iii. 413, 4 sqq.). In al-Ra‘ī, there was at the same time, a bāt al-I‘lām with over four hundred camel-loads of books, which were catalogued in a ten-volume ṭabārī and included many Shi‘i works (Ya’llī, Usulā, ii. 315, 3 sqq.). In the year 383, the vizier Sā‘īr b. Ardāshīf founded a dār al-I‘lām in Karīkh with a large library for scholars (Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Popper, p. 51, 76 sqq.; Ibn al-Ash‘ī, ix., Cairo edition, p. 357 sqq.).

Many of the libraries had a strongly, but by no means exclusively, Shi‘a character. As to the dār al-I‘lām, the ‘Abbāsid, as already mentioned, were interested in them and the Omayyad Khalīl b. Yaqūb b. Mu‘awīya studied alchemy and medicine along with Hadīth (Ibn Taghribirdi, ii. 240, 3; Ya’llī, Usulā, iv. 165). But the connection between the Shi‘a systems and Hellenistic science which we have evidence, for example in the khāsim al-Safa, perhaps caused a greater interest to be taken in this branch of knowledge among the Shi‘a than among the Sunnis. In Cairo, the Fātimids founded similar institutions in the interests of the Shi‘a. In their palace there was a library which was said to be the largest in Islam. It had about 40 rooms full of books and all branches of knowledge were represented; they had for example 1,200 copies of al-Tabarī’s History and 18,000 books on the “old learning” (Makrizī, ii. 251-255). The vizier Ya’llī b. Killis founded an academy with stipends for scholars and spent 1,000 dinars a month on it (Yahiya b. Sa‘īd, ed. Tallquist, fol. 1088; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, Cairo 1310, ii. 334; cf. Makrizī, iv. 192, 6). It was
and one built by Abū Sa‘īd Ḥamīd al-Astārshālādī and another built for the teacher Abū Isḥāq al-Isārthīn. A Niẓāmīya was also built here by Niẓām al-Mulk for the Imam al-Ḥaram al-Djumāwī (Maktrāzī, iv. 192; Ḥusn al-Muḫṣidāra, ii, 141 sq.). It was an event of great importance when Niẓām al-Mulk (456—485, vizier of the Šalṭāq sultan Abū Arslān and Malik Shībī) founded the celebrated Niẓāmīya Madrasa in Bāghdād; the building was begun in 457 and on the 10th Dhu ‘l-Ḵaḍra 459 (Sept. 1067) it was consecrated. It was founded for the Shī‘ī teacher Abū Isḥāq al-Shārtrī; but he at first refused to accept the call, because on the ground which it was built was said to have been acquired illegally, and Abū Naṣr Ibn al-Sabbāghīn therefore held the office for the first twenty days (ibid.; and Wustenfeld, Schāfī‘i, iii. 297; Ibn Khallikān, Wajšiyāt, Cairo, i, 143 sq.).

The Muslim historians are in some doubt about the history of the madrasa. Niẓām al-Mulk is given the credit of having founded it, but al-Maktrāzī and al-Suyūṭī point out that madrasās were already in existence before him and mention the four above-named, but, as we have seen, even they were not innovations. Al-Suhkī thinks (says al-Suyūṭī) the new feature was that Niẓām al-Mulk endowed scholarships for the students. But this again was nothing new as we have already seen. But the enthusiasm and energy of Niẓām al-Mulk meant the beginning of a new period of brilliance for the Madrasa. The sūṭān and men of high rank were now interested in it and the type evolved by Niẓām al-Mulk, a school in which the students were boarded, became the prevailing one after his time. We may presume that the older schools also had a place for prayer in them, i.e. they resembled mosques. The type of school known to us is built as a complete mosque. Since even the older mosques containing living-rooms which were frequently used by students, there is no difference in principle between the school and the ordinary mosque; only the schools were especially arranged for study and the maintenance of students. This character is expressed by the name madras, plural madāris; it is a genuine Arabic formation from the word dāra, "to read, to study," taken from Hebrew or Arabic roots (Šura lxvii. 37 and elsewhere; Ḥuṣaynīyāt, ed. Horovitz, p. 53; Aghrānī, xiv. 2nd Cairo ed., p. 78; cf. dāra "to teach"; Bukhārī, Bād‘u ’l-Wā‘īs, bab 5 and elsewhere; "to study"; Kātibi, ed. Wright, p. 17), where Buṭl Māridūs is a Jewish school (Bukhārī, Ziyā, bab 6; Ibn Hihshām, p. 383, 388); it is therefore an analogues formation to Masjīd (cf. also Fliesser, Klein. Schriften, ii, 122 sq.; Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge z. sem. Sprache, p. 58).

In the time of Niẓām al-Mulk and immediately afterwards, the madrasa spread in the Ḫurāṣ, Būrāṣ, al-Ḳaṣrā, etc. He was not content with the two he founded in Niẓām al-Dār and Bāghdād. There was also a Madrasa Niẓāmīya in Balkh (Wustenfeld, Schāfī‘i, iii, 240), in Mawṣil (ibid., p. 319), in Herāt to which al-Šāhī (d. 485 = 522) was called from Ghurma and in Merv (Wāṣir, iv. 509). Ibn al-Sabbāghīn, who had to give up his position in favour of al-Šāhī, received a promise from Niẓām al-Mulk that he would build a madrasa for him in Bāghdād, but the death of this scholar prevented this being done (in 477; ibid., p. 304). The great vīr’s rival Tādż al-Mulk (d. 486 = 502) in Bāghdād founded a Madrasa Tādżīya (ibid., p. 311). In Niẓābūr, other madrasa were founded at the same time, for example, one by al-Manṣūr who died in 492 (ibid., p. 277) and a Shāhīyā (ibid., p. 322). In Mawṣil, al-Samṣārī who died in 484 taught in a Shī‘ī madrasa (ibid., p. 321; cf. above). In Merv al-Rūdhī, Ahmad al-Manṣūr (d. 512) built a madrasa (ibid., p. 326).

The prosperity of the madīrīs stimulated by Niẓām al-Mulk in the fifth century survived for a long time in the east. In the sixth century Ibn Djabalār (580 = 1184) mentions some thirty madīrīs, all in the eastern part of the town, the most notable being the Niẓāmīya, renovated in 504 (Abūnā, p. 229). In 631 (1234), the caliph al-Manṣūr founded the magnificent Mustansīrīya as a school for the four rites, each with a teacher and seventy-five students and a teacher for Ḥadīth, as well as a physician. Attached to it was a library, baths, hospital and kitchens; one could enquire there for a clock at the entrance; beside it was a garden where the caliph had a pavilion (mn̄̃oparā) from which he could survey the whole building (cf. La Sanguenne, Bāghdād, p. 206; Wustenfeld, Akademien der Araber, iv. and 29).

The Māṣjīda and the Mustansīrīya survived the destruction of Bāghdād by Ḥūlāfī and both are mentioned at the beginning of the eighth century by Ibn Baṭṭūta (ii. 198 sq.) and the building of the latter still exists. Ten others are known of the eighth—ninth century including the Madrasa ‘Abd al-Kādir al-Qāṭaqī (688 = 1286), Madrasa Abū Ḥanīfī (of about the same date) and al-Miṣrīyī (738 = 1337), all still in existence, which were founded for Shī‘ī, Ḥanāfī and for the study of Ḥadīth and Ḥadīth. Besides these there still exist seven madrasas founded in Bāghdād in the xvīth and xvīth centuries (I. Masson, Les Médecins de Bāghdād, B.I.F.A.O., vii, 1909, p. 77—85; the inscriptions, d., in M.I.F.A.O., xxxi, 1912). Although the Tatars in 699 (1293) destroyed many madīrīs (Quatremère, Hist. des Sult., ii, 163 sq.), Ibn Baṭṭūta shows that in the eighth century there were still flourishing schools in the east. In Wāsīt there was a madrasa which specialised in tāfsīr al-Kur‘ān; it had three hundred rooms for foreign students (ii. 3). In Tustar, the sūṭān expended one-third of the revenues on madrasas and monasteries (ii. 31) and in Shībā and other Persian towns he also founded madrasa (ii. 62 and pass.). For Niẓābūr, he mentions four madīrīs besides the chief mosque (ii. 80); according to Ḥāfiz Abru (c. 820 = 1417), this town still had eight madīrīs under the Aḥṣā‘īs and he mentions seventeen in which Shī‘īs (rīs) was taught (Seif Nameh, ed. Scheler, p. 281). For Merv, Yāḥīyā about 600 mentions, in addition to the Niẓāmīya, the school founded by Abū Sa‘īd Mūḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Mustawāfī (d. 494), also the Amūnīya and the Khāṭāmīya (iv. 509). Large madīrīs were still being built in Persia in the xvīth century and they are still to be found there in modern times (E. G. Browne, A Year amongst the Persians, 1916, p. 104, 217 sq.). Although the institution had for long a Sunni tendency, it could of course be taken over by the Shī‘īs without any difficulty. 728 (1328) in Māshād ‘Alī, Ibn Baṭṭūta found a large Shī‘ī madrasa (i. 415). The Mongols also built madīrīs, e.g. Karaka Khān, the descendant of Cingis Khān (Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Mont., vi. 56). Ḥūlāfī’s mother built two madrasa in Bukhārā.
where 1,000 students studied daily in each (J.F.A., ser. 4, xx. 389). The period of greatest prosperity of the madrasas in Central Asia was under the Timurids, notably in Samarqand, where Timur built a djamā in "the Indian style", and his wife a madrasa (ibid., 248). The two madrasas of the "Mazār Akbarī, Vitol Timur, ed. Manger, 1767, p. 444 ap., see also Diez, Kunst der islam. Volker, p. 99 sq.

In the towns of Mesopotamia and Syria the movement spread from the fifth century onwards. Nūr al-Dīn b. Zangi founded madrasas for Shāfi‘ī in Damascus, Hālab, Hāmā, Hims, Ba‘albek (J.F.A., ser. 9, iii., p. 428; cf. 488; Makriz, iv. 192).

Kamāl al-Dīn (d. 573) founded a madrasa in Māski, two in Naṣībān and one in Damascus (Wüstenfeld, Schāb‘, p. 317). Tahtī al-Dīn, the nephew of Śalṭāl al-Dīn, built a madrasa in al-Ra‘īsh (Ma‘rizi, iv. 195, 56). Ibn Dzhīhār who travelled from Ṣinā‘ (1153) to 587 (1161) mentions two in Naṣībān (p. 240), one in Ḥarrān (p. 247) and a large Ḥanafī madrasa in Hālab and four or five others (p. 255), three in Ḥanām (p. 257), one in Ḥims (p. 297). Furthermore, in Damascus notably the great Nūrīyya (p. 283; s. 289) and one founded by Ẓāhirī, two in Māski (p. 236, 237); a madrasa in the last-named town was built in two stories with a Dar al-Hadīth on the ground floor (Ibn Aby Uṣā‘ī, ii. 204, in the year 585).

The development in Damascus was of particular importance. Information about this is contained in the Tūnūkh al-Talāb wa Fighī al-Darās of Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Nu‘aymī (d. 927 = 1521), the synopsis of which by ʿAbd al-Bāṣīr al-Ḥimawi (d. 1059 = 1549) has been published by Sauvare (J.F.A., ser. 9, iii., viii., vii.). The substance had already been given by Fleischer from Mīkhāil Meṣḥās, (K. Schriften, iii. 306, = Z.D.M.G. xvi. 814, 1854, p. 349 sqq.; cf. iii., 1849, p. 123; there are a few differences in points of detail between Fleischer's and Sauvare's publications). A Dar al-Kur‘ān, the Rtrimayy, was founded here about 400 (J.F.A., ser. 4, xx. 362) and the first madrasa for Ẓāhirī studies was the Ḥanafī Shāfī‘ī, which was founded beside the Mosque of the Omayyads by Shāhīd al-Dawla Sa‘īd in 491 (1097) (ibid., iv. 286); next came, sometime before 520, the likewise Ḥanafī Turkhāniyya (ibid.) and in 514 the Shāfī‘ī Amīnīyya founded by the Ḥanafī Aṣ‘īm al-Dawla (ibid.), iii. 395, then the Ḥanbalī Sharī‘īyya founded by a scholar who died in 536 (iv. 467), the Ḥanafī Khāṭṭīnīyya built extra muros by a princess in 526 (ibid., p. 254), the Ḥanafī Omartiyya founded by a shaykh who died in 528 (ibid., p. 473; cf. Fleischer, K. Schriften, iii. 328). The two rulers Nūr al-Dīn b. Zangi (541-569 = 1146-1163) and Śalṭāl al-Dīn (570-589 = 1174-1193) displayed a manifest activity in this direction as did their emirs and relatives. Nūr al-Dīn founded a Dar al-Ḥadīth and the Nūrīyya (ibid., iii. 280), and the following Shāfī‘ī madrasa: al-Shāfī‘īyya (ibid., p. 414), al-Ṭūsīyya (ibid., p. 428), al-ʿAṣ‘īmīyya (ibid., p. 430), al-Kullās (ibid., p. 439), and he began the building of the Alīdīyya (completed by al-Shāhīd; ibid., p. 422), and as a Ḥanafī madrasa, the large and small Nūrīyya (ibid., iv. 388, 291). In his reign an emir also built the Alīdīyya for Shāfī‘ī and Hanafī (ibid., iii. 387), another emir a Shāfī‘ī Mudāhirīyya inside and outside the town (ibid., p. 440); of Ḥanafī madrasa, an emir al-Ṣuṣ‘ī built two, the al-Balqā‘īyya and the Nūrīyya (ibid., iv. 245 sq.), a slave of Nūr al-Dīn, the Ra‘īshīyya in 529 (ibid., p. 259), an emir the Nu‘‘īyya in 555 (ibid., p. 281); a lady built a Hanbali madrasa with a Dar al-Ḥadīth, the Alīmīyya (ibid., p. 477), a Ḥanbali Shaykh, who died in 596, the Muṣāmīrrīyya (Fleischer, op. cit., p. 329). Śalṭāl al-Dīn rebuilt the Shāfī‘ī Kullās, which had been burned down (J.F.A., ser. 9, iii. 459) and himself founded the Mālikī Shāhīyya and a Mālikī šāfiyya in the Mosque of the Omayyads (ibid., iv. 460 sq.). There were also built in his reign a Dar al-Ḥadīth by the Kādī al-Fajjāl (ibid., iii. 277), a madrasa for Shāfī‘ī and Hanafī, the ʿĀḍ ḥrawīyya, by his daughter or brother's daughter in 580 (ibid., p. 425), six Shāfī‘ī madrasas (ibid., p. 391, 399 sqq., 403, 435, 440, some five Hanafī including one founded by his (previously Nūr al-Dīn's) wife (ibid., iv. 256, 266, 277, 284 sq.). This building activity was continued into the seventh to ninth centuries so that al-Nu‘‘īyya can give the following totals: seven Dar al-Kur‘ān, sixteen Dar al-Ḥadīth (one, the Kūṭya, is not given in Fleischer), three for both Kur‘ān and Hadīth, sixty Shāfī‘ī (two of them also for Hanafī; in Fleischer, Nrs. 16 and 30 are not given), fifty-two Ḥanafī (twenty of them especially for Shāfī‘īs). Of these some forty, or Dar al-Hadīth of Shāfī‘ī as Dabābighiya, four Mālikī and ten Ḥanbalī madrasas (in Fleischer, one of the two Dijīyya is not given; on the other hand he has the Muṣāmīrrīyya), also three Madrasa al-Šīṣī, all of which belong to the seventh century. The founders were mainly rulers and emirs, but also included merchants and quite a number of men of learning, and a few women also. As in the east, especially in earlier times, a madrasa was often founded for a particular scholar (ibid., iii. 400, 488) and sometimes finds a learned man handling over his house to be a madrasa (al-Dawla’s, ibid., p. 403, cf. 419; iv. 470). According to Mīkhāil Meṣḥās, in his time (14th century) these madrasas had practically all disappeared or were used as dwelling-houses, because their endowments had disappeared and there were only five left in his time (Fleischer, op. cit., p. 317=311). Śalṭāl al-Dīn introduced the madrasa into Jerusalém. In 585 (1189) he endowed the Khānsāḥ Shāhīyya, in 587 the Zāwīyya Khatunyya south of al-Aṣká for a particular scholar and in 588 he turned the Church of St. Anna into the Shāhīyya Madrasa; in 589, 593 and 598 emirs built similar institutions and in the seventh—ninth centuries a whole series of them came into existence. According to Muḥīr al-Dīn (d. 927 = 1521), there were thirty-one madrasas and monasteries (which were in part used in the same way as madrasas) in direct connection with the Haram; and or near it, and sixteen at some distance from them. Of these there were one Dar al-Kur‘ān and one Dar al-Ḥadīth (Sauvare, Hist. doc., p. 139 sqq.; v. Berchem, Corpus, ii. 1; cf. for Śalṭāl al-Dīn: Ibn Kallikā, Wafayāt, ii, Cairo 1310, p. 402 sq.). In Hebron there was also a madrasa, that of al-Malik al-Nasir (Sauvare, op. cit., p. 23). Next to Niṣām al-Mulk, Śalṭāl al-Dīn has the greatest reputation as a builder of madrasas. He owes this mainly to the fact that his great activity as a builder lay in countries, which became of great importance in the Muslim world, Syria with Palestine, and Egypt. Even before the fall of the Fātimids he had founded in the year 566 in the vicinity of the Mosque of ‘Amr, the Nasīrīyya
example (Yākūt, Udākhāri, vii. 20). These attacks on libraries did not mean they were tired of books as Yākūt (Udākhāri, v. 389) suggests, but was only one expression of the reaction against the Shī'īs.

3. Origin and spread of the Madrasa.

While the institutions called the Dār al-Ilm developed in Fātimid countries into centres of Shī'ī propaganda, the madrassa grew up in the east out of similar Sunni institutions. It is interesting to note that in 400, al-Hākim built a Sunnī Dār al-Ilm in Cairo. In it lived two Mālikī scholars, who gave instruction and gathered about them men learned in Ḥadīth and ʿĀthā (Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Popper, ii. p. 64, 105, 106; al-Ḍhabābi, Duwan al-Ilam, Haidarābdī, 1337, i. 186). As the instruction (see the first reference) was given in the Dār, the institute must have been connected with a mosque, probably that of ʿAmr. It owed its existence however only to a passing fancy and after three years, the institution was abolished and the two learned teachers executed. With the growing strength of the Sunna, especially in the Shāfiʿī and Ḥanafī form, many educational institutions arose in the east which had a pronounced Sunnī character; the Sunna in the fourth century wanted to have influence with the other schools (B. G. A. iii. 323, 365, 415). Many teachers built houses of their own, where they dictated hadīth and held lectures on ʿĀthā, e. g. a teacher who died in Merw in 420 (Wustenfeld, Islam Schafft, ii. 232). Abū Ḥātim al-Bustī born in 977 (890) founded in his native town a school with a library with apartments and allowances for the maintenance of foreign students (ibid., p. 163). In Aμur, al-Rūyūni (d. 502) built a school; he himself taught in the mosque, also in al-Rāy (ii. 245). In Tābarān a school was built for al-Ḥātimi (d. 393 = 1003) (ibid., ii. 202). In Baghdād, al-Isnaʿī (d. 396 = 1006) founded two lectureships in ʿĀthā studies, one of which was filled by al-Isaraʾīnī, who otherwise lectured in the mosque of Ibn al-Muḥarrak, and the other by al-Bābi (ibid., p. 204, cf. p. 217). The philologist and hijjāʾ poet al-Zawānī who died in 465 lived with other learned men in a madrasa al-Sayyūf (Yākūt, Udākhārī, vii. 409).

In Nisābūr especially, where studies were vigorously prosecuted in the mosque (e. g. Wustenfeld, Schafft, iii. 236) many such institutions arose. Thus a special school was built for the Shāfiʿī ʿĀthā scholars al-Sālıq al-Nisābūrī (349 = 960; ibid., i. 156; cf. 160). Abū ʿAli al-Ḥusaini (d. 393) himself founded a school in which to teach Ḥadīth and it was attended by 1,000 scholars (ibid., p. 200). Ibn Fārāk (d. 406; ibid., p. 216) did the same and in the year 437 Abū ʿĀṣān al-Kūshāri (ibid., ii. 284) and for Rukan al-Din al-Isaraʾīnī (d. 418 = 1027) a school was built which surpassed all others (ibid., ii. 290). As early as the tenth century we thus find al-Maḳdisi praising the very fine madrasa of Isfahān (B. G. A., iii. 315). In the first half of the fifth century, there were four especially famous madāris in Nisābūr: al-Madrasa al-Balḥakya, founded by al-Balḥaki (d. 384), when he became a teacher in Nisābūr in 441 (Wustenfeld, Schafft, ii. 270; al-Suyūṭī is therefore wrong in ascribing its foundation to before the birth of Niẓām al-Mulk [in 408]; see Husain, ii. 147, al-Saʿdiyya founded by the emir Nāṣr b. Subuktakān (governor of Nisābūr in 389).
for Şahîn and the Kamhiya for Mâlikis; for Şahîn also the Sharifiyas (called after its head also Madrasa Zain al-Tuğâdar) and notably the great Şâlihîya or Nâşirîya (for the identity of the two cf. Maqrîzî, iv. 254, with Hussain al-Mukhâbâra, i. 142 sq.) beside al-Shâfi‘î’s mausoleum; he also has had a madrasa beside the Mağhâd al-Husain and in 572 a. Hanâfé madrasa the Şuqîyiya, and he turned the house of an emir named Sa‘d al-Sû‘adâ into a khanâqâh (Husain al-Mukhâbâra, ii. 21 sq.; Maqrîzî, iv. 192 sq.; Ibn Khalîkîn, ii. 402 sq.). Those around him emulated this activity. His visitor the Kâdi l-Fâdîl in 580 built the Fâdîliya for Şahîn, Mâlikis and for Iskârî (Maqrîzî, iv. 197), a brother the Sâ’îfîya (ibid., p. 199), another, al-Mâlik al-Âdîl, the Madrasat al-Âdîl (ibid., p. 195), his nephew Ta‘kî al-Dîn built in Cairo the Manzûl al-Isâr or Takwâniya for Şâfi‘îs (ibid., p. 194; Ibn Dî‘kâmî, p. 93) and three others in the Fâyûm (Maqrîzî, iv. 195). Other emirs and their relatives followed his example (ibid., p. 196, 199 sq.) and even a merchant, al-Arsâfî, founded a madrasa in 570 (ibid., p. 194). Ibn Dî‘kâmî, who travelled through Egypt in the time of Şâlih al-Dîn, speaks of several madrassas in Alexandria (Rihla, p. 42) and particularly of one beside al-Shâfi‘î’s tomb, which looked like a whole town (ibid., p. 48).

During the period of the Ayyûbiyyas and Mâlikis the number of madâris increased to an extraordinary degree. In the street called Bâin al-Kâsaţân there were two long rows of madrasas on the site of the old Fa‘ṣîmîd palace in Cairo (cf. P. Ravaïsse, in M. M. A. F., iv, 1887, p. 409 sqq., pl. 3). As a rule, the madrasa was placed in the street, and the house. Ibn Dî‘kâmî mentions that in Cairo only two stood isolated (p. 98). Al-Nu‘aymî and Ibn Dî‘kâmî describe several madrasas (and madâris) as masâ‘i‘î makes e. above the ground-floor. Ibn Bâţîsh, who travelled at the beginning of the eighth century, found madrasa even in quite small towns, e. g. in Dâmûs, Munyat h. Khashîb, ‘Înâ, Kus, Asmâ‘ (i. 65, 96, 106, 108). Ibn Dî‘kâmî (p. 92-99) about 900 gives a list of twenty-four madâris; this is obviously very incomplete; on the other hand, it contains nine names, not given by al-Maqrîzî. This author (d. 845 = 1442) mentions 73 madrasas, fourteen for Şâfi‘îs, four for Mâlikis, ten for Hanâfîs, three for Şâfi‘îs and Mâlikis, six for Şâfi‘îs and Hanâfîs, one for Mâlikis and Hanâfîs, four for all four rites, two exclusively used as dâr al-harîshî, while the rite of twenty-five is not mentioned and four remained unfinished. Of these madrasas, according to him, about thirteen were founded before 600, twenty in the seventh century, twenty-nine in the eighth century and two after 800. To the two schools of Ma’dhûb (al-Kâmiya of the year 622 and al-Khawarijya of about 780, see iv. 201, 211 sq.) is to be added the Marғâjî, mentioned by Ibn Dî‘kâmî (p. 99). A notable feature is the decline of the Hanbalî and in contrast to Damascus the large number of schools which included all four rites. The first Egyptian madrasa to include all four rites was the Şâlihîya, founded in 640-641 by al-Mâlik al-Şâlihî (Maqrîzî, iv. 209 sq.) probably on the model of the Mustaqmîriya.

In Şahîn al-Dîn’s time, the madrasa was also introduced into the travel of Hâjî. In the year 579, the governor of ‘Aden built in Mecca a madrasa for the Hanâfîs and in the following year a Şâlihî madrasa was also founded there (Chron. Mecca, ii. 104). Up to the beginning of the ninth century, eleven madrasas are mentioned (ibid., p. 104-107) but others were added (ibid., iii. 177 sq., 211 sq., 225 sq., 351 sqq., 417). In the xviii century they ceased entirely to be used for their original purpose (see Sooneck Hurgronje, Meḵkân, ii. 229 sqq.). Madrasa were also built in Medina (Wistenfeld, Medina, p. 58, 95, 112).

In Asia Minor, madrasas spread under the Şâlihîs; the oldest known date from the seventh century. In Konya for example there were the Şâlihî Madrasa of the year 640 (1242-1243), Şâlihî Madrasa 649 (1251-1252) and Indjemînârî Madrasa 674 (1274-1276) (cf. Huart, Konîa, 1897, p. 156, 160, 178; Fr. Sarre, Reise in Kleinasien, 1886, p. 48 sq., 51 sq.; Gottscho, in Munich Annalen, 1928, p. 106 sqq.). In Siwâ‘ three madrasa date from the year 670 (1271-1272) namely the Şâlihîya or Gok Madrasa, founded by Fâkhr al-Dîn, that of Muqaffar Barîndî and that of Shams al-Dîn Muhammadd. The first mentioned is probably identical with the Dîr al-Tâdîrî described by Ewliyâ‘, which contained eighty rooms in two stories (see v. Berchem, Corpus, iii, p. 18 sqq., 26 sqq., 31 sqq.). In Diyārî, a madrasa has been built in the Dîmîs [Dâmîs] Aḥmad Şâh erected in 626 (1228-1229) (ibid., p. 71 sq., 80). About 753 (1333) Ibn Bâţîsh found madrasa all over Asia Minor, even in quite small towns (ii. 260, 267, 269, 285, 296 sqq., 340, 343, etc.). Building activity was continued under the Ottomans (cf. Huart, Konîa, p. 59, 97, 109; Fr. Sarre, Reise in Kleinasiens, index; R. Hartmann, op. cit., p. 24 sq.).

According to the Kûrâs, the madrasa was brought to North Africa as early as the time of Şahîh al-Dîn, for we are told that the Almohad Ya‘kûb b. Yûsuf (580-595 = 1184-1199) built mosques, hospitals and madrasas in Ifriqiyâ, the Maghrib and al-Andalus (Tornberg, Anmäne Regnum Mauritaniae, Upsala 1843, i. 143); but no exact details are given to corroborate this statement. The Maghribi madrasas were exclusively Mâlikîs.

In Tunis, many madrasas were erected under the Hafsîs (625-941 = 1228-1354), the oldest being the Madrasat al-Ma‘rîd about 650. In the Chronicle of Tunis (Zarqâshî, in Chronique de l’Alomahdet et des Hafsides, trad. E. Fagnan, in Rev. Des. et Hist. Soc. Arch. Cons., xxii, 1895, see index) eleven are mentioned including the Madrasat ‘Unî al-Djâmil of 742 (1344), the Madrasat Ibn Tâbrîdîn, founded by a learned man in 766 (1364), the Madrasa Shamâma‘îya (before 734 = 1333; see op. cit., p. 105, 106, 221), Madrasat Belkhallafîn in 796 (1393) (ibid., p. 183), and six of the ninth century (see op. cit., index; cf. also Margais, Manuel d’Art Musulman, ii. 500, N° 2). Ibn Bâţîsh mentions at the beginning of the eighth century the Madrasat al-Kutabîyîn (i. 20). There is no trace of madrasas of the Almohads and the statement in the Kûrâs regarding them does not agree with the other sources. The first madrasa in the Maghrib was, according to Ibn Sa‘îdî, Mustança‘î, the Madrasa al-Sa‘îdîân built by the Marinid Abd al-Yûsuf Ya‘kûb b. Abd al-Haṣîn (566-685 = 1258-1286) in Fâs in 685 (also called al-Halîfiyya, see the edition by Lévi-Provençal, in Heritier, v., 1925, p. 34 (Arabic) = p. 44 (French)). In Fâs, we are told by the same source, Abd Sa‘îdî (725-731) and his son Abu ‘l-Haṣan (731-749) built several madrasas: the M. al-Madina al-Bâdrî (M. Dîr al-Makhrî in Fâs Djâphil) in 721 (1323), the M.
interest in the specialised madrasa decreased considerably and the great builder of the xith (xviiiith) century, the emir Khâjudû, still built madrasas, but his real interest was in the mosque (see below). Lane only mentions the Arhangelsk as an important centre of study in Cairo. The development in Mecca was similar, where in modern times studies are only prosecuted in the mosque (Saouer Hurgronje, Mekhâ, i. 17, and cf. above). On education and the madrasa in general cf. also F. Wüstfenfeld, Die Akademien der Araber und ihre Lehrer, Göttingen 1837; Kremer, Kulturgeschichte, 1877, ii. 479 sqq.; Haneberg, Abhandlung über das Schul- und Lehrwesen der Muhammedaner im Mittelalter, 1850; v. Berchem, Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, ii. 252—
269; G. Gabrielli, Manuale di Bibliografia Musulmana, i., 1916, p. 109 sqq.

4. Development of the Madrasas and similar Institutions.

a. Madrasa, Masjid and Dâmî.

There was, as already mentioned, no difference in principle between the madrasa and other mosques. Even after the introduction of madaris, the regular mosques remained schools as before. Ibn Batûta, who travelled in the eighth century, in the period when madaris flourished most, attended lectures on Hadith not only in the Dâmî of Shâri'a but also in the Dâmî Maṭrî in Baghdad (ii. 83, 110). In Damascus in 580, Ibn Dâhûr refers to rooms in the Mosque of the Omaiyâ, which were used for Shâri'a and Mi'llîkî students, who received considerable stipends ( alfârî, mi'llîk) and among them were many Maghâribîs; the mosque had large endowments (ma'dîkî) for strangers and the al-talab (khûla, p. 266 sqq., 272 supra). Ibn Batûta also speaks of the helalî al-madhâbî of this mosque in the different sciences (i. 212). In Egypt in the time of al-Mâkrit (ninth century), there were 8 rooms for fiqh studies in the Mosque of 'Amr and before 749 there were over 40 hâlebî in it (Maṭrî, iv. 20, 21). In the Mosque of Ibn Tâlîn after its renovation in the reign of Lâdîn (696—708) courses of fiqh, according to the four madhâhib, and other studies were arranged (ibîb., p. 41; cf. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Mont., ii/ii. 47 sqq.) and in 767 an emir appointed 7 teachers in Hâsînî fiqh there (Maṭrî, iv. 42). In al-Ahâr in the seventh century and later after the earthquake of 702 many lecture-rooms with paid teachers were built (ibîb., p. 52), likewise in the Mosque of Hâkim, where, after the earthquake, lecture-rooms in fiqh for each madhâhib and for Hadîth were founded with salaries for the teachers and scholarships for the students (ibîb., p. 57). In Fâtîmid mosques, like the Dâmî al-Zâhir and the Dâmî Ma'kâs built by al-Hakîm, Mi'llik emirs founded new lecture-rooms (ibîb., p. 66, 81) and not only in the Ma'shad al-Husainî but also in the Ma'shad al-Nafisi were studies carried on in the eighth century (Hass al-Ma'sâîfâr, i. 195; Mûlîyî l-Dîn).

When a particular room was set apart for teaching purposes in a mosque, this was often called a madrasa; for example 6 of the Damascus madaris were in the Mosque of the Omaiyâ: the Shâhîsî, Ghaûlîsî, 'I'zîyî, Mâdîkî, Mâdîk'sî, or of which the first and third were also known simply as helâhî (J. A., i. 193, ii. 89, 410, 434, 437; et. al. 262, 276, 481; others: vii. 230); al-Hâkim's Mi'llik madrasa was
in the Mosque of ‘Amr (see above) and Ibn Du‘mān (p. 100 sq.) mentions 8 zawāyā in this mosque, which were endowed for ṭāfīsī. The madrasas were often built close beside the large mosques so that they practically belonged to them. This was the case in Mecca (Chron. Mubāh, ii. 104 sq.; cf. Ibn Baṭṭūta, i. 324), in Damascus where there was a Šāhī madrasa beside the western gate, Bāb al-Barid (Ibn Lūḥār, p. 271), in Niṣābūr (Ibn Baṭṭūta, iii. 80) and in Cairo where al-Madrasa al-Taḥārīya in 709 and al-Aqṣābāhīya about 730 were built so close to the Azhar Mosque that they had common walls and windows in them, which was specially permitted by a fetwa; these were afterwards completely incorporated in the Mosque (Maṭrī, iv. 223 sq.). In Fās, the chief madrasas are arranged round the great mosque al-Kanrawīn and the same arrangement is found in Mārrakāsh (Pauty, in Hosp. Fr., 1923, p. 514 sqq., 523).

If the madrasa, as a building, had little independence, its character as a home for students and place of instruction was very marked. But even where it was quite an independent institution, the distinction between madrasa and ordinary mosque was very slight, all the less as sermons were also preached in the madrasa. In the fifth century the minbar had already been introduced into a large number of mosques. In the Niṣāmīya in Niṣābūr, services were held as soon as it was finished (by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Wūṭiṣefīn, Šafīʾ, ii. 285) and the Niṣāmīya in Baghdaḍ had a minbar (Ibn Lūḥār, p. 219). A problem was however raised by the fact that these madrasa buildings were inhabited by the Šāhīs and this school held that only one mosque in a town could celebrate the Friday service, unless the town was of very considerable size and we are definitely told that al-Djūwānīt conducted the Friday service in the madrasa in Niṣābūr although he was also khaṭīb at the Manṭī mosque (Wūṭiṣefīn, Šafīʾ, iii. 251). In Egypt from 569 to 665 there was only one Friday khaṭīb, but after this there was usually a minbar in the large mosques. The callih actually preached in the madrasa built by Kāhsīn (676–689; Maṭrī, iv. 221). The minbar for the djūmā in many mosques is expressly mentioned, e.g. the Ḥadījīya 761 (ibid., p. 222 sqq.), the Baṭṭīsī 776 (ibid., p. 236), the Zaṭṣāmīya 797 (ibid., p. 241), the Ǧīlī (ibid., p. 249). The Šāhīya, which had not a minbar at first, was given one in 758 and was henceforth used for the Friday service (ibid., p. 205). In Fās the mixed type of ḍījīm and madrasa was found in the Bīr Ānāfīya (Bel, X.A., ser. 11, xii. 339).

It was only natural that the madrasas should also be called masḏijī (cf. Ibn Djaḥār, p. 48, 11 with line 19, 20). Ibn al-Ḥajjīd in the viith century still wants to distinguish between masḏijī and madrasa and to give more importance to the former (Maṭbaqā, ii. 3, 48). The distinction remained however quite an artificial one and this is also true of the distinction between madrasa and ḍījīm. The name madrasa was decided by the main object of the institution and the special style of the building. The name ḍījīm was only given if the Friday service was held in it. Thus, as late as 772, we find the emir Bihārī building a madrasa and opposite it a ḍījīm; but in the year 815, the madrasa was given a minbar and used as a ḍījīm (Maṭrī, iv. 235 sq.). If these two uses of the building were equal) either name may be used (cf. the double name in an inscription of the emir Mūkbbīl: van Berchem, Corpus, i., II, No. 201). In some cases a Friday mosque can be said to be in the madrasa (Ibn Battūta, ii. 39). The great Djiṃī ʿHasan begun in 757 was also one of the largest madrasas in Cairo (Maṭrī, iv. 117 sqq.) and on the other hand, the Djiṃī Khaṭīr in Bīṭāb built in 737 and the Djiṃī Aslam founded in 746 were educational institutions (ibid., p. 116, 111; Ibn al-Muḥāfṣara, i. 192). In the ninth century the Djiṃī al-Maʿāyīdy was the most important new madrasa in Cairo (Maṭrī, iv. 139). The same variation in nomenclature is often found in this century (cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i., II, 235, 253, 262). On the other hand Maṭrī, in the ninth century, only uses masḏij as a name for quite insignificant mosques (iv. 263 sqq., where masḏij are mentioned). In the xith century the emir Kattūḥād built 18 large mosques and many smaller ones and his interest in the furtherance of learning was specially displayed in his buildings at the Azhar mosque, which had developed at the expense of the specialist madrasa (al-Djābūṭī, Merveilles Biographiques, ii. 230 sqq.; Sulaimān Rasād, Kanz al-Djūwāhî fī Turāḥ al-Āshār, p. 74 sqq.); for the similar situation in Mecca cf. above.

The connection between maszūlum and mosque was also found with the madrasa. The tomb of the founder was placed in Nūr al-Dīn’s madrasa in Damascus (Ibn Djaḥār, p. 284, 1) and during the Manūlīk period it was the regular custom for the founder of a madrasa to be buried under a ḥubbā in it.

8. Monasteries.

A close connection arose between the monastery and the madrasa. As already mentioned, it was quite a common thing for devout men to live permanently in the mosque e.g. in the minaret or somewhere else on the roof or in subsidiary buildings or in a cell in the mosque. Such a cell which can be used for teaching or for meditation is called wiṣāwīya, lit. corner (Ibn Djaḥār, p. 246, 245, 266; Maṭrī, iv. 20; cf. Greek ṣanw; see Dossy, Supplement, s. v.). Pious ascetics however had retained from the older religion the custom of living in special monasteries e.g. in Djaḥālān in the fourth century (B. G. A., i. 188); Muslim historians trace these back to the time of the Companions (Maṭrī, iv. 272 sq.); in the fourth century ascetics and Sūfis, especially the Karrāmīya [q. v.] or Karrāmīya (cf. Men., Renaissance, p. 273), had quite a number of monasteries (ḥāmīmīn, also ḥīmīmīn, sing. ḥāmīmān) in Farghānā, Murc al-Rūd, Samarkand, Djūmūn, Ṭabaristan etc. (B. G. A., iii. 343, 365); Jerusalem and in Egypt also the Karrāmīya had their monasteries in which they held ḥāmīn (ibid., p. 179, 182, 202).

The distinction between ḥāmīmān and ṣfrū (plur. ṣfrūn) is one of origin rather than fact. Ṣfrū was simply a dwelling place of men of learning who possessed the ḥāmīn on the frontier but the word was also used by the Sūfis who waged a spiritual ḥiṣba (cf. Maṭrī, iv. 292 sqq.). There was a ṣfrū in the Maṭjī in the fourth century in the Wādir Salt (B. Γ. A., ii. 56). When Ibn Marrūṣa says that they had only two ṣfrūn of the eastern kind (in Saff and Salt, Hosp. Fr., v. 36, 71), it is doubtful whether he means an establishment of Sūfis or of ḥāmīmīn. In the vth (xst) century there were several military ṣfrūn on the river Niger, from
which the Almoravids originated. From the 12th century onwards many were built in Morocco against the Spaniards and Portuguese. Maʿārī is the usual word for riḥāʾ (see Bel, J. A., ser. II, ix. 1917, p. 325, No. 1). In the east in the fourth century, rubūj are frequently mentioned, which probably had a military character (H. G. A., iii. 303, 354, 415). The original distinction between khasmāh and riḥāʾ is never quite forgotten; as late as the beginning of the 18th century we find riḥāʾ used of barracks (Maʿārī, iv. 270). Ibn Baṭṭūta says that the word khasmāh had not reached the west; that the old Arabic term ṣamīr was used (Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii. 77). khasmāh however in Ibn Marzûq, Hisprīs, v. 35 sqq.). Usually we find the three terms used without any definite distinction being made between them (pawma also seems to be used in the Kirfās of a Muslim monastery, see Turnberg, Annates, p. 143; cf. p. 18); for all three names are applied to Sīfī monasteries, which are also taken, in sīfīs, e.g. are used as hospices.

Ibn Baṭṭūta mentions many monasteries in the Ifrīq and Persia. Besides the tomb of al-Ribāṭ, not far from Wāṣīt was a riḥāʾ, which he calls ṣamīr, where "thousand of poor men," i.e. Sīfīs, lived (ii. 4). In al-Lūr especially, he found a vast number of monasteries; the sūlān there built 460 rsaādīs and spent 1/2 of his revenues on them and the madrāzs (ii. 31).

In Ibn Djabṣir testifies to the flourishing monasteries which were often regular palaces and he says that the names khasmāh and riḥāʾ are used indiscriminately (p. 243, 271, 284); the word khasmāh sounded strange to him as a westerner, as to Ibn Baṭṭūta (p. 284). Nevertheless al-Nuʿaymī differentiates the three terms and mentions 29 khasmāk, 23 rubūj and 26 rsaādīs. The oldest khasmāh mentioned by him (Dawaira) was founded for a learned man who died in 401 (Sauvare, in J. A., ser. IX, v. 269, 377, 387 sqq.).

It was similar with Egypt. The first khasmāh was built by Salīḥ al-Dīn in 569 in Cairo (al-Sallīḥīa, originally called Dār Salīḥ al-Sawādā; Maʿārī, iv. 273), the next in the seventh century by Baḥr as-Bunduqdārī, who also founded new monasteries in Syria (ibid., p. 282, 293). Of khasmāk, al-Maʿārī mentions 22 (Ibn Duknāk only one), of the sixth century: one, seventh: one, eighth: 18, ninth: one. Of rubūj 12 (Ibn Duknāk 8), of the seventh century: 9, of the eighth: one, besides 5 on the Kufa. Of rsaādīs 26 (Ibn Duknāk, 9); these were mainly outside the town and were obviously quite small, often being simply the house, later the tomb of some devout man. The oldest dated from the sixth century. In Jerusalem also Salīḥ al-Dīn built a khasmāh (v. Berchen, Cervas, ii. p. 87 sqq.). Among the khasmāk, rsaādīs and rubūj in this city the last named seem to have been specially intended as hostels for pilgrims (ibid., p. 197 sqq.; see also Sauvare, Jérusalem, et Hébron, index). In Mecca 50 ruṣūj are mentioned; the oldest dated from 400 (Chron. Mekka, ii. 108–115). At places of pilgrimage, the monasteries played an important part as hostels but even in other places they also gave accommodation to strangers. Ibn Baṭṭūta on his travels usually stayed in them (he calls them rsaādīs) but he also lodged in madrāzs, which were generally used as hospices (cf. Quatremère, Hist. Sall. Islam., ii/35, note). Some of these institutions were convents for single women (Maʿārī, iv. 293 sqq.).

The main object of monasteries, however, was to afford Sīfīs a home and place for their devotional exercises. In the khasmāh of Baḥr as-Bunduqdārī founded in 766, 400 Sīfīs were maintained (Maʿārī, iv. 276 infra) and in the khasmāh of Sīrākīs founded in 100 (ibid., p. 285). They were given lodging, food, clothing and money; there were often baths attached to them. The building was arranged for ḍhūʾ exercises, and also for ṣalāt so that it was a kind of mosque. Ibn Djabṣir mentions a riḥāʾ on the summit of Abī Kūnīs in which there was a mosque (p. 108). The riḥāʾ may be actually called a madrāz (Maʿārī, iv. 294; cf. khasmāh and masajjīd, p. 282 and the term masajjīd al-riḥāʾ. Ibn ʿArabīshī, Vida Timūrī, ed. Manger, iii. 886). The monastery founded by Salīḥ al-Dīn was actually given a minaret in 780 (mtājama) and it is recorded that people used to wear sandals to walk in the ṣalāt (Maʿārī, iv. 275 infra). Sometimes only the occupants of the monastery are admitted to the ṣalāt (ibid., p. 277: Khasmāh Baḥr as-Bunduqdārī). There was therefore an imām on the staff of the khasmāh (ibid., p. 287). Like other sanctuaries the monasteries sometimes preserved relics; the Ribāt al-Khāṭir, for example, preserved a piece of iron and wood which had belonged to the Prophet (ibid., p. 295). We sometimes find a khasmāh built close to a large mosque like the khasmāh of Aḥū futḥalās beside the Aḥār Mosque (ibid., p. 292; cf. p. 350, ʿUṣārī) or the founder built a masajjīd for the Friday ṣalāt beside the monastery (Sīrākīs, ibid., p. 285). The occupant of the Sūlīhīya Khasmāh took a prominent part in the Friday service in the mosque of Ḥikīm (ibid., p. 274). At a later date, we find the monasteries themselves arranged for the Friday ṣalāt. This was the case with the Ribāt al-Afrām, which in 664 was given a minbar for the Friday and festival kūḥas (ibid., p. 297) and al-Muʿāyadī made a house, that had been begun before he came to the throne, into a ḍārīn wa-khasmāh (ibid., p. 134 infra) just as ḍārīn wa-dārī could be built with living-rooms for Sīfīs, e.g. the ḍārīn al-Bāṣīt (beginning of the 12th century, like the preceding, ibid., p. 140 infra) and in the 13th century, the ḍārīn al-Shāhīn (before the building of his khasmāh, ibid., p. 113). Baḥr as-Bunduqdārī was buried in his khasmāh and the monasteries had as a rule tombs, either of the founder, or of devout men who had lived in them.

The development of the monastery is therefore quite analogous to that of the madrāzā; the one institution merges into the other, because learning and manifestation of piety are inseparable in Islam. Learning was also cultivated in the monasteries; at the present day, we find students living in a monastery and attending lectures in a madrāzā. Some scholars lectured on Ḥadīṯ in their rooms in a monastery (ibid., p. 294, 295, 303) but instruction was also arranged for in some monasteries just as in the madrāzā. ʿAbd al-Lāṭif (d. 529 = 1231) lectured in a ribāt in Baghdad on ʿuṣūl, ḥadīṯ, etc. (Ibn Abī Usākhīs, ii. 203) and a Ribāt al-Khāṭirī is mentioned here, which had a library (Ibn Ḥimṣī, ed. Lippe, p. 260). There are other references to libraries in monasteries (see for Masr: Yāḥṣī, iv. 599). In Khānahkāh Shaikhtī founded in 756, an extensive course of lectures, Fiḳh according to all four Madhāḥībī, Ŧaḍīḥ and
Iṣrā' (Maqrizi, iv. 283), was given. In the Ribāṭ al-Āthār in the eighth century, instruction was given in Suḥrū' Fī Ḥikāh (ibid., p. 296) and in the Dār al-Faḡḥāṣ built in 821, arrangements were made for students as well as for Sāfu (ibid., p. 136); the Ḥanafi madrasa al-Djamāliyya (730) was also a khibnākāh (ibid., p. 238 supra); they had a common director.

In the eighth and ninth century this combination of the two institutions became quite frequent, for example in the Nīṣābiyya in Cairo of the year 757 (v. Berchem, Corpus, i. 242 sqq.), in the madrasa of Basbāl 935 (ibid., p. 365 sqq.; cf. Ibn Iyās, li. 21, 22, 41), of al-Malik al-Āṣrāf al-Insāl, 855—600 (ibid., no. 271 sqq.) and of Kāṭb Bī 879 (ibid., p. 431 sqq.). The same institution thus came to be given different names (cf. ibid., p. 172 sqq.) and al-Suyuti deals with the khwānākāh under the madrasa. In the east, Ibn Bāṭnija found the same relationship, for example in Shinās and in Kerbelā' (li. 78 sqq., 88, 99) and this is what he means when he says the Persians call the zāwiyya madrasa (li. 30, 32). In the west, he lands his own sovereign, who had built a splendid zāwiyya in Fās (l. 84); here also learning and Ṣafīṭism were associated (see the quotation in Dassy, Supplement, u. v. zāwiyya) and the zāwiyya still plays an important part in North Africa (see Djurf and Coppolani, Les Consécrations Religieuses d'Al-Mansūr, Alger, 1897; El-Hachaiachi, Voyages au Pays des Senousses, transl. Serres and Lasram, Paris 1912). Cf. on the monasteries: v. Berchem, C. I. A., i. 163 sqq., 174 sqq. c. Hospitals.

We commonly find, e.g. in Ibn Djufrī and al-Maqrizi, the hospital, mārūṣātān, māṣrīṣātān, mūṣrīṣātān, mentioned in close connection with the madrasa, probably because it was administered by learned men and as a rule also contained a medical school. Al-Walî said it had been the first in Islam to build a hospital, in the year 88 (Maqrizi, iv. 258 sq.; B. G. A., v. 106). In Cairo in 259 or 261 (i.e. before the mosque) Ibn Tulun built a hospital for the poor. At the same time he installed a dispensary behind the mosque and a physician used to sit there to be consulted every Friday. According to al-Maqrizi, his māṣrīṣātān (called in Ibn Dujmāl, p. 99 the "upper") was the first in Egypt; this probably means the first free public hospital; it is improbable that this Hellenistic institution did not already exist in Egypt (Maqrizi, iv. 38, 39, 258; Huss, ii. 139). Al-Maqrizi (iv. 259 sqq.) mentions in addition to this hospital in Cairo the mūṣrīṣāt al-Kuṭb (in 346, perhaps identical with that called the "lower" by Ibn Dujmāl, p. 99), al-Maghtāż (232–247), al-Mansūri (682), al-Mu'ayyadī (821). To these must be added the two which Sulṭān al-Din maintained in Mīṣr and Ḥādira (Ibn Dujmāl, p. 51, 52; cf. Ibn Khalīlān, Cairo 1502, ii. 402 sqq.). In Damascus Ibn Dujmāl found two hospitals, one of them the mūṣrīṣāt al-Nūr (p. 283, 284; cf. Ibn Khalīlān, ii. 403). He also mentioned one in Nīṣābūr (p. 240), in Ḥarrān 2 (p. 247), in al-Malāb 1 (p. 251), in Ḥamā (p. 457); in Baghādād he refers to a number without particularising them but we know of hospitals here from the third century and in 304 Sinān b. Thābit was director of the hospitals of Baghādād; he was responsible for the foundation of three more (Ibn al-Kift, ed. Lippert, p. 193; cf. Khākh al-Wasāṣ, ed. Amedrov, p. 21 and on the whole question: Mez. Renaissance, p. 326 sqq.). There was a hospital attached to the great Mustawriyya madrasa (Le Strange, Bagdad, p. 268).

As regards the teaching of medicine, Ibn Abī Usāibīa's shows (l. 103 sqq.) that it was continued without interruption in Islam; for example, he mentions 'Abd al-Malik b. Ablātār, who was in charge of the medical school in Alexandria, and after the conquest adopted Islam. At a later date, the chief medical schools were in Anjāfiyya and Harṭān, among other places (l. 116 sqq.). For a long period most of the physicians were Christians (cf. also B. G. A., iii. 183). Teaching was usually given in connection with the hospitals. The head physician collected the students around him whom he treated (khābād) and they assisted him (e.g. the Georgios, summoned from Gundishāpur to Baghūdād by Manṣūr: Ibn Abī Usāibīa, l. 124). Kāṭb b. b. Ṣalāh had a lecture-room installed in his hospital, the Māṣrāt, where the rāwī al-qāṭibāt lectured on medical science (Maqrizi, iv. 260); instruction was also given in the great al-Bīmāṣrīṣāt al-Nūr in Damascus (Ibn Abī Usāibīa, ii. 192). Lectures on medicine (fīhā) were sometimes also given in the mosques but in this case it was for the most part a theoretical science closely connected with philosophy. Ibn al-Haitham (d. c. 430) lectured on fīhā in the reign of al-Ḥākim (ibid., ii. 90) and when Lāḏān restored the mosque of Ibn Tulun he also endowed lectureships on this subject (Maqrizi, iv. 41; which shows that fīhā should be read in Quatremére, Hist. Sult. Maml., iii. i. 47). Sīhū could also be studied in a madrasa; for example, al-Ḍilī, who died in 641 lectured on it in the 'Aṣbawāya in Damascus (Ibn Abī Usāibīa, ii. 171). At the same time there were special madrasāt al-fīhū, thus in the seventh century three were built in Damascus (J. A., ser. 9, iv. 497–499; Fleischer, "K. Schr.", iii. 329). The teachers in them could also be physicians at the hospitals (Ibn Abī Usāibīa, ii. 266).

d. Children's Schools.

These were older than Islamic science, since at the very beginning of Islam, reading and writing were taught in Arabia. In Medina the teachers were often Jews (see Balāḏūrī, p. 473 infra; cf. the name ṣabbānī for the teacher: Sīhū, iii. 73; v. 48, 68; Būkūrī, "Ibn, bāb 10; Yaḥyībī, Hist. Kontuna, ii. 243); but ability to write was not so common here as in Mecca (cf. on the question Nidke-Schwall, Gesch. d. Quaran, ii. 83; Goldschmer, Mekk. Stud., i. 110 sqq.). After the battle of Badr, several captured Meccans were released to teach writing in Medina (Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 171; cf. Goldschmer, op. cit., p. 114; Spranger, Leben Mekk., iii. 131). After the capture of Kaṣfāyā, the prisoners were settled in al-Ḍurūf and some were taught in the school (kahhād) (Balāḏūrī, p. 142). Another contemporary of 'Ammar's, Djufrī b. Ḥaṣyā, who was later an official and governor, was a teacher (muṣallīn kahhād) in a school in Taʿfīr (Ibn Haiḍār, Ṣuḥāba, Cairo 1323, i. 235). Maʿṣūriyya, who had acted as the Prophet's amanuensis took a great interest in the education of the young: They learned reading, writing, counting, swimming and a little of the Kūrā and the necessary observances of religion. Famous men like al-Hadīṯī and the poets Kumātī and Tīmūḏān are said to have been schoolmasters (Lammens, Mekkā, i. 329 sqq., 356 sqq.). The main subject taught was adaḥ, so that the schools of the children were called madāṣīla ʿadāḥ (Aghānī, xvii, 2 Cairo ed., p. 101), and the teacher was called
mu'allim (e.g. Ma'qrizī, iv. 223; cf. Yāqūt, Uḍūdā, iv. 272; vi. 105), also mu'allim (Khākhār, Dīyārā, līhā 27; Yāqūt, iii. 410; IbnBatūṭah, i. 213) in modern times fīlīth (see Lane, Manners and Customs, Everyman's Library, p. 61). The teacher was as a rule held in little esteem, perhaps a relic of the times when he was a slave, but we also find distinguished scholars teaching in schools; thus Dālālāb b. Musājīm who died in 105 or 106, the ezegist, traditionalist and grammarian, had a school in Kūfa, said to have been attended by 3,000 children, where he had to ride up and down among his pupils on an ass (Yāqūt, Uḍūdā, iv. 372 sq.).

As language was of the utmost importance, we find a Bedūn being appointed and paid a teacher of the youth in Bāṣra (ibid., ii. 239). Schools spread during the Omayyad period. They were found in Kūfā and instruction was also given at home in the houses (see Haneberg, Schul- und Lehrweisen, p. 4 sq.). Under the Fatimid, there was a boys' school in the palace where the youth of the upper classes was prepared for the Caliph's service (Ma'qrizī, ii. 209-211). It is natural to find a children's school also attached to the mosque; but education became probably more and more centred round the Kūrān. In the Mosque of the Omayyads children were taught (Ibn Batūṭah, i. 213; Ibn Dābir, p. 272) and the teachers had special rooms at the north door of the mosque (Ibn Dābir, p. 2). In Palermo most of the numerous mosques were also used for teaching the Kūrān (ibid., p. 33); according to Yāqūt (iii. 410) there were no less than 300 teachers here, but, as he adds, because they were exempt from military service; but in the fourth century Ibn Hawākāl counted 300 kāṭībīn in Palermo, the teachers of which were held in high esteem (B. G. A., ii. 37).

To this day children are taught in the sāla of the Azhar Mosque. In the sixth century there were also many independent schools. In Cairo, Ibn Dābir found a large number of schools mainly for orphans and poor children and the teachers and pupils were maintained by the Sultan (p. 52) and in Damascus he saw a similar large institution (p. 272). In Jerusalem Sallāh al-Dīn built a school (v. Berchem, Corpus, iii/5, 108 sq.) Ibn Dābir says that in these eastern countries, the Kūrān was only taught orally (by kāṭīn) while writing was practised with pens etc., out of respect for the Kūrān (Rīḥā, p. 272). This did not hold generally however. At a later date (ixth century) we are told that a pipe was led from a school in the Azhar Mosque to the tomb of the founder so that his grave could be watered by the water in which the slates, on which sentences from the Kūrān had been written, were washed (Sulaimān Rasād, Kunū al-Dīwānwar fī Tarīkh al-Ashār, Cairo 1320, p. 73). As a rule the school was placed close to the mosque and beside a drinking fountain. During the Mamluk period, nearly every founder of a madrasa built in connection with it a similar institution for orphans and poor children who received free instruction and sometimes also maintenance in it (see Ma'qrizī, ma'madārī, passim). The object of such a school beside the mosque of Ibn Tulūn is thus defined by Lādānī: "to teach the orphans of the Muslims to recite the Book of God, the Exalted and also for other works pleasing to God and the various kinds of piety" (Ma'qrizī, iv. 41). Elsewhere it is said to be "to teach them the Kūrān". In the Maghrib also, the children only learned the Kūrān, i.e. to recite it, while in Andalus they also learned reading and writing (kāṭībīn), poems and a little grammar. In Ifrīqiyā they learned, beside the Kūrān, some Hādīth and a little of other sciences (Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddimah, p. 447 sq.; Hafiz, v. 32).

The children's school is called kāṭībīn (e.g. Yāqūt, Uḍūdā, iv. 272; Ma'qrizī, iv. 201) or kāṭībīn (Khākhār, Dīyārā, līhā 27; Ballādhuri, p. 142; Ma'qrizī, p. 197; 240); those founded for poor children kāṭībīn nabi or kāṭībīn sabīl (cf. e.g. Ma'qrizī, iv. 53, 117, 199, 201). The word sabīl characterises the school as a public benevolent institution; cf. the expression: "she made a kāṭībīn li'sabīlī" (ibid., p. 235); of Kālūn's hospital, ibid., p. 260; cf also Dusy, Supplement, v. 9; Quatremère, Hist. Scur. Maml., i/2, 229 note and B. G. A., iv. 211, 258). — Cf. on elementary education: Goldziher, Art. Education, in Hasting's Encyc. of Rel. and Eth., Men, Renaissance, p. 177 sq.; Lane, Manners and Customs; Snouck Hargroene, Mekka, ii. 144 sqq.

5. Libraries.

In Mecca, as well as in Medina, there were large collections of books in the mosques (Ibn Dūsār, p. 80, 193; on modern conditions in Medina, see Batmānī, Rīḥā, p. 254 sq.). The Dīwānī Zaftūn in Tūnis had a large library (Kec. Soc. Arch. Constantine, 1894, p. 287). The Niẓāmī in Baghādīd had a library of which al-Lafarīn (d. 488) was librarian (Wustenfeld, Sūfi, iii. 314). The Musanbriya was better supplied in this respect than any other madārīa (Chren. Mekka, ii. 174). In Māzīr, there were in the sixth century 20 public endowed libraries in the mosques and madārīa, two of them in the chief mosque, one of the latter containing about 12,000 volumes (Yāqūt, iv. 591). Among the madārīa in Cairo, the Fāshiliya was particularly well endowed in this respect; it contained 100,000 volumes (Ma'qrizī, iv. 1973); these were acquired by al-Kāfī al-Fāšili from the Fātijmad Academy (Shāhīb al-Dīn Abū Shīma, K. al-Rawḍàtānī, Cairo 1287, i. 200, 268; Ma'qrizī, ii. 255 sqq.) and in Kālūn's hospital there were according to Ibn Taghtīfīn (ii/483a), 100,000 volumes from the same library. These libraries were often broken up and portions put in other madārīa. During the famine of 954, the students of the Fāshiliya sold the valuable books for a loaf a volume (Ma'qrizī, iv. 197; cf. also p. 256). In Syria, Aṣīn Mīnūr (v. Berchem, Corpus, iii/6, 26 sqq.) and in the Maghīrb (J. A., ser. ii, x. 109 sqq.; Hafiz, v. 35) and elsewhere, libraries formed part of the endowments of the madārīa. With the decline in interest in learning many of these libraries became neglected. What survived has often been collected and placed in new libraries, as for example in Cairo in the Royal Library since 1851: for Damascus see Hāshib al-Zaynī, Kāfīb al-Kutub fī Dimānīh wa-Darūthā (Cairo 1902).

6. The subjects taught and the methods of instruction.

As already explained, in the earliest period the principal subjects studied in the mosque were Kūrān and Hādīth to which was added the study of the Arabic language. In Bukhārī (K. al-Imām)
TIM still means Ḥadith but, with the development of the laws of science and theology, these were also taught in the mosques. In the mosque of al-Mansūr in Bayra, al-ʿĀqīṣāʾi heard al-Djuḥābīʾi expand the Muʿṣalā takām (Whitfield, Sāḥibī, p. 131); closely connected with this was methodology (al-Muṣābātān was ʿl-Nūrā, cf. Yaḥū, Udaḥa, vi. 385). But many different subjects could also be taught. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who taught in Masjid al-Jāmīʿ in Baghdad, lectured on his history of Baghdad (Yaḥū, Udaḥa, i. 245 sqq.). Philosophy proper however disappeared from the mosques. In Spain, we are told, falsafah and kanājīyah were only cultivated in secret, as those who studied them were branded as ẓindikī, even stoned or burned (Makki, ed. Dozy, i. 136). The madāris were mainly established to teach the established systems of fiqh and originally each school was intended to represent only one madhhab. Where the four madhāhīb are represented in one school, one can talk about four madāris, e.g. al-Madāris al-Sāḥibiyah (Makki, iv. 209, 282); also al-Mawdūsāfiyyah, because it was divided by the street, p. 209; cf. v. Berchem, C.I.A., i. 104, note 1). The custom, often occurring before Nīṣām al-Mulk’s time of founding a Dār al-Ḥadith, was also continued after him. Al-Maḏrizī mentions two of them in Cairo: al-Kāmiyyah, founded in 1295 by al-Mulk al-Kāmil (iv. 211 sqq.) and al-Kharāṣīyah, founded in 785 (bidāʿ, p. 201). The former was restored in 1166 again as a ḥadith school (v. Berchem, C.I.A., i. 131). Before al-Mulk al-Kāmil, Nūr al-Dīn (d. 399) had founded the Nīṣāmīyah in Damascus as a Dār al-Ḥadith (Makki, iv. 211; cf. J.A., ser. 9, iii. 280); when al-Maḏrizī says this was the first built on the earth he must be corrected. In Damascus many similar schools were built. 16 are mentioned, and 3 ʿArʿān and Ḥadith schools besides (J.A., ser. 9, iii. 271 sqq.; Fleischer, Kl. Schriften, iii. 218 sqq., 320 differs slightly).

The ordinary madāris however included other subjects: the study of fiqh alone. Special mention is made of ʿaṣāf (al-Sāḥibiyah, Makki, iv. 205). In the Niẓāmīyah in Baghdad and in other madāris in the east, philological studies were proscribed (cf. Yaḥū, Udaḥa, vi. 409; v. 425 sqq. and iv. 255, but it must be an anachronism when Sulaymān al-ʿĀbd al-Kāmil is said to have taught philology in 403 in the Niẓāmīyah in Baghdad). In 604 (1207) al-Mulk al-Maghārī built beside the Sāḥibra mosque a Madrasa makāniyyah, exclusively for Arabic linguistic studies (Savvaire, Hist. J. et Élit., p. 86, 140) and schools for special subjects were not rare (cf. Subki, Miṣāʾl, ed. Myrmann, p. 153). In addition to those in Makki, there are frequent references to ʿomra both (often al-ʿomra al-lābiḥah, ṣafārīt, ṣafārīt and miʿād (devotional exercises; cf. therexon Quatrems, Hist. Sali. Mosl., ii/47). Al-Suhbī mentions, in addition to the special Ḥadith schools, also Madāris al-Tafsīr and Madāris al-Naqib (Miṣāʾl al-Naqib, ed. Myrmanm, p. 153).

In Ibn Ḥumaydīn (J.A. 6, N8, 4 sqq.), Ibn Khaldūn gives a survey of the divisions of Islamic studies. They are divided into ʿilm al-ṣafārīt and al-makāniyyah. The former are based on observation by the senses and deduction and are therefore also called falsafah or ʿalāʾib, the latter are dependent on revelation by the "legitimate determiner" (al-ʿilm al-ṣafārī, al-ʿilm al-ṣafārī). They are therefore based on special communication. "The ʿilm al-makāniyyah therefore comprises all branches of knowledge which owe their existence to Islam, namely Kurān, i.e. tafsīr and the seven Ḥadith (N9, 5), Ḥadith with the sciences auxiliary to it, including falsafah wa-l-μaṣlama, maṣlama al-ḥadith (N8, 6), al-ṣafārīt with special emphasis on al-falsafāt, the law of inheritance (N8, 7–8), al-falsafāt with the principles of law including methods of deduction on the differences between the madhāhīb (N9), al-ḥadith, theology, which is makāniyyah in so much as it is really a further development of imān which comes under the head of religious duties, but is still ʿalāʾib in its nature since it is entirely based on abstract proofs (N9, 10), maṣlama al-ṣafārīt, something like practical theology (N9, 11), ʿalāʾib, interpretations of visions (N9, 12).

Linguistic sciences come next to the study of Kurān and Ḥadith (cf. N9, 4, 37 beginning), which are divided into 4 parts: al-ṣafārīt, al-ḥadith, al-ṣafārīt, al-ṣafārīt (N8, 37), and in the last named category comes the whole study of Arabic literature.

The ʿilm al-ṣafārīt are variously classified, usually into 7 main sections (N8, 13) and are al-ṣafārīt, logic, which is the foundation of all others (N8, 17), al-arīğhiyyah, arithmetic, including ʿalāʾib etc. (N8, 14), al-manār, geometry (N8, 15), al-hawāli, astronomy (N8, 16), al-ṭāriʿ, the theory of tones and their definition by numbers etc. (see N8, 13); then there is al-ṭāriʿ, the theory of bodies at rest and in motion: — heavenly, human, animal, plant and mineral: among its subdivisions, special mention is made of al-ṭāro, medicine, and al-ṭāro, agriculture (N8, 18–20); cf. N8, 29). The seventh and last head is ʿilm al-ṭāro, metaphysics (N8, 21). Magic, talismans, mysterious properties of numbers etc. also form branches of Muslim learning (N8, 22 sqq.).

As above remarked, medicine was not only taught in special schools but also in the mosques; about 600 A. H., ʿAbd al-ʿAṭari lectured in the Azhar Mosque but it is not quite clear whether his instruction in Ḥadith was also given there (Ibn Abī Ṭālibi, ii. 207) and in any case the "philosophical sciences" in particular were cultivated in the mosques. Another division which still prevails, developed, that into principal sciences, those having a definite aim (makāniyyah) and instrumental sciences (dīnāf or makāniyyah). To the former belong sūf, al-maṣlama al-dīnīyyah (ethics, practically the same as savvah), ṣafārīt, ṣafārīt, Ḥadith (al-ṣafārīt and ṣafārīt), ṣafārīt. The latter comprise linguistics, (garf, ṣaḥīf, bayān, ṣaḥīf, bayān, ṣaḥīf, bayān, ṣaḥīf) and in addition metrics and prosody (ṭāriʿ, ṣafārīt), logic (manār) including the theory of proof (ṭāriʿ al-ṭāriʿ) probably the same as the older maṣlama and nasm, mathematics (ṭāriʿ and ṣafārīt), maṣlama al-ḥadith (cf. Muḥammad Bāzīm, Rīvīz, Cairo 1902, p. 201; Snouck Hurgronje, Mehnay, ii. 200 sqq.). There are no hard and fast lines drawn. When in 1162 Ahmad Pasha came to Cairo as governor, no ṣafārīt in the Azhar could give answers to simple questions on mathematics and astronomy, because they only knew much as arithmetic as sufficed to deal with questions raised by the law of inheritance; a very few studied these subjects privately. The Pasha pointed out that astronomy was necessary for the study of religious duties, to settle the times and seasons (al-Djāhāri, Miracites Biographiques, ii. 110 sqq.; cf. also A. Sprunger, Die Schriftsteller und die Scholastik der Muslime, E.D.M. Gxxii, 1878, p. 1–20).
The method of teaching was by lectures which had to be learned by heart afterwards (taṣbih). The first task was to learn the Kur'an by heart and then acquire many traditions as possible. The hadith was repeated three times so that the student could remember it (Buḫhari, I, p. 39). Lecturing soon became dictation (miḥā), when the student wrote down what was said, except in the case of the Kur'an (approved: Buḫhari, I, bāb 34, 36). The method was the same for linguistic or literary subjects as for Hadith, Taṣfīr, etc. The philologists not only used to dictate their grammatical works, as for example Ibn Duraid (Wüstenfeld, Schāfī, i, p. 127) or ‘Amr b. ‘Abd al-Walīd (d. 344) who dictated from memory 30,000 words on ṣuḥūfa (Yaḵšī, Udbāda, vi, 26) but also the text of the poets, like al-Ṭabarī, who lectured on al-Tīrām-nāzī in the Mosque of ‘Amr in 256 (ibid., vi, 432). Abū Bakr b. al-Anbīrī (d. 327 or 328), who dictated in one part of the mosque and his father in another, knew by heart 300,000 aḥādīth for the Kur'an and 120 commentaries on verses of the Kur'an with their iṣābād (ibid., vii, 73). Dictation was specially important in the case of Hadith, as the exact establishment of the text was the first necessity. It is therefore always said "he dictated Hadith" (Hussain al-Muḥādjīrī, ii, 159; Wüstenfeld, Schafī, p. 210, 224, 248, 257, 287 etc.; Ibn Kūfūbī, Taḥāhī, al-Ṭanāfīyya, ed. Flügel, p. 51; Yaḵšī, Udbāda, i, 246). The position of a teacher is therefore maglis al-ilmi (ibid., ii, 243; vii, 74), and his family is among the students: is al-mustāmīl (cf. ibid., vi, 282; vii, 74). Problems of fīlārah were also dictated (so Abī Yūsuf, Ibn Kūfūbī, ed. Flügel, No. 249).

Instruction frequently began immediately after the salat and the students lamented along with the teacher. The class (jāmī) began with the recitation of the Kur'an by a ḥātu, with blessings on the Prophet, and the other religious formulas (Madīkal, i, 56; cf. Mez, Renaissance des Ṣamār, p. 172 sq.). At the present day, the teacher as a rule simply pronounces the bismahah himself. Dictation alone was not everywhere the custom. In time, there came to be so many copies of the chief texts that the students were able to get copies for themselves. The text was in this case read aloud and the teacher gave his comments and emendations on the text (Yaḵšī, Udbāda, i, 255). It was only natural that the dictation of texts was first abandoned in philology; it said to have been dropped as early as the fourth (tenth) century (Mez, Renaissance, p. 171 with a reference to Schafī, Taḥāhī, al-Ṭanāfīyya, ii, 259; Sayūbi, Mithkāl, i, 30). This does not mean that dicating was completely abandoned for the teacher still made his pupils write down his comments, for example Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 584) dictated a commentary on Ḥarrī (Yaḵšī, Udbāda, vii, 20), and the method of having a text read aloud, while the lecturer explained any remarkable phrases was used as early as by the teacher of Hadith, Ibn Kasān (d. 299; iibid., vi, 282). At the present day, either the teacher or his famulus reads the text to be expounded from printed copy.

Cooperation between teachers and taught by questioning one another has always been an important feature of method. Ibn Khālidān laments that so few teachers in his time understand the correct methods of teaching (barak al-taṣbih). They put difficult questions at once to the pupil instead of which the taṣbih must be arranged systematically, so that it is always combined with exposition and it is a fundamental principle that the pupil should not mix the different subjects. In Spain and North Africa in particular in his time, the instruction was not particularly good, and they laid too much stress on learning by heart (ḥifṣ) (Muhāṣṣādīn, p. 344, 443 sq.; 445 = iṣābād 6, No. 2, 39, 39; cf. Subkī, Maʾṣūl al-Naṣīf, ed. Muḥyīmīn, p. 151 sq.). Mechanical learning by heart is required for the Kur'an. It is therefore regularly said "he dictated and expounded" (e.g. Wüstenfeld, Schafī, p. 220, 316). When the above mentioned Ibn Kasān expounded hadith, he also asked his hearers about their meaning (Yaḵšī, Udbāda, vii, 282). Vice versa, the class was at liberty to catechise the teacher. Al-Ṣafī ann't used to sit in his great bīla in Mecca and say: "Ask me what you want and I will then give you information on the Kur'an and sunna" (ibid., vi, 391; cf. B. G. A. T., iii, 379). The teacher was sometimes overwhelmed with questions (Yaḵšī, Udbāda, v, 273). Ibn Džairī saw written questions being handed to the teacher in the Nāṣīyya in Baghdiyā (p. 219 sq.). Both practices are still in vogue and even in large classes the student may interrupt with questions. Ibn al-Ḥāḍidī condemns irregular interruptions of the lecture (Mudīkal, i, 57).

7. The Teachers.

The name for a teacher is muṣarrī or (also in the pre-Muhammadan period): Ibn Abī Usābahī, i, 104; muṣāfah is a kind of honorary title (see Yaḵšī, Udbāda, i, 113, 209; ii, 271; v, 353, 354, 358, 448) and is still in use and applied also to students. There were a very large number of teachers in the great mosques. In the madrasa at first only one was appointed, for example in the Nāṣīyya in Baghdiyā (see above), in the first of those founded by Sulāḥ al-Dīn in Cairo (al-Nāṣīyya: Maḵrī, iv, 193) and in many others. A madrasa frequently took its name from a distinguished teacher (e.g. the Ṣaḥāmiyya in Cairo: Maḵrī, iv, 235; the Naṣiriyya: originally the Nāṣīyya: ibid., i, 193; M. Ibn Rašīd: ibid., p. 195; cf. Maḵrī, 351). Ibn al-Ḥaddī appointed 4 lectures to the Kāmīyya in Cairo (ibid., p. 193 sq.); in this case a definite number (20) of students was allotted to each teacher (cf. Chev. Mithkāl, ii, 105 sq.).

It is easily understood that the conditions in the older mosques, where every one could come and go, were freer than in the madrasa, which were built for particular teachers and students. There was certainly no official recognition of a teacher in the earlier period. After text-books had come into use, the certificate of recognition was the ḥifṣah, and so it has remained to modern times. Any one who had studied with a teacher could get permission from him to teach from the book, which he had copied out and studied from his dictation; the teacher wrote this permission (iḫfāṣ) in the book (e.g. Yaḵšī, Udbāda, i, 253; ii, 272). A teacher could also give an iḫfāṣa ḫamīn, which permitted the individual concerned to teach from all his works (Ibn Raṣīdī, p. 251). In Damascus, Ibn Raṣīdī was given quite a number of these "diplomas" (i, 251-253). It was the usual thing for a travelling scholar to collect numerous iḫfāṣa;
thus 'Abd al-Latif had certificates of this kind from teachers in Baghdaad, Khurâsân, Egypt and Syria (Ibn Abî Uṣâlàh, ii. 202). As late as about 1700 we find al-Nâbulûsî acquiring ʿidā ithâr on his travels (Z. D. M. G., xvi. 160). There were special formulae for the ʿidā ithâr for šâbīr and farrūq (al-ʿÎlāqānî, Sunûh al-ʿArâbî, al-ʿArâbî, vii. 322 sq.). Some scholars only gave occasional lectures. 'Abd al-Wâhid (d. 494) lectured on Hadîth every Friday in the Niṣâmîyya (Wûstenfeld, Schâbî, p. 287) and originally this was the case in the Azhar Mosque (see above).

The calîph al-Ḥâdrî, in his earlier days, used to lecture every Friday in a mosque in Baghdaad (ibid., p. 233). Some scholars only dealt with a very limited subject; thus one was appointed to the Niṣâmîyya to lecture on Bukhârî’s Ṣaḥîh because he had attended lectures on this from a celebrated teacher (ibid., p. 288). There were however many learned men who devoted themselves mainly to teaching and taught several subjects. Thus al-Shâbî began his ʿidâ immediately after the šabîr al-qalîb and taught students of the Qur’ân, at sunrise the students of Hâshîm came to him and heard his comments; later in the day he lectured on method (mihārâh wa ʿl-nâwar); at the ṣafâ the aḥî al-ʿArâbî came to him and he lectured on ʿurūd, maṣūr and ʿaṣr. He went off at midday (Yâkût, Uṣâlàh, vi. 383). About 300 a. d. he was found Ibn Kâsin lecturing for the best part of the day on a number of subjects in somewhat the same order (ibid., vii. 176; Ibn Abî Uṣâlàh’s, ii. 207, n. 345) and pious teachers even spent the night in the mosque in prayer (Wûstenfeld, Schâbî, p. 258). Sometimes a young teacher began by dictating ḥadhîth and later received a post with a wider scope in a mosque (ibid., p. 239).

The distinction between teacher and taught was not absolute; any one could have an ʿidâ ithâr in one subject, while he was still a student in others and even men of ripe scholarship attended the lectures of notable teachers. This led students to travel from one seat of learning to another, just as they used to travel in early days to collect ḥadhîth (Bukhârî, ibn, p. 7, 19, 26). All the biographies of learned men give examples of this; the old Hellenistic custom was thus continued (cf. J. W. H. Warden, The Universities of Ancient Greece, New York 1910) and royal courts still played the same part; at them learned guests received donations, which enabled them to appear as teachers in the mosques (e.g. Ibn Ḥaṭîm, ii. 75 sqq.; Ibn Khâlidîn, Nûmî al-albâ, Bulletin 1284, vii. 452; Ibn Abî Uṣâlàh, iii. 207; cf. Mommsen, Romische Geschichtsche, v. 589). Distinguished scholars were of course much visited by lovers of learning; of one of the latter, it is said râshîla ḥalîth or ḥalîth bâsit ʿatârîbi they used to travel to him” (Yâkût, Uṣâlàh, vii. 174; Mungan al-Muhâtârâ, l. 207; cf. p. 141). 4–600 ʿaʃârâkî had gathered round the teacher in the Mağrib in the time of Ibn al-Ḥâdrî (Ma’dhîb, ii. 5). Sometimes a scholar attended another’s class to try him with questions (see e.g. for al-Bukhârî: Brunnsw-Fischer, Christen- muthik, p. 193) and disputes often took place in which the pupils used to support their teacher vigorously. If the stranger was recognised, the teacher might receive him with marks of honour (al-ʿAbâfîst at al-Kâṣî’s: Yâkût, Uṣâlàh, iv. 243 sqq.). As in the Christian universities of Europe, public disputations were held in the mosques, in which considerable feeling might be displayed, e.g. in the disputations in the Raṣîf mosque in Baghdaad between Ibn Surâsîd (d. 366 = 918) and the son of Dâwûd al-Ẓâhîrî in which the former was victorious (Wûstenfeld, Schâbî, p. 110 sqq.). The teachers of the Niṣâmîyya also used to hold disputations (ibid., p. 309). Celebrated teachers were not only visited by other scholars. When (about 500) Ibn Kâsin was lecturing, about 100 horses etc. used to stand outside the mosque because prominent men were listening to him (Yâkût, Uṣâlàh, vi. 282). The teachers made up the class of “the turban-wearers” (mumârîm, mumârîm, arâbî al-imâmâ, aḥârî al-imâmâ; see Makrî, ii. 246; Quatremère, Hist. d’art, ii. 244 sqq.; ii. 268; Dozy, Supplément, ii. 169) in eastern Andalus, they did not wear the ṣi’ma, but this was exceptional (Makrî, i. 137). The Kâdî Abî Yûsûf (d. 82a) is said to have settled the dress worn by learned men (Ibn Ḥaṭîm, ed. Flügel, N. 249).

In spite of all this flexibility a certain stability developed in the teaching staff of the mosques. This was connected with the question of pây. It was for long in dispute whether it was permitted to accept payment for giving instruction. In the collections of Ḥâdrî, the practice is both supported and condemned and it is said that the teacher may accept money, but not demand it, and avocaricious teachers are strongly condemned. There are many references to people who gave lectures without payment (Bukhârî, Ithâr, bâb 16; Abî Dâwûd, Ḥaṭîm, bâb 36; Ibn Mâdhâ, Figâdî, bâb 8; cf. Goldziher, Muḥ. Studies, ii. 184 sqq.; Art. Education, No. 3–4 in Hasting, Encyclo. of Rel. and Ethics; Lumen, Lokus, s. v., p. 300 sqq.; J. A. 1901, p. 143; Wûstenfeld, Schâbî, p. 295; Mes, Renaissance, p. 176). The custom of the older Jewish scholars of exercising a handicraft was not common among the Muslims but was found occasionally. Among men of learning we find shoe-makers, lock-smiths, sandal-makers (Wûstenfeld, Schâbî, p. 227, 231, 267; cf. also Mes, Renaissance des Islam, p. 179). It was the rule however for the teacher to be paid for his work. This might be quite a personal donation from a prince or other rich man, for example al-Ẓâhîrî was given a sum of money when he taught in the Mosque of Al-ʿAmr (Yâkût, Uṣâlàh, vi. 428; cf. the remarks above on wandering scholars); it was as a rule however a regular salary which was paid out of endowment, so that the position was a regular professorial chair (see under G); this was especially the case in the madrasas. The salaries of the teachers (maṭâlîm, also āsârîm, esârîm; see Dory, Supplément, s. v.) varied considerably, according to the endowment. The lecturer in the Suyûfîyya received 11 dirhams a month (Maṭârî, iv. 196) but in another of ʿAlî al-Dîn’s schools, the Ṣâlîhîyya or Nâṣîrîyya, the pay was much higher; the principal teacher received 40 dirhams (of 121/2 dirhams) a month and 10 dirhams as principal, along with 60 ṭâbîn of bread and two beasts of burden, to bring water from the Nile (ibid., p. 251). In the Djâmî al-Dîn madrasa, each teachers got 300 dirhams a month (ibid., p. 253). The teachers also received donations in kind on special occasions; in the other Nâṣîrîyya school they received sugar and meat every month at the festivals (ibid., p. 222).
in the Ḥādīṣiya on 'Id al-Īdra' different kinds of bread and biscuit (ka'ād and ḥanūkūnahā), and the feast of sacrifice meat and in Ramadān food was prepared for them (p. 223). According to al-Makrī, learned men might have 50 dinars a month in all in addition to allowances in kind (iii. 364). On ceremonial occasions, they often were given special marks of distinction, such as gifts in money and robes of honour.

The men of learning were organised in a gild. How the organisation worked in detail is not known. At the end of the third century we find the institution of the rīḍā in established in Egypt. While Ya‘qūb b. Ḥālid (d. 128) is called faṣāḥ Miṣr wa-ḥaḍīṣaynā, and sa‘īyidūm wa-ulūmīm, and Ubaidallāh b. Abī Dīfā (d. c. 135) faṣāḥ tawāsinī (Hum, i. 131), it is said of a series of scholars beginning with Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī al-Kāsim (d. 161), Abū 'Abd al-Azīz (d. 204), Abū 'Abd al-Mu'min (d. 214 or 215) that they had al-rīḍā in Egypt (Hum, i. 133) which seems to mean that they belonged to an organisation. The position is also called rīḍāt al-īmān, as, for example, with reference to Yūnās (d. 264) (ibid. i. 136). When the madhhab arose, each school had its own rīḍī in the district. The formule for this was intakat ḥukmīr 'iradāt wa-madhhab mālīkī; e.g. of Ibn al-Mawāzī (d. 281), and others (Hum, i. 136; Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/ii. 116) for the Shāfi‘īs e.g. Isfahānī, died 406 (Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/ii. 121 sq.; cf. Hum, i. 156; Ibn Dājibār, p. 219, 220; for the Ḥanafīs e.g. al-Kāddī, died 340 (Ibn Kūtubīlah, Nî, 115; cf. Nî, 11, 13; Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/ii. 116; for the Ḥanbalīs al-Barbahārī (d. 329) (Hum) with Kawkāwshī, i, Cairo 1905, p. 260). Besides rīḍī we find other names like Imām al-Hanafīya bi-ḥāṣadh or bi-ḥaṣadhen or Shāfi‘ī, ṣāhih al batūnī, nābīn al-Nahī (Ibn Kūtubīlah, Nî, 57, 96, 196; cf. Shāfi‘ī al-Hanafīya: Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/ii. 116; Shāfi‘ī al-Mālikīya fi Ḥaṣābī: Hum, i. 209). With such names it is not always clear whether they are simply epithets like Imām Wāḥidi, Imām ʿAṣrī (Ibn Kūtubīlah, Nî, 206, 217), Ustādī Zāmahatī (Hum, i. 141), al-hās al-ʿAlamī (ibid., Nî, 192), Sayyidīnā (ibid., Nî, 50), “the teacher of the Hanbalis and their Fakhrī” (Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/ii. 114). There is also evidence of the Rīḍāya within the special subjects, e.g. Shāfi‘ī al-Nu‘ayrī bi-Mīrā (Hum, i. 230), Rīḍāyat al-Ḥadīth al-Mīr (ibid., i. 163; al-Raṣīd), Rīḍāyat al-Fatwā (Quatremeré, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/ii. 27), Rīḍāyat al-ʻIrāq wa-l-ʻUṣāfi in Alexandria (Hum i. 210). The physicians of a district had their Rūṭ al-ʿAṣrī (Makrī, iv. 237; Ibn Abī Uṣāf, ibid., ii. 247); a Kāfūr was appointed in 684 (1285) chief of the physicians (Quatremeré, Hist. Maml., ii. 81). There was also a Rūṭ al-Muḥādātan (Makrī, iv. 224). Shāfi‘ī al-Islām is found as a title of honour for a scholar, e.g. in the viii, viii, ixth century (Hum, i. 143, 205; Quatremeré, cit., ii. 68, note; it. 270, 280; Ibn Taimīyā), probably also used earlier (Maz. Renaissance, p. 179), while Shāfi‘ī al-Shaykhuṣayn means the most distinguished leader of the Sufis (Makrī, iv. 285).

It is not clear what real importance the organisation of teachers had. In the earlier period. In different districts there was a principal director of the organisation, a rūṭ al-ulāma, in Medīna (Ibn Dājibār, p. 200, 3), in Baghādā (ibid., p. 220, 3), in Cairo and Upper Egypt (Hum, i. 141, 143, 191), also called rūṭ al-rīḍā (Ibn Abī Uṣāf, ii. 204; Ya‘qūb, Uṣāf, i. 248). Every madhhab has its rīḍā for the district (Hum, i. 148, 14; Ya‘qūb, iv. 512). The chief rūṭ could interfere in the activities, for example, of the teacher of Ḥadith (Ya‘qūb, Uṣāf, loc. cit.). He is probably identical with the nābī al-ṣūrāfī, without whose permission the caliph would not admit a teacher to the Mosque of al-Musīr in 455 (ibid., i. 246 sq.). This shows that the head of the gild of learned men even then could exact influence on the appointment of new teachers. Whether appointments were made after an examination we do not know. The right of lecturing was in any case limited in this way in practice, but a systematic set of regulations hardly existed. ‘Abd al-Lā‘īf lectured in the Masjid al-Ḥādīth Lu‘Lai‘, being paid by the Kāfūr al-Faqīh and afterwards in the Ashar, paid out of the Bait al-Māli (Ibn Abī Uṣāf, ii. 205, 207), but what his relation to the gild of teachers was is not known. In later times the chief of the learned men in Cairo and Mecca was of great influence, because he decided who should be admitted into the gild of teachers and also controlled salaries (see G 23).

The teacher had his particular place in the mosque, often beside a pillar: this was his madīrī, which was inherited by his successors. Al-Buwāṭī was ḥaṭīṣātun ‘l-ṣūrāfī fi ḥaṭīṣātun (Hum al-Musīr, i. 135; cf. 181 infra, 182; Makrī, iv. 5; Ya‘qūb, Uṣāf, iv. 135; Wüstenfeld, Schaf, p. 239). The outward appearance of the class did not alter through the centuries. His hearers sit in a circle (ḥulī: the listeners ṣabālāt): Makrī, iv. 49, 91 sq.; cf. on the word Quatemire, Hist. Sult. Maml., i/ii. 197 sqq.) on the ground before the lecturer. The teacher sits on a carpet (mudāṣfāda, cf. Ya‘qūb, Uṣāf, i. 254) or skin (jarsam). This was described as a symbol of his dignity in his majīsya (al-Umarī, Twṣf, p. 134). It is quite irregular for any one to teach standing (Ya‘qūb, Uṣāf, v. 424, 4; for the other view see Bakhārī, Hm, bbb 45). On the other hand, we often find in large audiences that the teacher has a raised seat (for the older period see Ibn Batūta, i. 212). Ibn al-Ḥādīthi condemns this because the teacher must not raise himself out of the circle of his hearers; he even wants to reject the use of the skin and carpet as elevamento (Mashfad, i. 96 sq.).

It was not the custom for teachers, to live in the mosque. Of course a teacher, like any other pious individual, could stay in the mosque and even: have a room there; al-Ghazālī for example lived in the mosque of the Umayyads, where Ibn Dājibār saw his room and Ibn Batūta saw a teacher, al-Ku‘tābī, who lived on the roof of the Ashar Mosque (Ibn Dājibār, ii. 92; cf. also Ibn Abī Uṣāf, ii. 204). But there were exceptions; al-‘Azrī built a dwellinghouse for the teacher in the Ashar near the mosque (Makrī, iv. 49). The earlier madrasī founded by Nāṣīm al-Mulk had often lodgings for the teacher, especially as the teacher sometimes made his lodging his classroom and this is also found later. Thus al-Khadżīrī, who died in 543 (1149) lived in the Bāṣṣātīyya (Wüstenfeld, Schaf, p. 307) and in the Shāfīya the head of the college had his home within the buildings (Ibn Dājibār, p. 48). Shams al-Dīn (d. 637) lived in Damascus in the ‘Aḍīlīyya where he taught fikr (Ibn Abī Uṣāf, ii. 171; cf. also p. 260). This must also have been the case in other madīzīs. But in any
somewhat modernised, was still given. The education in the madrasa is linked up with the new universities in Calcutta and elsewhere (Calcutta University Commission, 1917-1919, Report, Calcutta 1919, i. 143-187; v. 60-70). In 1922 there were already 14 universities of which five were founded after 1919 (Oriente Moderno, iii, 1922, p. 60); on earlier discussions on the foundation of a university see R. M. M., xxi. 1912, p. 268 sqq.). The older universities, founded on the model of Oxford or London, are those of Calcutta 1857, Madras and Bombay 1857, Lahore 1882, Allâhâbâd 1857 (R. M. M., vi. 4; on Chiefs' Colleges, ibid., p. 1-51; ix. 44-81). The essential feature of the reforms is the new method of instruction, the systematic organisation of the courses, which are concluded by examinations, and the creation of a qualified body of competent teachers.

Inspired by the same spirit, if not so thorough, were the reforms which were carried through at the capital of Islamic studies, the Azhar in Cairo without the assistance of a European power. In 1872 an examination for those beginning teaching was instituted and the ordinance expanded by new regulations in 1855, 1888 and 1895. The principal could however appoint teachers without examination. The students had to be registered so that unworthy persons should not share the stipends. On June 4, 1895, a council of five members was appointed to prepare reforms. They dealt with the finance and organisation. In 1896 the mosque-schools in Tantâ, Damiëtta, and Dassiük and in 1903 those of Alexandria were put under the Azhar. On July 1, 1896 (supplemented in 1897 and 1898) examinations for students were arranged in history, geography and mathematics were introduced as voluntary subjects and it was forbidden to read glosses and super-commentaries in the first four years.

The driving power in the council was one of its members, Muhammad 'Abduh, but he retired in 1905. The Khedive 'Abbas II Hilimi in 1908 and in 1911, after several commissions had been working at the subject, promulgated a new law which is still (1928) practically in force. The administration of the Azhar Mosque and the institutions connected with it (particularly other mosques and the Kâdi School) were reorganised. The organisation is based on the old organisation of the staff with the principal as head of the 'alam and the heads of the maâshubih as members of the committee of management. New subjects were instituted, such as âshâb in combination with the sirr, history, especially Muslim, geography, natural history, chemistry, mathematics, drawing, hygiene, education. Instruction is given in three divisions, each of which is estimated to cover 5 to 7 years. To obtain admission a student must be 10-17 years of age, be able to read and write and know the Kurân by heart (by the law of 1911 he was allowed to learn half of it in his first six months in the Mosque, but this was abolished in 1921). Each year ends with the examination in the month of April; the final examination of the first section enables the successful candidate to teach in elementary schools, that of the second to obtain an appointment in certain offices or to be imam or âshâb in the mosques; by the examination, the candidate obtains the highest degree of 'aimân, and can become a teacher in the Azhar, or judge or council in the Sharia courts. By new laws of 1921, 1925 and 1924, the examinations were reformed and the relationship to the Kâdi School, Dâr al-'Ullâm and other educational institutions reorganised so that in the Azhar, a kîma al-taâkhirî for Fîhûn, Tajât, Ḥadîth, Tawbâh, Manûfî, Waqîé, Bayân, Ahkâm, Islamic history and practical courses in teaching and court practice were instituted. When by the law of Aug. 26, 1927, a university was founded with faculties of arts, law, science and medicine (cf. Oriente Moderno, v, 1925, p. 110 sqq., 434-436; vi. 1927, p. 627 sqq.), the question of education in the mosque again came up and a new commission on Nov. 27, 1927 was charged to consider new proposals (for the reforms of Egyptian institutions see P. Arminjon, L'enseignement, la doctrine et la vie dans les universités musulmanes d'Egypte, 1907, Muftîfâ Bâirâm, Risâla, 1910; Sulaimân Rašâd al-'Alîyât, Liwa'ab fi 'Uthûr al-Azhâr, 1925, p. 143 sqq.; Amâl Maâshub al-Idârât al-Azhâr, Cairo 1323, anonymous, but by 'Abd al-Karîm Salîmî, cf. al-Mâshå, xxv, 1324, p. 703; Commission de la Réforme de l'Université d'El-Azhâr, Projet de Réforme présenté par M. Pacha Sâlîd, Cairo 1911, and the official regulations; Joh. Petessen, al-Azhâr, Copenhagen 1922, p. 67 sqq.; A. Sékâly, in Revue des Études Islamiques, iii, 1927, p. 95 sqq., 465 sqq.; ii, 1928, p. 47 sqq.; Orientale Moderno, v, 1925, p. 113 sqq.; vii, 1927, p. 634). In Morocco the ruler in 1844 introduced European subjects into the Madrasa in Fès Djaïdîl (whence its name Madrasat al-Muâhadînî); these innovations did not become permanent but in 1916 the madrasîs in Fès and Rabat were reformed (Bell, in J.A., ser. 11, x. 152; Périer, in Arch. Maroc, xviii, 1912, p. 257 sqq.; see also for Tunis: R. M. M., iii. 385).

Since the World War, throughout the world of Islam, particularly in Turkey, very far reaching reforms in education have been introduced the results of which cannot yet be surveyed.

The Administration of the Mosque.

1. Finances.

The earliest mosques were built by the rulers of the various communities and the members of the community did all the work necessary in connection with the primitive mosques. The later mosques as a rule were erected by rulers, emirs, high officials or other rich men in their private capacity and maintained by them. The erection of the mosque of Ibn Tûlûn cost its builder 120,000 dinars, the Mosque of Muâçâyêr 100,000 (Maâtrakî, iv. 32, 137, 138). The upkeep of the mosque was provided for by estates made over as endowments (waqf, hâshî). Cf. thereon besides the Fihî books: L. Krismârî, Das Wâghrecht, E.Z.M. G., xlv. 1891, p. 571-576; E. Mercier, Le code du hâshî au waqf selon la législation musulmane, 1899). In the third century we thus hear of houses which belonged to the mosques and were let by them (Pajûsîs Erverzor Rûnî, Fûhrâr, N. 775, 837) and Ibn Tûlûn handed over a large number of houses as an endowment for his monastery and hospital (Maâtrakî, iv. 83). This custom was taken over from the Christians by the Muslîms (see Becker, in Islam, ii. 404). According to Maâtrakî, estates were not given as waqf endowments until Muhammad Abû Bakr al-Mâdâhârî (read thus) besought Bîshât al-Hâshî and Sayyâf as endowments (about 300 A.H.); this was however cancelled by the Fâtimids again (ibid.). Al-Ḥâkîm made large endowments not only for his own,
but also for mosques previously in existence, such as the Ashar, al-Khākim, Dār al-Iltihāb and Džamī' Maṣūm and Džamī' al-Khāmya; the endowments consisted of dwelling-houses, shops, mills, khasāysa and hamāla, and the document (ibid., p. 50 sq.) specifies how and for what purposes the revenues were to be distributed. Baths were also given as endowments for mosques (ibid., p. 76 for 529; cf. 81 of the year 543). Salāb al-Dīn granted lands to his mašāli: in 566, for example, a khashāya to the Khānyūk and a ḍawâ in Al-Fayyūm and the teachers received wheat from Al-Fayyūm and in the same year he endowed the Nāṣiriyyah with goldsmiths' shops and a village (ibid., p. 193 sq., cf. another document: p. 196 sq.). During the Mamlūk period also, estates were given as endowments for documents of this period see van Berchem, C.I. A., i, N°. 247, 252, 528; Moberg, in M.O., xii., 1918, p. 1 sqq.; J.A., ser. 9, iii. 264–266; ser. 11, v. 158 sqq., 222 sqq.; J.A., x, 357 sqq., 256 sqq., 365 sqq.). They were often a considerable distance apart: the mosques in Egypt often had estates in Syria (v. Berchem, C.I. A., i, N°. 247; al-Makrīzī, vi. 507, 137). Not only were mosques built and endowed but already existing ones were given new foundations for teachers, mubarizza, stipends for Kursā reciters, teachers etc. There were often special endowments for the salaries of the imām and the mu'āshāhids, for the support of visitors, for blankets, food etc. (see Ibn Djuibar, p. 277 with reference to the Mosque of the Umayyads). The endowment and the purpose for which they might be used was usually laid down in the grant and the document attested in the court of justice by the kāfīr and the witnesses (cf. al-Makrīzī, iv. 50, 196 infra). The text was also often inscribed on the wall of the mosque (cf. ibid., p. 76; the above-mentioned inscriptions amongst others. Documents from Tashkent see R.M.M., xii., 1911, p. 278 sqq.). Certain conditions might be laid down, e.g. in a madrasa that no Persian should be appointed there (al-Makrīzī, iv. 202 infra) or that the teacher could not be dismissed or some such condition (v. Berchem, C.I. A., i, N°. 901), that no woman could enter (J.A., ser. 9, iii. 369), that no Christian, Jew or Muslim could enter the building (ibid., p. 405), etc. Endowments were often made with stipulations for the family of the founder or other purposes. That mosques could also be burdened with expenses is evident from an inscription in Edfu of the year 797 (1395) (v. Berchem, C.I. A., N°. 359). If a mosque was founded without sufficient endowment, it decayed (e.g. al-Makrīzī, iv. 115, 201, 203) or the stipends were reduced (ibid., p. 251), but in the larger mosques as a rule the rulers provided new endowments. According to al-Mawardi, there were also special "Sūlṭān-mosques," which were directly under the patronage of the caliph and their officials paid from the Bait al-Mal (al-Ashārī al-Sulṭāniyyah, ed. Enger, p. 172 supra, 176 supra.) Just as the Bait al-Mal of the state was kept in the mosque, so was the mosque's own property kept in it (e.g. the "houses or khashāya at-Khān", which is mentioned in 'Omar's time and was preserved to have existed under his predecessors (al-Khābīr, ed. supra; C.M., i. 307; ii. 14. The Bait al-Mal al-Džamī' in Damascus was in a khāba in the ṣāfī (B.G.A., iii. 157; Ibn Djuibar, p. 267; Ibn Baṭṭal, i. 201; cf. for Medina: Wustinfeld, Medina, p. 86). Rich men also had their private treasure-chambers in the mosque (see E. Schürrer, Gesch. d. Jud. Völker i, 1907, p. 322–328; F. Cumont, Fouilles de Douar-Europei, 1926, p. 405 sq.).

**Administration.**

As imām of the Muslim community, the caliph had the mosques under his charge. That was also the case with the sūlṭān, governor or other ruler who represented the caliph in every respect. The administration of the mosques could however not be directly controlled by the usual government offices. By its endowment the mosque became an object sui generis; it was withdrawn from the usual state or private purposes. Their particular association with religion gave the kāfīr special influence and on the other hand the will of the testator continued to prevail. These three factors decided the administration of the mosque but the relation between them was not always clear.

**The administration of the separate mosques.**

The mosque was usually in charge of a nāṣir or wali who looked after its affairs. The founder was often himself the nāṣir or he chose another and after his death, his descendents took charge or whoever was appointed by him in the foundation charter. In the older period the former was the rule and is said to have applied especially in the case of chief mosques, if we may believe Nāṣir-i Khwarazm, according to whom al-Fāmi paid the descendents of Ibn Tūlūn 30,000 dināris for the mosque and 5,000 for the minaret and similarly to the descendents of 'Amr b. al-'Aṣ 100,000 dināris for the Mosque of 'Amr (Sefi-i Nūr, ed. Schefer, p. 39 and 146, 40 and 148). In 578 we read of an administrator (mu'awallih) of the mosque in Jerusalem (al-Makrīzī, iv. 11). In the case of mosques and madrasas founded during the Mamlūk period, it is often expressly mentioned that the administration is to remain in the hands of the descendents of the founder; e.g. in the case of a mosque founded by Bābars (al-Makrīzī, iv. 89), in the Džamī Maṣūm when the vizier al-Makrī paid it (ibid., p. 66), the al-Sābiyyah (ibid., p. 205), and the Karānumūrīyyah (ibid., p. 322) etc.; also in the Badiyya in Jerusalem ("to the best of the descendents", cf. van Berchem, C.I. A., ii/ii. 129). Other cases are also found. Sometimes an emir or official was administrator e.g. in the Mu'ayyad (al-Makrīzī, iv. 140), the Ta'īzirīyya (ibid., p. 224), the Ashar, (ibid., p. 54 sq.) or the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (Kalkhashandī, Sād al-Abānī, xi. 159–164). In Džamī al-Dīn's madarsa, it was always the šāhīd al-wallā (al-Makrīzī, iv. 250), in the Madrasa of Bābars the khāniqāh and his successors (v. Berchem, C.I. A., i, N°. 352); but it was more frequently a kāfīr; for example in the mosque of Bābars just mentioned, the Ḥanīfī kāfīr was to take charge after the descendents (al-Makrīzī, iv. 89); in the Aqbarha-wyia, the Şāhīd kāfīr was appointed but his descendents were expressly excluded (ibid., p. 225). In the Mosque of the Umayyads during the Mamlūk period, the Şāhīd's chief kāfīr was as a rule the nāṣir (Kalkhashandī, iv. 191) and in the Nāṣir mosque in Cairo (ibid., xi. 262–264). In this city we find during the Mamlūk period that emirs and kāfīrs alternately acted as nāṣirs in the large mosques (e.g. the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn:}
MAQTR, iv. 42). Cases are also found however in which descendants of the founder unsuccess fully claimed the office of nāfir (Maqtr, iv. 216, 253). This was the result of the increasing power of the kādh (see below). In the maqāris the nāfir was often also the headmaster; the two offices were hereditary (ibid., p. 204: the Şabîhiya al-Bahā'îya, p. 235: Ṣubur: the Djamâliya). In Tushtar a descendant of Sahl as nāfir and teacher conducted a madrasa with the help of four slaves (Ibn Batuta, ii. 25 sq.)

The nāfir managed the finances and other business of the mosque. Sometimes he had a fixed salary (in Balâshr, Kābolnāv 500 dinhams a month: v. Berchem, C. A., l., i. N°, 252; in the Dilmâniya in Damascus in 847 only 60 dinhams a month: Z. D. M. O., xlv., 1807, p. 354). But the revenues of the mosque were often applied to his personal use. His control of the funds of the mosque was however often limited by the central commission for endowments (see below). The nāfir might also see to any necessary increase of the endowments. He appointed the staff and fixed their pay (cf. e.g. Maqtr, iv. 41). He could also interfere in questions not arising out of the business side of administration: for example the amir Sawdâb, the nāfir of the Ashar in 818 ejected about 750 poor people from the mosque. He was however thrown into prison for this by the Sulhân (ibid., p. 54). Generally speaking the nāfir's powers were considerable. In 784 a nāfir in the Ashar decided that the property of a mudâhir, who had died without heirs, should be distributed among the other students (ibid., p. 54).

In Mecca, according to Kāthi al-htm, the Al-Mu'izzî al-Harrâwî was in charge of the great festival of the mawlid of the Prophet (12th Rabi' I) and distributed robes of honour in the mosque on that occasion (C. M., iii. 439). In the Ashar, no nāfir was appointed after about 1100 but a learned man was appointed. Shâhi al-Ashar, principal and administrator of the mosque (Sulaimân Rasâd al-Zâyîyî, Kâmil al-Dinârâr fi Tulûth al-Ashâr, p. 121 sqq.). Conditions are similar in Mecca (Sârâbî, Hurgongne, Mekkâ, ii. 235 sqq., 312 sqq.). As we have seen, kâdhs were often nāfirs of mosques. This was especially the case in the maqāris, where the kâdhs were often teachers (cf. Maqtr, iv. 209, 219, 222, 238, etc.); the kâdhs were particularly anxious to get the principal offices in the large schools (cf. Kâhalâshidi, ii. 235). Their influence was however further increased by the fact that, if a nāfir qualified by the terms of the founder's will no longer existed, the kâdhs of the madhab in question stepped into his place (Z. D. M. O., xlv., 1807, p. 354). By this rule, which often gave rise to quarrels between the different kâdhs (e.g. Maqtr, iv. 218: the Şabîhiya), a kâdhs could accumulate a large number of offices and "milâh the endowments" (ibid., iii. 354). Sometimes their management was so ruthless, that the schools soon declined (e.g. the Şabîhiya and the Djamâliya: Maqtr, iv. 204 sqq., 235). They also exercised influence through the committee of management of the mosque.

A Centralisation in the Management of the Mosques

The large mosques occupied a special position in the Muslim empire, because the caliph had to interest himself particularly in them: especially those of Mecca and Medina where the rulers and their governors built extensions and executed renovations (cf. C. M., i. 145; iii. 83 sqq.). During the ʿAbbasid period, the kâdhs occasionally play a certain part in this connection; for example al-Mahdî (158-169) presented the kâdhs with the necessary money to defend and repair the Meccan mosque (C. M., 1. 312; ii. 43). In 265, al-Muwallâf ordered the governor of Mecca to undertake repairs at the Kaʿbah (ibid., ii. 200 sqq.). In 271 the governor and the kâdhs of Mecca co-operated to get money from al-Muwallâf for repairs and they saw the work through (ibid., iii. 136 sqq.). In 281, the kâdhs of Mecca wrote to the vizier of al-Munṣîd about the Dâr al-Nadwa and backed up his request by sending a deputation of the staff there (sâdun). The caliph then ordered the vizier to arrange the matter through the kâdhs of Baghdâd and a man was sent to Mecca to take charge of the work (C. M., iii. 144 sqq.).

The importance of the kâdhs was based primarily on his special knowledge in the field of religion. A zealous kâdhs like al-Ḥarîrî b. Miskin in Cairo (237-245) formed a kind of mosque to recite the Kûrûs melodiously: he also had the maqâshîf in the mosque of ʿAmr inspected and appointed an amin to take charge of them (Kâmil, Wilâyat, p. 469). After the building of the Tulûth mosque, a commission was appointed under the kâdhs L-Kâdhs to settle the kîlê of the mosque (Maqtr, iv. 21 sqq.). But at a quite early date they also obtained a say in the management of the funds. The first kâdhs to lay his hands on the aḥâla was Tâwba b. Namir al-Ḥarrâmî; while hitherto every endowment had been administered by itself by the children of the testator or some one appointed by him, in 1118 Tâwba brought about the centralisation of all endowments and a large diwân was created for the purpose (Kâmil, Wilâyat, p. 346). How this system of centralisation worked is not clear at first, but it was carried through under the Fâtimids.

Al-Mu'izzî created a special diwân al-ḥâšî and made the chief kâdhs head of it: at least as of the dâwâr wa-l-maşajîd (Maqtr, iv. 83 and 75; cf. Kâmil, Wilâyat, p. 585, 587, 589, according to whom al-ʿAzîza specially appointed the chief kâdhs over the two dâwar's), and a special bâdî al-hâlî was instituted for it in 363; a yearly revenue of 130,000 dinhams was guaranteed; anything left over went to form a capital fund. All payments were made through this office after being certified by the administration of the mosques (Maqtr, iv. 83 sqq.). The mosques were thus administered by the kâdhs, directly under the caliph; the diwan al-ḥârîr wa-l-kaʿba wa-l-dâwâr in Baghdad (Mez, Renaissance, p. 73) perhaps served similar purposes.

Al-Hâshim reformed the administration of the mosques. In 407 he had an investigation made and when it proved that 800 (or 830) had no income (ghallâs), he made provision for them by a payment of 9,220 dinhams monthly from the Bait al-Mulûk; he also made 455 new endowments (of estates) for the officials of the mosque (Maqtr, iv. 84, 264). Under the Fâtimids, the kâdhs used to inspect all the mosques and maşajîd in and around Cairo at the end of Ramadan and compare them with their inventories (ibid., p. 84). The viziers of the Fâtimids, who also had the title kâdhs did much for the mosques (Djâhwar, Yaʿqub b. Killîs, Bâdî al-Djâmilî; cf. v. Berchem, C. A., l., i. N°, 11, 376, p. 631).
Under the Ayyubids, conditions were the same as under the Fatimids. The dīwān al-‘arbā’ī was under the ḥāds (Maqrizi, iv, 84). Salāḥ al-Dīn gave a great deal to the mosques, especially the madrasas (cf. above); 20,000 dirhams a day is a figure given (Ibid., p. 117). When Ibn Dhi‘ayīr says that the money paid the salaries of the officials of the mosques and schools of Alexandria, Cairo and Damascus (p. 43, 52, 275), he must really mean the Dīwān already mentioned.

The same conditions continued for a time under the Mamluks. In the time of Balbars, for example, the chief āsār Talḥ al-Dīn was shāfi‘ al-‘arbā’ī. He caused the Mosque of ‘Amr to be renovated and when the funds from the endowments were exhausted, the Sulṭān helped him from the Bait al-Mal (Maqrizi, iv, 14); after conferring with experts, the chief āsār forbade a water-supply brought by Salāḥ al-Dīn into the mosque (Ibid., p. 14; Suyūṭī, Ḥāṣn al-muḥādharā, ii, 137). In 687 the chief āsār Talḥ al-Dīn complained to Kallān that the ‘Amr and Aḥār mosques were falling into ruin, while the sāfhas were much reduced. The Sulṭān would not however permit their restoration but consented to repair some of the mūqarns to certain limits, one to each (Maqrizi, iv, 14, 15). This principle was several times applied in later times and the ensembles frequently gained influence at the expense of the sāfhas. Thus after the earthquake of 707 (1305) (cf. theecon Quatremerre, Hist. Sult. Maml, ii, ii, 314 sqq.), the mosques were allotted to emirs, who had to see that they were rebuilt (Maqrizi, iv, 15, 53). From the middle of the seventeenth century, we often find enems as administrators of the chief mosques. The āsār had however obtained so much authority that he was conceded *a general supervision of all matters affecting the endowments of his madrasah* (al-Umari, Tūrīf bi l-maṣālik al-sharī‘, p. 117; cf. Z. D. M. G., xiv, p. 559); according to this theory the āsār could intervene to stop abuses. In Syria in 660 (1262) Ibn Khalīkān became āsār over the whole area between Arish and the Euphrates and supervinted the mālik, mawṣūl, mādīrān etc. (Quatremerre, Hist. Sult. Maml, i, 170).

Sulṭān Balbars reformed these endowments and restored the office of nāqīr al-‘arbā’ī or nāqīr al-‘arbā’ī al-mukābir or n. dīfā‘ al-bayr (Kalāshiddu, iv, 34; 38, v, 465; l, 256; xi, 252, 257 sqq.; cf. Khalīl al-Zāhirī, Zuhd al-Ra‘if al-Mamūlī, ed. Ravaisse, p. 109). According to al-Maqrīzī, the endowments were distributed among the Mamlikhs in three departments (dīfā‘ī): 1. dīfā‘ al-āsār, managed by an emir, the Dāwā‘ari; this looked after the funds of the mosques, in 740 in all 130,000 fards; 2. dīfā‘ al-mālik al-bayr wa l-khāṣṣa wa l-‘ālī, which administered dwelling-houses; it was managed by the Shāfi‘īs and the Sūfis, with the title Nāqīr al-‘arbā‘ī. This department came to an end in the time of Malh al-Nāṣir Farajī because an emir supported by the opinion of the Ḥanafī chief āsār spent a great deal and amassed the funds; 3. dīfā‘ al-‘arbā‘ī al-mālik al-bayr, comprised all the endowments which still had particular nāqīs, either descendants of the testator or officials of the Sulṭān and the āsār. The emirs seized the lands and the Bārī‘ū, before he became Sulṭān, sought in vain to remedy the evil by appointing a commission. The endowments in general disappeared somewhat later because the ruling emirs seized them (Maqrizi, iv, 83—86). In modern times, as a rule, endowments in Muslim lands have been combined under a special ministry.

To be distinguished from the administrators of the mosques is the nāqīr who is only concerned with the supervision of the erection of mosques. Any one could be entrusted with the building of a mosque (e.g. Maqrīzī, iv, 98). Under the Mamluks there was also a clerk of works, mutawwili juḥad al-‘arbā‘ī or nāqīr al-‘arbā‘ī: he was the overseer of the builders (Ibid., p. 102; see Zubdat Kāfri al-Mamūlī, ed. Ravaisse, p. 115, cf. p. 109; v. Berchem, C. I. A., i, 742 sq., 751).

The caliph or the ruler of the country was in this, as in other matters, supreme. As we have seen, he intervened in the administration and directed it as he wished. He was also able to interfere in the internal affairs of the mosque, if necessary through his usual officers. In 353 (1067) after the rising in the Fāyūm, the chief of police issued strict orders by which it was forbidden to say the ḥusnun al-a‘m al-masjīd in the mosque: the number of prayers in the month of Ramadān was cut down, the āsār from the minarets were silenced (Ibid. Bahrur Surārī, Fihir. No, 788). In the year 394, the governor Ḥakīm al-Nāṣirī had the mosque of ‘Amr closed except at the salāt because the Bait al-Mal was kept in it, which however produced protests from the people (Maqrizi, iv, 11; Kindt, Wüste, p. 266; H. G. A., vii, 116). Many similar examples could be mentioned, especially during periods of unrest. In 821 the mālī in conjunction with the kāfīr revised the budget of the Mosque of the Omayyads and made financial reforms (J. A., ser. 9, vii, 220). The mālīn were laid down in edicts by the ruler (Maqrizi, iv, 44, 45). In the year 373, the vizier in Baghda‘d had a man whipped who had recited a variant text of the kūrin in the misbāb, after he had been heard in his defence in the presence of the kāfīr and learned men (Ya‘qūb, Uṣūlī, vii, 300). The importance of the the mosque depended on his personality. As a rule, he recognised the authority of the regular officials. When for example al-Khāṭīb al-Baghdadī asked the Caliph al-Kā‘im for authority to read Ḥadīth in the mosque of al-Ma‘ṣūrī, the latter referred the question to the nāqīr al-‘arbā‘ī (Ya‘qūb, Uṣūlī, i, 246 sqq.; cf. Wattenfeld, Schāhī, iii, 280).

The consecration of the mosque was attended by certain ceremonies. When for example the midday service was conducted for the first time in the Dīwān al-Salāh in Cairo, a representative from Baghdad was present (Maqrizi, iv, 81). At the consecration of the Mosque of Im Īm in 997, the builder gave al-Kā‘im b. Sulaimān, a cup of al-Shāhī, who lectured on Hadīth there, a purse of 1,000 dinars (Staunefi, Haṣn al-Muḥādhorah, ii, 139). Al-Maqrīzī describes the consecration ceremony at several mosques. In the M. al-Ma‘ṣūrī the Sulṭān was present seated on a throne surrounded by his officers; the basin of the āqīn was filled with sugar and salt, the people ate and drank, lectures were given, then the salāt was read, and ḥusnun delivered and the Sulṭān distributed robes of honour among the officials of the mosques and Shāfī‘īs (Maqrizi, iv, 139); similarly at the Zāhirīya (p. 662) and poems were also recited: cf. Quatremerre, Hist. Sult. Maml, i, 170, 228 sqq.; Madrasat Dīwān al-Dīn, p. 811; al-Sārghīmī, p. 757 (Maqrīzī, iv, 217—247, 255, 526).
H. The Personnel of the Mosque.

1. The İmām.

From the earliest days of Islam, the ruler was the leader of the salat; he was imām as leader in war, head of the government and leader of the community salat. The governors of provinces thus became leaders of the salat and heads of the khardan and when a special financial official took over the fiscal side, the governor was appointed ʿala ʿl-qālāt wa ʿl-bahr. He had to conduct ritual prayer, especially the Friday salat on which occasion he also delivered the khutbah. If he was prevented, the chief of police, shark al-qātir, was his khutbah. (Cf. Maqrizi, iv. 83.) Amir b. al-ʿAla', the last Abbasid governor permitted the people of the villages to celebrate the two festivals, while the Friday divine service could only take place under those qualified to conduct it (who could punish and impose duties; ibid., p. 7). This was altered under the ʿAbbāsids.

The caliph no longer regularly conducted the salats (after the conquest of the Persians: Maqrizi, iv. 45.), and ʿAbd aṣ-Ṣālaḥ, the last Arab governor of Egypt (238-242), was also the last emir to conduct the salat in the ʿamīrī. An imām, paid out of the ʿābd al-mīrād, was now appointed (ibid., p. 83), but the governor still continued to be formally appointed ʿala ʿl-qālāt. Henceforth the ruler only exceptionally conducted the service, for example the Fāṭimid son on ceremonial occasions, especially in the month of Ramaḍān (Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. ʿUyayn, ii, 482 sq.; ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, Sharh al-Aʾthār, ii. 509 sq.); in many individual mosques probably the most prominent man conducted the service; according to the Ḥadīth, the one with the best knowledge of the ʿuṣūl and, failing him, the eldest should officiate (Bukhārī, Aḥbāb b. 46, 49).

The imām appointed was chosen among those learned in religious matters; he was often a Hāshimi (Mes., Rūmāsī, p. 147), or might be at the same time a šaykh or his aʿlīb (see Kindi, Waṣīf, p. 575, 580; Ibn Batūta, i. 276 sq.). During the salat he stood beside the miḥrāb; al-Maṣkūl mentions the anomaly, that in Syria one performed one's salat "in front of the imām" (B.G.A., iii. 202); he could also stand on an elevated position; on one occasion ʿAbd Allāh ʿArafa conducted the salat in the Meccan mosque from the roof (Bukhārī, saʾla, bāb 17). In Mecca, in Ibn Dāliʾs time, each of the four recognized madhab (with the Zaidīs in addition) had an imām; they conducted the salat, one after the other each in his place, in the following order: ʿAbdāl, Mālik, Ḥanafī, and Ḥanbalī; they only performed the salat al-maghrīb together; in Ramaḍān they held the ḍahf in different places in the mosque, which was also often conducted by the kūrā (Rīhāʾ, ii. 101, 102, 143 sq.). This is still the case; very frequently one performs the salat, not after the imām of his own madhab (Snouck Hurgrone, Mykka, ii. 79 sq.). In Jerusalem according to Muḥammad b. ʿAmr al-Dīn the order was: Mālikī, Shāfiʿī, Ḥanafī, Ḥanbalī, who prayed each in their own part of the Haram; in Hebron the order was the same (Sauvain, Hist. Jér. et Hébron, p. 156 sq.). In Ramaḍān extraordinary imāms were appointed (ibid., p. 138).

When the imām no longer represented a political office, each mosque regularly had one. He had to maintain order and was in general in charge of the divine services in the mosque. In al-Maṣkūl's time the imām of the Mosque of ʿAmr read a āja in the ʿuṣūl every morning after the salat (B.G.A., iii. 205). It was his duty to conduct every salat, which is only valid fi ḍamāʾa. He must conform to the standards laid down in the law; but it is disputed whether the salat is invalid in the opposite case. According to some, the leader of the Friday salat should be a different man from the leader of the five daily salats (Maṣrūq, al-ʿAbāb al-Mashīr, ed. Lang, i. 171 sq.; Ibn al-Ḥārīmī, K. al-Maṣkūl, ii. 41, 43 sqq., 50, 73 sqq.; al-Tabarī, Muḥib al-Nīmān, ed. Muyīlī, 195 sq.; al-Ḥādīthī, s. Westcott, Handbuch, p. 109 sq.). Many cherished misgivings against being made for religious services and quoted in support of their view a saying of Abū Anīfa (B.G.A., ii. 127).

2. The Khutbah.

The development of this office is analogous to that of imām. When the ʿAbbāsids caliph no longer delivered khutbas regularly, a man learned in religious matters was appointed to the office of khutbā (see D.1 and the article KHUTB). It could be pointed out that the Prophet himself had a khutbah namely ʿUṭbīrī b. Ḥadīth (Darāʾī, Bayān, i. 175) and sermons outside the Friday service had in any case become quite usual. Thus ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was already a noted preacher (ibid., p. 190). Later it sometimes happened that a general like Djawhar himself acted as imām at the salat, while the khutbah was left to a learned man (Maqrizi, iv. 44). As the khutbah in theory represented the ruler, he uttered a blessing upon him; to this extent the office had a political significance. The caliph was blessed and the heir-apparent and the king of the country (cf., above D. 1). When the caliph himself preached, he also pronounced a prayer for himself (Yâkūn, Uddāb, ii. 349 sqq.) and the Fāṭimid mentioned their fathers. The sermons gradually became quite stereotyped; Ibn Batūta (1355) praises the khutbah in Mecca, because he gave a new sermon every Friday. A ʿājīb was frequently chosen as khutbā and a chief ʿājīb could sometimes preach in a large mosque (Kindi, Waṣīf, p. 596; Maqrizi, iv. 132; Ibn Djubair, p. 156; according to Qutman, Hist. Sait. Maml., ii. 15, a ʿājīb was for the first time appointed khutbā in 694/1295 in Damascus). The khutbah could also be a "witness" (Ḥīlāl al-Sibī, K. al-Wasāra) or hold another office like that of ʿāṣib al-sīrī (Maqrizi, iv. 137, 138, 139, 140); in the last mentioned case the office was hereditary, which we also find elsewhere (ibid., p. 98; Sayyid, al-Maṣkūl, p. 185; al-I拉萨ī).

The khutbah had frequently a khutbastā, in the Mecca mosque, where in 1412 two khuttās were deliberately appointed, they both preached at the same time on the minbar (Maqrizi, p. 63 sq.). Later we find in the larger mosques a number of khutbas being appointed who relieve one another.

In Mecca the khutbah was a particularly imposing figure. In his black cloak, trimmed with gold, and turban with julūbi, he went up to the minbar between two black hunters carried by mināṣifhūs, while a servant walked in front of him cracking a whip; after he had kissed the Black Stone, the chief mināṣifhūs went quickly in front of him with the sword with which he guided him on the minbar (Ibn Dāliʾ, p. 95 sq.; Ibn Batūta, i. 376 sq.).
The whip (ṣurkū`a: Ibn Djbair, p. 96, 97, 144, 156; Ibn Batūṭa, i. 376, 379, 390, 394; see B. G. A., iv., s. v.) is also used as he goes out and on other occasions. The black was the colour of the `Abbasid; it was also used in Egypt (Ibn Djbair, p. 50). The Jihādī khaṭṭah was a cap (halawnumma: Makrizī, iv., s. v.) and the dress of the ḥuṭbār differed with time and country (cf. ibid., p. 90; O. G. G., ii., 129, 416; Ibn al-Ḥudūd, Maḥkamat, ii., 73). In Mecca there were celebrations when a young man became a ḥaṭib (Ibn Djbair, p. 149).

Very frequently the khaṭṭah and the imām were on different shoulders, especially in the smaller mosques, but sometimes also in larger ones (Yābdū, Uddâtā, viii., 174, 179; Makrizī, iv., 122). Ibn al-Ḥudūd even regards this as the normal thing (K. al- Ḥudūd, ii., 59, 60, 73, 74); s. also al-Ṣubkī, Muḥī`, p. 160 sq.; and the article Ḥaṭīm.

3. Ḥaṭīm and Ẓari`. On these see C 3. Sometimes, in the later usage ḥaṭīm is used as the official speaker, very like khaṭṭah (cf. Ibn Ḥaṣaṣṣa, iii., s. v., while al-Ṭari` is only applied to the street story-teller (al-Ṣubkī, Muḥī` al-Naṣrī, p. 161 sq.). The ḥaṭīms are also frequently appointed to madrasas and particularly to maṣāḥebe (Makrizī, iv., 232; Yābdū, iv., 509; Subkī, Muḥī`, p. 162; v. Berchem, C. T. A., i., No. 252).

[4. The Mu`ādhdhin.]

According to most traditions, the office of mu`ādhdhin was instituted in the year 1, according to others only after the irṣā, in the year 2, according to some weak traditions while Muhammad was still in Mecca. At first the people came to the saḥīl without being summoned. Trumpets (biḥā) were blown and rattles (maḥṣū) used or fires lit after the custom of Jews, Christians and Madjūs. `Abd Allāh b. Ṭa`lār learned the time of prayer by ear, and in a dream it was approved by the Prophet and when Būkār proclaimed it, it was found that ʿOmar had also learned the same procedure in a dream (Ibn Ḥāthīm, p. 357 sq.; Khawāṣṣ, i., 404 sq.; Buḫkārī, Aḥṣāṣṣ, bāb 1; Zarkhānī, i., 121 sqq.). There are also variants of the story, e.g., that the Prophet and ʿOmar had the vision, or ʿAbd Bakr or seven or fourteen Amīrs; according to some, the Prophet learned it at the ṣuṣrāq from Gabriel, wherefore the introduction of the ṣuṣrāq is dated after the irṣā; among the suggestions made, the hoisting of a flag is mentioned (Sīra al-Ḥalālbīya, i., 100 sqq.). Noteworthy is a tradition which goes back to Ibn Sa`d, according to which at ʿOmar's suggestion at first a mu`ānād, Būlīl, was sent out who called in the streets: al-Ṭalāṣṣ al-Dimārī, 173 sqq. Only later were other possibilities discussed, but the method already in use was confirmed by the dream, only with another formula, the one later used (Khawāṣṣ, i., 404; Sīra al-Ḥalālbīya, ii., 100 sqq.). According to this account, the consideration of other methods would be a secondary episode and probably the tradition in general represents a later attitude toward the practices of other religions. But in Islam other methods were certainly used. In Fāṣ, a flag was hung out in the minarets and a lamp at night (J. A., ser. 11, xii., 341). The flag is also found in the legend of the origin of the practice. The public crier was a well-known institution among the Arabs. Among the tribes and in the towns important proclamations and invitations to general assemblies were made by criers. This crier was called Mu`ānād or Mu`ādhdhin (Sīra al-Ḥalālbīya, ii., 170; Lammens, La Mosquée, p. 62 sqq., 145; do. Bercovici, i., 229 note; do. Muḥī`, p. 150; Aḥsanī, Hidayat, p. 54 sqq.). Therefore means Mu`ādhdhin, Mu`āhdhin, Mu`ādhdhib, Sūra viii., 50; "to proclaim" and "crier." Mu`āmī (Buḫkārī, Fasr al-Ḳibās, bāb 15) and Mu`ādhdhin (ibid., Sūra, bāb 69; Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 10 = Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 16; Sīra al-Ḥalālbīya, ii., 270) are names given to a crier used by the Prophet or ʿAbd Bakr for such purposes. Official proclamations were regularly made by criers (cf. Tabārī, iii., 2131, 3). Sadīq and Musallimīna used a mu`ādhdhin to summon the people to their prayers (Tabārī, i., 1919 sq.; cf. Annali dell' Islam, i., 410 sq.; 638 sq). It was therefore very a natural thing for Muhammad to assemble the believers to common prayer through a crier (mudūl bi`i or iba` al `salāt, Sūra v., 63; xix., 93) the summons is called Mudūl and Aḥsanī, the crier Mu`āmī (Buḫkārī, Waqīf, bāb 5; Aḥsanī, bāb 7) and Mu`ādhdhin; the latter names are used quite indiscerningly in ibid., Waqīf, bāb 5; Tabārī, ii., 297 sqq.). Mu`āmī (al-Ṣalāt, R. G. A., i., 182, 39, also Ṣaḥīḥ, "crier") is used (Tabārī, iii., 861; Chron. Mehaki, i., 340).

In these conditions, it was very natural for the crier in the earliest period to be regarded as the assistant and servant of the ruler; he is the mu`ādhdhin (Ibn Sa`d, i., 7; Muslim, Ṣalāt, iv., 43, Makrizī, iv., 43, etc.; cf. Tabārī, i., 1120). ʿUmar sent to Kūfa ʿAmr b. Waṣṣ as enmār and ʿAbd Allāh b. Kāītā as mu`ādhdhin and waṣṣir (B. G. A., v., 165); he is thus the right hand of the ruler. Al-Ḥusain had his musalli and later summoned to the salāt on al-Ḥusain's instructions (Tabārī, ii., 297, 298; cf. Ibn Zayyād, ibid., p. 260 and in the year 196 the ʿʿalām in Mecca, ibid., iii., 861, 73; also Chron. Mehaki, i., 340). During the same period the mu`ādhdhin probably visited his summons in the streets and the call was very short: al-Ṣalāh al-Dimārī (Ibn Sa`d, i., 7, 7; Chron. Mehaki, i., 340; Tabārī, iii., 861; also in the year 196, Sīra al-Ḥalālbīya, ii., 101; Khawāṣṣ, i., 404 sqq.). This brief summons was, according to Ibn Sa`d, also used later on irregular occasions (i., 7 sqq.; cf. the passage in Tabārī). Perhaps also the summons was issued from a particular place even at a quite early date (see D 2a). After the public summons the mu`ādhdhin went to the Prophet, greeted him and called him to prayer; the same procedure was later used with his successor; when he had come, the mu`ādhdhin announced the beginning of the salāt (ṣamī` al-ṣalāt, Waqīf, bāb 5; Aḥsanī, bāb 58; Sīra al-Ḥalālbīya, ii., 104 sq.; Makrizī, iv., 45). The activity of the mu`ādhdhin thus fell into three sections: the assembling of the community, the summoning of the imām and the announcement of the beginning of the ṣalāt. With time changes were made in all three stages. The assembling of the community by crying aloud was not yet at all regular in the older period. During the fighting, Ibn Zayyād in the year 60 called his mu`ānād with threats to the evening ṣalāt in the mosque and when after him the mosque was full he had the ṣīma announced (Tabārī, ii., 260). When a large number of musalsas had come into existence, the public call to prayer had to be organised lest confusion arose, and the custom
of calling from a raised position became general after the introduction of the minaret. While previously the call to prayer had only been preparatory and the ḥāma was the final summons, the public call (adḥān) and the ḥāma now formed two distinct phases of the call to prayer. Tradition has retained a memory of the summoning in the streets, now completely fallen into disuse, when it tells us that ʿOthmān introduced a third ʿaḍḥān, a call in al-Zawār, which was made before the call from the minaret: this call however was transferred by Ḥishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik to the minaret (Bukhārī, Qūnawā, bāb 22, 25; Sīra Ḥalabīya, li. 110; Ibn al-Ḥāḍīdī, Madkhal, i. 45). This may be evidence of the gradual cessation of the custom of summoning the community by going through the streets. Ibn ʿAbī Ṭālib, but this is exceptional, tells us that the muʿāḍhdīn in Kháṣrīr still fetched the people from those houses who did not come were whipped (ill. 4 sq.), which recalls Wahhābī measures. When exactly the Sunna and in distinction to it the Shiʿī formula, finally developed can hardly be ascertained [see Ṣaʿīdī]. The call ḥāyaʿa ʿala ʿl-fāṭīḥah is known from the time of ʿAbd al-Malik (65–85) (Akhṭār, ed. Ṣaḥḥān, p. 254; see Horovitz, in Jsl., xvi., 1927, p. 157; on ṣaḥāf see ibid.; on ṣaḥāf formulae see further Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 105 sq.). At first: the call was only made at the chief mosque, as was the case in Medina and Mīṣaʿ (Makritz, iv. 43 infra) but very quickly other mosques were also given muʿāḍhdīn; their calls were sufficiently audible in the whole town. The chief mosque retained this privilege, that its muʿāḍhdīn called first and the others followed together (Makritz, iv. 43 infra, 44).

The summoning by the imām in Medina was therefore quite a natural thing. The custom, at: first associated with the ruler’s mosque, was not observed in Medina only (see for ʿOthmān and ʿAlī: ʿAbī Ṭālib, i. 2050 sq.) but was also usual under the Omayyads. The formula was: al-Salām ʿalā ikhwān ʿl-Mukrīn wa-Rahmatum ʿl-Ikh was-Barākātuhum ḥāyaʿa ʿala ʿl-Fāṭīḥah, ḥāyaʿa ʿala ʿl-Fāṭīḥah al-Ṣūrāt, yarhamuka ʿl-Ikh (Makritz, iv. 45; Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 105). After the alteration in the adḥān and the greater distance of the ruler from the mosque, to summon him was no longer the natural conclusion to the assembling of the community. In the ʿAbbaseid period and under the Fāṭimids there was a survival of the old custom, in as much as the muʿāḍhdīn ended the adḥān call before the ṣalāt al-fajr on the minarets with a ʿaḍḥān upon the calliph. This part of the muʿāḍhdīn’s work was thus associated with the first adḥān call. When Saḥḥ al-Dīn came to power, he did not wish to be mentioned in the call to prayer, but instead he ordered a blessing upon the Prophet to be uttered before the adḥān to the ṣalāt al-fajr, which after 761 only took place before the Friday service. A multasib ordered that after 791 in Egypt and Syria at each adḥān a ʿaḍḥān was to be uttered over the Prophet (Makritz, iv. 46; Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 110). Ibn Dajbur relates that in Mecca after each ṣalāt al-maghrib, the foremost muʿāḍhdīn pronounced ḥāyaʿa ʿala ʿl-Mahṣūm ʿalā ikhwān al-ʿAbbasīm ʿalā ʿl-Iṣlaḥ wa-Shuʿayb, ḥāyaʿa ʿala ʿl-Iṣlaḥ wa-Shuʿayb (p. 103) and according to Makritz, after each ṣalāt prayers for the ʿAlī were uttered by the muʿāḍhdīn (iv. 53 sq.). Another relic of the old custom was that the trumpet was sounded at the door of the ruler at times of prayer; this honour was also shown to ʿAbd al-Lāwwah in 698 by order of the caliph (Ibn Maskawī, vi. 490; Cairo 1315, p. 356).

The ḥāma always remained the real prelude to the service and is therefore regarded as the original adḥān (Bukhārī, Qūnawā, bāb 24 sq.). In the earliest period it was fixed by the arrival of the ruler and it might happen that a considerable interval elapsed between the summoning of the people and the ḥāma (cf. ʿAbī Ṭālib, ii. 260, 297 sq.). The times were later more accurately defined; one should be able to perform 1–3 ʿaḍḥāts between the two calls (Bukhārī, Adḥān, bāb 14, 16). Some are said to have introduced the practice of the muʿāḍhdīn calling ḥāyaʿa ʿala ʿl-fāṭīḥah at the door of the mosque between the two calls (Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 105). From the nature of the case the ḥāma was always called in the mosque; at the Friday service, it was done when the imām mounted the minbar (Makritz, iv. 43) while the muʿāḍhdīn stood in front of him. This muʿāḍhdīn, as a rule, called some, ought to be the one who called the adḥān upon the minaret (Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 109), while Ibn al-Ḥāḍīdī ignoring the historical facts only permits the call from the minaret (Madkhal, i. 45). In Tunisia, the ḥāma was announced by ringing a bell as in the churches (Zarkaš, transal., Fīgūn, in Rev. Soc. Arch. Constantinii, 1894, p. 111 sq.). A similarity to the responses in the Christian service is found in the fact that the call of the muʿāḍhdīn, which contains a confession of faith, is to be repeated or at least answered by every one who hears it (Bukhārī, Qūnawā, bāb 23); this is an action which confers religious merit (Ibn ʿUsākhūḡa, ʿAbī Ṭālib al-Ḥanafīya, ed. Rūgīl, p. 30). It is possible that we should recognise in this as well as in the development of the formulae the influence of Christians converted to Islam (cf. Becker, Zur Geschichte der Islamzeit, in Jsl., iii, 1912, p. 374 sqq. and Islamstudien, i. 472 sqq., who sees an imitation of the Christian custom in the ḥāma in general; on the possibility of Jewish influence see Mittwoch, in Abb. Fr. A. W., 1913, Phil.-Hist. Cl. 2).

The muʿāḍhdīn thus obtained a new importance. His work was not only to summon the people to divine service, but was in itself a kind of religious service. His sphere of activity was further developed. In Egypt we are told that Maslama b. Muhkallad (47 sqq.) introduced the ṣaḥāf. This consisted in praises of God which were uttered by the muʿāḍhdīn all through the night until ṣaḥīr. This is explained as a polemical imitation of the Christians, for the government was troubled by the use of the muṣṭafī at night and forbade it during the adḥān (Makritz, iv. 48). In the time of Ahmad b. Tūsī and Khūmarwarāshī, the muʿāḍhdīn recited religious texts throughout the night in a special room. ʿAbd al-Dīn ordered them to recite an ʿaḍḥān in the night adḥān and after 700 ḥādr was performed on Friday morning on the minarets (ibid., p. 48 sqq.; Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 113). In Mecca also the muʿāḍhdīns performed ḥādr throughout the night of the first Shawwāl on the roof of the Ḥubba of the Zemmām well (Ibn Dajbur, p. 155, 156; cf. for Damascus: Makritz, iv. 49). Similar litanies are kept up in modern times as well as a special call about an hour before dawn (Ebel, Türkm. see Lane, Manners and Customs [Everyman’s Library],
The original call of the mu'adhdhin thus developed into a melodious chant like the recitation of the Qur'an. Al-Ma'adhini tells us that in the fourth century in Egypt during the last third of the night, the adhān was recited like a dirge (B.G.A., ii. 205). The solemn effect was increased by the large number of voices. In large mosques, like that of Mecca, the chief mu'adhdhin called first from a minaret, then the others came in turn (Chron. Mecca, iii. 24; Ibn Dzungar, p. 145 sqq.; cf. B.G.A., ii. 327; i. 327; cf. supra). But in the mosque itself the īklim was pronounced by the mu'adhdhins in chorus on the dakkah (see II. 26) erected for this purpose, which is also traced to the Muslims. In the third and fourth centuries we hear of these melodious recitations (tajārij) of the mu'adhdhins on a raised podium in widely separated parts of the Muslim world (Sanā'ī, Egypt, Khurāsān; B. G. A., iii. 327; vii. 111; the expression al-muḍāla 'iṭība, "the musicians," if correct, probably refers to the mu'adhdhins: B. G. A., iii. 205; cf. also: Kindi, Wafā', p. 469; for Fāris we are expressly told that the mu'adhdhins call without tajārij; B. G. A., ii. 439, 17). Sometimes in large mosques they were stationed in different parts of the mosque to make the īklim's words clear to the community (tabāgha). The singing, especially in chorus, like the salāh, was regarded by many as bid'a (Kindi, op. cit.; K. al-Ma'adhīl, ii. 45 sq., 61 sq.; Sīra Ḥalabiyya, i. 111). In other ways also the mu'adhdhins could be compared to deacons at the minbar.

The khāṭib on his progress to the minbar in Mecca was accompanied by mu'adhdhins and the chief mu'adhdhin girded him with a sword on the minbar (Ibn Dzungar, p. 96 sq.).

The new demands made on the mu'adhdhins necessitated an increase in their number, especially in the large mosques. The Prophet in Medina had two mu'adhdhins, Bīlāl b. Rikāth, Abū Bakr's muwāfa, and Ibn Umm Maktūm, who worked in rotation. 'Oqīmūn also is said occasionally to have called the adhān in front of the minbar (i.e. the īklima) (Ma'adhīl, iv. 43). It is therefore regarded as commendable to have two mu'adhdhins at a mosque (Muslih, Sāhī, tr. 4; cf. Subk, Mu'īd, p. 165). Abū Ma'hāshira was also the Prophet's successor as mu'adhdhin in Mecca. Under 'Omar, Bīlāl's successor as mu'adhdhin was Sa'd al-Kaṣār, who is said to have called to prayer for the Prophet in Ḫūba (Ma'adhīl, op. cit.; cf. Sīra Ḥalabiyya, i. 107 sqq.). In Egypt under 'Amr, the first mu'adhdhin in al-Fuṣaṭ was Abū Muslim: he was soon joined by nine others. The mu'adhdhins of the different mosques formed an organisation, the head (qażm) of which, after Abū Muslim, was his brother Shurahbīl b. Āmir (d. 65); during his time Maslama b. Mukhāḍīd built minarets (Ma'adhīl, iv. 44).

The office of mu'adhdhin was sometime hereditary. The descendants of Bīlāl were for example mu'adhdhins of the Medinan Mosque in al-Rawḍa (Ibn Dzungar, p. 194) and we also find in Medina the sons of 'Uthmān al-Kaṣār officiating (Ibn Kutasba, Hamzah d. Gesh, ed. Wäszenfeld, p. 132, 279). In Mecca the sons of Abū Ma'hāshira (ibid., p. 278; Sīra Ḥalabiyya, ii. 106), in Basra, the sons of al-Mundhir b. Ḥassān al-Ablī, mu'adhdhins of 'Uthmān al-Kaṣār (Ibn Kutasba, p. 279); it is also possible that this was really the result of a system of guilds of mu'adhdhins. In the Ḥajāmī of the Maghrib in the eighth century each had regularly four mu'adhdhins who were stationed in different parts of the mosque during the īklim (K. al-Ma'adhīl, ii. 47, supra); but there were often quite a large number. In the Asḥār mosque in the time of al-Jākīn there were fifteen, each of whom was paid two dinārs a month (Ma'adhīl, iv. 51). Ibn Baṭṭūlāf found seventy mu'adhdhins in the Mosque of the Omayyads (i. 204). About 1900, in Medina there were in the Mosque of the Prophet fifty mu'adhdhins and sixty assistants (Iṣāmāli, 'Ābīb, p. 242). Blind men were often chosen for this office; Ibn Umm Maktūm for example was blind (Bukhārī, Aṣbāb, bāb 11; Sīra Ḥalabiyya, ii. 104; cf. Lane, op. cit., p. 75). The Prophet is said to have forbidden the Thābitī to pay a mu'adhdhin (Wāqī'īṣī-Waḥīmmī, p. 383). Īqāmūn is said to have been the first to give payment to the mu'adhdhin (Ma'adhīl, iv. 44) and Ahmad b. Ḥajīm gave them large sums (Jābīl, p. 49). They regularly received their share in the endowments, often by special provisions in the documents establishing the foundations.

The mu'adhdhins were organised under chiefs (mu'awāfī; Ma'adhīl, iv. 14). In Mecca the wālī al-mu'adhdhin minbar was identical with the mu'adhdhin al-Zamānī who had charge of the singing in the upper story of the Zemzem building (Chron. Mecca, iii. 424 sq.; Ibn Dzungar, p. 145; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 322). The mu'adhdhin was next to the Imām but subordinate to him; in certain districts, it was the custom for him to mount the pulpit during the Khutbah with the Imām (when the latter acted as khāṭib) (K. al-Ma'adhīl, li. 74; correct above p. 928, l. 31 sq. in keeping with this). The position which they originally occupied can still be seen from the part which they play in public processions of officials, e.g. of the Rāṣī l-Kufrī, when they walk in front and lead the ruler and his visir (Ma'adhīl, i. 246).

Closely associated with the mu'adhdhin is the mu'māshit, the astronomer, whose task it was to ascertain the īklim and the times of prayer (Subk, Mu'īd, p. 165 sqq.); sometimes the chief mu'adhdhin did this (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 322).

5. Servants.

According to Abū Hurairah, the Mosque of the Prophet was swept by a negro (Bukhārī, Sālāt, bāb 72, cf. 74). The larger mosques gradually acquired a large staff of servants (khālīdūm), notably buwādū, ḥarīfī, and water-carriers (cf. e.g. v. Berchem, C. I. A., i, N° 253). In Mecca there have always been special appointments, such as supervisor of the Zemzem and guardian of the Ka'ba (ṣālmī, pl. ṣālīmān, also used of the officials of the mosque: Ma'adhīl, iv. 76; cf. Ibn Dzungar, p. 278). In Ibn Baṭṭūlāf's time the servants (khālīdūm) of the Mosque of the Prophet were numerous, particularly Abyssinian; their chief (ṣālmī al-khālīdūm) was a great emir and paid by the Egyptian-Syrian governor (l. 278, 348); cf. the title of an emir of the year 798: abū Ḥādī al-ṣālmī al-khālīdūm in ʿālam al-arṣuṣ al-mawāni (v. Berchem, C. I. A., l, N° 201). In the Mosque of Jerusalem about 300 a. h., there were no less than 140 servants (ṣālmīt: B. G. A., v. 100); others gave the figure 250 (Le Strange, Paléologue, p. 163) and according to Muṣṭir al-Din, Abū al-Malik appointed a guard of three hundred black slaves here, while the actual menial work was done by
certain Jewish and Christian families (Sauvain, Hist. Jér. et Hbr., p. 56 sq.).

In other mosques superintendents (kamim, pl. haswawa) are mentioned, a vague title which covered a multitude of duties: thus the Madrasa al-Madidiya had a kajim who looked after the cleaning, the staff, the lighting and water-supply (Makrizi, iv. 251), the Azhar Mosque had one for the miṣṣa'ya, who was paid twelve dinars (ibid., p. 51) and also a haswawa, who were paid like muḥaddiths (two dinars a month) and are mentioned between them and the imams, probably supervisors of the staff (ibid., p. 51). In other cases a kajim al-dādhi, sometimes a kajmi, is mentioned, who is apparently the same as the îmãm, the khaṭṭb or some similar individual of standing (ibid., p. 75, 121, cf. 122; cf. Ibn Dhu-bair, p. 51). A musâkhâf, inspector, is also mentioned, e.g. in the Azhar (Makrizi, iv. 51).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(JoH. PEDESEN)
the Muslim community are more or less respected; the secular authorities however exert a great influence.

The revenues of mosque officials come from various sources: donations, freewill offerings, in cases where their services are required; *— at religious festivals, burials, etc. — need only be mentioned. The chief source of revenue is the so-called marriage fees, less from *djakat* and *pitra*; these are administered and distributed by the superintendent of the mosque. As already mentioned the mosque and its accessories have to be maintained out of the income. Neglect of this duty has induced the chiefs in Java and Madura to intervene and form a special fund, the so-called mosque fund for this purpose. This was arranged as follows: a certain percentage of marriage fees and of the *djakat* and *pitra* was set aside; the chiefs took charge of these funds. The revenues of the mosque officials earmarked in this way were however only a small fraction of the total; the greater part, perhaps 1/3 or more, remained at the disposal of the officials. This same procedure is found here and there on other islands but is not general.

The Dutch government maintains a neutral attitude to Islam, in all business matters of the mosque also. It takes no part in the building or restoration of mosques; only very exceptionally does it give a contribution in money for such purposes. This was done for example in Kuta Raja (Aceh), where the chief mosque, which had been destroyed during fighting, was rebuilt from government funds in 1881. But this act of the authorities was not appreciated by the Muslim population; in general, the government officials only see that no compulsion is used to procure materials or funds for the building or maintenance of mosques.

With the end of the sixteenth century the Colonial administration began to pay some attention to the regular organisation of the staffs of the mosques, primarily in Java and Madura. Their measures aimed at maintaining things as they were and at getting rid only of abuses and such customs as had proved to be a burden on the people.

*Djakat* and *pitra* are regarded as "freewill offerings" by the colonial authorities; the native chiefs and village authorities were therefore forbidden to interfere with them. It is left to the individual to give them or not; he is also free to give his gifts to whom he pleases. The giving of *djakat* varies very much with places and persons and is smallest in Central Java. It is concerned almost entirely with agricultural produce, especially with the staple product and even then it rarely happens that the legal quantity is given. In practice the *djakat*, where it is levied, is collected by the village mosque officials and handed over to the *pa**h**ulu*; he then distributes it in a certain proportion among his subordinates. The proceeds go almost entirely to the staff of the mosque and the village officials, firstly because they are *awan* and secondly because they consider themselves *pahulu* and *masahlu*; they have, as they say, no means of livelihood like other people.

*Pitru* is paid regularly; it happens very frequently with this "donation" that it is paid direct to those entitled to it and not through the officials. Nevertheless a considerable portion goes the same way as the *djakat*.

The government confined itself to seeing that the *djakat* and *pitra* collected by the *pa**h**ulu* was distributed as it ought to be according to custom but this was not always done.

Marriage, *walit* and *raji**h** have been regulated by a colonial law. The *pa**h**ulu* or his deputy was confirmed in his already mentioned functions as an official with legal standing. At the same time, others than the appointed *pa**h**ulu* were forbidden by the secular authority to perform marriages. The registration of marriages, *talab* and *raji**h** was improved. The fees and their distribution among the staff were fixed according to local custom.

Every effort is made to keep these as low as possible. Similar regulations were later promulgated for the other islands.

As to the funds of the mosques, it was ascertained that there was more money in them than was required for the maintenance of the building and that they were being used for other purposes than the traditional ones. This caused the government to place the funds of the mosques under the joint control of European and native authorities. This holds particularly of Java and Madura; but wherever else the mosque had funds, these were retained.

The regulations promulgated for Java and Madura have recently been attacked by Muslims; they wanted as far as possible to withdraw everything relating to marriage from government interference. The intervention of the government is now (since 1929) limited to the fact that parties who wish to enter into matrimony have to report themselves to a registrar. *Talab* and *raji**h** have also to be reported to him. The marriage ceremony may be performed by others, but they are under the control of the registrar; this last method is now the exception; the majority continue to go to the district officer.

In one other respect the mosque has come under the control of government regulations. In Muslim districts of the East Indian Archipelago hardly a mosque is built without the consent of the local secular authority. Although it does not have to give its approval expressly, no work will be begun until the plan is approved. In Java and Madura the chiefs have long held themselves entitled to decide on the question whether a new mosque should be erected, though they justified this claim by saying among other things that a new mosque, if not desired by the entire community, may easily lead to jealousy and disputes about the validity of the Friday service etc., which might result in general unrest.

The custom of making the site of a mosque *wahf* — or at least regarding it as such, results in it being impossible to use such pieces of ground for public purposes, even if it is long since the mosque buildings had been removed from them.

These and other difficulties induced the government to require the approval of the chiefs for the building of new mosques on Java and Madura and also that the sites should become *wahf*. It was however expressly laid down that there can be no possible question of interfering with the religious requirements of the Muslims; the chief can only refuse his consent in the public interest.

The law of the Dutch Indies demands the presence of the *pa**h**ulu* or some one with similar functions, at the courts for Muslim natives and also when a native appears as accused or plaintiff
in a court, to assist the court as adviser. An endeavour is made to get the most suitable people as advisers: they are officially appointed. It was found to be desirable to combine this office and that of the administrator of the mosque in the one individual; and this is now the normal practice. The influence of the government on the appointment of the personnel of the mosque, which otherwise is reserved for the chief, has thus been increased, especially as in the appointment of the assistant[s] of the paḫ[ḫ]alu, the ability of acting as adviser is also taken into account.

The bonds which connect the personnel of the mosque and the secular authority are thus fairly close; — in the opinion of some too close. In recent years the effort has been made in nationalist Muslim circles, to loosen or even break all secular connections in the fulfillment of religious duties. One way of doing this is to get private individuals to found mosques with the help of similar-minded people. This is quite possible in the conditions described and is still done.


III.

Architecture.

The mosque with an open quadrangle was the natural form for the hot southern lands of Islam, and is simply a continuation of the many types of pillared halls and chambers which were to be found all over the near east, beginning with the Egyptian temples and coming down to the apadana of the Persians and the stoa of the Greeks, of which course only the latter influenced the development of the early Muslim mosque. This consists of a courtyard or quadrangle (paḫn) usually very large which is surrounded by cloisters (rīsāf) which are either connected by flat beams, or more usually by arches and covered by a flat roof. At the khâba side the rīwâţs were deeper so that the rows of worshippers could find shade from the sun. The supports were at first very often columns taken from ancient buildings and where these were not obtainable, were of wood or brick. The pillared hall at the khâba side was called al-wâma al-bihî or râwâqa. A portion of the râwâqa was shut off by a railing and reserved for princes and priests. On the quadrangle side of the râwâqa is a podium (diqqa) supported by pillars and reached by a staircase or ladder; this is for the officials of the mosque, who repeat the words of the imâms during the service to make them audible on all sides. At the end of the râwâqa the muqâba is set into the middle of the wall and beside it is the minâb. In the centre of the court is a well, originally intended for ritual ablutions but these were as a rule performed in rooms specially set apart for the purpose.

These mosques with open quadrangle were built in the first century s.t. on a large scale, as they were primarily intended to be mosques for the troops, whence they were called 'askar mosques.
in Central Asia. They are as a rule oblong quadrangles with cells built round them and a stupa in the centre and several large rooms for living quarters. In Persia, under the influence of these buildings, the type of quadrangle and cells with 4 iwans in the form of a cross became established as the ideal scheme of a madrasa. That this plan which was architectonic in origin was also the practical ideal for the fourfold doctrine of the Sunnats, was a fortunate combination, which in some large state madrasas became of practical significance.

The Persian Mosque-Madrasa. The quadrangle surrounded by cells with four iwans of the Persian Madrasa was now combined with the old pierced mosque and the result was a very happy combination: the mosque-madrasa (as we Europeans call it). The important result of this combination was from the architectonic point of view the monumental courtyard with cells, which now replaced the old courtyard with pillars or piers which were no longer architectonically satisfactory and was also foreign to the spirit of Persian architecture. But with this transformation of the quadrangle a change was brought about in the spiritual aspect of the mosque. It symbolised the transformation which had meanwhile taken place internally and externally in Islam from a combative, conquering religion organised on military lines into a spiritual attitude to life, controlled by theologians and men of learning. The fighting, however, which was still conducted by military forces, and the conquests had now become more or less the private business of the secular rulers, above whom was the religious propaganda of the Muslim clergy. The most instructive example of this penetration of the older type of mosque by the Persian quadrangle surrounded with cells is the Masjid-i Djam's in Isfahan. This mosque, like all the Friday mosques in Persia was originally built as a pierced mosque and had been frequently enlarged. At the present time, as the plan shows, it consists of colonnades which have in course of centuries been added to one another from time to time. A great deal of wood must have been built into its framework, since Vīkūtī tells us that during the siege of Isfahan by the Seldjük Tughhrî Beg (443 = 1050/1051) the mosque was destroyed to obtain wood. From the contemporary accounts that have been handed down, we further learn that the Seldjük Sultan Malik Shâh when the mosque was completely burned down by his orders began with robbing the walls of the courtyard. He is credited with building the southern iwan. The other three iwans are over their present form of later origin. By covering over this large quadrangle, the courtyard, the only characteristic architectural feature of the mosque, received the necessary unity and importance. (Around it, this mosque, like most Friday mosques, was completely surrounded by bazaars which made any external development impossible: the quadrangle was therefore all the more important). The rows of cells had here no longer any practical significance as dwellings but became an architectural feature. Behind the southern iwan, directed towards Mecca, a large domed hall was built as a sanctuary, in the south wall of which were the mihrâb and pulpit. Here the solemn Friday service was held. Thus the Friday mosque was created of the type which became general in Iran and Turkestân. Mosques and madrasas were frequently combined with mausoleums (cf. the article Architecture).
The Mosque building in the early period. Muhammad left no instructions as to how future mosques were to be built so that the earliest mosques varied considerably and we can hardly talk of a fully developed type before the third (ninth) century. The Prophet’s house in Medina, where he performed the salât with his faithful followers and instructed them, was a dar of the usual local type quite unsuitable as a model for the future mosque. It consisted of a courtyard surrounded by a brick wall with living rooms and out-houses along the inner wall. As was usual and still is in every house of this kind in Arabia and other tropical lands, palm trunks were put up in the courtyard and a flat roof of palm leaves put over them and covered with a lattice of clay. This is how the earliest accounts would lead us to picture the Prophet’s house. In the courtyard was a reception tent furnished with fine carpets and materials, for Muhammad did not despise the nomadic luxuries and comforts of his people (cf. H. Lammens, Fatima et les filles de Mahomet et de, in J. A., 1915, p. 238 sqq.).

Around this establishment of the Prophet, his wife and daughters, lay the court in which his friends and followers used to assemble for the daily prayer and which thus became the first quadrangle of the first mosque. The use of a typical Arabian courtyard arranged in this way as a masjid however gives us no idea of the type of imposing building. For half a century, it is true, they were content with this primitive mosque, during the patriarchal period of the first four caliphs, out of respect for the Prophet’s mosque, but the first Omayyad caliph Walid I, who in transforming the church of St. John in Damascus into the Mosque of the Omayyads had acquired experience in matters of building and connections with builders, on the occasion of his pilgrimage to Medina in 90 (709) ordered the primitive mosque which had served the purpose so far, to be replaced so that an entirely new building could be erected on its site, which was extended. For this purpose, as Sambabi tells us, he asked the Byzantine emperor for skilled workmen and shells for the ornamentation, which were sent to him.

"The walls and columns of the new mosque were built of large hewn stones of equal size and bound with plaster; ornamentation in shell and marble was carried out in the roof built of palm wood and covered with gold paint." Instead of the early primitive mosque, Walid had thus given the Medinah a substantial pillared mosque, like the first mosque which he had built in Syria with the help of Byzantine artisans from pillars plundered from Hellenistic colonnades and Christian churches. It was only in this Hellenised form that the Mosque of Medina could have influenced the further development of the mosque in so far as we can speak of such influence at all. (It was given its present form by the Mamluk Sultan Kâfi Bey in 888 (1483). The ordinary Arab village mosque is different in appearance. It has retained the form of the Arab pre-Islamic masjid. This "place of salât" was and still is a long hall supported by pillars, open on one side without a courtyard and having no miyâkh and minbar.

The lack of any generally binding or recognised rule or tradition is shown by the varying form of the mosque in the early centuries A.D. The earliest mosque of the general "Ain in Fâra' of 21 (642) was an enclosed rectangular hall without a courtyard, with a rûba which was not yet marked by a miyâkh. The first mosque in Bagh was, like the whole city of Damascus, built of red clay that it could be taken down with the camp. In the year 15 or 17 A.H. Abd Mūsâ, the newly appointed governor of Bagh, built a mosque of unhewn clay and brick with a roof of thatch. It was only under the Omayyad governor Ziyâd that a mosque was built of brick and plaster with a roof of tile and pillars, which came from the quarries of Ahwâz on the Kârim river. The first mosque in Kûfâ on the other hand of 17 A.H. was *a covered hall*, which had no roof nor walls buildings behind it (Tabari); before it was an open square and so, continues Tabari, were all the mosques except the Masjid al-Haram (i.e. Mecca), out of respect for the sanctity of the latter, it was not copied in the other mosques. This mosque also was rebuilt by Ziyâd, governor for the first Omayyad Ma'dâwi (67–702). For it he had plans drawn up by Mazaraki architects: *Uno degli architetti gli fece un disegno nel modello degli edifici eretti dal re sassanide, ossia un vasto colonnato con tetto e chiuso ad ovest* (cf. Amm. di Costanzo, III, 347, p. 857). When, on the other hand, the conquerors found buildings in towns which were suitable for masjids from the point of view of space, they utilised them. In al-Madînâ, for example, the old twin-city of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the ruins of the white palace was used as a place of assembly for the Friday service and the pictures of men and animals in it were not destroyed. In Syria, however, the churches were turned into mosques by changing the orientation from east to south and by placing a quadrangle in front of them. In this way the building of the mosque of any place in the early centuries A.D. was adapted to the traditions in existence and where there were no buildings, as in the newly founded camp-cities, it was on every occasion a problem for the governor requiring much consideration. In spite of this uncertainty, one can deduce from the descriptions, they were more inclined, even as early as the first century A.D., to the type of pierced mosque with a quadrangle, to which all the prototypes as well as the climatic point.

Development of the Masjid and the Madrasa in the different countries.

Syria. As the place of residence of the first dynasty of the young Muslim empire and a land of ancient culture, Syria was naturally destined to build the first substantial mosques and to influence early developments. This influence it exercised on the one hand indirectly through the Syrian mosque built by Walid in Medina, next to Mecca, the most sacred and most visited city of Islam; on the other hand, the Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus, as we know from Arabic sources, was taken as a model as far away as Córdoba. The earliest centre of Muslim building was Jerash, the name of which the Omayyads endeavoured to play off against Mecca. Beside the ruins of the *Abâr al-Sawâr al-Hasân on the Harâm al-Sharif, the sacred rock of which was to supplant the Ka'ba, *Abd al-Malik used the part still standing of Justinian's Church of the Virgin to build the *zâïf al-Aïma* (finished in 83 (702)). According to de Vogüé's plan, this building, later often restored or rebuilt, was a pil-
lared hall with three naves, of necessity oriented to the south with the mihrab in the long axis. At a later date, the transept with the dome and four side aisles were added. The Mausoleum of the Omayyads in Damascus arose out of the rebuilding of the Church of St. John, which had been built on this site by Theodosius out of the pillars and other stones of the Antonine temple of Jupiter. We must assume that Wahil had the pillars of the basilica moved so that three equal naves were built. These were crossed in the centre by a transept, which led up to the mihrab and had a dome over its centre. The rich decoration with mosaics was a suggestion from Syria and was probably done by Syrian workmen (plan and history of these buildings in Diez, Die Kunst d. islam, Folker, p. 144 sqq. of the first and p. 32 sqq. of the second edition; with references to the literature). The mosque of Damascus was the first to have a transept, the prototype of which Thiess does not doubt rightly finds in the chalke of Byzantium (Pharos, p. 214), which frequently appears again in Syria and Northern Mesopotamia. The great mosque of Aleppo was also built after the plan of the Omayyads with a transept, as the latter can hardly have been added until the rebuilding of 365 (970) (pictures in Saladin, Monüll, p. 85). The mosque of 1st in Ephesus, limnated in 777 (1375), and the mosque of Dīyār Bahrī are northern prototypes of this type, the influence of which can also be often traced in Cairo and the Maghrib. 

Alongside of these principal mosques in Syria a series of smaller mosques arose, partly out of ancient temples (Abū Ḥija, Hamā, Homs, Bal'alebeh, Tabūs, al-Umayya), partly built out of material available from Christian buildings (Ramis, Kusair, al-Halabī, Baṣrā). Some of these mosques may have been Omayyad foundations, certainly the mosque of Omar in Baṣrā. All these mosques, except Kusair al-Halabī, have the same type of quadrangle with halls around it, two or more being on the kibla side, without transept. The development of these halls varies however, as a result of local tradition or material available (e.g. the naves of Christian churches). They are all vaulted with pointed arches; sometimes they have gable-roads and thus, along with their closed façades in front of which we exceptionally have a bowed corridor, bear a western or northern stamp in keeping with the colder climate. The later Syrian mosques under the Ajyūbiya and Mamluks differ very much in their plan. The Mosque of Frādis in Aleppo, for example, has a small pillared court and a broad nave, with a row of five small domes, as the burām besides various side-rooms; cf. M. v. Berchem and E. Faúo, Voyages en Syrie (M. J. F. A. O., Cairo 1914, 2 vols.).

Magrebb in Syria. A very complete state of the madrasas in Syria and Egypt by K. A. C. Creswell (The Origin of the Cruciform Plan of the Cairo Mosques, B. I. F. A. O., 1920) has brought some clearness into the question of its typical formal development. After an examination of eight madrasas built before 1370 a. d., the plans of which can still be traced in Aleppo, Damascus and Hamā, Creswell shows that the symmetrical plan was unknown in Syria and that there was no regular scheme in the arrangement of the rooms, but it depended on the site available. A typical specimen is the always correctly oriented mosque; a nave of three vaulted rooms with three pointed arched doors to the court; a iwan on the court, rows of cells in the rear of the court and usually two tomb-capsules usually flanking the mosque; the rest of the area is occupied by rooms. Madrasas used by two rites had two iwāns. Of the So madrasas counted by al-ʿIlmawī in Damascus in the 13th century (J. A. 10, vol. iii—iv), 33 were Ḥanāfi, 31 Shāfiʿī, 9 Ḥambali, 1 Maḍhabī, 6 used by Shāfiʿīs and Ḥanāfs. Creswell's investigation shows that in Syria there was not one madrasa of all four rites nor a cruciform one, a result which suggests some deduction for the Egyptian madrasas.

Arabia. The indigeneous form of the masjid in Arabia is a large hall formed of chambers with pillars and arches. The author found such instances, more correctly to be described as musallas, in Manāmān Bahārain (picture in Diez, K. d. isl., F., p. 46). These praying chambers, open to the street without a courtyard, have no furniture, not even a minbar or mihrab. The latter was foreign to Arabia and in the larger masjids its place was taken simply by a slab of stone with some adornment. But these pillared halls were only a more substantial form of the local native masjid of palm-trunks, which could probably often be found in the simple villages of the interior and whose sanctified precursor was the Masjid al-Nabawī in Medina, built in this fashion. Alongside of this type of mosque which was indigeneous to Arabia we find imported forms, like the masjids in Medina (see above), of slight importance from the archaeological point of view. Mention may be made of the ruins of a mosque near Manāmā 1240 (1339/1430) described in an inscription as masjīda al-harīf ḍuri dīn wa-maʿrūṣ, with old pillars of teak of the fourth (tenth) century; the Shāfiʿī form of the creed on this as well as the inscriptions on the kibla stones of the tīwīn century mark it as a Shāfiʿī edifice (cf. Diez, Eine wissenschaftliche Untersuchung auf der Insel Bahrain, in Der, d. ass. Kunt, 11, 1925).

Iraḳ and Mesopotamia. The earliest settlements of the conquering Arabs in the Iraḳ were primitive camps built of reeds; equally primitive were the earliest mosques. Slashed buildings were used for the purpose in conquered cities, like Ctesiphon. A pillared mosque was early built in Kīifa (17. a. m.) which Ṭahārī describes and which was rebuilt as early as the beginning of the Omayyad period by "Persian builders" in the form of a completely enclosed pillared hall (see above). In the capital of the caliphate also, as a result of its complete destruction by Timūr nothing worthy of note has survived. We know however that the Friday Mosque of al-Mansūr (149 = 766) was built of pillars of teak with capitals of wood and a flat roof. A wooden dome gives the masjīda is probably. It was rebuilt under Harūn in 192—193 (808). Al-Muṣṭaqī began to enlarge it after the return of the troops from Samarrā (280 = 925) (cf. Sattari- Ḩerdan, Arch., Reis., II, 134 sqq. with plan). Outside of Baghdaḏ the unlimited space available permitted great mosques for the soldiers to be systematically planned, as in Ṭarāṣ and Samarrā, these were the great-pillared mosques of the third (ninth) century, which were copied in the Mosques of Ibn Tulun in Cairo. Of the three large old mosques in Muṣṭa, that of the Omayyads has completely disappeared; according to Ṭahārī's description it was "completely vaulted, with suboctoster slabs." This seems to be the origin of that type of pierced mosque.
with vaulted arches which was later further developed by the Saljūqs and Ottomans (see below). The Mosque of Nur al-Din (541–569 = 1146–1172) or Qānim al-Kahf was also vaulted from the first (with cross-vaulting) on piers (543 = 1148) and on its rebuilding in 566–568 (1170–1172) was not given cupolas. The third Mosque of al-Mudżāhidī, Khiḍr Ilīya, has been completely modernized. Smaller mosques of the 11th century like the Qānim Nabī, Dījīra have single domed chambers as prayer-rooms.

In Baghdad the following madrasas were built under the Abābašī; the Shāhī Naqšīya in 459 (1066), the Tawījīya in 482 (1089), the Ḥanafī Tawījīya in 508 (1114), the Naqshīya, c. 600 A.H. and the Muṣṭaṣirūnīya about 630 A.H. Only the latter is still in existence and is used as a customs warehouse (sketch-plan in Serre and Hersfeld, Arch. Reise, ii. 161). Of remarkable ovoid shape (86 × 310 feet) it has six iwans, a large vaulted hall, rows of cells and side-rooms. Besides the four iwans this, the first state madrasa, also accommodated a dār al-fudūd and a dār al-ṭurūq. If the Mustaṣirūnīya was not planned in a strictly symmetrical way with four iwans at the intersection of the axes, it nevertheless incorporated the same idea and may therefore have stimulated the development of the next type. In Mīqāl there were several Ḥanafī madrasas.

Egypt. The type of pillared mosque imported from the 'Irāq under Ibn Tulnī prevailed in Cairo along with the pillared mosque down to the Mamlūk period. It is the regular rule that the large military and Friday mosques always have pillars, the smaller mosques intended for the people of the quarter have pillars. Some of the latter however were on occasion also used as Friday mosques. The rows of pillars were always parallel to the Kibda wall and connected by arches, a natural result of the rectangular form of the pillars, which had to run parallel to the rows of worshippers. In the pillared mosques the naves might also be perpendicular to the Kibda wall, without inconveniencing the worshippers. The Cairo mosques of this group are:

The Mosque of 'Amr Ibn al-Aṣīr in Fustāq, which received its present form as a result of repeated rebuilding and additions to the above-mentioned hall of the year 21 (642) (cf. E. K. Corbett, The History of the Mosques of Amr at Old Cairo, J. E. A. S., 1890).


The Mosque of al-Azhara of 339–341 (970–972) is a pillared mosque of Fatimid Cairo, remarkable for its central nave; broader than usual with two domes (tudajīs) probably borrowed from the Magribi and unusual here; also for its stilized pointed arches which henceforth became frequent in Cairo; finally for its rich decoration of the plaster in the arches, which were recently cleaned. (They will be published by S. Flury in Casswell's great work on the architecture of Cairo). The Azhara has long been used as a Dār al-Fudūd (state madrasa).

The Mosque of Ḥākim, a pillared mosque of the year 380–403 (990–1012), with valuable decorations on the plaster and inscriptions and two unvaulted, historically important maqāras [q.v.] (cf. M. v. Berchem, Notes d'Archéologie Arabe, Mém., et Isaac, Palermi, J. A., 1391, reprint, p. 23). The Mosque of al-'Askar, a small pillared mosque historically important for its façade built by Abū al-'Askar al-Maqrīzī (495–524), finished 519 (1125); restored by Burqī in 799 (1396–1397) and given a madrasa which was renewed in 815 (1412) (cf. M. v. Berchem, J. A., 1391, reprint, p. 81).

The Mosque of al-Fāṭimī, built by the Fāṭimid caliph al-Ẓahir in 543 (1148–1149) completely restored in the Ottoman period.


The Mosque of al-Zāhīr Buḍlīn of the year 665–667 (1266–1268) a mosque with pliers of brick, built for the troops with a very strong stone wall and three portails jutting out like the Mosque of al-Ḥākim. The six rows of columns in the ḥārdān are crossed by a transcept with a dome of three naves breadth in diameter before the miḥrāb. Porticoes with double naves surrounded the court.

The Mosque of Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Nasir on the citadel, of the year 718–735 (1318–1335) on pillars.

The Mosque of Aḥmad al-Maṣrī (Shāhī Ḥīrīya) of 730 (1332–1333).


The Mosque of Aḥmad Akūṣīn of 747–748 (1346–1348) on pillars.

The Mosque of Muḥammad of 819–823 (1416–1420).

Of pillared mosques in Egypt outside Cairo we may mention the Mosque of "St. Athanasius" and the Mosque of "The Thousand Pillars" in Alexandria the plans of which were recorded by the French expedition (Description de l'Égypte, Antiquités, v., reproduced in Thiersch, p. cit., p. 224). Shortly before the arrival of the French, Alexandria still had 88 mosques, 45 of which were large. Practically nothing of these is left at the present day. The mosques above mentioned were pillared mosques and particularly the second, also, called: the "Mosque of the Seventy" with its iwans of equal depth on all sides (only the northeastern one has 4 instead of 5 rows of pillars) the arches of which run parallel to the outer walls, i.e. palm-like, continue the type of the Hallenstück pillared agora or the gymnasium as Thiersch has pointed out. The same type predominated in the towns of the Delta.

The second, later type of mosque in Egypt was decisively influenced by the madrasa, to which we may now turn our attention. As Casswell has shown, the Egyptian madrasa was by no means always cruciform, as was usually supposed previously. It is also distinguished from the Syrian type and cannot be at once said to have been introduced from Syria. It is true that the first madrasa for all four rites in Cairo was built by Sīhī Naqīm al-Ṭūnī at-Tūnī, but this Sīhīna was a building divided into two halves and cannot be considered as the original of the later type (641–644). The first cruciform madrasa with 4 iwans in Cairo was the Zāhīrīya which was built on the site of a part of the old Fāṭimid palace which was cleared for this purpose and consecrated in
The typical mosque of the Muslim west is the mosque with courtyard, on pillars or columns. It was only under Turkish rule that the domed mosque became established in those parts of North Africa affected by it. The rows of pillars run, as a rule, perpendicular to the Kibla wall from which however they are separated by a transept. The axis of the latter is a continuation of the axis of the central nave which is always broader. Of the rows of pillars in the axis the two or three outermost ones are continued over the court and form the arcades of which the inner entrance side of the court has as a rule only one row. The beginning and end of the central nave are as a rule marked by a dome. The western mosques are given their characteristic features by the horseshoe and bulbous arch (a mixture of the horseshoe and the pointed arch). The mihrāb of the western mosques is as a rule a pentagonal niche considerably deeper than the semi-circular one.

The oldest surviving large mosques in the west are in Kairawa, Tunisia and Córdoba (since the expulsion of the Church).

The foundation of the Great Mosque of Kairawa like that of 'Amr in Cairo goes back to the first century A.D., but like that of 'Amr also retains nothing from its founder, 'Uqba b. Nābī, except the name. By 76 (695) the original mosques was rebuilt, and later enlarged but in 222 (836) it was completely taken down by the Aghlabid Ziyadūt Allah and rebuilt and in the third (ninth) century again enlarged on two occasions. In spite of many later restorations, the mosque has retained the form it was given in the third (ninth) century. Seventeen naves on pillars run perpendicular to the Kibla wall from which however they are separated by the transept. The central nave is broader and flanked by double columns and marked externally by two domes. It may be noted as a special feature that the first two travées of the hārūm seem to be one with the court arcades while the part behind was shut off by doors. The arcades of the court are on pillars with double columns in front of them, which with their bulbous arches give the court its special charm. The Džamī Zaïtūnā in Tunisia was built as early as 114 (734) by the Omayan governor Ibn al-Habbah but entirely rebuilt in 1850 (864). In spite of many internal restorations, it has in the main retained to the present day its old form of the end of the ninth century, In Spain we have from the Omayan period the former Mosque of Córdoba. It was built by 'Abd al-Rahím I (1228-172) = 750-785) and several times restored by his successors until the hārūm contained 19 naves each with 35 pillars. The special feature of this mosque is the double storied arrangement of its rows of arches, a bold innovation, which does not seem to have been imitated elsewhere. Recent investigations have revealed the original form of the mosque as a much lower level, which is decorated with mosaic. This would alter the proportions. The horseshoe arch taken over from the Visigoths was varied in the clover leaf and indented arch and these arches were imitated in the Magribi mosques of Algiers, Tlemcen, etc.). The domes swelling into various shapes were frequently imitated in Kairawa and Córdoba. The mosque of Sūk (236 = 850) and the Bâzaa (235 = 849) were founded in the Aghlabid period but the latter was completely restored in the tenth century.
the Fatimid empire in North Africa (907-909) brought about a new development of mosque building. The mosque of the new Shi'ite capital Mahdiya in Tunis however corresponds completely to the preceding Aqabite type. A novelty however is the use of cross vaulting which henceforth we find frequently, first of all in the two mosques of Monastir and in the new part of the Great Mosque at Sfax. Of the great pillared mosque of the Ka'a of the Rani Hammad, the minaret of which still stands and was mentioned in the article MANSIA, it is only possible to reconstruct the general plan, which had 15 naves with 48 arches (cf. MARCHETTI, Nouvelles architecques Musulmanes, Vol. XX, 1905, pp. 3, 4, and De Beytie, Le Qu'ara de Bani Hamouda, p. 77, 1956). A second mosque of the Rani Hammad has been destroyed in Beja, but it is extant from an old description that it belonged to the type of Kairouan (De Beytie, op. cit., p. 103—104).

Mosques of the Almoravids (448-541 = 1056-1157) and Almohads (524-667 = 1130-1227). The great mosques in Algiers and Tiemcen, the Koutoubia in Marrakesh and the mosque in Tamiouk, which are pillar mosques with jalousia arches. On the other hand the Mosque of Hassan in Rabat, now completely destroyed, the largest mosque of the Maghrib, stood on round area of 207 by 207 feet (63 m. by 63 m.) and was begun in 1196—1197. A noteworthy feature is the minaret behind the mihrab in the mosque of Tiemcen, which now becomes frequent in the Maghrib (but seems not to have been unknown in eastern Islam, as the plan of the madrasa of Khairqan shows; cf. Dest, Chorassan, Hauendahler, p. 73).

Maridins in Morocco (1426—1470), successors of the Almohads (1122—15th century): A large mosque in Zaouia, Morocco, piers, broad central nave and transversal nave, finished in 693 (1294). A large mosque in Aayda on the Algerian—Moroccan frontier (698 = 1296). Siddi ibn-Hassan in Tiemcen (696 = 1296), a square mosque with seven columns, and Awdal al-Ism in Tiemcen (710 = 1310), small, richly decorated. The greatest Ma'dara mosque in Tiemcen (736 = 1336), a very regular building, thirteen naves on seven columns, a broad central nave; a three naved transept, a madrasa in the centre, a polygonal mihrab with maqsura behind. Siddi ibn Madyen al-Awdal (739 = 1339) and Siddi ar-Hassan (754 = 1353), both in Tiemcen, small, the former on piers, the second on columns with slightly modified horseshoe arches with wide spand. Sidi (harbour of Rabat), Necropolis of the Marinids, a tomb—mosque (739 = 1339) (plan in Mazar, Manuel, p. 498). Around Tiemcen there are a number of small mosques of the sixteenth century.

Mosques of the Harmands in Tunis, sixteenth—seventeenth century: Mosque of the Ka'a in Tunis, built by the founder of the Hafsid—dynasty Abu Zakaryya Yalib (625—647 = 1228—1249) finished in 643 (1243). Pillars with chapiteles, supporting horseshoe arches in the quadrangular and cross vaulting, the usual form in roof in Ifrikiya from the tenth century (cf. Sfax etc.) is similar. The Mosque of al—Hajet of the sixteenth century is similar.

Mosques in Morocco under the Marinids 951—1311 (1544—1593).

In Morocco preference was given to the old Almohad type of mosque as exemplified in the

Koutoubia. The Bdh Darrakha 995 (1587) and Malikiya 976 (1567) mosques in Marrakesh have seven naves at right angles to the sihba, and a transom along the sides of the naves. Nave openings seem to be, in addition to the broader central nave, that the two outside naves left and right along the side-walls were broader and a dome was placed at each of the four corners of the mosque. A second transept on the court side of the Darrraka seems to be exceptional, as in the Bdh Darrakha. The Mosques of the Ka'a of Marrakesh dates from a foundation of the Almohad al—Mansur. After the explosion of 1574 it was rebuilt and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries repeatedly restored (cf. the monograph by H. Buset and Terrasse). The Mosques of al—Kurtawiyin and Malikiya Fdris in Fes have likewise been restored.

Mosques in Algeria under Turkish rule (1518). In addition to the two mosques which date from the Almoravide period, the Great Mosque 490 (1096) and the M. Sidi Kheider at Algiers, only two other mosques of the old type are believed to exist; all the others, over 100 in number, are Turkish. The oldest Turkish mosque is 'Ali Birtiv (1532); now Notre Dame des Victoires. This building had a large central dome, which is surrounded by small domes. It is noteworthy that the square minaret was not adopted by the Turkish type. All the later mosques of Algeria show variations of this type, except the "Mosque on the Fish Market" 1050 (1660) of which the plan which recalls those of the Islamic churches of the fifteenth century; it may however owe much to them, but derives from Byzantine—Turkish models.

Mosques in Tunisia under the last Hafid and Turks (from 1534). Under the last Hafids the venerable Djami Zaatun was again restored and enlarged and given its present portico and the outer gallery of arcades. The oldest Turkish mosque is Yusuf DDr (1610—1637). It is significant that it built after the old Tunisian type on pillars with cross—vaulting, as are the later M. of Hamuda's Bey finished in 1607 (1654) and several mosques of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Turkish style (Almohadi in Constantine) represented by the Sidi Muharem (second half of the sixteenth century) remains the exception in Tunis.

The madrasa in the Maghrib. Madrasas were first introduced into the western lands of Islam by the Almoravids, but nothing of these seems to have survived. The oldest madrasa data from the sixteenth—seventeenth centuries. The Marinids in Maghrib al—Aksa were particularly active in building and encouraging madrasas, which, as in Syria and Egypt, were also state institutions. This evolution of the madrasa was apparently a result of the Sunni, particularly Maliki, revival under the Marinids (1425—1470). Al—Nafarrin, the oldest madrasa in Fez, built by the great warrior and champion of the religion Yusuf Vizzi (685—700 = 1288—1306) of the Marinids who also built the Madrasa (see above), was the prototype of all the later madrasas in the extreme Maghrib. An angular gateway, such as is usually only found in private houses about a courtyard with a central basin and the cells. A domed chamber with a pentagonal mihrab adjoins it. On the analogy of the mosque, it is called ghasba. Adjoining it reached by a corridor is a iwta, with a basin in the centre for ablutions and fountains. These three main parts of the building, iwta, ghasba and iwta, are usually
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a separate minaret, are found continually in a number of variations, usually dependent on the space available, which Margais, cf. cit., ii. 504, divides into three groups. In Fès in addition to those mentioned there are other seven medersas of the xviith century. With the medersas of Marrakesh, Taza and al-Awāzīd in Tlemcén we have in all eleven medersas of the Marinids extant (cf. the list in Margais, op. cit., ii. 504 sqq.). The most imposing and finest medersa in Fès is the Bû ‘Aīnānīa, founded by Abû ‘Aīnān, 749–759 (1348–1358). With its madjidi of two transits at the end of the square court and two domed chambers in the central axis of the court it recalls the mosque of Hasan in Cairo with its iwāns. The façades on the court display the wealth of wall adornment usual in the Maghrīb, tiles, stucco moulding and stalactites.

Medersas of the xvith–xvith centuries in Morocco: The Medersa of Ben Yāṣif in Marrakesh is regarded as the largest in the Maghrib and stands on the site of an originally Almoravid (?) mosque instead of the Marinid Medersa of Abû ‘l-Ḥasan. The plan seems to be old and in its regularity recalls the al-Hiri type of Arab palace and the palaces of the Ommeyyids and Abū’l-Ḥasan built in this style in the desert (plan in Marçais, op. cit., ii., p. 702). The Medersa al-Sharrûtīn in Fès, begun in 1670, shows a similar plan but is smaller and simpler.

Medersas of the xvith–xvith centuries in Tunisia. In the xvith century the Hájifí built a number of medersas here. Of the Turkish, the most interesting is the Medersa al-Badâya of ‘Ali Pasha (1740–1775), a court with cells, madjidi on pillars and stilts, but, like the Egyptian madrasa, it has also the tomb of the founder and a public fountain. In Tunisia, probably as the result of Egyptian or Oriental influence, it is common to find medersas and mosques associated with the tomb of the founder. The three varieties distinguished in Egypt by van Berchem, mosque-madrasa, madrasa-mosque, and monastery-mosque were also built in Tunisia.

Saljūq empire in Rûm, Armenia and Georgia. In Saljūq Anatolia (470–700 = 1077–1300) the three types of pierced mosque, the court-lawan madrasa and domed madrasa are to be distinguished. The pierced hall was used as the large public mosque. On account of the colder climate the open courtyard with pillars was not found here. The pillars were sometimes of wood (Eshref Rûm Djamí), usually however of stone. The flat wooden roof rested directly on the pillars or on the arches which connected them, which run sometimes parallel, sometimes perpendicular to the kibba wall. The Ulu Djamî in Wân has a vaulted roof resting on pillars, a system later often used in the Ottoman empire. Of more importance architecturally are the smaller (mosque–madrasas, which played a prominent part in the Saljūq empire; but they fell far behind the Persian madrasa in impressiveness and harmonious development. The model for the evolution of the iwan-madrasa was the Mesopotamian–Anatolian pîrmâ-house. From the latter came the bowers along the sides of the court which were placed in front of the iwan and the rows of cells. The combination of school and madrasa in which the builders, usually high officers of state, were interested, was the rule. The domed madrasa consists of a domed hall with a water basin in place of the open court with living rooms, a lecture-room and a mausoleum containing it. The external ornamentation of these Saljūq madrasas and mosques is confined to the gateways. The façades of the gates, irrespective of the material used elsewhere in building (brick or moulding), were always covered with slabs and the portals then ornamented with strips of decoration or inscriptions, fantastic looking candle-labra of palmettes (Divrigî), bundles of rods and convolutions in low and high relief and thus one of the highest points in Muslim decorative art was attained. The iwâns along the court, interiors of the comparatively low domes (which belong to the bridge over the corners on triangular consoles), the friezes on the wall and the mihrâbs are frequently adorned with glazed brick and mosaic friezes in a style which in pattern and colour is readily distinguished as an independent pattern from the Persian decoration. Here we find geometrical network patterns, which were not usual in Persia and a colour scheme which receives its special character from the much used black, alternating with bright and dark blue, although other colours are also found. The following is a list of the most important buildings, so far as they are known: 1. Pierced mosques: Mosque of ‘Ali al-Din in Konya, completed 616 (1219–1220), Djamî Kebir in Siwās, xith–xiiith century, and great mosque 679 (1280–1281) in Diyarbakr, Eshref Rûm (Eskî) Djamî, xiiith century, in Beýazî chillî, Ulu Djamî in Egerdir, xiiith century, Ulu Djamî in Çağdara (Cappadocia), mosque of Minâzeh 464–465 (1072–1100) in Anî (with octagonal Maâra), Ulu Djamî in Wân, xiiith–xiiith century. 2. Court iwân madrasas: Sirîddî Madrasa 642 (1242–1244), Gîik Madrasa, Baradîddîyâ and Tîîtîe Mînâzeh, all 670 (1271–1272) in Siwās, Khrîzî, 783 (1381–1382) in Kâmân, İbrâhîm Bey Madrasa, xith–xith century in Akgirâl, Tîîtîe Mînâzeh, xiiith century in Erzerum. 3. Domed madrasas: The Fârâb Mînâzeh 649 (1251–1252) in Konya, İndîe Mînâzeh 660–654 (1262–1285) in Konya, Gîik Djamî in Konya, xith century. 4. Madîs Madrasa 613 (1216) and 659 (1260) in Akgirâl, Sultân Wânîlîe xith and xiiith century in Salyîdî Gîârî.

The mosque of the Turcoman ruler İânî I (1348–1390) in Aşyanûk (Ephesus) is an exception in Asia Minor; it was finished in 777 (1375–1376) and its architect is said to have been ‘Ali b. al-Dîmbî. The interior is modelled on the mosque of the Ommeyyids in Damascus; the walls however are in the Turkish style of that period, as developed in the provinces of the Atabegs. The west façade is closely related to the façades of the mosque of Hasan in Cairo, which also drew inspiration from Northern Mesopotamia, the Ottoman empire. The Ottoman Turks further developed the types of mosque built by their predecessors, the Saljûqs. A second very important factor in the development was their expansion into Europe and the new model, the Byzantine domed churches, especially the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Here three main types of mosque may again be distinguished: the pierced hall, the cruciform domed mosque and the central or great domed mosque. The first and third were
commonly used for Friday mosques and mosques for the people, while the second type was reserved for the Sultan’s Friday service and religious instruction, and was more used for private mosques. The Ottoman pierced hall mosque is distinguished from the Sahilbâk, principally by its vaulting, rows of cupolas over the pillars. The court is limited to a hypaethral water-basin of the same size as the dome above it. The Ulûl Dîvânî in Brusa for example is an unadorned pillared hall, rectangular in shape with five aisles each with four domes in a row. The second group of four pillars in the central aisle was originally uncovered (now it has a glass dome) and contains the basin for ablutions, the rudiments of a court. The domes of the five aisles rise one above the other to the central row. The most important buildings of this group are: Ulûl Dîvânî 1370–1422 in Brusa, Uç Şerefeali Dîvânî 1889–93 (1484–1487) in Adríanople, Ulûl (Eski) Dîvânî ca. 1403–1422 in Adríanople, Ulûl Dîvânî 16th century (?) in Manisa (Magnesia on Sipylus), Djumaya in Filibe (Philippople), old mosque (now museum) 1477–1478 in Sofia, Sîndjîlî Küy Dîvânî ca. 1500, Ahmed Paşa Dîvânî by Sinan ca. 1555 and Pişle Paşa Dîvânî 1573, all in Constantinople, Eski Wâlide in Scutari. The pierced hall (and an unlined form became extinct in the 18th century. The 1374 in Constantinople is a mixture of the latter with the great dome. The origin of the cruciform domed mosque is rightly sought by Wulzinger in the Sahilbâk madrasa with courtyards which come in to be covered over with a dome. The centre which lies somewhat below the level of the rest, is occupied by a square roofed with a dome, again the rudiments of the former courtyard, and still often containing a fountain. The Kibla chamber is vaulted with a barrel or dome, the praying chambers to right and left are either flat or open towards the centre or have barrel-vaulting. The similarity of these mosques to Byzantine churches (in plan, not in structure) is involuntary and lies in the system. On the other hand, they are open pierced-out outer court (kibyâl) may go back to Byzantine stimulation. These outer courts however are very general in the east to give shade. The most important buildings of this type are according to Wulzinger’s list (op. cit. p. 186): Mosque of Murad I (1359–1389) in Brusa, fin, end of sixteenth century, two storied, Mosque of Bayzât I Yildirim (1389–1403), fin. after 1402, Yâhidî Dîvânî in Brusa, fin. 1423, Mosque in the Kolmessa church in Isnik, beg, of sixteenth century, Nilufer Kâltan “imaret, end of sixteenth century, Pirâz Paşa Dîvânî in Mila, fin. 797 (1394), Mosque of Murad II (1421–1451), fin. 1447 in Brusa, Mosque of Mustafa II in Adríanople, “imaret Dîvânî in Philippopolis 1535, Mosque of Hafetz Bey before 1452 in Brusa, Ghiyîh Michal Dîvânî ca. 1400 in Adríanople. The great domed mosque developed out of the more primitive single domed mosque which was very common throughout Asia Minor and Turkey as the simple village mosque, private mosque etc. and continued to survive. (In Aysoluk alone 14 small single domed mosques can be counted). This type of building was also used for the numerous temples. The following are more important single domed mosques outside Constantinople: Yâhidî Dîvânî 794 (1392) and Mahmut Celebi Dîvânî about 1400 in Isnik, Masjid of Khodja Vadygar beg. 1369 in Isnik, Masjid of Elia Baî 806 (1404) in Balat (Milet). The development of the great domed mosque from this type took place in part through combination with cruciform domed types, but its aim was however the elimination of all minor domes which at first it had for constructional reasons to put at the sides. A. Gabrjel’s table gives a good idea of the different variations. He gives the mosques of Constantinople, which number 42 (with Scutari), under six main types (Lei Mosqe de Constantinople, in Syria, vili., 1926, p. 352–419):

A. Square or oblong halls with one or more domes, sometimes flanked by secondary domed chambers: Mahmut Paşa Dîvânî 868 (1464), Murad Paşa Dîvânî 870 (1466), Dâwud Paşa Dîvânî 890 (1485), Atyk ‘Ali Paşa Dîvânî 902 (1497), Sulman Selim Dîvânî 926 (1520).

B. Quadrangular single domed halls (continuing the list given of the not yet very large single domed mosques from the city area of Constantinople): Firuz Ağa Dîvânî 896 (1491), Dicer Kâsim Paşa Masjid 921 (1515), Khâseki Khurem Dîvânî 946 (1539), Mehmed Ağa Dîvânî 993 (1585), Çelebi Dîvânî 1030 (1640), Nûru ‘Othamnîya Dîvânî 1169 (1755), Lalîlî Dîvânî 1177 (1763), Wâlide Dîvânî 1287 (1780).

C. Square hall with a central dome, usually supported by two half domes: Sulman Bayzât Dîvânî 906 (1500), Sulman Suleyman Dîvânî 937–964 (1550–1557), Kiliî ‘Ali Paşa Dîvânî 988 (1580).

D. Square hall with a central dome supported by four half axial domes: Şihhâde Dîvânî 955 (1548), Sulman Ahmed Dîvânî 1026 (1617), Yeşil Wâlide Dîvânî 1120 (1708), Sulman Mehmed Dîvânî 867 (1463), reconstructed 1180 (1767); variants: oblong hall with a central dome supported by three half domes: Iskele Dîvânî in Scutari 954 (1547).


F. Oblong hall with central dome and aisles.

Group a. Central dome with square plan and pendentives: Ball Paşa Dîvânî middle of sixteenth century, Muhammed Dîvânî middle of sixteenth century, Zal Mahmut Paşa Dîvânî 953 (1551).


A survey of this list shows that the type given under A is also the earliest. This was directly linked up with that in use in the older capital Brusa and already being built in Konya in the sixteenth century (Kara Ta’i Madrasa, Yeşilbûn and Yâhidî Dîvânî) which seem to be continued in the Mahmut and Murad Paşa Dîvânî. But already the original Sulman Mehmed Dîvânî (rebuilt in the sixteenth century)
which forms a striking anachronism in Gabriel's list under D, with its date 1463 (only the second modern Meḥmədšah of 1767 belongs properly there), had made the first important step towards a single great chamber (cf. Agha Ogli's reconstructed plan in Diez, Kunst d. isl. Volker, 2nd ed., p. 105) and this plan was repeated for the ʿAṭṭāʾ ʿAlla Pahaşı Džamı, while the Dâwūd Pahaşı Džamı of 1485 had already used another variation (cf. the plans in Gabriel, op. cit.). This in brief is the historical development of the Constantinople mosque from the Anatolian Sâlûq-Ortowan type. The next important step to the gigantic domed mosques of Constantinople given under D, was completed by the greatest of Ottoman architects Sinān (1486-1588) step by step in the Şehzade Džamı, the Sisahane and the Selimiye (1567-1574) in Adrianople. His guiding idea was, by thrusting the pillars of the domes as far back into the walls as possible, to get a single domed chamber of the largest possible dimensions, no longer interrupted by pillars; Sinān achieved this end in the Selimiye in Adrianople.

Persia, Turkestan and Afghanistan.

Old mosques or remains of them have not survived in Persia, as in Egypt, the Maghrīb and Syria, except perhaps for a few old parts still standing in the great complex of buildings that forms the Friday Mosque of Isfahān or in the old Friday Mosque of Shirāz. We know however from literary sources that at the beginning of the ʿAbbāsid period large mosques were built everywhere in the towns and some must have existed even earlier. ʿAbū Ḩasan the celebrated general and ʿAbbāsid propagandist, built mosques in Merv and Nishābūr. The latter was built on pillars of wood and similar structures are occasionally mentioned in Persia (e.g. at Rubāṭ in the province of Dzhurdžan, Strass on the Persian Gulf etc.). In the ninth century, however, greater use began to be made of columns of brick or stone or marble columns taken from older buildings where they could be obtained, as in Isfahān at Perspolis, Amt b. al-Layth (928-937 = 899-909), the second ruler of the ʿAbbāsid dynasty, renovated the Friday Mosque in Nishābūr and among other mosques built the Džamı ʿAṭṭāʾ in Shirāz, both mosques with columns of brick, of which parts are still standing in Shirāz. The Friday Mosque of Balkh destroyed by the Mongols in 1220, is said to have had splendid pillars, as Ibn Bāṭtuta records. An old mosque on piers of the fourth (tenth) century has survived in the remote desert town of Nainj in east of Isfahān, and enables us to make deductions about the architecture of mosques in the early period in Irān. The ḵarām consists of eleven barrel-vaulted aisles running perpendicular to the ʿibba wall, of which the central one is broader than the others. The court is flanked by four aisles of iwāsā which run parallel to the ʿibba wall, only the wall of the entrance has an arcade. The plan is therefore similar to that of the mosques of the Maghrīb. It is built on columns or piers of different forms. The part around the miḥrāb is richly ornamented in stucco and has bands of inscriptions around it (cf. H. Viiolet and S. Flury, Un monument etc., Syria, ii, 1921). How securely the pierced hall, as the type of Friday Mosque, maintained itself in the Sunni east, is seen from the rebuilding of Timur's great mosque in Samarkand after his return from his raid on India in 1410, a mosque with columns, which was directly connected with the madras of Bibi Khamim, but has now completely disappeared. The mosque had 460 columns of hewn stone, each seven ells in height. The vaulting was covered with large beautifully carved and polished slabs of marble. There was a minaret at each of the four corners of the mosque. The door was of bronze and the walls were covered inside and outside with inscriptions in relief (according to Sharif al-Din ʿAla Vazdi). How far there was any Persian influence here cannot now be ascertained. In any case, the twin and miḥrāb court became established in Persia in the fifth (eleventh) century and as the above described Friday Mosque in Isfahān shows, became blended with the pillared court. The great Mosque of Herat (cf. Niedermayer-Diez, Afghanaistan, p. 55 and fig. 149-153) shows a similar miḥrāb court adapted to the (probably older) pierced halls. In the completely new buildings of the Timurid and ʿAbbāsid period, the pierced hall completely disappeared and the ḵarām is extended by a central dome with vaulted halls at the side, when the ʿibba itself does not fulfill the purpose. The mosque of the great sultans of Timur, Tahmās, Jalal Ad-Din and especially of Masjīd-i-Shah, the mausoleum mosque of Khudâberd and many other urban mosques of Persia are built on this plan. Only in eastern Khurāsān, as in the Tabrız-i-Shah Mosque, does the old pierced mosque survive but with vaulted arches and a large dome in the centre of the ḵarām, all of which betray Indian influence (cf. the plan in Diez, Churussamische Beidücke, p. 79).

Of the already characterised type of domed mosques may be mentioned the "Blue Mosque" in Tabriz and the Masjīd-i-Shah in Masjīd-i-Shah, both similar in plan with a large central dome and two flanking minarets. The former was built during the reign of the ʿAbbāsid ruler Džihanšah (1437-1467), the latter by Amir Malik Šah, the architect being Ahmad b. Šamsa al-Din Muhammad Tabrīzī (cf. J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 131). The Tabrīz mosque had a chapel leading from the domed area with a second smaller dome. Both domes were decorated with tiles, the larger with white tendrils on a green ground, the smaller with white stars on a black ground (Tavernier). Only fragments survive of the Blue Mosque, which show how splendidly it was once decorated; on the other hand, the Masjīd-i-Shah in Masjīd-i-Shah is still standing, although the dome has lost its decoration. To this group belong also the mosque on the citadel mound of Erliwān, the mosque of ʿAlī b. ʿAlī the Māhī, the Kālīya mosque used as a royal private mosque and the public mosque of 1631 in Buhštā, both with high entrance iwāsā and without a court. At largely attended common prayer, the people assemble in front of such mosques. This is particularly the case in Turkestan; for the ʿibba and niches were simply very large miḥrābs and nothing further was necessary. In Balkh also there is a similar, formerly domed mosque probably intended for the ruler with a towering iwān (xvth century) (cf. Niedermayer-Diez, Afghanaistan, fig. 204-205). Besides these large main types, there were and are in these lands of eastern Irān hundreds of smaller mosques in the towns and villages, which sometimes show very interesting structures. Thus in Bāḏarīm in the ʿAlīshānsteppe (northern Persia) there is a mosque with a small
open court and domed chamber in front of the mihrāb, and two triple yoked aisles, probably a reminiscence of Nestorian churches (cf. Dier, Chrest. Būkūn, p. 85). We also find everywhere small masjidas, which are simply little oratories, where the people can promptly worship at the proper time: flat-roofed large halls on wooden pillars, which are frequently richly carved in Turkestān, Afghanistan (Kābul) and Central Asia (Kābūrīn etc.).

The Madrasa in Persis, Turkستان, and Afghanistan. Šahr-i madrasas were built in the 1̊Abūsūr period in Nīshābūr (where Haš阿 Abū counted 17), Merv, Bahgārā, Āmol, Tūs, and other towns. Nāṣir, brother of Mahmūd of Ghāna, is said to have built the first state madrasa. Under the Saljuqs, Sūsān al-Mulk, vizier of Al-Azm and of Malik Sīh, built three state madrasas in Nīshābūr, Tūs, and Bahgārā. None of these pre-Timurid madrasas in Persis has survived; unless the ruined iwān in Khārgīrjard, which is left of a madrasa, which is very probably (cf. Dier, op. cit., p. 71 sq.), the ruins of the Timurid period however give us a picture of the Persian madrasa of the golden period of Muslim Persian architecture. The madrasa in Khārgīrjard near Khāfar close to the Afghan frontier, completed in 848 (1444-1445), still shows a pure unmixed madrasa design: a quadrangular court with four barrel-vaulted large iwāns, equal in size, at the intersection of the axes, each flanked by two orphan, with the upper storey, four cells, four vaulted corner-chambers, a narthex-like outer building, comprising the three and two domed chambers; low combined mihrāb façades with low flanking towers at the corners. The walls, especially of the court, were adorned with rich tiles, the walls of the domed chambers with ornamental frescoes (cf. Dier, Chrest. Būkūn, p. 72-76, pl. 31-34). In contrast to the low façade of Khārgīrjard built by a West Persian (Shīrāz) architect are the Turkistan madrasas, with their high iwāns, characteristic of the east in general, and gateways, especially. In Sāmarqand we have the three Rūgistan madrasas: Shāt Dār (c. 1610), Tillya Kūt (c. 1610) and Ubūg Beg (c. 1434); also the Madrasa Bibi Khānum (about 1410) built by Timūr, all large courtyards with mihrāb courty and domed chambers, usually four minarets at the surrounding. In Bukhārā, the Madrasa Mir Arab of the end of the xvith century is related to the Madrasa Shāt Dār. Of the madrasa in Herāt, e.g. the celebrated Elkāssiyya, nothing has survived, nor do we have anything left of the madrasa of Turbat-Shaikh Džam in Eastern Khurāsān (cf. Dier, op. cit., p. 78). A ruin architecturally interesting is the state madrasa founded in the xvith century by Malik Ḥusain, the Gumbāz-Surkh at Kafl-i-Fath in Sīdījistan (cf. Tate, Sīdījistan, fig. p. 78). The cells are vaulted with the typical Persian house and bazaar domes. The last fine Persian madrasa is the Mader-i Shah Sultan Hūsain in Išfahan built by the Safawī Shah of this name (1694-1723). The tiled decoration of the court is among the finest of its kind that has survived in Persia (cf. Sarwe, Pers. Jūhān, and Dier, Aṣwar d. lit. Velber, p. 106-107). The dome still shows the original glazed tiles with foliage patterns: dark blue and white, changing to black stalks and and yellow leaves on a turquoise blue-ground.

Inda. In India the history of Muslim archit-

ecture so far known does not go beyond the xith century. The two earliest mosques of which the ruins still survive, the mosques of Mādnīr and of Dehlī, are large covered courts, built of pillars taken from Jainas temples. The domes on eight pillars found in all Jainas temples are here found ranged in rows. The richly sculptured pillars were simply cleared of any figures on them before being used. Vaulting on square piers continued in use after there were no more pillars to plunder (mosques in Kīlārga and Bīdāpur). For the rest, Indo-Muslim mosque architecture developed in different ways according to varied traditions and local conditions. In towns completely Islamised like Māndū on the Narbada, the capital of the sultanate of Māwās founded by Dillāvar Shāh at the beginning of the xvith century, or Dhānpūr near Bānambāh, which was founded by the sultan of Dehlī in 1359, Muslim places of worship show a marked synthesis of Hinduistic tradition with the rigid forms of Muslim symbolism. Similarly in the Muslim towns of Gādārī, in Bānambāh, Kamībā, Dīlākha, Māḥmūdnābd, Muslim sacred architecture developed out of the local Hindu art so that the demands made by Iṣlām on the shape of a mosque, such as an entrance-iwān and minaret, were carried through by purely Indian means and only the arch gave the building a Muslim stamp. In Bengal again, where the curved bamboo roof prevailed, mosques were built with curved roofs from the bricks in use there, as is shown, notably by the ruins in Gaur on the Ganges. Instead of glazed tiles, the walls were generally adorned with richly ornamented stucco and lajas, the Vidhīvāra range also, in the Deccan and in South India local schools of architecture grew up according to the same general principles. In Aṣmādānāg, Golkonda, Kīlārga, Bīdār, Awrangbād and other capitals of Mūhāammadan principalities, the building of mosques was much cultivated. Architectonically, the most important city was Bīdāpur, the capital of the state of the same name, which became independent in 1490 under Yūsuf 'Adī Shāh and survived down to the xvith century, when its great period of building culminated in the gigantic dome of the mausoleum of 'Adī Shāh. The mosque of Bīdāpur (second half of the xvith century) consists of a pierced half with small domes over each group of four piers and a large dome in the centre. In the Moghul period little change was made in this mixture of Hindu and Muslim methods, although the Persian elements are often more marked. The huge mosque with courtyard built by Akbar in Fathpur Sīkri has the usual plan with slight variations. The Great Mosque of Agra built by Akbar still shows little Indian pavilions on the tops of the cornices. It was only under his successors that a Puritan reaction set in, which finds its fullest expression in the mosques of Dehlī and Lahore. The process of assimilation thus attained its end.

China and Indo-China. From the Maghrib to the Pamirs and southeast of them the general character of the country, plains and deserts, linked the peoples of Islam together by certain common features, which also secured the mosque its unifying structure. In the early centuries in China where Iṣlām was only the religion of a few isolated groups of immigrants the mosque soon adapted itself to the well marked Chinese style of architecture and the mosques of the south and western
provinces, where Islam has established itself in places, are not distinguished externally from the Chinese temples or yamen and internally only by the absence of idols which are replaced by the muezzin and minbar. Exceptions are the mosques in the seaports, where the colonies of Muslims kept up steady intercourse with the home of Islam and the mosques were at the same time built by native architects. This holds for example of the mosques of Ts'ian-tchan, province of Fu-kien, the Zaitun of mediaeval writers, which was built in 400 (1009—1010) and restored in 710 (1310—1311) by an architect, a native of Jerusalem, who came from Shiraz, as the inscription testifies. This mosque which is built of hewn stone consists of a hypostyle hall, such as we find in Asia Minor (e.g. Sivas) and has bulb-shaped niches (cf. G. Arnaud and M. v. Berchem, Mönche und Klerikanten in Turkischen Islam, 2 vols., xii., 1911). The mediaeval chief mosque of Canton also followed the western tradition and even has a minaret, which is never seen on the mosques of the interior. The same holds of mosques in Burma and the Indian Archipelago. They are usually built of wood and adapted to the native architecture.

Bibliography: The works quoted under Manaka will also serve for Mosque and Madrasa. Special works are quoted in the text. For the Maghrib the new, excellent Manuel d'Art musulman of G. Marquis was mainly used, which deals only with the Maghrib (2 vols., Paris 1927).

AL-MASJID AL-AXSA, the mosque built on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem.

The name means "the remotest sanctuary" and is first found in the Qur'an, Sura xvii. 1: "Praise Him who made his servant journey in the night from the holy place to the remotest sanctuary, which we have surrounded with blessings to show him of our signs".

As was explained in the article IERA [q. v.], the older exegesis refers this verse to the journey to heaven (cf. mu'allaq) and sees in the name al-Masjid al-Aksa a reference to some heavenly place (cf. Sidrat al-Muntaka, Sura liii. 14).

This explanation had however in time to give way to another, according to which the expression is a name of Jerusalem. This explanation is connected with Muhammed's "journey in the night" (iraq). The combination of the iraq and mu'allaq thus gives the story of the Prophet's journey by night to the Masjid al-Aksa (Jerusalem) and his journey following it from Jerusalem to the heavens.

The question arises how Jerusalem came to have this name among the exegists of the Qur'an. According to Schrieke [cf. IERA] it is a result of the Omayyad tendency to glorify Jerusalem at the expense of the holy land of Islam. Horovitz has challenged this explanation (in Islam; cf. the Bibl.). In any case, Jerusalem was from very early times regarded in Islam as a sacred place, the original Kihla, which, although abandoned in favour of the al-Aksa, still retained its sanctity as may be seen, for example, from the fact that 'Omar had a Masjid built on the site of the Temple [see AL-KUBS, ii., p. 1097].

The name al-Masjid al-Aksa is now particularly attached to the mosque in the south of the Temple area, which according to some was originally a church built by Justinian [cf. AL-KUBS, ii., p. 1095].

According to late Arab writers the mosque was built by the caliph 'Abd al-Malik (705—750), a statement which might simply mean that Justinian's church was rebuilt. On this compare AL-KUBS, ii., p. 1098 sqq. where the further history of the mosque is given.

For a picture of the site and the mosque see Pl. v to the article AL-KUBS; plan and description of the interior in Travels of All Bey, London 1816, ii. 214 sqq.; Badecker, Palastina und Syrien, p. 54 sqq.


AL-MASJID AL-HARAM, the name of the Mosque of Mecca. The name is already found in the pre-Muhammadan period (Horovitz, Keronatische Studien, p. 140 sqq.) in Kaab b. al-Khattab, ed. W. von Kaulbach, v. 14: "By Allah, the Lord of the Holy Masjid and of that which is covered with Yemen stuff, which are embroidered with hempen thread" (?). It would be very improbable if Mecca was poet by these two references meant anything other than the Meccan sanctuary. The expression is also frequently in the Qur'an after the second Meccan period (Horovitz, op. cit.) and in various connections; it is a grave sin on the part of the polytheists that they prohibit access to the Masjid Haram to the "people" (Sura ii. 214; cf. v. 3; viii. 34; xii. 25; xli. 25); the Masjid Haram is the pole of the new Kihla (Sura ii. 159, 144); contracts are sealed at it (Sura ix. 7).

In these passages masjid harem does not as in later times mean a building but simply Mecca as a holy place, just as in Sura xvii. 1 Masjid Aksa [q. v.] the "remotest sanctuary" does not mean a particular building.

According to tradition, a wall was performed in the Masjid al-Haram is particularly meritorious (Bukhari, al-Sa'ud fi Masjid Masbaha, bkh. i). This masjid is the oldest, being forty years older than that of Jerusalem (Bukhari, Ambiya, bkh. 10, 40).

This Meccan sanctuary included the Ka'ba [q. v.], the Zamzum [q. v.], and the Makam Ibrahim [see aqana], all three on a small open space. In the year 8, Muhammad made this place a mosque for worship. Soon however it became too small and under 'Umar and 'Uthman, adjoining houses were taken down and a wall built. Under 'Abd Allah ibn al-Zubair, the Umayyads and 'Abbasid caliphs, successive enlargements and embellishments were made. Ibn al-Zubair put a simple roof above the wall. Al-Mahdi had colonnades built around, which were covered by a roof of tile. The number of minarets in time rose to seven. Little columns were put up around the Ka'ba for lighting purposes. The mosque was also given a feature which we only find paralleled in a few isolated instances: this was the putting up of small wooden buildings, or rather shelters for use during the salt by the ihram, one for each of the four orthodox rites. The fact that one of these makam might be more or less elaborate than another occasionally gave
rise to jealousies between the Ḥanafis and the Ṣaḥḥāfīs. Ultimately the ground under the colonnades, which was covered with gravel was paved with marble slabs, in the maṣṭāf around the Kaʿba as well as on the different paths approaching the maṣṭāf.

The mosque was given its final form in the years 1572—1577, in the reign of the Salāḥ al-Dīn Selim II, who, in addition to making a number of minor improvements in the building, had the flat roof replaced by a number of small white-washed cone-shaped domes. A person entering the mosque from the Masāf or the eastern quarters of the town, has to ascend a few steps. The site of the mosque, as far as possible, was always left unaltered, while the level of the ground round— as usual in oriental towns and especially in Mecca on account of the Sāl— gradually rose automatically in course of centuries (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i. 15—20).

The dimensions of the Ḥanāf (interior) are given as follows (al-Batānīnī, Rihla, p. 96): N. W. side 545, S. E. side 556, depth 860, S. W. side 364 feet; the corners are not right angles, so that the whole roughly represents a parallelogram.

Entering the maṣṭāf from the eastern side, one enters first the Bāb Bani Ṣāḥiva, which marks an old boundary of the masjid. Entering through the door, the Maṣṣūm ibn ʿAmr al-Iṣḥāqī is on the right, which is also the Maṣṣūm al-Ṣaḥḥāfī, and to the right of it is the miṣrāb. On the left is the Zemzem Well. As late as the beginning of the sixteenth century, there stood in front of the latter, in the direction of the northeast of the mosque, two domed buildings (al-Kababtain) which were used as store-houses (Chron. d. Stadt Mecca, ii. 337 sq.). These Kabbats were cleared away (cf. already Burchhardt, i. 265); they are not given in recent plans.

Around the Kaʿba are the maṣṭāfs for the imāms of the masjihābs, between the Kaʿba and the south-east of the mosque, the maṣṭāf of 'Arīyāt (or muṣalla) al-Ḥanbali, to the south-west the maṣṭāf al-Mālikī, to the north-west the maṣṭāf al-Ḥanafī. The latter has two stories; the upper one was used by the muḥādhdhin and the mubālligh, the lower by the imām and his assistants. Since Wahhābi rule has been established, the Ḥanbali imām has been given the place of honour. The maṣṭāf al-Ḥanafī stands on the site of the old Meccan council-chamber (dār al-nadwah) which in the course of centuries was several times rebuilt and used for different purposes. The maṣṭāf is marked by a row of thin brass columns connected by a wire. The lamps for lighting are fixed to this wire and in the colonnades.

The mosque has for centuries been the centre of the intellectual life of Islam. This fact has resulted in the building of madrasas and riwaṭs for students in or near the mosque, for example the madrasa of Kāṭib Bey on the left as one enters through the Bab al-Ṣaḥīm. Many of these waḥfs have however in course of time become devoted to other purposes (Burchhardt, i. 282; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i. 17). For the staff of the mosque cf. Shamsa (Handbuch); Burchhardt, i. 287—291.


**MAṢḤAF. [See MAṢḤAṬ.]**

**MAṢḤAṬ, Muḥammad ibn Hammad al-Wali Muḥammad, a distinguished Urḍū poet, was born in Lucknow but went to Delhi in 1190 (1770), where he applied himself to the cultivation of Urdu poetry. His house was resorted to by the eminent poets of the capital. In 1201 (1786) he passed to Lahore and died in 1242 (1824). He was the author of several Divāns in Persian and Hindustānī, and of biographies of Urdu poets, called Taḍdhīb-or-i Hindi. He also wrote another Taḍdhīb of Persian poets who flourished in India from the time of Muḥammad Shāh (1131—1161 = 1719—1748) to the reign of Shāh ‘Alam (1173—1221 = 1759—1806) entitled Iḥād Taḥrīrīyāt, and a historical work in verse which he entitled Ṣaqā-Nama.


(M. HINDKET HOGAN)

**MAṢḤAṬ ALLĀH, the son of Abū’l’Fiṭr or Sāḥaṭ, a celebrated astrologer, who along with Nāsibkabī fixed the day and hour for the foundation of Baḡdād by order of al-Manṣūr. According to the Führer, he was a Jew whose original name was Māḥaṭ (a corruption of Manāṣṣah, i.e. Masanne?) whether he later adopted Islam and for this reason took the name Māḥaṭ-Allāh is not recorded. The date of his birth is unknown, but it can hardly be later than 112 (730). He is said to have died in 200 (815).

In numerous works Māḥaṭ-Allāh covered the whole field of astronomy, and also the making and uses of astronomical instruments. There has only survived in Arabic fragments of a treatise on the pros of various series which was translated into Latin under the title Metaelegia de Mercibus. Many of his astrological works were translated into Latin by Johannes Hispalensis and others and later printed. Hebrew versions are also known. It may be safely assumed that Arabic originals will still be found in eastern libraries. The critical study of the Latin translations existing in manuscript and printed form is most desirable in view of the early date of the author.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Nadim, Führer, ed. Flügel, i. 273; ii. 129; H. Suter, Das Mathematikerverzeichnis, 1892, p. 61—62; H. Suter, Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber, 1900, p. 5—6; Nachtrag, 1902, p. 158; M. Steinach, Die urd. Litteratur der Juden,
stands the sultan’s palace, at the south end the offices of the British political agent. On either side the town is flanked by an old Portuguese fort, Marun and Djallati. The chapel in one of them bears the date 1588. The bazaar consists of low buildings and is of little importance. The mosques are remarkable for the absence of the usual tall minarets.

The climatic conditions are by no means favourable. With al-Jodeida and Djidda, Maskat is one of the hottest towns in the world. In 1912 the maximum temperature was 45° F. C., the minimum 17° F. C.; the rainfall varies between 75 and 150 mm. The high temperatures are caused mainly by the hot winds which at certain periods in the summer months usually blow from the Arabian desert and from the rocky hills for several hours in the night. From November to the middle of March the weather is however quite pleasant, but one must beware of malaria and fever.

Maskat plays a considerable part as centre of trade with the nearer east. There are regular communications with India, Persia, East Africa and Mauritius. The ships of quite a number of steamship companies call regularly at Maskat; e.g. the British India Steam Navigation Company on the route from London to India, the Backa Steamship Company and the Strick Line to Basra, the West Hotelpool Steam Navigation Company on the Aden-Basra route, the Hamburg-America Line monthly to the harbours of the Persian Gulf, the Arab Steamers Ltd. on the Bombay-Basra route, and the Compagnie Russe de Navigation et de Commerce. In 1912—1913 the total number of vessels entering the port was 98 steamers and 127,885 tons and 63 sailing vessels with 3,221 tons and leaving it 86 steamers of 90,863 tons and 39 sailing ships of 3,379 tons. The ships in question were mainly British (36.73%).

Maskat has a regular postal service with the rest of the world instituted by the British, as well as a cable connection which the Indian Government has laid to Djidda. The population, which changes a good deal, is about 10,000 souls, primarily Arabs but there are also Persians, Hindus, Indian Muslims, Beludji and a few Europeans settled here, mainly traders.

Maskat was at one time a flourishing centre of the silk and cotton trade but in recent years this has almost been destroyed by Indian and American competition. The gold and silver work done by Indians here is famous, notably richly ornamented swords and daggers. The imports of Maskat in 1912—1913 were valued at £ 63,000 and the exports at £ 301,477. The former were mainly arms and munitions, cereals, dyes, precious metals, pearls, foodstuffs, textiles, tobacco, building materials, enamel, glass and porcelain, ironmongery, perfumes and soaps, the latter camels, horses and asses, weapons, cereals, dried and salt fish, dates, lemons and pomegranates, wares and dragon’s blood, pearls, melted butter (ghar), muslul, mother-of-pearl and tortoise-shell, textiles, hides and leather. The chief importer was India, then Belgium, England and A’aden, the exports went mainly to Arabia, the Arabian coast, England, Persia, America and Zanzibar.

According to local tradition Maskat was founded at an early period by Hīmyar colonists. A. Sprenger has identified Maskat with the wavb or town of Ptolemy, vi. 7, 12. As the harbour has only a narrow entrance on the north and is enclosed on
the east by rocky heights, it is, as a matter of fact, easy for sailors to overlook it, and the name "the hidden" would be quite appropriate. Al-Muḥādhaṣi (B. G. A., ill. 93 sq.) who mentions the port of al-Maṣqūṭ, says that it is the first place which the ships from Yemen reach and is a fine town, rich in fruits. Iblī al-Fāṣih al-Hamzahī (B. G. A., v. 11) says of Maṣqūṭ that it is the very end of Ṭūmān, about 200 parasangs from Ṣṭrāf, the starting point for ships sailing to India and to Kuḥūmāl, a month's journey beyond it. Ships take in water here and Chinese ships pay 1,000 dirhams for it, the other 10--20 dirhams. Iblī briefly mentions Maṣqūṭ as a densely populated town; Ḏujūr-al-Maṣqūṭ is fuller (in A. Sprunger's Post- und Reise- reis, p. 145 sq.), and tells us that Maṣqūṭ was originally called Maṣqūṭ -- so also Niebuhr, p. 296 -- and that it is a considerable centre of trade with Africa and the east coast of the Persian Gulf, whence the wares are forwarded to Sidjāṣa, Ḍjārāṣa, Transoxania, Ḥawwah and Zābulistān. In the beginning of the xvth century A.D., Maṣqūṭ, whose history had hitherto been that of Ṭūmān, attracted the attention of European powers. In 1506, Albuquerquè appeared before the town and demanded that it should submit to the Portuguese. At the first the people seemed to be peacefully inclined, and willing to accept his terms, but this attitude changed and the Portuguese admiral decided to attack and destroy the town. Forty large and small ships and many fishing-vessels and the Imām's arsenal were destroyed, the mosque pulled down and the town burned. The Portuguese fortified the place and in 1527 built two forts, Marāfū and Dhjīlālī, and factories; the present buildings of these names were however only built after the union of Portugal with Spain in 1580 by direct instructions from Madrid. The Portuguese had not an easy position here. They were frequently attacked by the surrounding tribes and in addition by the Turks; in 1526 a rising in Maṣqūṭ was put down by Lopo Vas, the governor of India. In 1550 a Turkish fleet under Pir Bey appeared before Maṣqūṭ, attacked the town and took it by storm after eighteen days' bombardment. The Portuguese commander and 60 men were carried off to be Turkish galley-slaves, but in 1553 the Portuguese succeeded in destroying the Turkish fleet and re-establishing their sway in the Persian Gulf. Maṣqūṭ was now fortified as a naval base. But after 1631 Portuguese prestige began to decline rapidly. At the end of 1649, Maṣqūṭ was attacked by the Imām's army and had to surrender on January 23, 1650, as relief came too late. The town now lost much of its former importance, although under Dutch influence its commerce was still considerable. Towards the end of the xvith century it attained an unmistakable notoriety as a nest of pirates; in 1733 it was taken by the Persians, who were driven out by Aḥmad b. Sāliḥ, the founder of the dynasty still ruling in Maṣqūṭ, who was elected imām in 1741. Since 1793, Maṣqūṭ has been the capital of the sultānate of Ṭūmān. After 1797 the French began to be influential in Maṣqūṭ; the town played a prominent part as a base for attacking India in Napoleon's grandly conceived plan for destroying England's power; we need therefore not be surprised that England also spent an increased attention to the town. In January 1800, Capt. John Malcolm was sent to Maṣqūṭ by the Indian government and concluded a treaty with the sultān by which an earlier agreement between the East India Company and the sultān and also sent a consular agent to Maṣqūṭ. The town flourished under this sultān, Ṣa'id b. Sultān, and became a centre for commerce with the Persian Gulf. Maṣqūṭ repelled an attack of the Wāhahīb with the assistance of the English in 1809, but in 1833 it became tributary to them. The change from sailing to steamships brought about a decline in the importance of the town. In 1865 Palgrave describes Maṣqūṭ as an important harbour with 40,000 inhabitants, but in 1895, Bent found the population at only 20,000 and at present it can hardly be more than 10,000. In 1853 however, the sultān was able to negotiate a commercial treaty with the United States, followed by a similar one with England in 1859; in 1844 France and Maṣqūṭ drew up a commercial treaty by which France obtained the privilege of the most favoured nation and French subjects were given full freedom to trade in Maṣqūṭ. The independence of Maṣqūṭ, although expressly stated in the Anglo-French declaration of 1862, was however little more than nominal, for England, who had several times come forward to protect the sultānate, had through her political agent considerable control over the sultān. In connection with the slave-trade, which England was endeavouring to suppress, the sultān of Maṣqūṭ had bound himself in various ways to England and in 1854 even ceded to England the Khurūn-Mūrūn Islands of which France was endeavouring to obtain possession. When Sultan Sāliyād Ṣa'id died in 1856, his kingdom was divided between his two sons Thawāwi and Madjīdī of whom the former received Maṣqūṭ, while the latter was given Zanzibar which had belonged to Maṣqūṭ since the end of the xvith century. This division was negotiated by England through Lord Canning, the Viceroy of India. In 1861 Zanzibar was declared independent, but it had still to pay an annual tribute to Maṣqūṭ, which England in 1873 undertook to pay in compensation for various concessions of the sultān and Maṣqūṭ in connection with the suppression of the slave-trade as long as the sultān fulfilled his pledges and showed friendship for England. This readiness to meet the English was also seen in a telegraph agreement of 1864. In 1861 Sultan Fāṣih concluded a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation with England in which the sultān bound himself and his successors not to cede, sell or let land except to England. The French opposed this and in 1854 succeeded in obtaining a coastal station five miles S. E. of Maṣqūṭ. England raised objections and quoted the treaty with the sultān although France in the treaty of November 17, 1844, had secured the right to acquire land. Diplomatic negotiations finally brought about a settlement, by which France gave up the coastal station in the Gulf of Ṭūmān, and in compensation was lent half the coal depot at Makallī. As France in 1916 again lent this coastal station to the English, the dispute was finally settled in favour of the English.
sultan of Maskat, and when the latter took steps to deal with them they were protected by France. The affair finally became so serious that in 1903 there appeared to be danger of a conflict between England and France, but in 1905 the question was submitted to the Hague Tribunal which decided that only those sailing-vessels which had received the French flag before January 2, 1892, had the privilege renewed and licences later issued were cancelled as invalid, in so far as they were not given to French protégés of 1863. As, in 1917, only 12 'Omān sailing-vessels still carried the French flag, this privilege of France must soon die out. It was only natural that the active smuggling of weapons from Maskat not only to Persia and Afghanistan but also into the interior of Arabia, should cause anxiety to England. The flourishing trade in arms was put down in 1912 by the establishment of a depot for the sale of arms under government control, which alone could sell arms. It is true that the smugglers have now migrated to Birk, Shabain and Ru'nis, but the great decline in the statistics of the year 1912–1913 when in the first half year 147,391 lbs. of arms were still imported while in the last five months the total was only 36,667. In 1913, the new ruler Sultan Taimur, who succeeded his father on October 4 and was recognised by England and France on November 15, 1913, met with serious opposition from the tribes in the south of 'Omān, who declared themselves independent, under an imām whom they chose themselves. It is only England's power that keeps these rebels from Maskat and thus secures the existence of the dynasty, whose rule has long been quite nominal.

**Genealogical Table of the Imāms of Maskat**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad b. Sa'id</td>
<td>1154–1188</td>
<td>A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salim</td>
<td>1219 A.H.</td>
<td>Sa'id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Salim       | 1219 A.H. | Taimur | (1273–1285 A.H.)
| | | |
| | | |
| Turki       | 1287–1305 A.H. | Faisal | (1888–1913 A.D.)
| | | |
| | | |
| Taimur      | 1273–1285 A.H. | Jami'd | (1193–1206 A.H.)
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
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| | | |
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| | | |
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| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | | 1856) ruler of Oman and Zanzibar, London 1929; cf. also 'OMAN and the Bibl. of this article.

On 2. Yākūt, Muṣfjam, ed. Wüstenfeld, lv. 529; Marāšid al-Iṣbaši, ed. T. G. J. Juynboll, iii. 98.


(A. Grohmann)
MASLAMA,  son of the second Maṣrawi Caliph. “His chivalrous figure seems to have made a vivid impression on the popular imagination; one might think he came out of a popular romance” (C. H. Becker). Few of the Maṣrawi princes were so active and gifted as he, and in many diverse directions. He lived long enough to give proof that he was not unworthy of the high hopes placed upon him. His gifts earned him the confidence of all the Maṣrawi rulers, to whom he was a Nestor whose counsels were always heeded, from ʿAbd al-Malik to Hārūn, not even excepting ʿUmar II, who was not always favourably inclined to the sons of ʿAbd al-Malik, nor the tyrant and fanatic Walīd II, who wept at his loss. He had been carefully educated by his father ʿAbd al-Malik. His long career as a military leader revealed his personal courage and his knowledge of the art of war. A man of good counsel and excellent judgment, versed in literature, a patron of poets and an accurate critic of their merits, adored by his men, Maslama made use of his exceptional position to be a protector of all the oppressed, to maintain the unity and cohesion at the heart of his dynasty, which was threatened by the absurd law of seniority which regulated the succession to the throne.

The chance of birth — his mother was a slave-girl — prevented him from rising higher. Walīd I gave his brother Maslama the task of conducting the military operations against the Greeks. Henceforth — with a few short intervals — he was to hold the office of commander-in-chief of the Arab armies, in which he frequently had under him his nephew, the able and valiant ʿAbdās [q. v.], son of the caliph Walīd. In the year 91 (709-710) he succeeded his uncle Muḥammad as governor of Armenia, a province not completely subdued, which required a military man to rule it. He also governed the ʿamār of Kūnārīn [q. v.], another frontier province continually exposed to the attacks of the enemy. He never spent much time in civilian appointments, for which his soldierly spirit seemed less adapted and in which the independent character of the Maṣrawi prince usually came into conflict with the central power.

His first campaign was marked by the capture of the important fortress of Tyana (Tawhna); the rigorous winter of the high Anatolian plateaus did not interrupt the operations of this long siege, in which the assailants suffered great hardships [for the chronology see ʿABD ʿABBĀS IBN AL-WALID]. The dismantled town remained deserted, a serious loss for the Byzantines. Their enemies now held both slopes of the Cilician Taurus, the gateway to Anatalia. Under Maslama’s directions, his nephew ʿAbdās in the next two or three years completed the conquest of mountainous Isauria. In 93 (712) the fortress of Amassia was taken and Maslama entered Galatia through Armenia. This opened up the road to Constantinople. In 95 he laid siege to the capital. The attack dragged on, and as a result, Maslama’s forces suffered severe hardship in the winter seasons. Contemporary writers blame for their failure the lack of foresight and insufficient diplomatic skill in the commander-in-chief, ʿUmar II recalled the besiegers to Syria and sent Maslama to the Ṭirāq against the ʿArḍrījīs. Yazīd II sent his brother to put down the rebellion of Yazīd b. Muhallab [q. v.] in the Ṭirāq. After the death of this rebel (102 = 720), Maslama became governor of the two Ṭirāq.

Before this, he had very opportunistically persuaded the caliph not to modify the order of succession to the disadvantage of Hārūn. Yazīd was not long in finding fault with his brother, especially as he neglected to send him the taxes of his immense eastern vice-royalty. He recalled him to Syria, where Maslama endeavoured to combat the influence of favourites on this weak sovereign. Returning to the army in 108 he conquered Cappadocia. The following years were marked by Maslama’s great campaign in Armenia and the land of the Ḳaṣara. After partial successes in which the country was laid waste, the stubborn resistance of the natives and the Turkish tribes forced him to retreat. The rest of his life was one with great difficulty Maslama succeeded in bringing back the remnants of his army to the Arab territory by sacrificing all his baggage and equipment (115 a. n.). His intervention to support the claims of Walīd b. Yazīd [q. v.], heir presumptive to Hārūn, compromised him at court. He died before this caliph and seems to have taken with him to the grave the fortune of the Maṣrawis, for they rapidly declined after his time.


(H. Lammens)

MAṢMŪDA (the broken plural Maṣmūdīya is also found), one of the principal Berber ethnic groups forming a branch of the Barānīya.

If we set aside the Maṣmūda elements mentioned by al-Bakrī in the neighbourhood of Bone, the post-Islamic Maṣmūda seem to have lived exclusively in the western extremity of the Maghrib; and as far back as one goes in the history of the interior of Morocco, we find them forming with the Ṣaḥāḥ [q. v.], another group of Barānī Berbers, the main stock of the Berber population of this country. Indeed from the first Arab conquest in the seventh century to the importation of the Hīsfīs by the Almohad Sultan Yākūb al-ʾAṣamur in 1190, it was the Maṣmūda who inhabited the great region of plains, plateaus and mountains, which stretches from the Mediterranean to the Anti-Atlas to the west of a line from N. E. to S. W. passing through Meknès (Meknās) and Dimūn; the only parts of this territory which were not occupied by them were three small Ṣaḥāḥ exclaves in the Ṣaḥāḥiyya of Tangier, of the valley of the Wargij and of Azemmūr. To the north and to the west, the land of the Maṣmūda was bounded by the Maṣran and the Atlantic. To the east and south it was bounded by the lands of the Ṣaḥāḥiyya. To the north were the Ṣaḥāḥiyya of the tribe of Tāzī and those of

(H. Lammens)
Wartha: in the centre, the Zanāşa or Şanţâida of the Central Atlas, to which should be added the Zanāşa of Fāzra; to the south, the Haskūra, the Lamta and the Gazīla.

It was from the presence of this Mašmuđa bloc, extending continuously from Sūs to the Mediterranean, that eastern Morocco generally must have received the name of Sūs, a name found for example in Yākūt (cf. Muṣṭafā, s.v. Sūs) who distinguishes a Hithr Sūs (capital Tangier) and a Farther Sūs (capital Tarqalāf) separated from the other by two months' journey. It is also to this racial unity that are due the legends according to which all the N.W. corner of Morocco was once inhabited by the people of Sūs (ak Sūs). Before the Mašmuđa peoples were divided into three groups:

1. In the north, from the Mediterranean to the Sahi and Wartha, the Ghamāra [q.v.].

2. In the centre from the Sahi to the Wādire Umm Rabī, the Baraghwāta [5. BARGOWA].

3. In the south, from the Wādire Umm Rabī to the Anti-Atlas, the Mašmuđa in the strict sense of the word.

Like the majority of the Barbâls, who in this respect are a contrast to the Buttr, who are inclined to be nomads, the Mašmuđa were all settled; for if, in one passage, Ibn Khaldūn mentions two nomad tribes, the Lâkhs and the Zaggan as forming part of the Mašmuđa confederation of the Hāba, he also points out that they were tribes of the Lamta, i.e. of the nomadic Şanţâida, who finally became incorporated in the Hāba. He also points out that they were tribes of the Lamta, i.e. of the nomadic Şanţâida, who finally became incorporated in the Hāba. The anti-Atlantic tribes of the southernmost Sūs. Ibn Khaldūn further makes special mention of the fortresses and fortified villages (maš bīl wa-bajūn) of the Mašmuđa who lived in the mountains of Dāran or the Great Atlas.

Other Arab historians and geographers mention the many little towns (jarāy) in the plains occupied by the Dukkâla or the Baraghwāta, a pastoral and agricultural people; but these were gradually ruined and destroyed in the course of the fighting which went on without interruption in their country from the establishment of the Zanâşa principalities of Shalla, Tâdil and Aghmâl; the Amoravidi and Almoravid conquests, repeated campaigns against the heretical Baraghwâta, the Hiflîl occupation, the struggle between the Almoravids and the Marinids, the rivalry between the Marinid kingdom of Fās and that of Marraquṭ and lastly the wars with the Berbers. Exterminated as heretics, dispossessed of their lands and driven from them by the Arab or Zanâşa nomads brought into their territory, transported to a distance (region of Fās) by the Wātāsid saltīns, for whose taste they showed too little hostility to the Portuguese, the central Mašmuđa, the original inhabitants of the Aqgār, of Tâmâsûâ and of the land of the Dukkâla finally disappeared; their place was taken by nomads, Hiflîl Arabs (in the north, in Hâlī and Aqgâr, the Rī'yâ; in the south, the Djelas, Satisf, Khât, Bayn Djetlar) and the Berbers (Zanâşa Hâfya; in the xvii century the coming to power of the Sâ'idâr dynasty brought about the immigration of Maš'îl Arab tribes to the same region: Abda, Aqmar, Rahâ'îmâna, Barâshî, Wâdîa, Awlad Duaîm, Za'air, etc.).

From the xvii century onwards, as a result of the occupation of their central plains by the Arabs, Hiflîl then Maš'îl, the Mašmuđa only survived in the mountainous regions which formed the northern and southern extremities of their old domains.

The Mašmuđa of the north (or Mašmuđat al-Sâhid; "M. of the shore" of al-Râyûn) were chiefly represented by the Ghamâra group [q.v.]. But, alongside of them, we find two small groups having the same racial origin:

a. The Mašmuđa of the Sûmâ, settled between the district of Cetâa, which belonged to the Ghamâra and that of Tangier, a Şanţâida country. It was they who gave their name to the fortified port of Kasr Mašmuđa, also called Kasr al-Maṣîla, the modern al-Kasr al-Sâghir. Their presence here is attested in the tenth century, for it was while fighting here against them that Hâk-Mtn, the prophet of the Ghamâra, was slain; al-Bakri (xii century) knows them in the same area corresponding to that of the modern Andajza.

b. Al-Bakri mentions another group of Mašmuđa (tribe of the Aghâra) settled in the land lying between al-Kasr al-Kabîr and Wâzzan; there is still a small Mašmuđa tribe between these two towns.

The Mašmuđa of the south, who inhabited the lands between the Wàdire Umm Rabî and the Anti-Atlas, were divided into two groups: those of the plain and those of the mountains.

a. The Southern Mašmuđa of the plain lived to the north of the Great Atlas. The chief towns were the Dukkâla; the Baṭūf Maqîr (around Suf); the Hâsha; the Ragâsha and the Hâsha (to the south of the lower course of the Tânsîf). The chief town in this region was Sâfî (Ar. Aṣfî), for the town of Asemîr [q.v.]; and the riṣâf of Tî [q.v.] were in the enclave of Şanţâida; beside the port of Sâfî, we must also mention that of Kât (the Acos of the Portuguese) at the mouth of the Tânsîf, which gave Aghmâr access to the sea and had a riṣaf, and that of Amagîlî (the Mogador of the Portuguese) which served the district of Sûs. Besides these three centres, there were, as in Tâmâsûâ, a large number of fortified little towns (jarây) many of which survived down to the xviii century. The Portuguese chroniclers, Leo Africanus and Marmion have preserved for us many names of these places which have now disappeared, their very memory being lost; the local hagiographic collections and notably the Kirsh al-Thugriyyîn of al-Tâbiîn (xii century) have preserved a good deal of valuable information on this subject. At the present day all the country to the north of the Atlas is arabicised and if the old Berber element has not completely disappeared, it is at least overwhelmed by Arabs of whom the majority seem to be of Maš'îl origin. The Hâsha alone, between Mogador and Aghâra, have remained almost intact and have retained the use of the Berber language.

b. The Southern Mašmuđa of the mountains occupied the Great Atlas (Qobâl Darân), the massif of Sirwāt (anc. Sirwāt) and the Anti-Atlas or mountains of the Nâgûta (Berh. In Gisînt).

In the Great Atlas, the Mašmuđa extended to the east as far as the upper course of the Tânsîf (a pass called Tisîn-Telwet). From east to west, the following were the chief groups: the Gallâwa; the Hâlîkîn (or Alâkîn); the Warîka and the Hârîdja, near Aghmâr; the Aṣâdān, including the Masîfma, the Mâshîl and the Daghâshâ or Bagh Daghîsh; the Hâkîika, including the Aṣâdâhika; the people of Tin-Mâlît, on the upper course of the river of Nafîs; the Sūda or Zâuda, in the lower valley of the Asîf al-Mâl; the Gudmâwa and...
Lastly in the west, the Gafsa, the chief tribe of which was the Sakawa or Sakawa.

The massif of Sirwa and the high valley of the Wadi Sūr were inhabited by the Banū Wawarazt and the Sakata. The N. E. part of the Anti-Atlas was occupied by the Hargha.

Further to the south, the Sūr, properly so-called, was inhabited by heterogeneous elements of Maṣmūda origin (al-Idrisi, al-iḥṣāʿ miʿt al-Bakri al-Maṣmūdī). Describing the road leading from Tārūdānt to Aghmat, al-Idrisi mentions between Tārūdānt and the land of the Hargha, four tribes the names of which, corrupted by the copyists, are unfortunately hardly identifiable.

Besides these highlanders, who were strictly Maṣmūda, we must mention the Haskara (or Hasaqına). These were highlanders of Ṣanḥāda origin, breach of the Lamsa and Gazella, who led a nomadic existence to the south of the Great Atlas and the Anti-Atlas. The Haskara were settled in the high valley of Tānsift and the Wāl al-ʿAblad, on the two slopes of the mountain range which links the Great Atlas, the home of the Maṣmūda, with the Central Atlas, the home of the Zānāga (Ṣanḥāda) of Tādil; their chief tribes were the Zāmariya, the Mughriša, the Garaša, the Ghajdira, the Fatwa, the Maqṣawa, the Hufanis, and the Hanfit, who, according as they lived on one slope or the other, belonged to the Haskara al-Khābi (H. of the south) or to the Haskara al-Dūl (H. of the north). Ibn Khaldūn, who calls attention to the Ṣanḥāda origin of the Haskara, adds that, as a result of their taking up the Almoravid cause, it became customary to associate them with the Maṣmūda tribes, but that they never enjoyed the same privileges as these latter.

History. In 682, ʿUqba b. ʿAbd marched against the Maṣmūda of the Atlas with whom he fought several battles. On one occasion he was surrounded in the mountains and owed his safety solely to the help given him by a body of Zanata. In the same year he attacked and took the town of Naffis which was occupied by ʿĀṣim and literate professed Christianity. Thence he went to Īgli, a town of Sāh which he also took.

Legend adds that he even thrust his way to the Atlantic where he rode his horse into the water, calling God to witness that there were no more lands for him to conquer. This first submission of the Maṣmūda does not however seem to have lasted after the departure of ʿUqba. In 707, ʿAbd b. Nusair aspired to reconquer Morocco; he in person took Dār and Tāfīlit and sent his son to the conquest of Sāh and the land of the Maṣmūda.

In 732 ʿAbdād al-Habbaš was appointed governor of the Magrib; he appointed his son Ṣamīr as assistant to the governor of Morocco and gave him particular charge of the district of Sāh. In 735, the same ʿAbdād al-Habbaš sent Ṣamīr, grandson of ʿUqba, to make an expedition into Sāh against the Maṣmūda and the Ṣanḥāda (Maṣmūda). Later the latter's son ʿAbd al-Rahman Filīn (d. 745) becoming semi-independent governor of the Magrib occupied Īgli and built a camp there, the remains of which could still be seen in al-Bakri's time. It is to the same governor that is attributed the making of the wells which supply the road from Tānsīf to Awdtāghast via Walūda, through the modern Mauritania.

The land of the Maṣmūda then disappears from history till the ninth century. The conquests of Idris I did not extend in the south beyond the Tāmānsa and the Tādil. But in 812 Idris II made an expedition against the town of Naffis; on his death in 820, his son ʿAbd al-ʿUmr al-Maṣmūda obtained as his share of the kingdom of Aghmat, Naffis, the lands of the Maṣmūda and of the Lakha as well as Sāh. Al-Bakri records that some of his descendants ruled as lords of Nafiss and among the Banū Lamasa, not far from Iglis. Other Idrisids, descendants of Yahya b. Idris, were at this time lords of Darūs.

With the decline of Idrisid power in the tenth century, the Maṣmūda again became independent and were ruled by elected sheiks or ṣābān (= Arabic ṣāḥib); Al-Bakri tells us that those of Aghmat were appointed by the people for a term of one year. When at the end of the tenth century, Zanata principalities became established in Morocco (at Faz, Shalla and Tādil), Maṣmūda established themselves at Aghmat; but all we know of them is that they were attacked by the Almoravids. In 1057, after receiving the submission of Sāh and of the Maṣmūda (Zarza, Sabilla, Gadda, Mina, Ragaqa and Ḥallia), the Almoravid chief of Sāh sent ʿAbd al-Bakri al-Muṣriḥ b. Yūsuf to Aghmat, the last Magribi ruler of which, Lāgūt b. ʿAli, fled to Tādil. His wife, the famous Zamāb, who was one of the Nafarzā, finally became the wife of Yūsuf b. Tādil whom she initiated into the fine art of diplomacy.

From 1057 Aghmat was the capital of the Almoravids till 1062, when Yūsuf b. Tādil founded Marrakush [q. v.]. In 1074 the same ruler, having divided his empire among several governors, gave his son Tamīn the governorship of Marrakush, Aghmat, of the Maṣmūda and of Sāh, thus of Tādil and Tāmānsa.

The Maṣmūda seem to have remained subject to the Almoravids till the rebellion in 1121 provoked by the ṣaḥāna Ibn ʿAbd al-Muttār [q. v.] of the tribe of Hargha, who, supported by ʿUmar Intīf, shāhin of the Ḥintlān, and by ʿAbd al-Muḥsin [q. v.], brought about the foundation of the Almohad dynasty [q. v.]. The history of the Maṣmūda is henceforth involved with that of the dynasty which they brought to power and which lasted till 1269. The Maṣmūda, together with the Almohad dynasty, thus contributed to the rise of the Ḥafṣids [q. v.], who ruled over Ifriqiya from 1228 to 1574, through the descendants of ʿAbd al-Haf ʿUmar Intīf, shāhin of the Ḥintlān.

During the first half of the fourteenth century, the power of the Almohads, routed by the Christians of Spain at the battle of Ḥiṣn al-Uqba (las Navas de Tolosa) in 1218 and vigorously attacked in Morocco by the Banū Maqrīz, soon began to decline. The Maṣmūda of the Atlas, indifferent to the fate of the dynasty, took advantage of its plight to regain their independence. It was the submission of the Ḥintlān and the Hargha, which in 1224 at the proclamation of al-ʿĀṣim assumed the leadership in the movement; frequently allied with the Ḥilāla Arabs of the plains, Sufyān and Kholī, we find them fighting in all the civil wars and supporting various pretenders to the throne.

Whereas in 1269 the Marinids had definitely crushed the Almohads, the Maṣmūda retained a certain amount of independence and lived more or less in submission to the central power, ruled by chiefs chosen from the great local families: ʿAbd al-Ḥamīn among the Ḥintlān; ʿAbd al-Salām al-Maṣmūda among the Gadda; among the Sakawa, ʿUmar b. Ḥaddū
was an independent chief who went so far as to claim the Berber title agiella (as king). In Sás, the Banú Yaddar founded an independent principality which lasted from 1254 till about 1340. As to the Haskhara, the power among them was exercised by the Banú Khatib.

Down to the xvth century, except during the first half of the reign of the Almohad dynasty of which they had been the principal supporters, the Maśmūda of the Atlas were hardly ever under the direct rule of the Moroccan government; only the tribes of the plains, Dukhala and Hája, in a position of inferiority as a result of their geographical situation, were able to offer less resistance and had to submit. The later dynasties, Sa'dian and Álawi, were no better able to subdue the Maśmūda of the highlands; but instead of gathering round local chiefs with temporal power, the latter now placed themselves under the leadership of holy men with religious prestige.

In the beginning of the xvth century, the land of the Maśmūda was in a state of anarchy. Some ashqādī of the tribe of the Hinaḫa held the lands of Marrakūsah; the most famous was Abū Shāntift; to the south of Tānsif, the xivth century saw the rise of the warlike group of the Rāgrāgīs; in the xvth century, the power of the emirate of Al-Djasūlī [q.v.] spread among the Hája in the adjoining country of Ibrāhīm's, the Sa'dian dynasty was rising, which after occupying Sás imposed its domination on the whole of Morocco.

But it did not however succeed in subjecting completely the highlanders of the Atlas. The powerful Ahmad al-Mansūr himself had to fight against a pretender who had proclaimed himself king of the Sakaṣāwā.

After the death of al-Mansūr, the Atlas and Sás were all under the authority of local religious leaders of whom the most important were to be found among the Hája and in Tānsif (family of Ahmad U-Murūs).

It was the 'Alawīd Sulṭān Māwlylh Rāshīd who restored Sás and the Atlas to the Moroccan empire. The only episode to note is the con-\textit{\textbf{ee}}ulation in Tānsif, by a marabout Saiyidī Hījān of a kind of independent kingdom, the capital of which was Ilīghīt and which lasted from the end of the xviiith century till 1886.

Henceforth the Maśmūda disappear from history. The Atlas remained more or less independent, according to the degree of power of the ruling sovereigns, but all the important events in the region took place among the Hája or in Sás [q.v.].

The French occupation found the old Maśmūda grouped, since the death of the 'Alawīd Sulṭān Māwlylh al-Ḥasan, into three bodies each under the authority of a local family: the Gūwās in the east, the Gunāfs in the centre, and the Muğgra in the west. The only use now in existence is the Gūwās; as a result of the disappearance of their leaders, the two others were recently broken up.

The name Maśmūda, still preserved in the north Morocco in the name of a little tribe of al-Kays al-Kahīr, seems to have completely disappeared in the south, where the former Maśmūda peoples, continuing to talk Berber, bear the name of Siyyīk (French Chleuha, q.v.). It may even be asked if the name Maśmūda, which is found so often in the Arab historians and geographers, was ever in regular use among the peoples to whom they apply it; it is, indeed, suggestive that it is not found in the long lists of tribes given in the Kāhīb al-Āṣrāfī, published in the Documenti indigenti d'Antica Almohade.

Sociology. The Maśmūda of the Atlas lead a settled life, living by a little agriculture and breeding a poor type of cattle, they live in villages or hamlets of stonehouses with clay roofs. Ibn Khālidīn notes the existence among them of numerous little strongholds and fortified villages (mādīr waṣṣā-lín), the ancestors of the modern fighranīt and agīṣīt. There were no towns among the mountains; Tīn Mallā, famous for the mosque where Ibn Tūnār was buried, was never a town. Before the Almoravīd ruler Yūsuf b. Tānsif founded Marrakūsah in 1063, built moreover in the plains out of reach of the highlanders, whom it was to control, the only urban centres in the district were situated at the foot of the Atlas on its lowest slopes. The principal towns were in the north, the double town of Aghmat [q.v.] and that of Nafīsī on the river Nafīsī; in the south, in Sás, Iglī and Tarāshant; as places of less importance we may mention in the north, Shīrīīs (mod. Shīlā+Famāna, Aṣfān and Tanūtīr, to the east, among the Hája and in the borders of Sás: Tānsif. The great trade-routes which traversed the region started from Aghmat for the port of Kāk (at the north of the Tānsif), Fās (via Taifāl), Sīdji-līūn (through the land of the Hāzrajda and the Haskhara), and Sás (via Nafīsī, the land of the Banū Maǧūf and Iglī; no doubt using the pass now called Tābīn-Tēst). Al-Bakrī particularly mentions the industry and application and the thirst for gain, characteristic of the Maśmūda of the Aṣlf and of Sás. The principal products of the country were fruits (nuts and almonds), honey and oil of argain (kargânīl, a tree peculiar to the country, of which there were regular forests among the Hája. The Maśmūda could eat and work iron and also copper, which they exported in the form of ingots or "loaves" (kangīd); they also worked and chasell silver jewellery. In Sás also the cultivation of the sugar-cane enabled sugar to be made.

From the intellectual point of view, the Maśmūda seem to occupy a place of first rank among the Berbers. Each of their three principal groups has produced a reforming prophet, the author of sacred works in the Berber language: Hā-Mu'in of the Qumārā; Sāliḥ b. Tarīf of the Baragāwīyā; Ibn Tūnār of the Maśmūda of the Atlas. It may also be noted that Sás is one of those few districts in which books were written in Berber down to a quite recent date (cf. H. Sanensi, 

\textit{\textbf{ee}} Essai sur la \textit{\textbf{ee}}tre de \textit{\textbf{ee}}'res des \textit{\textbf{ee}}res, P. 73—81).

As regards religion, the Maśmūda were converted to Islam in the viith century by Ḥūḥā b. Nāfī, who left his comrade Ǧhikār among them to teach the new religion. The latter died among them and was buried on the banks of the Tānsif where his tomb is still venerated. The place is now called Ǧhikār Saiyidī Shīkār near the confluence with the river of the Shīlā+Famāna. The Mosque of the town of Aghmat of the Hašinna was founded at the beginning of the eighth century in 704.

Ibn Khālidīn describes the Maśmūda of the Atlas as being attached to Islam from the first conquest, in which they differed from their brethren of the north, the Baragāwīyā and the Qumārā, who remained faithful to their heretical beliefs. At the beginning of the eighth century, several
of them accompanied Tārikh on his conquest of Spain; the best known of these was Khūshāyir b. Wāsilā b. Shamlā, of the tribe of the Aṣṣāād, who settled in Spain and was the grandfather of Vāyah b. Vāyah, one of the maṣā'ūl of the Mawṣūfāt; many others also settled in Spain and their descendants played important parts under the Ommayyads.

In the eleventh century however, al-Bakrī notes Rāfi'ī's heretics among the Masmūdā; these were the Banū Lamās settled to the north of the Hāmās and the town of Iglī. In this district he also mentions the existence of idolators who worshipped a rūm: perhaps we have here a relic of the cult of the god Ammon among the ancient Berbers. The towns however formed important centres of Muslim culture, the influence of which was felt not only by the Masmūdā of the district but also by the Sanhāja of the adjoining deserts: Lāṃja and Gāstū. We know that it was in the town of Naffā, with Wāqgāg b. Zālī, a learned jurist of Lāṃja origin and a pupil of Abū Imrān al-Fāsī of the Kairawān, that in 1059 Vāyah b. Ibrāhīm al-Gudālī recruited Abū Allāh b. Yūsuf al-Gudālī who was the promoter of the Almoravid movement. For the Almohad period, al-Tāffīlī's hagiographic collection, entitled Kitāb al-Tāffīlī, shows us the land of the Masmūdā of the south fall of wonder-working saints. Later the tribe of the Kārgā, settled on the lands now occupied by the Shaykūjīna, was the cradle of a movement at once religious and warlike, the details of which are little known but the memory still alive. In the first half of the xvth century, religious activity seems to have been concentrated in the south of Sūs, in Tāsārwālā where the descendants of the saint Saiyūhī Aḥmad U-Mānā considered themselves out an independent maraboutic principality.


Al-Masmūdā, a Zoroastrian dynasty whom the Arabs found in the region of Dunbāwand (Dāmūsī) to the north of Rayy.

The origins of the Masmūdā. The dynasty seems to have been an old though not particularly celebrated one as is shown by the legends recorded by Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 275—277, and in al-Burānī, p. 227. The title of masmūdā is said to have been conferred by Fārsīn upon Arūmāl, Bārūmāl's former cook (Zobāhā), who had been able to save half the young men destined to perish as food for the tyrant's serpents. Arūmāl (according to Yābzī, ii. 606, a Nabatānī, a native of the Zab) showed to Fārsīn in the mountains of Dālīm and Shīrīsī, a whole nation of these refugees, which caused Fārsīn to exclaim was mānī kādir bihi, hadd hadrī, which is explained to mean: 'What a large number of people of the house (ahl bā'ině) thus hast saved!'

The first historical reference to a masmūdā is found in Tabārī's (i. 2656) account of the taking of Rayy by Nurāin b. Mūhammad in the time of the caliph 'Omar according to Ibn al-Asbīh in the years 15, 21 or 22; Marqārī however puts these events as late as 98 (716—717). The King of Rayy, Sūyāwsh b. Mūhammad b. Bahrām-Cōbit, had received reinforcements from the people of Dunbāwand, but when he was defeated, the masmūdā of Dunbāwand made peace at once with the Arabāwīs and received honorable terms (alā ghārī ṭarīqī wa lū maṣūrlīn) promising an annual payment of 300,000 dinārīs. The charter given by Nurāin was addressed "to the masmūdā of Dunbāwand, Mūhammad, to the people of Dunbāwand, of Fārūs, of Lārīs (Lārīrāt) and of Shīrīsī." This gives us an idea of the extent of the sway of the country round Mount Dunbāwand, [p. v] and stretched down the plains as far as the forests of Rayy. The district of Dunbāwand [Dubāwand, (the land occupied by) the Dubāwand ēsan] did not form part of Tabaristan. The Arabs mention it along with Rayy (Tabārī, i. 2653—2656; Muḥaddīd, p. 209; Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 275—277); but as we have seen at the time of the conquest, Rayy and Dunbāwand were under different dynasties. The old capital of Dunbāwand may have been at Mūhammad where, according to Ibn al-Fakhrī, Arūmāl had built a wonderful house of teak and ebony, which in the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd was taken to pieces and transported to Bagdad. In the Arab period there were two towns in Dunbāwand: Wūnīs and Shālahūn (the latter is marked on Stahl's map to the south of the modern town of Dāmūsī which lies on the slopes of Mount Dāmūsī). According to Yābzī, the masmūdā's principal stronghold was called Ummārī or Dādbhūd. This should be sought above the village of Shīrīsī, which must correspond to the old Kārīyat al-Haddān. Ibn al-Fakhrī's story of the shops (hāmilānī) in which worked the smiths, the noise of whose hammers exercised the enchanted Bitwārāsp must refer to the chambers carved out of the rock near Reiz; cf. Crawshay-Williams, Rock-Dwellings at Reizāb, J.R.A.S., 1904, p. 551; 1906, p. 217.

An attempt made by Abū Muslim in 134 to conquer the masmūdā was a disastrous failure: his general Mīhā b. Kā'ī was attacked by the masmūdā's men and on account of the difficult nature of the country (al-i'fā ẖilaẖ) was forced to return to Rayy (Ibn al-Asbīh, v. 304; cf. Hāfiz Abūl in Durr, Aṣāṣī, p. 441).

The principality was not conquered until 141. In this period there were few dissensions in the family of the masmūdā. Abarwāl b. al-Masmūdā, quarreled with his brother and went over to the caliph al-Masīr who gave him a pension (Tabārī, iii. 130). The Kitāb al-Ṣīnān wa l-Ḫaḍrāt, p. 228, testifies to his bravery in the rising of the Rūwandīya and calls him "al-Masmūdā Mīlāk b. Dinārī, malik of Dunbāwand." This Abarwāl (or Malik) had enjoyed considerable influence, for, according to Ibn al-Fakhrī, the appointment of 'Omar b. 'All as commander of the army sent against Tabaristan was made on the advice of Abarwāl who had known him since the trouble with Sunbāth (on the partisans of this "Khurramī") in Tabaristan cf. Māsā'il, Musāfīrī, v. 188) and with the Rūwandīya.

In the year 141, the brother of Abarwāl who occupied the throne of Dunbāwand was at war with his father-in-law, the ispahānī Khwālid of Tabaristan; but when he heard that the forces sent by al-Masīr were on their way to Tabaristan, he hastened to effect a reconciliation with his adversary (Tabārī, iii. 136; Ibn al-Asbīh, v. 356).
The stories of the campaign against Tabaristan directed by al-Mahdi by order of his father al-Manṣūr are very contradictory as is shown by their very detailed analysis in Vasmer, op. cit. After the defeat of the ispahbad, the Arab forces conquered the maṣmughān and captured him and his daughters Bakhtariya (?), and Śīyār (or Śāhki). Of these princesses one became the wife of Mahdi b. Manṣūr and the other the amun-wulad of 'All b. Raita. According to a story in Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 514, Khālid b. Barmak (Vasmer, op. cit., p. 106, thinks that his expedition was sent especially against the lord of Drewbānd) sent the maṣmughān and his wife and his two daughters to Baghdad, but in another passage, p. 275, the same writer says that the maṣmughān obtained ṣawān from Mahdi b. Manṣūr and came down from the mountain of al-Airān (?). He was taken to Rayy and there Mahdi ordered him to be beheaded.

After the death of the maṣmughān, the people of these mountain regions lapsed into barbarism (kuwviya) and became like wild beasts (Tabari, ii., 136). According to Ibn al-Fakhrī (p. 276) however, the descendents of the maṣmughān (= Armālī) were still well known.

Spiegel's and Maqrqi's Hypotheses. Yāhīyā b. 344 interprets maṣmughān as kahir al-magāfī (= the great one of the magi') (see, "great", N.W. Iranian form). Spiegel thought of connecting this dynasty with the prince-princes of Rayy, whose existence is known from a well-known passage in the Avesta (Yasn. i., 18, transl. Darmesteter, i., 170; cf. Jackson, Vorstetter, p. 202-205). In spite of Marquart's criticisms, who says it is impossible to quote the authority of Avestan traditions which relate to much earlier state of affairs, Spiegel's suggestion is still of interest. We have certainly to deal with vague memories and not with actual facts. In the time of the Arab conquest the descendents of Bahram-Cobin were ruling in Rayy, but the Arabs (Tabari, i., 2653-2655) installed there a certain al-Zainabī, son of Kūfa and father of al-Farrukhān. It remains to be seen if this family of Zainabī, "whom the Arabs call al-Zainabī" (Bāhrāmī, p. 347) is connected with Drewbānd. Their stronghold in Rayy was called Armālī (against J. D. Pretzen, in the article above) and resembles the name of the mountain al-Airān from which the last maṣmughān came down (cf. the note by de Goeje in Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 275). Marquart wanted to connect the maṣmughān of the Bawand dynasty, the eponymous ancestor of whom Baw, a descendant of Kāša, brother of Khusraw I., is said to have lived in the time of the later Sāsānians. This Baw was a man of piety and after the fall of Yavagird III had retired to his father's fire-temple. Marquart regards him as a "magus" and identifies him with the father of the Christian martyr Anastasius, who bore this name (Baw') and was a "master of magian lore". Lastly, he quotes the fact that the Bawandīs appeared in 167 only after the disappearance of the maṣmughān (after 141) as if to confirm their line. Unfortunately several details of the ingenious argument are not accurate: our sources (Ibn Isfandiyār, Zahir al-Din, p. 9; 204, 205) give not the slightest suggestion that Baw belonged to the priestly caste. According to Ibn Isfandiyār (transl. Browne, p. 98), his grandfather's temple was at Kūšān, which Rabino, p. 160, locates a little distance west of Ashraf i.e. quite remote from Drewbānd. The passage in Tabari, iii., 1294, which Marquart quotes to prove the occurrence of the name maṣmughān among the Bawandīs refers to the cousin of Māziyar of the Kairinī dynasty, which is quite different from the Bawandīs (cf. below).

The Kairinī maṣmughān. It is curious that neither Ibn Isfandiyār nor Zahir al-Din speak of the dynasty of the maṣmughān of Drewbānd, perhaps because they do not include this region in Tabaristan proper. On the other hand, they mention a maṣmughān (maṣmughān > miyān-rudd) by name al-Walsh, who was the marzūrin of Miyan-rudd (Zahir al-Din, p. 42), says that this canton was near the Sārī between the rivers Kāhilād and Mīhrānī and that on the east it adjoined Karasvand; Miyan-rudd is thus quite close to where Rabino puts Kūšān). This maṣmughān Walsh (Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 101; Zahir al-Din, p. 42) lived in the time of Djamaspid Farahkhan the Great (709-727) and belonged to the elder branch of the Kairinīs descended from Zarmrī b. Suhāk. (We do not know why Justi, p. 430, takes this Walsh to be the son of the last maṣmughān of Drewbānd). The Kairinī Walid Hurmund (of the younger line, descended from Kūra, brother of Zarmrī) in his rising against the caliph (cf. Mahdi, p. 158-169) had combined with the ispahbad Sharwin (772-797) and the maṣmughān Walsh of Miyan-rudd. This latter (Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 126; Zahir al-Din, p. 145) seems to have been one of the successors of the maṣmughān Walsh mentioned above.

Under 224 (838) Tabari (iii., 1294) mentions a cousin of the Kairinī Mażiyār, who was called Shāhīrūyār b. al-Maṣmughān. According to this, this al-Maṣmughān would be identical with Walid Ummid, uncle of Mażiyār (cf. Justi, p. 430). On the other hand under the year 250 (864), Tabari, iii., 1329, mentions a Maṣmughān (šah) among the allies of the Alī b. Ḥasan b. Zaid. Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 165 calls him Maṣmughān b. Walid-Ummid. One must either suppose there is an error in Tabari's genealogy or admit that the title of maṣmughān was borne both by Walid-Ummid and his son, but the form of the designation of the latter (al-maṣmughān) would rather show that the title had become a simple proper name (Browne is wrong in translating "the Maṣmughān").

To sum up then: Alongside of the maṣmughān of Drewbānd, we have the maṣmughān of Miyan-rudd. These maṣmughān, if we may rely on Zahir al-Din, belonged to the Zarmbīrī branch of the dynasty of Sāhīr (Sāsānian governor of Tabaristan descended from Kūra, son of the famous smith Kaω). Later we find the title (or proper name?) of maṣmughān recurring in the younger branch of the line of Sāhīr (the Kairinī branch), which occupied a position in Tabaristan subordinate to the Bawandī ispahbad (Zahir al-Din, p. 154, 14); Bibliography: Tabari, i., 2656; iii., 130, 136 (1294, 1529); Būrīni, al-Asghar al-Fārābī, p. 101 (transl. p. 209), p. 227 (transl. p. 213); Kīšāb al-Dīmān wa-l-Firdawši, ed. de Goeje and de Jong, p. 228; Ibn al-Arabi, v., 304, 386-387; Ibn Isfandiyār, index: Yāštī, p. 6, 243-244 (Ustednawān); ii., 606-610 (Drewbānd); Zahir al-Din, index; Spiegel, Erum. Alterturkei-und, 1871, iii., 563; Spiegel, "Uber d. Vaterlande al-Avesta, Z. d. M. G., xxxii., 1884, p. 529-545; Justi, Iran. Namenbuch, p. 109 and 130 (tables); Maqrqār, Geogr. d. M. G., xix., 1895.
MASSA (Berber Mass). the name of a small Berber tribe of Morocco of Sūs, settled some 30 miles south of Agadir at the mouth of the Wūdī Māsā; the latter is probably the flumen masatūt mentioned by Pline the Elder (v. 9) to the north of the flumen Dārat, the modern Wūdī Dār'a, and the Māsātī of the geographer would correspond to the modern al-Māsā.

The name Māsā is associated with the first Arab conquest of Morocco: according to legend, it was on the shore there that, after conquering Sīs, 'Ugīb b. Nāfī' drove his steed into the waves of the Atlantic calling God to witness that there were no more lands to conquer on the west. In any case, Māsā appears very early as an important religious and commercial centre. Al-Ya'qūbī (emil of the third (= ninth century) notes that the harbour was a busy one and mentions a riḍāf already renowned, that of Bahūli. Al-Bakrī and al-Idrīsī mention the harbour of Māsāt; al-Bakrī emphasises the fame of the riḍāf and the importance of the fairs held there. Ibn Khaldūn devotes several passages in his Kitāb al-Ibar to the riḍāf of Māsā, where according to popular belief the expected Mahdi or Fāṭīmīd was to appear; this belief induced many devout people to go and settle in this riḍāf and also sent many adventurers there to raise rebellions.

Towards the end of the xvi century, the religious movement begun by a-Baddālī made Māsā one of the great centres of Sūs. In the middle of the xvi century Leo Africanus describes Māsā as a group of three little towns surrounded by a stone wall in the middle of a forest of palm-trees; the inhabitants were agriculturists and turned the rising of the waters of the Wūdī to their advantage. Outside the town on the seashore was a very venerable "temple", from which the Mahdi was to come; a peculiar feature of it was that the little bays in it were formed of ribs of whale-bone: the sea actually throws up many cetaceans on this coast and ambergris was collected here; local legend moreover says that it was on the shore of Māsā that Jumah was cast up by the whale.

After the fall of the Sa'dīans, the development of the Marabout principality of Tāṣārwālt again made Māsā a commercial centre. This port was frequented by Europeans but it was soon supplanted by that of Agadir. The rapid decline of the principality of Tāṣārwālt and the steadily increasing influence of the central Moroccan power finally destroyed almost completely any religious and economic importance of Māsā.


MASŪD Aḥmad Salīḥ, the eldest son of Sūlṭān Māhīmūd of Ghasna, was born in the year 388 (998). In 406 (1015—1016), Sūlṭān Māhīmūd nominated him his heir-apparent, and two years later made him governor of Herīt. In 411 (1020), at the command of his father, he led an expedition to Ḥūrūd and reduced the northwestern part to submission. Shortly after this, he was disgraced and sent as a prisoner to Mūltān, but he was soon taken back into favour and was reinstated in his government at Herīt. When the province of Ṣafī following was conquered in 420 (1030), Sūlṭān Māhīmūd placed it under Masūd who, after subjugating the outlying parts, conquered Ḥamḥātān and Iṣfahān from their Buwahid rulers, Aḥāl al-Dawla b. Kākawsh, in the beginning of 421 (1030), and was making preparations for further conquest when news arrived of the death of his father and the succession to the throne of his brother Aḥāmīd Mūḥammad. Masūd hurried to Ghasna to claim the throne. In the meantime, the army tired of Mūḥammad, deposed him, and had the khwāja said in the name of Masūd. Mūḥammad was blinded and sent to the fort of Mānīdī, and Masūd ascended the throne in Șawārūlī, 421 (October 1030), about 5 months after the death of his father. The Caliph al-Kādir b. līlīḥ conferred on him the titles of Nejr Dini līlīḥ, Ḥūf b. Ḥūf līlīḥ and Zabrī Khaṭīfī līlīḥ.

In 422 (1031), Sūlṭān Masūd sent an army to punish Isā, the ruler of Mūrīn, for his rebellion. Isā was defeated and put to death, and his brother named Aḥād Mu'āsakar was placed on the throne. In 424 (1032—1033), Masūd laid siege to a fort named Sarasti in the southern Kāšmīr hills, took it by assault and returned to Ghasna in the spring. After this he attacked Tābaristān, as the ruler of that country, named Aḥād Kānlīdār, had adopted a hostile attitude, and captured Aṣṭarābkāh. Aḥād Kānlīdār was forced to offer submission and to promise to pay an annual tribute. About the end of 426 (October 1035), Ahmad b. Nīyūtīlm, the governor of Lahore, rebelled. Masūd sent against him one of his Hindī generals who was defeated and slain in battle. He then sent another Hindī general named Tilāk, who defeated Ahmad and forced him to fly to Sīnī where he was drowned while attempting to cross the river Indus. About the end of 427 (October 1036), Masūd led an expedition to India, took the forts of Ḥāmīt and Soufāt and returned to Ghasna, leaving his son Masjūd as the governor of the Punjab. In 430 (1038—1039), Masūd crossed the Oxus to punish Pūrīmā, son of Aḥālīnī, ruler of Bakhhāra, for his hostility, but before he could accomplish anything he received news that the Sālṣūkīs were advancing to Bakhth to cut off his retreat, and he immediately returned to Khurāsān.

Early in his reign, Sūlṭān Masūd had been called upon to deal with the Sālṣūkīs whose power had considerably increased during the period of their disappearance following the death of Sūlṭān Māhīmūd. They raided Herīt as early as 422 (1031) but were repulsed with heavy loss at Fārāwīkh and forced to take refuge in the Bakhthān Mountains. This however did not stop their activities, and by 425 (1033—1034) they had started to make systematic incursions into Khurāsān. In Șawārūlī 426 (June, 1035) Masūd sent against them two of his generals, the Ḥājīb Baktīrī b. b. Mūhīlī, who inflicted a crushing defeat on them, but while the Ghaznavids were engaged in plundering the camp of their vanquished foes, a body of the Sālṣūkīs under Ǧawābī issued from the hills, fell upon their disorderly ranks, and made fearful slaughter among them. Ḥusain ʿAll was taken prisoner, and
Bakhtugdī managed to escape. Instead of marching against the Saljiqūs, Mas'ūd wasted his time in a fruitless expedition to India in 427, as stated above, and the result was that they became bolder and more powerful. In 428 (1036–1037), they captured Balkh, but retired to Marw at the approach of Sultan Mas'ūd, and sued for peace. Mas'ūd gladly consented to it, but it was only a sham peace and when Mas'ūd started on his return march to Ghazna, the Saljiqūs fell upon his rear and put many of his soldiers to death. Mas'ūd turned round and took terrible revenge for this treachery. The Saljiqūs redoubled their efforts against the Sultan, and won over the people of Saraqib, Naṣā and Kāšāw to their side. Mas'ūd now personally took the field against them. The Saljiqūs advanced to meet him under their leader Tughrīl. The two armies met at Dandākan on 8th Ramaḍān, 431 (May 25, 1040). Mas'ūd fought bravely but being deserted by his generals and finding himself surrounded on all sides by the enemy, he fought his way out of the field of battle and managed to reach Ghazna in safety.

The Saljiqūs had evidently become too strong for him, and he resolved to withdraw to India, possibly with a view to gaining a respite and preparing a large army there to retrieve his affairs. He left Ghazna with all his treasure and companions. His captive brother Abbās Ahmad Muḥammad, son of Ruhjī, Mārkakah, shortly after crossing the river Indus, was held by the slave leaving against him, plundered his treasure, and, being joined by the rest of the army, they seized Mas'ūd and proclaimed the blind Muḥammad as their sovereign. Mas'ūd was sent as a prisoner to a fort where he was put to death on 12th Dhu-al-Miḍād 432 (January 17, 1041). His reign had lasted 10 years and three months.

Mas'ūd was a man of strong build and great physical strength. He was brave and generous, but he lacked the wisdom of his father, and early in his reign, he lost the co-operation of his officers by foolishly attempting to bring about the ruin of the old servants of the House on the advice of his young and ambitious curators, and demanding the return of the money which Muḥammad had distributed at the time of his accession to the throne. Mas'ūd was a great lover of learning, and numerous scholars had assembled at his court, one of whom was the famous Abbās Rājaqī al-Birūnī who dedicated some of his greatest works to him. Several poets sang his praises and were given munificent rewards. He adorned his capital with beautiful buildings, and the New Palace with its magnificent throne was one of the wonders of the times.


Mas'ūd and Nūr al-Dīn, M. Yazdī, Tazkīrāt al-Dīn, a Saljūqī historian in the 15th cen (429–547 = 1134–1152). Like Muḥammad's other sons, Mas'ūd, when quite a child, was entrusted to an atābeg to be educated, namely the celebrated emir Mawḍūd and when the latter was murdered, Aḥ Solṭān and Aḥāa Dīwānī Beg acted successively as Mas'ūd's tutors. The latter, an ambitious emir, in the beginning of Muhaddīdīn's reign tried to secure the sultanate for his protege, then an eleven-year-old boy, but the attempt failed; in an encounter with Muhaddīdīn's troops he was put in flight and Mas'ūd as well as his warf, the famous Arab poet Tughrī (q. v.), were taken prisoners (414 = 1110). On the fate of the prince see the article on him. Mas'ūd was pardoned and later given Gandī by his brother (4150). After Muhaddīdīn's death (455 = 1151), his son Dāwūd was at first recognized as sultan but Sanjar decided that Mas'ūd's brother Tughrī should be sultan. Mas'ūd soon made peace with Dāwūd, after some fighting near Tahirī, and sought to obtain from the caliph al-Mustārṣūdī that the latter should mention him in the khutba in
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Baghdad: The caliph, who had been approached with the same object by another brother of Mas'ud's name, made himself and his staff beg Kāṣṭānī, who found himself forced to accede to their request, by having Mas'ud's name mentioned first, followed by that of Sadiq. He also collected his forces to go in alliance with them against Sandjar; but when he arrived in Kharāja, he withdrew so that Mas'ud and Sadiq had to continue the struggle against their uncle alone and they were routed by him near a hill called Pāndj Anghaht in the neighbourhood of Dīnawar (1132). Sandjar however allowed Mas'ud to return unhindered to Gandja and at the end of the same year Mas'ud found an opportunity to go to Baghdad where Dāwūd also now was. Both princes were received by the caliph in public audience and given robes of honour and other tokens of esteem. Homage was paid to Mas'ud as sułtan and to Dāwūd as heir-apparent. Thereafter he fought with varying fortune against his brother Tughril and after the latter's death in 1134 (529 = 1134) was generally recognised as the legitimate successor. Meanwhile the caliph's vizier, now was given the office of vizier to the sułtan. Soon afterwards however, a number of Turkic emirs became dissatisfied with Mas'ud because they had felt themselves insulted by the advancement of Kāna Sandjar, the powerful emir of Aḫmarbadjūn, and were able to win the caliph over to their party. In the hope that Dāwūd would join him, he went with some 7,000 horsemen towards Hamadhan, where Mas'ud then was, but when the sułtan's troops met him at Dāmarg, his own men left him in the lurch or even went over to Mas'ud so that he and his vizier and other high officials were taken prisoners (529 = 1134). The sułtan, it is true, treated him with deference, and began to 'dispute terms of peace, but he did not release him. He took him with him to Marāq, where in the same year (cf. the various dates given: Weiss, Gesch. der Chalifen, iii. 234, note 4) he was murdered by a number of 'Adān. The murderers were apparently hired by the sułtan, on the advice of Sandjar, who had been stirred up against the Caliph by Dubān (q.v.). The latter, who was also with Mas'ud, was soon afterwards treacherously slain by him. These deeds of violence naturally made a very bad impression. Dāwūd and Sadiq began again to beset themselves; the new caliph al-Kāshīd Ḥīlāṭ, a son of al-Mustahsid, adopted a hostile attitude and other Turkic emirs, notablyZAṬG, the lord of al-Mawjūl, began to be insubordinate; in a word, anarchy soon prevailed everywhere. But when Mas'ud returned to Baghdad with his prisoners, as they all returned. Mas'ud thereupon had the caliph, who had escaped with Zangī to al-Mawjūl, deposed by a faṣūd of the kāšīd and jurists and approved the appointment of al-Muqtaṣir (530 = 1136). After peace had been to some extent restored, Mas'ud thought he might now devote himself to his pleasures and remained the whole year of 1137 in Baghdad in comparative inactivity, without allowing his leisure to be disturbed by a demonstration by the mob of the capital, which was intended to remind him that it was his duty to wage war upon the unbelievers. Once again several Turkic emirs rebelled and tried to bring Dāwūd to the front again; amongst them the most dangerous were 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Tughanberek, lord of Khalkhāt, and particularly the prince Mungubār, whom Sandjar after Kāṣṭānī's death had sent to Fārs and who was vigorously supported by his deputy in Khuzistān, Buzāba. Mas'ud, it is true, sent troops against them under Kāna Sandjar but they had to retire, and a battle was only fought when Mas'ud himself came up, at Kurzhāna near Hamadhan (532 = 1138). The sułtan was at first victorious and put Mungubār, whom he had captured, to death; but when his troops were scattered plundering the enemy's camp, Buzāba fell suddenly upon them so that he and Kāna Sandjar had narrow escapes and some twelve of the emirs with him were captured and all put to death by Buzāba. Fortunately for Mas'ud, Buzāba did not pursue them, but was content with occupying Fārs; the sułtan was also able to make peace with Dāwūd, and the deposed caliph was murdered in Esfāhan on Ramaḍān 25, 532 (June 6, 1138). The sułtan's position however was not one whit better, for the different provinces of the empire were in the hands of powerful emirs, who not only paid no heed to the sułtan, but occasionally appeared in open rebellion against him in the name of various Sadiq princes whose abbeys they were. The most powerful of these was still Kāna Sandjar, who began a war on Buzāba to avenge his son, who had been murdered by the latter. When he approached, however, Buzāba withdrew into an inaccessible citadel and when Kāna Sandjar retired, he took prisoner the prince Sadiq, whom he had appointed to rule over Fārs and then continued to rule in Fārs as abbeq of two sons of Māḥmuḍ, Malikkāh and Muhammad. After the death of Kāna Sandjar, who died in 535 of a broken heart after the great losses he suffered in the terrible earthquake in Gandja in 535 (1138), Cawīt al-Dīnjādī took his place and like his predecessor was generally attached to Mas'ud. Buzāba's attempt along with another emir named 'Abbās (q.v.), who had gained an influential position in al-Raŷ, to put the sułtan's youngest brother Salāmān on the throne therefore failed. Mas'ud invited the prince to come to him and when he came he was imprisoned in spite of the sułtan's promise. Cawīt died in 541 (1146) in the same year as Zangī and in the following year 'Abd al-Raḥmān and 'Abbās were disposed of by assassination so that Buzāba alone remained of the enemies of Mas'ud. Buzāba now set out for Hamadhan to attack the sułtan, but not far from this city was taken prisoner in a fierce battle and executed (542 = 1147). The princes Muhammad and Malikkāh who were with him escaped. Mas'ud afterwards sent for the latter, gave him his daughter in marriage and designated him his successor. In these negotiations the sułtan followed the advice of his favourite beg Aṛān b. Balkarānī, best known by the title Khāṣēb, who in this way disposed of all his rivals, but at the same time aroused great discontent so that even the aged Sandjar came once more to al-Raŷ to remonstrate with his nephew (544 = 1149). But all this was in vain; and when in 547 (1152) Mas'ud died, Khāṣēb took Malikkāh upon the throne; when in a short time the latter showed himself quite incapable, he was sent for Muhammad, who had Khāṣēb treacherously murdered.

Bibliography: in the article sandjar, Ibn Khallikān's article on Mas'ud (Būkāl edition 1299, ii. 531) is of no importance.

(M. Th. Houtsema)

Mas'ud, R. Sa'd, Salīm, a poet in Arabic and Persian, was born in Lahore. His father
remained for a considerable time in the service of the kings of Kharb and had become the possessor of great wealth and lands in Lâhore and other parts of India. After his father’s death these lands were confiscated by the Governor of Lâhore and Masûd was compelled to proceed to Kharb to demand justice; but there also his enemies were able to put him to more troubles and bring against him a false accusation, which caused him to be imprisoned. He at last through the recommendation of Masûd b. Sulûn Ibrîshîm was permitted to return to India and take possession of his estate. When Saîf al-Dîn Maḥmûd b. Sulûn Ibrîshîm came in India as viceroy, Masûd attached himself to this prince as courtier and panegyrist and became one of the special favourites of his court. But again, a false charge being brought against him, he once more fell upon evil days and loss of fortune. It was maliciously reported in 492 (1098) to Sulûn Ibrîshîm b. Maḥmûd that his son Saîf al-Dîn Maḥmûd intended to go to ‘Irâq to Malikshâh. This report so much aroused the indignation of the Sulûn that he ordered his son with all his courtiers to be arrested and put to prison. Our poet for the next three years remained a prisoner. But on the intercession of Abu Tâ’âsîn Khâûs, the Sulûn pardoned him and released him from prison. He returned to India and was again placed in possession of his father’s lands and dignity.

He died in 515 (1121). He is the author of two diwâns, one in Arabic and the other in Persian.

**Bibliography:**

**Masûd**, Abu l-Ḥasan ‘Ali b. al-Ḥusâin, Arab historian and geographer and one of the most versatile authors of the fourth century A.H.

Information about his life can only be gleaned from occasional references in his works; as his activity lay outside the lines of the regular schools of learning, he gets little mention from their representatives. The author of the Fihrist regards him as a Mağribî. According to his own statement, however, he was born in Bâghdâd and descended from an Arab family which could trace its ancestry to a Companion of the Prophet. While still quite young he travelled through Persia where he spent part of 305 (915) in Iṣfâkh. Next year he went to India and visited Mâlân and al-Muṣûrûn. He went by Kâhâbâ and Şâmîr as far as Ceylon, joined some merchants on a voyage to the China Sea and back to Zanâhir from which he returned to Oûmân. We again find him travelling along the southern shore of the Caspian Sea and in 314 (926) at Tibrius in Palestine. In 332 (943) he visited Antioch and the Syrian frontier towns and after a brief visit to his native province of Başrâ, he was staying in Damascus in 334 (945). Afterwards he seems to have lived sometimes in Syria and sometimes in Egypt. He was in al-Fustâ Ghana, and 344 (955) and he died there in Djumâdâ II 345 (956) or 346.

His restless life is reflected in his literary activity. His travels were certainly stimulated not by thirst for adventure but by a strong desire for knowledge. But this was superficial and not deep. He never went into original sources, as did al-Birûnî later, but contented himself with superficial enquiries and accepted tales and legends without criticism. Nevertheless we owe him a good deal of valuable information about the lands on the periphery of Islam. His method of presenting his material has the same faults as his scholarship. He is never able to finish a subject he has begun but continually diverges from his theme. His literary activity, in addition to philology and theology in the narrower sense, touched on almost all the fields of interest of his time, particularly natural philosophy, ethics and politics as well as heresiography. His works, a list of which is given by de Goeje in the preface to the Kitiât al-Tamhîd, p. vi., are for the most part lost because they were not of general interest. Positivity was only interested in him as a historian. In the year 332 (943) he began his great history of the world, Kitiât Aḥhâr al-Zâmûn wa-mân al-akhâla ‘alâ l-Mûthamnîn min al-Osma wa-l-Abdhâra wa-l-Adârîr wa-l-‘Amadî, which is said to have filled 30 volumes. Bâchehkarî’s statement (Travels in Persia, 53) that twenty volumes of it are preserved in the Aya Sofâ in Constantinople has unfortunately not been confirmed. Only a single volume, the first of the work, which A. v. Kremer obtained in Aleppo, is preserved in Vienna (see A. v. Kremer, S. B. W. A., 1850, p. 207–211; Flügel, Die arabischen und türk. His. der K. K. Hofbibliothek, ii., p. 1262; another MS. of the same part is in Berlin, see A. d’Herwath, p. 9426). The work begins with the creation and after a brief geographical survey discusses the non-Muslim peoples and goes fully into the legendary history of Egypt. He reproduced extracts from this in the Kitiât al-amâsât of which one volume perhaps survives in Oxford (see Ural, Catalogus cod. MSS. or., l. 666). The substance of these two works he gave in a briefer form in the Mardin ‘al-Dîshâs wa-Maḏâhîl al-Qâdîs, which was finished in the Djumâdâ II, 336 (Nov.–Dec. 947) but revised in 956. In addition to the manuscripts used for the Paris edition, a number of others are in existence, e.g. in the Ambrosiana (R.S.O., iv. 97), in the Bibliothèque Nationale (269) and Mosul (Dâwûd, Maǧhâfîr al-Mawṣûlî, p. 123, 122, p. 123, 122, p. 123, 122). Printed as Maqouîl, Les prairies d’or (the more correct translation would be “Gold-washings”), see Gildemeister, W.Z.K.M., v. 202, Textes et Traductions par C. Barbier de Meynard and Pavot de Courtellie, 9 vols., Paris 1861–1877, Bâle, 1283, Cairo 1315, on the margin of Ibn al-Aṣîr, Bâle, 1305, of Maqouîl’s, Nosîb al-Tâbî, vol. 1–3, Cairo 1302. A synopsis of the Murûtîl ‘al-Dîshâs down to the fall of the Omâiyads was made by Ibrâhîm al-Ashûbî in 1118 (1706) (MS. Vienna, Flügel, p. 302). Another of which it has still to be ascertained whether the two works on which it was based were not also used in addition to the Murûtîl, with a continuation down to the year 638 (1238) was composed by Abu ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. Abî l-Ṣâjîl of Târîn in Morocco under the title al-Qâmûs fi Maǧhâfar Aḥhâr al-Zâmûn (wrongly ascribed by de Sacy, N. E., ii., 1787 to Maqouîl; MS. Gyronas, 64, fol. 31–195; see Asin Palacios, Excavaciones, p. 374; other MSS. in Cairo and
Dammass: C. M. Kurl 'Atil, R. A. A. D., ill. 219, 224). An anonymous synopsis of his magnum opus with special reference to travelers' tales from the Indian Ocean with additions from the Kidath 'Adulth al-Hind of Ramhanmuti, as well as from the legends of Egypt, entitled Kidath Aghbar al-Zamami wa-'Adulth al-Buldan, or Muhammed al-'Adulth wa-l-Gharb is preserved in several MSS. in Paris (see Carra de Vaux, J.A., ser. 9, vol. vii., 133-144). Towards the end of his life, Mas'ud composed a survey of his whole literary activity and supplemented it wherever necessary from new sources in the Kidath al-Tamami wa-l-Jahrib (ed. de Goeje, in B.G.A., viii., Leyden 1894; additions to these in a Leipzig MS., Z.D.M.G., iv., 223-236; see Carra de Vaux, Mawdud, Le livre de l'aventure et de la revolution, French trans., Paris 1892),


(C. Brockelmann)

MAŠYÀD, a town in Northern Syria on the eastern side of the Djidhal al-Nusairiyeh. The pronunciation and orthography of the name varies between the forms Mas'ud, Mas'ad (in official documents and on the inscriptions mentioned below of the years 646 and 870 A.D.), Mas'ud, and Mas'ad (on the interchange of /a/ and /a/ see Kochchre, Z.D.M.G., lxxiv. 465; Praetorius, Z. D. M.G., lxxx. 201; Dussaud, Topographie de la Syrie, p. 142, note 4; 209; 395; note 3). The variants Mas'ud (Yakk, Al-Suhayl, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 556), Mas'ad (Khalil al-Zahir, Zuhd., Rassia., p. 49) and Mas'ud (al-Nahshadi, in v. Krasser, S.B. Ab. Wm., 1856, p. 331) are no doubt due to mistakes in copying (van Berchem, J.A., Ser. 9, ix. [1897], 437, note 2). At a later period, the pronunciation Mas'ad, Mas'ud became usual (al-Damaschki, ed. Mehren, p. 208; al-Khaljashch, 'Adulth al-'Abbas, Cairo, iv. 113; Ibn-al-Shihab, hadrill, p. 265; cf. Mas'ud on v. Oppenheim's map in Petermanns Mitteilungen, ivii. [1911], 71, Tab. 11). The name is perhaps a corruption of a Greek Mapesia (= Marwia) or Matwia, which presumably lay on the Marwian unitt, the boundary river of the Nasizi (ancestors of the Nasiria Plinis, Nat. Hist., v. 81) (E. Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Realenzyklopädie, xiv., Col. 1985 sqq., v. Marwia, No. 3).

A number of ancient pillars and capitals built into the gates of the fortress (some reproduced in G. L. Bell, Syria: The Desert and the Sown, p. 217-220) are its only remains of antiquity. An old Roman road (rastf) from Hamadi to the west passed the town (according to Miss Bell, loc. cit.).

Mas'ud is not mentioned in the early middle ages; the first mention of the fortress is probably in a Frankish account of the advance of the Crusaders in 1099: pentervimus gaudenter hospitali et quadam Arabam caritum (Aemontio gessa Frambavorum et allorum Hierosolymitarum, ed. Hagenmeyer, 1895, p. 418 with note 99; Dussaud, Histoire et religion des Nusairies, Paris 1900, p. 21, note 4). When in 903 (1109-1110), the Franks advanced on Raffia, 'Usamah set out to relieve it by the terms of the peace concluded between them, the Franks bound themselves to abandon all designs on Mas'ud and Hisn al-Akrad and in compensation these two places and Hisn Tafah were to pay them tribute (Siq, d. d.,Uusna, Marwia al-Zamami, in Rec. Hist. Orv. Crozz., iii., 537). Before 542 (1147) the fortress was in possession of a branch of the Mirdasis, who sold it to the Bani Munkadir. After the Nasiriid citadel of Radd and al-Kahf had fallen into the hands of the Ima'mils in 527 (1132-1133), the latter also seized the fortress of Mas'ud in 535 (1140-1141), by outwitting the commander Sani, a man in the service of the Bani Munkadir of Shizar, who was surprised and slain (Abu 'l-Fish', Muhacir al-'Adhhr al-Nasiri, in Rec. Hist. Orient. Crozz., i. 25; Ibn al-Allhr, Kam'il, ibid., i. 458; al-Nuwasir, Cod. Leyden 240, No. 220, in van Berchem, J.A., 1897, p. 464, note 1). Mas'ud now became the residence of the Syrian 'Master' of the sect (as we may call him, with van Berchem, to distinguish him from the Grand Master in Alami), known as Sahilah al-Djidhal after the Master (Muhammad) Abu Muhammad had dethroned him the members of the sect in the bills of Kudmats, about 537 (1102), K. a shid al-Djin Sinân [q. v.] appeared in Syria, as envoy from the Persian Grand Master, took over command of the aassasins [q. v.], and displayed his unusual organisability ability, by raising the sect to be a well equipped and dreadful force, the terror of the Crusaders. Saladin, who wanted to punish them for two attempts on his life, invaded the land of the Ima'mils in Maharra'm 572 (July-Aug. 1176), laid it waste and laid siege to Sinân in Kaft Mas'ud. Through the mediation of Saladin's uncle Shihâb al-Din al-Hâmini, lord of Hamad, Sinân however succeeded in obtaining Saladin's forgiveness; in the beginning of August, he went with his army to Hamad (Abu'l-Fish' and Ibn al-Allhr, in Rec. Hist. Orient. Crozz., i. 47, 626). Shortly before he raised the siege of Mas'ud (about the 1st Safar), he received from Ustâma b. Munkadir, who was in Damascus, a letter containing a posthumous prefix of his great patron (Dereonbourg, Vie d'Oppenhein, Paris 1893, p. 400 sqq.). Râjîd al-Din died in 588 (Sept. 1192). The Syrian Masters, as the official epithet al-Djidhal wa-l-Djin henceforth regularly borne by them shows, were raised by him to a position with power and privileges equal to those of sovereign rulers (van Berchem, op. cit., p. 470). While Sinân had completely emancipated himself from the autocracy of the headquarters of the sect in Alami, in 608 we find the old conditions completely restored (Abu Shâma, al-Dhahir al-Kamâl, in van Berchem, op. cit., p. 475 sqq., note 1). According to an inscription in the inner gate of the castle (Ball, J.A., 1897, p. 482 = van Berchem-v. Oppenhein, Brittexte z. Assyriol., vii/l, p. 17, No. 18.), this building was restored by the Syrian Master Kamâl al-Djn wa-l-Djin al-Hâsr b. Mas'ud under the auspices of the Grand Master of Alami "Ali" al-Ins Muhammad III (618-653). The reference is probably to the al-Kamâl, who according to al-Nasawi (Hist. du Sultan Djidal al-Djin: Mankhârî, ed. Houssas, p. 152) was for a period before 624, governor in Syria for the grand master of the Ima'mills. It is uncertain whether the commandant (muwa'lli)
Madjad al-Din, who received in 624 the ambassadors of Frederick II (Hamaši in Amari, Bibl. arabo-islamica, App. II, p. 30) was one of the Masters (van Berchem, A.A., 1897, p. 501, note 1). About 625/6 and still in 635, Sudjadj al-Din Muşafar b. al-Husain was Syrian Master (Nasawi, op. cit., p. 168, inscription of al-Kačh, ed. van Berchem, A.A., p. 488). A Persian from Alamaat, Tadj al-Din, was in 637 muqaddas of the Syrian Ismailis (Ibn Wāsīl, Geschichte der Ahl al-Baydah, Paris, MS, Ar. 1702, f. 333b in van Berchem, p. 466, note 2). As Tadj al-Din Abu'l-Futūḥ he appears in an inscription in Mayḥā of Dhu'l-Qāda 646 (Feb.-March 1249), according to which he had built the city wall of Mayşāf and its south gate. The commander of the fortress under him was 'Abd Allah b. Abī 'Ishaq b. Abu 'Ishaq (inscriptions A and B in van Berchem, A.A., 1897, p. 456 = van Berchem-v. Oppenheim, Beitr. s. Assyry., op. cit., No. 19). Probably it was Tadj al-Din to whom the Dominican monk Yvo the Breton, a member of an embassy sent by Louis IX to the "Old Man of the Mountain" in May 1250, sent a naive and fruitless appeal for his conversion to Tanniser, Hist. de St. Louis, ed. Wailly, p. 244 sqq.; van Berchem, A.A., 1897, p. 478-480). In the time of the Master Ridja al-Din Abu'l-Ma'shī in 1252 (1260) the Tatars seized and held the fortress for a time, but after the victory of the Egyptian Sultan Kūčuk at 'Ain Džālūt, they abandoned it. About two years later Baibars interfered to interfere in the affairs of the Ismailis and to demand tribute from them. He very soon deposed the Master Nadjam al-Din Ismail and appointed his son-in-law Sārim al-Din Muhārak in his place and took Mayşāf from him. When the latter returned there, Baibars had him seized and brought to Cairo, where he was thrown into prison. Nadjam al-Din was again recognized as Master for a brief period and then his son Shaass al-Din, before the Sultan definitely invested Mayşāf in his Kingdom in Rājdah 668 (1270) Abu 'I-Fidā, in Rev. hist. orient., siv. t. 153; Muṣafadād b. Abī 'I-Fadālī, Gesch. d. Mohammeds, ii. 188, ed.ablochet, in Patrul. Orient., siv. 445; van Berchem, A.A., 1897, p. 465, note 2). Mayşāf presumably at first belonged to the "royal province of fortunate conquests" the capital of which was Hijj al-Akrād, then to Tarābulus (after its capture in 688). It was later separated from this province and added to the nīṣāba of Dināshā to which it still belonged in the time of Khālaq al-Mustanṣērī (Sulţān 'Ibrāhīm, Cairo, iv. 113, 202, 235) about 814 (1412). Khaliṣ al-Zāhiri (Zahba't Kashi al-Mušālib, ed. Ravaisse, p. 49) includes Mayşāf with Hanī (about 850) Under Egyptian rule the position of the lands of the Ismailis with Mayşāf as capital was to some extent exceptional (Gaudrely-Demoutneys, La Syrie à l'Epoque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. 182, No. 3). Abu 'I-Fidā (about 720 = 1320) described Mayşāf as an important town, with beautiful gardens through which streams flowed; it had a strong citadel and lay at the eastern base of the Djabal al-Lukkâm (more accurately Djabal al-Silkin) about a farasch north of Tarraín and a day's journey west of Hanī (not Hums, as Stravone, Palestine, p. 507 erroneously says; Abu 'I-Fidā, Geogr., ed. Reinaud, p. 229 sqq.). As a result of its high situation, it has a more temperate climate than the low ground on the Naḥr al-'Aṣī; the young ʿUṣnām in 516 (1122-1123) brought to Mayşāf the wife and children of the emir of Shīraza, his uncle Yaz din al-Din Abu l-'Aṣāhir Sulṭān, from the heat of Shīraza which was causing the emir anxiety about their health (Derenbourg, Vie d'Ousman, p. 43). The Banū Shīna'a passed through Mayşāf in 736 (1336) and al-Nāṣiri in 1105 (1692-1694). The latter mentions that the governor of the town then was a certain Sulaimān of the tribe of Tafākki. An inscription of Mayşāf of Ramadān 870 (April-May 1466) contains a decree about taxes of the Sulṭān al-Malik al-Zāhiri Khushṣāhād (van Berchem-v. Oppenheim, Beitr. s. Assyry., vii., p. 20, No. 23: No. 22 is perhaps of the same Malik al-Zāhiri). Of a later date are two inscriptions of an emir Mustafā b. ʿIbrahim, one of the year 1203 (1788-1789) relating to the building of a well (zūdī) (op. cit., p. 21, No. 24), the other (No. 25) of 1208 (1793-1794) to the building of the house of the Ismailis etc.

The Ismai'lis lived constantly in open or secret communion with the Nūsiris, although various tribes of the latter had offered their services to the Ismai'lis Masters, for example in early as 724 (1324) to Raqīd al-Din (Guyard, Un grand monument défendu de l'histoire arabe: Les Ascencignes au temps de Saladin, J.A., p. 1877, p. 165; Dussaud, Histoire et Religion des Nusiris, p. 80). A number of Nūsiris of the tribe of Rašān, whom the emir of Mayşāf had allowed to settle in the town under their Shāhīd Ṭaḥmān, in 1806 murdered the emir, his son and about 300 Ismai'lis and seized the town. The other inhabitants, who had sought refuge in flight, applied for protection to Yūsuf Pāshā, the governor of Damascus. He sent a punitive expedition of 4-5,000 men against the Nusiris; the Ismai'lis had to be surrendered by the Han Rašān after three months' stubborn resistance and the fugitive Ismai'lis returned to Mayşāf in 1810 (Dussaud, op. cit., p. 32; Burchhardt, Reisen in Syrien, p. 258). In 1812 Burchhardt estimated the population of Mayşāf at 250 Ismai'lis and 30 Christian families. The population since then seems to have diminished still further. Burchhardt and Lumans found many houses in the town and ruins and large gardens within its walls. According to Burchhardt, the land east of the town is a desert moor, while in the north at the foot of the hills the citadel stands on a high steep rock; on the west side is a valley, in which the inhabitants grow wheat and oats. The town, which lies on the slope of a hill is about half an hour's walk, in circumference. Three older gates have been incorporated in the present more modern walls. The mosque is in ruins. The citadel has an outer wall from which the inner defences are reached by a vaulted passage (G. L. Bell, Syria: The Desert and the Sea, p. 218). The old citadel is for the most part destroyed; only a few buildings have been roughly restored and in parts are still inhabited. BIBLIOGRAPHY: Yavana, Musas, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 556 [the article Safaʾil, al-Din, iii, 399, according to Dussaud, Syria, iv, 329], is based on a misquelling of Mayşāf); Safaʾil al-Din, Mayşāf al-Sufaʾil, ed. Juyhandi, iii, 111; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, ed. Tortonge, xi, 52; Abu 'I-Fidā, Toḥin al-Ruhānī, ed. Reinad, p. 229 sp.; Abu al-Dimashqī, ed. Mehr, p. 208; Ibn Ṣanyūṣī, ed. Defrémery-Sanguineti, i, 166; Khāliṣ al-Zāhiri, Zabtiṣ Kāṣf al-Maṣhīlib, ed. Ravaisse, p. 49; Ibn al-Shīnaʾ, al-Durr al-muntakhab fī Tutālīk Mamlukat Ḥalab, Baitur 1909, p. 265; Umar,
The Darāwīkh cut the head of Yoḥannes and sent it to the Mahdi as a sign of their victory.

The battle of Matamāh however had no greater value for the Mahdi's followers than a successful razzia: they retreated to the Sūdān after pillaging some neighbouring countries and did not occupy any territory of Ethiopia. On the contrary, Matamāh caused the end of the Northern Abyssinian dynasties; and the southern region— the Shāwa kingdom— became the political centre of the Empire, when in the same year, 1889 A.D., King Menfik proclaimed himself Emperor (Negusa Nagnit) as a descendant of the Salomonic dynasty.

The death of the Emperor Yoḥannes as a martyr during the battle against the Muslims, hereditary enemies of the Christian Abyssinians, has been celebrated in many songs and poems. The following is a very interesting example of the Abyssinian poetry in recent times:

"The Emperor Yoḥannes was a fool, and we all despise him!"

They said to him: "Reign in the middle of the country!"

He answered: "I will be the keeper of the frontier!"

The Emperor Yoḥannes was a liar!

He said: "I do not like drink!"

And we have seen him drinking a drink which causes the head to turn around!"

(The last verses allude to the head of the Emperor sent to the Mahdi by the Darāwīkh.


Enrico Cerulli.

Maṭğara, the name of a Berber tribe belonging to the great family of the Askari; they were related to the Zanjāt and the brethren of the Maṭğāta, Kūnum, Lamū, Sāditā, Māḍīfā, and Māḥīta etc., with whom they form the racial group of the Banū Fāṭim. Like the other tribes belonging to this group, the Maṭğara originally came from Tripolitania; the most eastern members of the Maṭğara, however, known to al-Bakri and Ibn Khaldūn were those who lived in the mountainous regions along the Mediterranean from Milīyāna and Tūn to the north of Ummāfa (port of Tāḥhit); those of the western part of this zone were allied with the Kūnūm; their mountain rose not far from Ḍadāmūn and the fortress of Tawnn was on their territory.

Three sections had reached the western Maghrib as early as the eighth century and they formed an important bloc. These were:

1. The Maṭğara of Fās and the connorl of TāṢa; al-Bakri observes that the source of the Wāḍī Fās was on their territory, in the region where Leo Africanus still mentions the Sab al-ḥamīt of the Maṭğara "fifteen miles west of Fās".

2. The Maṭğara of the Middle Atlas in the Jābl al-Maṭghāra which Ibn Khaldūn locates S.E. of Fās and which Leo Africanus says is five miles from TāṢa (to the south). The reference then is to the mountain region now occupied by the Al Wāṭrān; an important section of the latter, the Al Dīlīlīsān, represents the Banū Callīlīsān.
whom al-Bakri gives as a section of the Maghāra, settled near Tenes in Algeria. We still find among the Ait Wārīn several sections of the Imghān who represent the Maghīta, brethren of the old Maghāra.

In al-Bakri’s time (9th—10th century), these two sections of the Maghāra had as neighbours in the west, the Zawīla of Fāzā and of Tāfū. 3. The Maghāra, the bases of the Sahara, settled in the region of Siulīmba and in the town itself, in which they constitute the main element of the population, in the region of Fūtīg, in Tuwat, Tāmāṣūrt and as far away as Wāllān (Ghānem).

At the beginning of the Arab conquest, the Maghāra were represented by Ibn Khaldūn as settled and living in huts built of branches of trees (ṣaḥlīḥīḥ); those of the Sahara lived in fortified villages (fisāḥī) and devoted themselves to growing dates. In the time of Leo Africanus, the Maghāra of the Central Atlas occupied about fifty large villages.

Like other peoples belonging to the group of the Bantu, the Maghāra took an active part in the events at the beginning of the Arab conquest and weakened themselves considerably in the fighting. As soon as they had become conversant to Islam, a number of bodies of Maghāra went over to Spain and settled there. Later, like their brethren, the Matmāta, they adopted the principles of the Sufis — one of their chiefs, Maimur, provoked the famous schismatic risings of 740, which was the beginning of Morocco in the Baragwāta heresy. In a list of the tribes which adopted this heteretical teaching we find the Maṭmāta and Maghāra of the Central Atlas, as well as the Banū Abī Naṣr, the modern Ait Bil-Naṣr, the eastern section of the Ait Wārīn.

With the rise of Idris, the chief of the Maghāra, Bahālīl, declared himself at first a supporter of the caliph of Bagdad, Hārūn al-Rashīd, then rallied to the new dynasty. Later and down to the 11th century, the Maghāra of the Central Atlas do not seem to have played any part in politics; they retained their independence at least. From the 12th century, they seem to have been supplanted on their territory by invaders from the south. As to the Maghāra of the shore, settled in the region of Nalāg, their alliance with the Khānya gained them considerable political importance, when the latter became supporters of the Almoravids. It was at this period that they built the fortress of Tawwnt. They then rallied to the Almoravids but this brought upon them the wrath of the ruler of Tlemcen, the celebrated Vaqīmarūn, who finally crushed them.

Ibn Khaldūn uses the form Maṭḥāḥ instead of Maghāra; in Moroccan texts of late date we also find Madghara.

Bibliography: al-Bakri and al-Idrisī, indices; Ibn Khaldūn, Kitāb al-Ibar, transl. of Slane, i. 237—241; Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, ed. Schefer, ii. 54 and 542; III. (O. S. Colle.) 71 and 225.

MATHAL (pl. atmathāl) is originally by etymology, like the Eth. mthāl, mshāl, Aram. malthā and Hebrew maṭṭhāl (see O. Eissfeldt, Der Maschāl im Alten Testament, Beilage zur Z.A.T. W., xxiv., Giessen 1913), similar to comparison; as popular sayings commonly appear in this form, the term was applied to them in general and thus obtained the general sense of proverb and popular saying. The fondness for similes and allusions, which is common to all primitive cultures, survived among the Semites and especially among the Arabs with great tenacity and therefore plays an important part, even in the higher forms of literature. The simplest form of metaphor is usually drawn parallel between man and beast. Of a sleepy man, one says nātāb bi-lahīr ankhā (or amkhā) “he spent the night like a hedgehog” (Abū Ḥülāl al-Askari, Masāma al-Anthāl, on the margin of Ma’dīn, Cairo 1310, l. 109, 15; Liām al-Arba‘, iv. 437) and with the downright beloved by the Arabs the good example and educative influence of a leader or father is described as bāla hāymān fa ṣāṭibā ṣawmātun or bāla fāṣīsh fa bāla sīwār (al-Ma’dīn, Maṣma al-Anthāl, Cairo 1310, l. 64, 65). The comparison to animals is also used to indicate veiled mockery of unpleasant social conditions as al-bālaḥa‘ fi‘ ardīn yasītārīn “here among us the sparrow plays the falcon” (al-Askari, l. 193, 80). Such proverbs are sometimes developed into regular tales (see Brockelmann, Fabri und Tiermärchen in der älteren arab. Literatur, Islamica, ii. 96—128). Among them they find much that is common to all nations, which it is hardly ever possible to trace back to a single source (cf. the discussion on the “goat and knife”); Z. D. M. G., xlvi. 237, 247; xlvi. 86 sqq.), unless the origin is as well known as that of the two bulls from the Kalīla wa-Dīnawar, which is given by al-Askari, l. 47, 22 sqq. and therefore ‘Ali cannot have applied it to his relationship to Othmān.

But the circumstances of everyday life also provide material for similes which usually take the form at ma‘n mīn, as in those which al-Askari and al-Ma’dīn quote at the end of each chapter of their collections of proverbs arranged in alphabetical order. Even quite banal happenings may pass into proverbs (fa‘ardār or abhāhab matba‘ or quvāfik bāl‘-i-emthāl, as so many Arabic stories end), like the story of Ka’il of whom we know no more than that his son once gave him a copper and never redeemed him (al-Mufaddal b. Salama, al-Fāghir, ed. Stoerzy, p. 24, No. 61), or the story of the poor woman selling butter of whom a rogue took advantage after inducing her to hold two skins of butter firmly together in her hands (al-Fāghir, p. 70, No. 147). But the memory of important historical events is also perpetuated in proverbial sayings, like that of the fratricidal war between the Bakr and Taghlib provoked by flauts (al-Fāghir, p. 76, No. 157); al-Mufaddal in his al-Fāghir, p. 217—231, and al-Ma’dīn, ii. 38—47, therefore give the most notable battles of the Arabs in their lists of proverbs and proverbial allusions. Many incidents of the Muslim period have attained equal renown, like Mu‘aṣṣīya’s explanation of why on hearing that al-Aṣhtar had been poisoned (see above, l. 504; al-Ma’dīn, i. 8, 8) or the memory of the fine voice of the two singers of the bon vivant Caliph Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Malik (al-Ma’dīn, l. 157, 8). It is however not always epoch-making events that are handed down to posterity in this way, like the stormy night in the time of the Caliph al-Muhdi, which provoked him and his retinue to do such pence (al-Ma’dīn, l. 176, 8); or in the story of the defeat and fall of the Khāliṣ, apparently that chief of the Khattāl, whom Asad b. ‘Abd Allāh conquered in the year 119 (737), which, according to Tahārī, ii. 1676, made a great sensation at the court of Hijāj, while Mufaddal in al-Fāghir, p. 80, 16 sqq., refers it to the fighting
against the Khāzān, but the historians record no event of the kind among them; or the story of Maʿāwiya's ambassador to the Emperor of Byzantium (Ibn Kūtabis, 'Iṣāma, p. 235, and the proverb; 'Askari, i. 76, 19 sqq.; Maidānī, ii. 75, 1). Such historical memories are frequently preserved in the form of allusions like the famous qaṣīfet al-Muhāmandi and the ǧaţf Sinimūr. Many problems of this kind are of local origin, like the allusion to the two equally poor asses of the man from Ḫrā (Maidānī, i. 72, 16) or to the Meccan dandy (Maidānī, i. 127, 11); such proverbsial allusions are particularly numerous from Medina (ibid., i. 168, 9; 173, 30; 261, 19; 264, a; 280, ag; 298, a); but we also have them from Basra (ibid., i. 145, 16 and 30; a parallel from Kufa in Dāḥiq, K. al-Hayyāvān, v. 133, 43; Kuفا (ibid., i. 192, 15, as a nest of ʿArabis), ʿAṣr (ibid., i. 97, 9) and Ḥimes (ibid., i. 190, 21). Men celebrated for particular qualities, as in other lands, are frequently commemorated among the Arabs in proverbial sayings, but the popular imagination very often inverts the representative of such virtues; when Ḥākim has to share the reputation for liberality with the Ḥamīd Kaʿb b. Māʿṣūr and Ḥātim b. Sinām (ibid., i. 223 sqq.; Maidānī, i. 193 sqq.), this is due to tribal rivalry. There are therefore various typical representatives of fertility ('Askari, ii 251 sqq.; Maidānī, ii. 231 sqq.), of perspicacity (Maidānī, i. 219 sqq.), and also of stupidity (Dughā: al-Fahlīt, p. 24, N. 58; Maidānī, i. 147; Shawkā: al-Fahlīt, p. 71, N. 148; Gothamis of Arabia, the people of al-Ḥaḍrat Māḏānī, i. 178, 4; Abū Ḥabīb Shāhīr, and others in Maidānī, i. 146 sqq., 150 sqq.; the best known is Dīghz, around whom have been crystallized the stories of a wandering rogue in the Adāb literature (cf. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., j.v. 237, 1), but also we have the Qayyūd governor of the Ḥizār. Vīsaqī, b. ʿOmar al-Thāqafī (Maidānī, i. 29, 31). In Memories of Penelope seem to have found their way to Arabia in completely perversion form ("stupider than the woman who continues undisturbed the weaving", which is found as early as Kaʿūn, xvii. 945; cf. 'Askari, i. 283, 7; Māḏānī, i. 172, 3) and of Sīhāyūn "greedier than he who turned the rock" (Māḏānī, i. 297, 79), among the typical representatives of stupidity and greed respectively.

But among Arabic proverbs there are not a few the meaning and origin of which had already been quite forgotten at the time they were put on record, so that Arab writers invented all kinds of explanation for them from pseudo-history, with a particular fondness for the Amalekites; not infrequently a choice is given of several stories, as for the "naked_warner" (Māḏānī, i. 31, 90), "the gatherer of acacia shoots of the tribe of "Anasā" (ibid., i. 49, 21; 288, 17), "the repentance of Kuṣāt" (al-Fahlīt, p. 74). We also find widely disseminated motives, as in the story of Khūṣān, which the Prophet is said to have told his wives (al-Fahlīt, p. 137, N. 280). In many cases the learned editors have gone so far as to invent stories because they passed over the simplest explanation as too easy. Thus the saying ʿaḏā, ṣī ṭa, muṣṭak ʿandāsah probably only means "Hawk, hawk, the ball (which was shot from the bow before the invention of fire-arms) is behind you"

which Aldī ʿUthūrī refers to a children's game; al-Kalbī and al-Shārīf however interpret Ḥāṣ and Banūdaḥa as names of South Arabian tribes who had fought with one another (al-Fahlīt, p. 38, N. 93). Similarly the same writers invent stories of the time of the Amalekites in which Ḥimār is a proverb name to explain tarākūn ḥūma hut maʿā, which al-Aṣʿāṣī rightly takes literally (al-Fahlīt, p. 12, N. 18).

The number of proverbs is naturally very large in which maxims of life, often very trivial, are laid down; they include some which have to do with their origin to social conditions in Arabia, like "a manthy brother whether he is right or wrong" (al-Fahlīt, p. 119, N. 259). They also include much that is the common property of all nations, the origin of which can rarely be demonstrated, as in the Arabic pendant to the definitely Roman Res vera et trivialis in al-ʿAskari, ii. 32, 16. The subject can only be touched on here. To the references given by the writer in Ostas, Zeitsschrift, viii. 65 sqq. we may add a few Arabic parallels to our proverbs: "Walls have ears" (Māḏānī, i. 57, 21); "Speak of an angel and you hear his wings" (ibid., p. 57); "Hammer and anvil" (ibid., p. 58, 19); "A liar must have a good memory" (ibid., i. 49, 21); "Festa lieslent" (ibid., i. 87, 21); "Out of frying-pan into the fire" (ibid., ii. 25, 9); "To fall between two stools" (ibid., ii. 64, 7); "To be on tender-hooks" (ibid., 74, 46); "Holst with his own petard" (ibid., 168, 21); "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush" (al-Ṭirmīzī ʿAlī-baṣīr b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, K. al-Hamadānī, Rāzī, Bārātī 1890, p. 44, 3).

Among sayings which are international in character those disseminated by religious communities occupy a special position. It is of course not an accident, but is quite in keeping with the importance, which is becoming more and more evident, of Christianity for the intellectual life of ancient Arabia, that New Testament sayings are common among Arabic proverbs, notably from the Sermon on the Mount, like Mt. 7, 2 = Māḏānī, ii. 67, 27; Mt. 7, 15 = Māḏānī, i. 192, 21; Mt. 7, 16 = Māḏānī, ii. 34, 336, 34; Mt. 18, 4; 'Askari, i. 68; Mt. 9, 24 = Māḏānī, ii. 113, 21; Mt. 17, 3 = Māḏānī, ii. 67, 36; Mt. 23, 24 = Māḏānī, ii. 259, 16; Gal. 6, 7 = Māḏānī, ii. 73, 20. On the other hand, except for a few echoes of Proverbs and Ecclesi-ism in which the origin is uncertain, the only one from the Old Testament is Māḏānī, i. 228, 20, which looks like a quotation from Deut. 21, 15. From Christian legend we have also the proverbary tradition of Dūjarjūt (al-Fahlīt, p. 256, N. 517) and the story of the Seven Sleepers which appears in various forms (al-Fahlīt, p. 109, 239; Māḏānī, ii. 156, 4; Kāli, Amāli, i. 61; cf. M. S. O. S., v. 228). On the other hand, Old Testament figures are rare, and we find only Nosh once in a late proverb, probably native to Mīṣal (Māḏānī, ii. 250, 11). The Mandanae Creator-daity Fitāh must have gone into the proverb Māḏānī, ii. 67, 36, from the verse of Ṭurāʾis quoted there, to whom it was welcome, like other foreign matters, to give an appearance of learning (see Aḥward, Der Dīnaus al-Rabʿis, av.). Later tradition also associated with Lākūn (q. v.), the wise hero of Arab antiquity, sayings attributed to Alīṣar and common to many nations.

Although the proverb is from its nature anonymous, learned tradition often tries to find authors. Many proverbial sayings are therefore attributed
to the Prophet and his Companions. The *Amālib al-Našt, which circulated outside the canonical collections of Tradition were collected by Ibn Khālid al-Rāmhmurist (Fīhrīṣ, p. 155) and Ṣaḥīḥ al-Madīnī asserts the latter of being uncritical and quotes in his preface as an example of genuine Ḥadīth the parable of the good and bad companion in Būkārī, Ṣaḥīḥ (ed. Khehl, ii. 17). This does not prevent him however from putting in his collection a series of sayings of the Prophet, as his predecessors had done, and at the end of his book compiling a special chapter of them, which also includes sayings of the first Caliphs. Special popularity was always enjoyed— not only among Shi'is—by sayings attributed to Ṭālim al-Kutabi in his *Cayam al-Askārī, in the fifth book, *K. al-Tālim wa-l-Maṭrā'īn (ed. Khehl, fol. 155), already uses a collection of this kind, such as was current in various recessions (enonyms in al-Tahrīf al-ḥālīyā, Stambl 1302, p. 107—114), c. e.g. in alphabetical order by Abū al-Wāhid b. Muhammad al-Ḥāfīz, about 510 (1116), entitled *Sawar al-Hišam wa-Durr al-Kārim, lith. Bombay 1828 and also edited in Persian and Turkish (s. l. 299, and also W. Yule, Aepopechmes of Aes the son of Aes Tālim (*Maṭrā'īn) of a Persian translation and an English translation, Edinburgh 1813; Sad Allah Mawālī Muḥāfazat Ahmad al-Munīm, Thehrān 1304; Najāt al-Askārī, the second coll. in Fīhrīṣ, with Turk, paraphrase by Mu'allim Nādirī entitled *Amālib *Alī, Stambl 1311, with Turk, comm. by Naṣīr entitled *Kāfīta al-Askārī, Stambl 1257).

Numerous also are the proverbs which have a number of sayings inserted in them to say whether the poets in whose *Divān they are originated or only gave it its form. Al-Sawākt (Fīhrīṣ, p. 78) and *Cayam al-Mā'in (ibid., p. 48, 108) collected such *Cayam al-Mā'in. A fine collection has been made by al-Ḥāfīz in the *Kāfīta al-Askārī, Cairo 1320, i. 27 seqq. Among such metrical sayings are some by the greatest poets of the pagan period like *Ṭārīf al-Askārī, p. 254, 509; al-Mā'dīnī, i. 161, Ibrāhīm al-Askārī, i. 255 = Mā'dīnī, i. 133), Lahlūb (Askārī, i. 37) and by later poets like al-Farāzīf al-Askārī, p. 250, No. 450; al-'Askārī, i. 46 and Muḥt b. Iyās, whose two palms of *Hulwān (Askārī, i. 297, 452; Mā'dīnī, i. 297) are famous. From a misunderstanding of a verse of Farāzīf's which the way to *Uṣūlūn is mentioned (Mā'dīnī, i. 36; quoted by Ṭālim, ill. 736), this verse became typical of taking the wrong way. Al-Mutānabi's verses that have passed into the language have been collected by Isnādī al-Talākānt, d. 385 = 972 (Ṭālim, p. 511—518; Sāvātī, Ṣugag ʿal-Askārī, p. 35), in *Amālib al-Askārī min Shī' al-Mutānabi (Fīhrīṣ, Cairo 3, ill. 23).

Proverbs excited the interest of the learned from the very beginning of Arabic literature; historians and philologists emulated one another in collecting and explaining them. Thus we find among the sources of the works that have survived to us the old historians and genealogists like al-Shāfī b. al-Kaṣim (Wustenfeld, Geschichtskreiter, ii. 23) and *ʿAwāna b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (ibid., i. 27) and Abū 'Uyaynī b. Ṣaḥīḥ (ibid., p. 36; al-Fāhrīṣ, p. 253), the two former very often as authorities for Ḥāfīz b. al-Kalbī, to whom with the great monographists Muhammad b. Ḥāfīz (Wustenfeld, No. 59), Zubair b. Bakkār (ibid., p. 61) and al-Askārī (ibid., p. 47), we owe most of the legendary and historical material. Almost all the philologists of note have devoted special works to the subject. To their interest in language is to be ascribed the fact that the limits of the scope of the subject are extended to include phrases and idioms which have nothing to do with the proverb and, as for example *ʿAmālib *Thālus (al-Fāhrīṣ, p. 7), do not seem to require explanation; but we owe, for example, to al-Mufajjīl the interesting note that it had become a habit with some Syrian Arabs to use the Greek *φφαρ, "say he". The oldest work of the kind that has survived is the *Kāfīta al-Askārī, in which, and in the Escurial (Derenburg, Leiv-Pröpfel, 1757), also the commentary by Abū Ḥamīd al-Bakrī (d. 487 = 1094), ibid., No. 526 and Lālīlī, No. 1719; printed as No. 1 of the *Cayam al-Askārī, Stambl 1302, p. 2—16; on the other hand, the work dealt with by E. Bertheau in his Diss. Göttingen 1836 (s. Freytag, Arabum Proverbium, ill., vii.—xi) is much more recent. The *Kāfīta al-Askārī of al-Mufajjīl b. Salama, a pupil of Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 513), has been edited by C. A. Storey for the "De Goeje Foundation", I 1915. The specially numerous proverbs of the form *afāfa min were collected by Ṣaḥīḥ (d. 520—620 = 960—970) in a work which only survives in a unique MS. in Munich (see Mittwoch, in M. S. O. S., 1900, p. 33 seqq.), which was much used by later writers, and copied word for word in M. S. O. S.'s corresponding section of his book. Abū Ḥamīd al-Askārī (d. 524 = 1028) compiled the *Jamiʿat al-Askārī, extant in several MSS. in Stambl (see R. D. M. G., iv. 513; M. F. B., v. 501; M. S. O. S., iv. 36) and printed at Bombay in 1306—1307 as well as on the margin of Mā'dīnī (Cairo 1310), in which an attempt was made for the first time to annotate each proverb from the philological and historical point of view, excluding all post-classical material, to which Ṣaḥīḥ had allotted considerable space. Al-Mā'dīnī [q.v.] collected the material compiled by his predecessors in his *Madīmī al-Askārī and expanded each section by an appendix on modern proverbs. This has since then been regarded as the standard work on the subject and not even Ṣamākhshārī's *Kāfīta al-Masāyaq b. al-Askārī, although also much read to the MSS. mentioned in C. A. Storey's, may now be added the following in Stambl, M. S. O. S., xiv. 155; R. S. O., iv. 708; M. O., vii. 97, 102, 123; also ʿAḥšā, No. 991; Dānūkī, No. 1557; Sciūt, Z. D. M. G., lvii. 58; Brunis, ibid., p. 50; Ṣasūn, *Dānūkī, al-Maṣqūfī in al-Maṣqūf, p. 329, 33, Cairo; Fīhrīṣ, ill. 355), could according to Ṣamākhshārī, No. 5141, permanently affect its popularity. Al-Mawardi's [q.v.] book, like the different collections of sentiments made by al-Zamakshārī, was from the first intended to deal rather with the literature than with the language of the people.

It was not till the sixteenth century that interest in the east was again aroused in proverbs under the influence of European scholarship. Almost all works on modern Arabic dialects contain collections of proverbs (cf. the lists which could of


(C. Brockelmann)

AL-MATHANI, a term of uncertain meaning which occurs twice in the Kur'an, namely in Surat xv. 87; "and we have brought thee seven of the mathani and the noble Kur'an", and Surat xxxix. 24: "Allah sent down the most beautiful recital, a book which is in harmony with itself, mathani, at the skin of those who fear our Lord creeps".

The interpretation of the word is made more difficult by the fact that in the latter passage it seems to mean the Kur'an itself, in the form on the other hand, something similar to the Kur'an.

In Tabart (Tafirs, xiv. 32 sqq.; cf. xxiii. 124 sq.) we find the following opinions:

a. Mu`adh was given six out of the seven mathani; two were lost when he broke the tablets. The seven mathani are like seven long straws, i.e. ii.-vii. and a seventh, on the identity of which there is a difference of opinion; it is either Surat s. or viii. and is combined.

b. The seven mathani mean the Fathis which contain six verses. These with the barami in the handwriting make seven. It is called the mathani, i.e. repetition, because it is repeated in the sa`at of each `ama`. This explanation is supported by quoting the term mathaniyyah ("in harmony with itself") which immediately precedes the word mathani in Surat xxxix. 24.

c. The mathani mean the Kur'an in general. Haddith hesitates among these interpretations a. (Tirmidhi, Tafirs, Surat ix, trad. i.; cf. Bukhari, Al-Bid'at, bab 166 and b. (Bukhari, Tafirs, Surat i., bab 1; Surat xv., bab 3; Fadil al-Kur'an, bab 91 Tirmidhi, Tafirs, Surat xv., trad. 3. 4; Nasr (Ismaili, bab 26).

Nor is there any unanimity in explaining the form mathani. Badawi on Surat xxxix. 24 gives as the singular mathanman, mathan or mathani. Zainalakhshir gives mathani. The latter form is found in the Kur'an (Surat iv. 3; xxxiv. 45; xxxv. 1) and in Hadith (Bukhari, Sahih, bab 84; Muslim, bab 1, Tashbid, bab 10; Muslim, Manafiin, trad. 145-148; Tirmidhi, Sahih, bab 206) as a distributive, meaning "occurring in pairs". This meaning however would not be at all suitable for mathani.

Geiger (Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judaentum aufgenommen?, p. 57 sq.) has already compared the Hebrew mishna (Arasn: mathanah). According to him then mathani would mean the Kur'an itself as a whole. His suggestion is approved by Noldeke-Schwalley (Geschichte der Geviere, p. 114 sq.). Attention might further be called to the fact that mishna means a single law as well as the whole codex and from this could be derived the double meaning of mathani (separate verses and the whole Kur'an), a derivation which could be supported by the parallel double meaning of the word Kur'an (single: revelation and all revelation as a whole).

Sprenger (Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed, Berlin 1861, i. 463 sq.) explains the word from the Hebrew nishnah "to repeat" and the conception from Surat xxxix. 24, from which it would appear that the mathani are part of the stories of punishment. This view has been adopted by D. H. Müller, Die Prophezeiungen in ihrer grammatisch-sprachlichen Form, i. 43, 46, note 2; H. Grimm, Mohammed, ii. 77; N. Rhodokannikis, in W. Z. K.M. xxv. 66 sq.; J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, p. 26 sq. This would imply that, at least when Surat xv. 87 was revealed, there were seven of these legends of punishment.

Early evidence of the use of the word outside of the Kur'an is found in a poem of Abu l-Awsad al-Di`ali (text and transl. by Noldenke, in Z.D.M.G., xviii. 236 sq.; cf. thereon Bevan, in J. R. A. S. 1921, p. 554 sq.; Horovitz, op. cit.). Here the mathani are mentioned along with the Fath, "the seven verses" along with the "hundred verses" surus of the Kur'an. The exact content of these groups is unknown.

In conclusion it may be mentioned that Goldscheider (Z.D.M.G., i. 866 sqq.) has called attention to a term mathaf, which occurs in non-canonical tradition and is obviously a new formation modelled on the Hebrew mishna.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article: Th. Noldenke, Neue Beitrage zur german Sprachwissenschaft, p. 26; Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, Mathaf al-Ghaffar, iv. 110-112; al-Suyuti, Idrisi, p. 124; Idrisi al-Azhar, xviii. 177 sq.; Lane, Lexicon, s. v. mathanam.

MATHNAWI, a form of poetry in which each bait (verse) is normally a self-contained whole, grammatically complete and with the two mathaf (hemistichs) rhyming with one another and not except accidentally — with the verses that follow. In Persian, Turkish, Urdu and Urdu, poetic compositions of any length dealing with epic, romantic, ethical or didactic themes are of the mathnawi form, which probably originated in Persia. Dowlatshah (ed. E. G. Browne, p. 29) relates a tradition that in the time of the Dailamite `A`, al-Dawla (272-928) there was still to be found inscribed on the palace at Kar-i Shrin a baiat in "Old Persian" having the two hemistichs rhyming. There would appear to be no pre-Islamic Pahlavi verse of the kind extant, and the mathnawi form may be merely a development or expansion of the mathaf of the fahuza or ghazal. However that may be, in the oldest fragments of Muslim Persian literature that have come down to us, there are examples of the mathnawi as of the other forms of verse. Of these fragments the oldest belong to the work of Abu Bakr of Bahil, who is said, probably on that account, to have invented the genre. They appear to be parts of a series of narrative mathnawi (cf. Aamir's Lughat-Fars, ed. P. Horn, p. 29 of the Persian, and also p. 22 sq.). Alongside of them are to be found sufficient portions of the work of Rida (a later contemporary of his), to indicate that he also used the same form.
for a translation of the Kātibeh u-Dīnma (Asadi, ep. cit., p. 192 and Dawlatshāh, p. 31). There is also a complete in the ḥaṭafī meter indicating an erotic mathnawi (Asadi, p. 48; cf. Efsī, Kedaghi, in N. G. W. Levt., 1875, p. 735, 893).

The first complete poem that has survived of the genre is the Shāh-nāma, begun by Dātki and completed by Firdawsi. Actually, apart from the arrangement of the rhyme, it is not of the regular mathnawi type. More characteristic is Firdawsi's Vīrūf u-Zālīkhā, composed in the same metre (the mutaṣfīrī). It begins with a number of introductory sections of which the first is in praise of Allāh and the rest are headed respectively, "In praise of the Prophet", "In description of the king of Islam", "On the cause of the revelation of the Sūra of Joseph", "On the reason for setting down this narrative", etc. Then comes the story proper, commencing with the description of Jacob's working for Rachel and pursuing its way through the adventure of Joseph. Joseph becomes treasurer to the house of the Diṭī Potiphār, whose wife Zālīkhā falls in love with the youth. When he refuses her advances she denounces him for witchcraft and his wife is taken away. Then comes the story of the imprisonment of Joseph, the events that lead to his release and exaltation, the confusion of the wicked brothers, the repentance of Zālīkhā, her rejuvence and marriage to Joseph, and the death of Jacob.

A contemporary of Firdawsi's, 'Ursī, is credited with a mathnawi romance which has not survived: Wāmiq u-Adhrī. What purposes to be a version of the story is given in a Turkish mathnawī by Lāmī (d. 940 = 1533), according to which, Wāmil, a priest in a fire temple, is described as having fallen in love with Adhrī, a maiden devoted to the cult. They are forced to part; Adhrī going to the frozen regions of the North and Wāmil to the torrid lands of Ethiopia. They pine away in separation, and dying are turned into stars. The maiden becomes Vīrūf holding Spice in her hand, while Wāmil becomes Ārthārūt. The story bears marks of being of Pahlavi origin, the Arabic names being only translations.

Of mathnawī which have survived there follow chronologically two works of Nīṣārī, Khaṣraw, namely the Khaṣraw al-Maṣṣāḥ and the Shāh-nāmah, two ethico-didactic poems in the ḥaṭafī metre. After them in time is usually put the romance of Wīs u-Rūmīn, ascribed to Aftāf to Fakhr al-Dīn Gurgān (d. 440 = 1048), who is said to have derived it from the Pahlavi. In the version which has come down to us (ed. W. N. Lees, Calcutta 1865), we have a tale of passion unrestrained, which Pizzi (Persia Persiana, ii. 88) characterizes as a vulgar product of India in Akbar's time. In the tale, Wīs or Wīsa, the wife of Mūḥād, king of Mūḥād, has for her paramour her husband's brother Rūm or Rūmīn, who proves unfaithful to her but in the end marries her after Mūḥād has been killed. If the work is genuine, it marks a step in the differentiation of the romantic from the epic mathnawi, being composed in the ḥaṭafī and not the mutaṣfīrī metre which had hitherto been common to both.

The true creator of the romantic mathnawi is Nīṣārī of竿aist, who, after beginning with the composition in that form entitled the Khaṣraw al-Aʿārāt — a collection of ethical and religious maxims interspersed with anecdotes, — wrote in succession the four other works which form his Khaṣraw u-Fandi Gandji. This quintet provided the model for all subsequent mathnawi writers. Strictly speaking, only the second, third and fourth of them are romances; namely (a), the Khaṣraw u-Sīrīn, the story of the love of the Sūrāni prince Khaṣraw Parwiz for the Christian princess Shīrīn, who is also loved by the mighty builder and engineer Farbānī, and of the latter's betrayal and tragic end; (b), the Lālī u-Maḏghūnūn, the scene of which is laid in the desert and which shows the two lovers prevented from union by the hatred of their families for one another; and (c), the Ḥaft Pāhūrān, which has as its hero and consists of seven tales, each told to the king by one of his seven favourite wives. The Shāh-nāmah, which forms the fifth of the group, treats of the life of Alexander in epic style, but with a mystical touch in the later passages which makes him a prophet as well as a conqueror. Each of the five mathnawīs is prefaced by introductory sections similar to those in Firdawsi's Vīrūf u-Zālīkhā, with the necessary changes for the names of patrons etc. and with a further section headed "On the mufrad of the Prophet" added in the works which follow the Khaṣraw u-Sīrīn. Every imitator of Nīṣārī's mathnawī copies him in this respect as in others, so that even the xvii century Judaeo-Persian Dāndīl-nāmah (by Khaṭība Bakhšī, British Museum, MS. Or. 4743) has this introductory matter, though Moses is substituted for Muhammad in the section devoted to the Prophet.

The chief imitators of Nīṣārī are, in Persian, Dānti; in Turkish, Shāhī with his Khaṣraw u-Sīrīn and Fadālī with his Lālī u-Maḏghūnūn; in Turkish, Mir 'Ali Shīr Nawātī with his Khaṣraw; and in Urdu, Amin with a Vīs u-Zālīkhā, Fadālī with a Lālī u-Maḏghūnūn, etc. (cf. G. de Tasay, Antiquités Hindoustanis, Paris 1885, p. 30 sqq.).

The Mathnawi par excellence, i.e. the Mathnawī-i Shāh-nāmah of Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, is in a class by itself, being a long medley of the doctrines of Sūrān combined with parables, allegories, and pseudo-historical narratives. It is without the preliminary sections characteristic of the romantic mathnawi.

Arabic contains no poems of the mathnawī genre, but poems written in the two muraqīr of each half rhyming together independently of the rest are known. The arrangement of the rhyme is known as mawṣūdīyya. Short specimens translated from Persians are quoted in Thālibī's Vatīnas al-Dāhk (iv. 23), and there are longer compositions, metrical grammars, by Ḥafṣī (Mathān al-Fāsī), and by Muhammad b. Mālik (Khitīb al-Ifiyā) (for both of which see de Sacy, Anthologie Arabe, p. 184 sqq. and 145 sqq. of the Arabic text and p. 325, 356 of the notes).

The metre normally associated with the mathnawi form are those used by the masters in their compositions; viz., in addition to those mentioned above, the waqf and khašf used by Nīṣārī for Maḏghūn al-Aʿārāt and the Ḥaft Pāhūrān respectively;
and the rami, used by "Djalal" al-Din Rumi in his Mathnawi and by Farid al-Din 'Attar in the Manafi al-Tair.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works quoted above, cf. Echel, in the Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie: F. Rückert, Grammatik, Poetik und Rechtswesen der Perser, ed. F. Fasching, Gotha 1857; and E. J. W. Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, and Aga Ahmad 'Alli, Haft Asman (Bibliotheca Indica), Calcutta 1873.

MATHURĀ, name of a city, situated in 27° 31' N. latitude and 77° 41' E. longitude, and of a district of the same name in Northern India. The site of the city was of importance in the Buddhist period, as is proved by the numerous inscriptions and pieces of sculpture that have been found there. In later Hindu times it attained sanctity as the reputed birthplace of the god Krishna and the temples erected there acquired great wealth and reputation. In 1017 Muharram of Ghanza (q.v.) captured the city and levelled all the temples to the ground; there is no further record of the city until the reign of Sikandar Lodî, Sultan of Delhi (1488-1516), who destroyed all the temples that existed in Mathurā in his time. The city was practically refounded in the reign of Akbar, who visited the sacred site and gave permission for the erection of four temples, the ruins of which still exist. In 1665 Aurangzeb destroyed a vast temple that had been built in the reign of Djiñângir and changed the name of Mathurā to Lâlâbâd, but like many other Muhammadan designations of towns in India it failed to displace the original name of the city. With the break-up of the Mogul empire after the death of Aurangzeb, Mathurā suffered from the political confusion in which all the country between Delhi and Agra was involved, and at one time or another passed into the hands of the Moguls, the Marathas and finally the Britis.

In the centre of the modern city stands the mosque erected in 1665 by 'Abd al-Nabi Khân, who was appointed governor of Mathurā by Aurangzeb in 1659. The Muslims number 3,473 out of a total population of 56,666 (in 1921).

**Bibliography:** Elliot-Dowson, History of India, ii. 44; iv. 447; Vincent A. Smith, Akbar, Oxford 1917, Index v. 2; F. S. Growse, Mathurâ, a District Memoir, 3rd ed., Allahabad 1883; D. L. Drake-Brockman, Mufrâ (District Gazetteer of the United Province of Agra and Oudh, vol. viii., Allahabad 1911); al-Ultâb, Turâh-i Yamin, Muḥammad Firdaus, Gulâmar-i 'Irâkî, Bombay 1852; Niẓâm al-Din Ahmad, Tâbâhâr-i Akbarî, 'Abd al-Kâdir Badami, Munawarâb al-Tâwirî, ed. and trans. by Rankin; Mulla 'Abd al-Hamid Dhaâwi, Padshâh Nâma; Mustâfîd Khân, Mabarî-i 'Alâmîrî, all in the Bibi, Indica series of the As. Soc. of Bengal; Nawâbâb Inâbâtîn Khân, Turâh-i 'Irâkî, MSS. and trans. in Eilol; and Dowson's History of India. (T. W. Haid)
2. The ascensio obliqua (fig. 2) of a point $A$ in the ecliptic at any point is the curve $\gamma B$ of the equator the poles of which are $P$ and $P'$, between the beginning of Aries and the horismus meteoroscope (Johann Werneri de Meteoroscopis, publ. by J. Würschmidt, Abhandlungen zur Gesch. d. Mathematik, Heft xxiv/ii., 1913) and the orium quadrants. On the sine quadrants, the system of lines which enable the sine and cosine to be read off, the above formulae can be obtained with the help of the latter (on the quadrants see P. Schmidl, Zuw Geschichte des Quadrantin bei den Arabern, Munich 1929).

Along with the mašāli, the maghārid also were ascertained. If one is observing, not the rising but the setting points, the corresponding curves are called maghārid (a table for the latter is given by al-Birūnī in the Mašālidic Canon).

Addendum. Among the Greeks and Arabs and European astronomers of the xii-th-xvii century sqalpa means: 1. the globe or geometrical sphere; 2. the space between two surfaces of two concentric spheres, a shell of a sphere; 3. the circle which corresponds to the assumed path of a heavenly body, i.e. the ecliptic, the epicycles, the eccentric circles. – The Arabic ši'ra has only the first meaning, the word falak the second and third, the second in the theory of Ibn al-Hāthim (see al-Khwarizmi). The spherea recta, al-falak al-mušatāh is the sphere of the heavens, i.e. for the inhabitants of the equator; in the Latin translation of the tables of al-Khwārizmi (table 59) it is said of the ascension in the spherea recta "horoscopius secundum terram Arin" (Arin is a corruption of Azin-Ujgjin = Ujgjin in Sanskrit, which was erroneously taken to be the ḫubbat al-qayd, dome of the earth, the centre of the earth and of the inhabited world). At all places which do not lie on the equator, there is a spherea obliqua so that these are innumerable.

Bibliography: Ptolemy, Almagest, ed. Heiberg, passim; al-Battānīs Opus astronomicon etc., ed. C. A. Nallino; H. Suter, Die astronomischen Tafeln des Muhammads Ibn Mūsā al-Khwārizmi etc. [cf. also AL-KHWĀRIZMI] and numerous works on astronomy. — I am much indebted to Prof. Nallino for a number of suggestions. (E. Wiesemann).

MA'TMATA, the name of a Berber tribe, belonging to the large family of the Butr, and brethren of the Magiha, Kannia, Lasemia, Shaddūna, Madytuna, Maghila, etc. They formed with them the ethnic group of the Bantat Fātin who, like all the other Butr, seem to have had their original home in Tripolitania.

Our chief source of information about the Maťmata are al-Bakrī and Ibn Khaldūn. As with the majority of the Butr Berbers, three principal divisions can be distinguished:

1. Elements settled in the eastern Magribi not far from their original home: these are the modern Maťmata in Southern Tunisia, some 30 miles S.W. of Gábes.

2. Elements which have settled in the central Magribi: first in the steppes of the Sahara in the N.E. of Mināda; then having been driven out of this territory by the Zanla Beni Tadjā, they sought refuge in the mountainous massif of Wānngarts (the modern Ouaraïnès).

3. Elements which have migrated as far as Morocco. In the fourth (tenth) century we find them in the country of the modern Kabdiha (to the S.E. of Melilla) and in the upper valley of the Moluya at Amakūr. Ibn Khaldūn also mentions a little isolated group settled on the mountain.
which bears their name between Fās and Sufīdy; there must also have been some of them in the conoer of Tān for a place between Fās and Tān still bears their name. Finally we owe to al-Idrīsī the record of the most western body: the Mā'tmatā of Tāmaskān.

The Mā'tmatā played a fairly important part in the early centuries of Islam. Those of the central Mā'āridi had adopted Ābārī doctrine; being conquered by the Ṣanāḥiyya and Zānāta, many of them migrated to Spain. The most famous member of this people was Ṣāliḥ ibn Salamātīn, the famous Berber genealogist, so frequently quoted by Ibn Khaldūn.


**MATN** (n.), a term with different meanings (cf. the lexicon, a.v.), of which that especially that of the text of a tradition, deserves to be mentioned here, to be especially here, to be mentioned here.

Mā'TRAH, a town on the Gulf of Omān, two miles west of Maskat on the east coast of Arabia. The town, which has about 14,000 inhabitants, is the starting-point for caravan traffic into the interior of Arabia, and, next to Maskat, the most important commercial centre in Omān. The town is beautifully situated in fertile surroundings, has a good harbour, easily entered but little sheltered, from which Maskat can be reached in an hour by boat. The inhabitants of Omán used to have wharves for shipbuilding here and the textile industry was not insignificant (spinning and weaving). A fort built by the Portuguese still stands as a memorial of their rule in Omān. According to Wettstein, the town used to have 20,000 inhabitants.


MĀ'TURĪDI, ABDU'LLĀH MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD K. MAḤMŪD AL-HĀNĀFĪ AL-MUṬṭARAṬI. Al-Mā'turīdī is the titular head of the Mā'turīdī School of theology, which, after the ʿĀshīrī School, formed orthodox Sunnite Islam. The two Schools are equally orthodox, but there has always been a tendency to suppress the Mā'turīdī's name and to put the Āshīrī forward as the champion of Islam against all heresies except in Transoxiana (Mā'mūr al-Nahr) where his School has been, and is, the dominant, representing the views of abī al-munma wa'l-dimānā. Next to nothing is known of al-Mā'turīdī's life, but he died at Samarkand in 333 (944), a contemporary of al-ʿĀshīrī who died a little earlier about 320 (931), while al-Tahāwī (q.v.), another contemporary, died in Egypt in 331. All three represented the movement, which must have been very widely spread, to defend orthodox Islam by the same weapons of logical argument with which the Muʿtazilites had attacked it. Mā'turīdī or Mā'turīdī is a locality (ματουρίδιον) in Samarkand. Its geographical reality and the identity of Abū Mansūr al-Mā'turīdī are assured by the article Mā'turīdī in the *Αναλ. of al-Samʿānī* (fol. 498b, 14), also by Barhīdī, *Turkbistan down to the Mongol Invasion*, G.M.S., p. 90, notes 9 and 10, p. 267, note 5, and the Russian references there). The books of Hanafīs give the names of his teachers, but to us they are names only (see Ibn Kuṭlūbhāghī, ed. Flügel, N. 173) and Flügel's *Hananici*, p. 274, 293, 295, 298, 313). The Sāyid Murtah in his little treatise on Mā'turīdī, inserted in his commentary on the *ṣūrah* (i. 5–14), complains that he has found only two biographies of Mā'turīdī, both are short (ςον 'Αδηνίας). Even Yākūt in his *Muṣāfās* has no mention either of him or of Mā'turīdī. Ibn Khaldūn in his sketch of the origin and history of Kaṭān (Makhdūma, transl. de Siane, ii. 55 sqq.; ed. Quatremère, ii. 38 sqq.) has no place for him and speaks only of ʿĀshīrī and the Ṣufis. For Ibn Ḥanīfa (d. 456 = 1064; Fīqī, ed. Cairo 1320, i. 111) the orthodox opponent of al-ʿĀshīrī is Abū Ḥanīfa and he has no mention of al-Mā'turīdī. Similarly Shahrastānī (d. 548 = 1153; Miṣrī, transl. Harhrücker, i., p. 135; text on margin of Ibn Ḥanīfa, i. 188) gives the views of Abū Ḥanīfa but does not mention Mā'turīdī. Abū Ḥanīfa, he says, inclined to the Muʿtazilites and his followers were even called the Muʿtazilites of the Sema, meaning, apparently, a form of Muʿtazilism consistent with orthodoxy. Similarly the Sāyid Murtah (loc. cit., p. 13 foot) says that the Muʿtazilites claimed Abū Ḥanīfa for themselves and rejected his authorship of one book because it was too contrary to their positions. The truth evidently was that Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150 = 767) was the first to adopt the methods of the Muʿtazilites and apply argument to the foundation of the Faith. Also, from the beginning, his standing was so high that it was simply impossible to call him a heretic. This status continued in the Mā'turīdī School.

All this goes back to the time before Kalūm had become a technical term and when al-ʿĀshīrī meant both theology and canon law, with the difference that theology was called "the greater al-ʿĀshīrī" (al-ṣūrah al-āshīrīyī, see article Kalūm above, vol. ii., p. 6728). That was the title of one of Abū Ḥanīfa's books and we have a commentary on it ascribed to Mā'turīdī (Ḥalāfūlī Kārid 1321), the only writing ascribed by him apparently to print. This does not occur in the two exactly similar lists which we have of his books (Sāyid Murtah, p. 5; Ibn Kuṭlūbhāghī, p. 43): 1. Kiḥb al-Tawḥīd; 2. Kiḥb al-Ādārī; 3. Kiḥb Radd Aswād al-Adillī ʿl-ʿKhwā; 4. Kiḥb Bayān Waḥīm al-Maṭsurīlī; 5. Kiḥb Taʾwīl al-Kawārnā. Of these only the last is given by Brockelmann, i., p. 195, 4; the biographers praise it highly. The others suggest only anti-Muʿtazilite polemic (for al-ʿKhwā see Horten, *Philosophische Systeme*, by index). As a matter of fact it is only in one MS. of the com-
from the *Arabian Nights*, composed in everyday language an elegy on her old master and at the end of each strophe she added a new melih to "O my mother!" Whence the name of this kind of poetry.

From the point of view of metre, the *mawâsl* is a popular form from *mawwâl*) or *mawâl*, is a song in the *bash* metre (first *ˈərīf*) of which the last verse of each hemistich is fā'īm, fāʿīn or fīm.

In its primitive form, the *mawâsl* consisted of strophes, each of four hemistichs rhyming with one another. Later it was somewhat altered: the strophe contained five hemistichs in which the first, second, third and fifth, but not the fourth rhymed together or it contained seven hemistichs of which the first, second, third and seventh had the same rhyme and the fourth, fifth and sixth rhymed together.

The red *mawâsl* is used for war-songs while the green *mawâsl* is used for love-songs. In all cases the *mawâsl* must be in the popular dialect and make use of alliteration.


(MOH. BENCHENNE)

MA ḪĀRAʾ AL-NĀHR (Arab.) "that which (lies) beyond the river"; the name for the lands conquered by the Arabs and subjected to Islam north of the *Amū-Daryâ* (*q.v.*). The fourth *Māwarāʾ al-Nūh* on the north side of the east coast were where the power of Islam ceased and depended on political conditions; cf. the statements of the Arab geographers on *Māwarāʾ al-Nāhr* in G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge 1905, p. 433 sqq.; W. Barthold, *Turkestān* (*G. M. S.*. N., s. v., London 1928), p. 64 sqq. The phrase *Māwarāʾ al-Nāhr* passed from Arabic literature into Persian. As late as the ninth (xixth) century, Ḥāfiz ʿAbūt (*q.v.*) devotes a special chapter (the last) to *Māwarāʾ al-Nāhr* in his geographical work. Under the influence of literary tradition, the phrase *Māwarāʾ al-Nāhr* was used down to quite recent times in Central Asia itself (*Gābur, G. M. S.*. I., Index; the *Ozbek Muḥ. Stīḥī, Ṣawrār. Kitabāt, *Oblast, v. 240 et pass.*).
although to the people of Central Asia the lands in question were on their side of and not across the rivers.

(W. BARTHELD)

AL-MÅWÅRÅD, ABU 'L-ḤĀBÅN 'ALÌ KUMLAMÅD B. ḤĀΜÅD B. 'HÅ mêdåH, a S̱̱īḵ̱ī fāqīh, who on the conclusion of his studies taught in Bāṣrā and Baghdad and after holding the office of chief kāfīr at Uṣūwār near Nābulā, settled permanently in Baghdad. Here he often acted for the caliph al-Kādī (381–402–991–1031) in his negotiations with the Byzantians, whom he then ruled al-İrāq; when the Būyids Līmān al-Dawla in 429 (1037–1038) asked the caliph al-Muḳātād to grant him the title of shahādā (mākū al-muḳātād), he expressed his objections in a fāṣēd and thus earned the enmity of the Būyids. He died an 13th Rāhī 1 450 (May 27, 1058) at the age of 88.

His works are said to have been collected and edited only after his death by one of his pupils. The following have survived: 1. Tafsīr al-Karān or Kitāb al-Nuḥāt wa l-Uṣūl; MSS. in Rampur (s. Faww, Ar. Soc. Bengal, N. S., ii, xii), Fez (Fiskrīr Māwīdīh al-Karānīyā, N. 215) and Stam-bul (Khīṭār 'Ālî, N. 90); 2. K. al-Iṣlaḥ l-ḥanāb l-ḥaṣan f. 'l-Furqān'; MSS. in the Brit. Museum. Or. 5828; 3. Ellis and Edward, Dicr. List, p. 22; Cairo (Fiskrīr, ill. 215) and Stam-bul (Sulaimānīyā, N. 436); 3. his most celebrated work, dealing with constitutional law in purely theoretical fashion, disregarding the political conditions of the time (s. A. v. Kremer, Culturgeschichte, i. 396; M. Hartmann, Unpolitische Briefe aus der Türkei, p. 242), entitled K. al-Iṣlaḥl al-Sulāmānī, Constitutions politiques, ed. R. Enger, Bonn 1853; 4. Cairo 1337, 1344, 1377. Translations: Public and administrative regulations are found in different veils; an indication of the politiques; in Nederlandsch-Indie, door S. Keizer, s. Graevenhage 1862; Les constitutions politiques, trad. et commentées d'après les sources orientales par le comte L. Ostrog, Paris 1900–1905; These statutes government are given in detail and administrative, trad. et com. par F. Fagman, Algers 1915; cf. H. v. Amerdor, The Medaillums juridiction, J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 635–674; 4. K. Nâṣrāt b. Maḥāzīb, MS. in Paris, de Slane, N. 3447, 35; 5. K. Tāshīl al-Naqṣāb wa-Taḏīl al-Ẓāfār, on politics and the art of government; MS. in Goyon, a. Festsch., Fext., N. 1874; 6. K. Kâzimīn al-Ṭāwīrī; Ms. in Vienna, Consularakademie, Krajt, p. 473, entitled Kānān al-Wālī, in: Mâdīl, MS. formerly in Landberg's possession, a. Goldhaber, unt. sur. Philologie, ii, note p. 14, with K. al-Iṣlaḥ al-Ṭārī in Stam-bul, Top Kapro 2405, 3 is however, according to Rescher, R.O.S., iv. 710 perhaps only a part of No. 4); 7. K. 'l-Anām al-Nuḥāt; MS. in Berlin, Ahlwardt, N. 2427; Cairo, Fiskrīr, i. 270; p. Cairo 1319, 1330 (cf. Diez, Denkmälerlist von Asien, ii. 382; Schreiner, in Kohlsens Lepid. Studien, p. 502–513; 8. K. Badīb al-Kāhī; MS. in Stam-bul, Sulaimānīyā, N. 381; 9. K. al-Anamīl wa 'l-Iusūl, a collection of 300 traditions, 300 wise sayings and 300 verses in 10 to 30 proverbs in Leyden, a. Catalogue, i, N. 382; 10. K. (al-Mukāyā al-Iṣlaḥī fī) Ṣabū (Ṣabū) al-Dunāy wa 'l-Din, a work still much read; p. Stam-bul 1299, Cairo 1309, 1330, 1347, 1347, 1335, 1339 (on the margin of K. al-Anāmīl wa 'l-Iusūl, Cairo 1316, in India 1315). Uwais Wafā' b. Dāwīd al-Arābi, 'Abd al-Karim Khāmāsh wrote a commentary entitled Mīshāq al-Yākīn, p. Stam-bul 1328. A synopsis was prepared by


Bibliography: Ibn Kārīm b. Ṣulaymān al-Saʿīdī, Cairo 1299, i. 410; Ṣaḥābī, Ṣaḥābī, 407; al-Sabīlī, Taḥārī al-Shāfi'yā, ill. 303–314; Ibn Taghāthudī, ed. Popper, p. 718 (ii. 224); Wustefeld, Schrifttum, N. 395; R. Enger, De vita et scriptoris Mawardei, Bonn 1851; Brockelmann, G. A., i. 386.

(C. BROCKELMANN)

MAWÅRÅD, ABU 'L-FA'TIH, SHIHÅD B. AD-DÅLÅWA-KÅTÅR B. AL-MÅLLÅWA, RULÅTÅ of Ghana, was born about 742 (1011–1022). In Muḥarrām 432 (September 1040) he was appointed to the government of Balkh with Khuwās Abī Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad as wāṣir. A few months later, his father Sultān Maṭyād was deposed and Muhammad, son of Sultān Mahmūd, was raised to the throne. On learning news of this, Mawārud left Balkh, took possession of Ghana, and spent the winter in making preparations for a struggle for the throne with Muḥarrām. At the end of the winter, Muḥarrām marched from India to take Ghana, but Mawārud advanced to meet him. A fierce battle took place on 3rd Shawwāl, 432 (April 6, 1042) near Danūr or Dinawar (modern Fatḥābād on the Pešāwar-Kabul route) in which Mawārud was victorious. Muhammad, all his sons except Abī al-Rahim, Sulämān b. Yūsuf, and Nāṣiguīn of Balkh were taken prisoners and executed. Mawārud returned to Ghana in triumph, but he was not yet the undisputed master of the kingdom. His brother Maṭyåd, governor of Māltān, was advancing on Ghana by way of Lahore, but three days after his arrival at Lahore, he died mysteriously on the morning of 10th Dīn 'l-Hijājī, 432 (August 11, 1041).

In 435 (1043–1044) Suhklāl, alias Nwāsā Shāh, son of Dīqāqīl of the Hindūkhāyī dynasty of Wānā, formed a confederacy with some Hindu Rājās and laid siege to Lahore. Suhklāl was killed in action, and after his death the Rājās quarrelled among themselves, raised the siege and retired to their respective kingdoms. The Muslims followed them in pursuit and laid siege to the fort of Sōnpur where one of the confederates named Dīqāl Haryānī had taken refuge. The fort was captured and given up to plunder but Dīqāl managed to escape. About 5,000 Muslims who had been imprisoned in the fort were released. The victors next attacked another Rājā called Ṭāḥā Bīrī by Ibn al-Athīr, took his fort and returned to Lahore with immense booty. These victories restored for some time the waning prestige of the Ghanāwīs in Upper India.

It was the ambition of Mawārud to restore the greatness of his empire by conquering the provinces which his father had lost to the Sālādkūs. In Muḥarrām 435 (August 1043) he attacked Khurāṣān but was defeated by Alp Arslān b. Dāwūd. In the following month the Ghanāwīs retrieved their reputation by inflicting a defeat on the Sālādkūs near Bust, but in spite of this reverse they became so powerful that Mawārud found it difficult to overcome them single-handed. After protracted negotiations, he secured the assistance of the ruler of Isfahān and the Kāhān of Turkistan, and marched towards Balkh to join forces with the Kāhān of Turkistan, but he had not gone far
when he was taken ill with colic and was forced to return to Ghazna where he died on 20th Rajab, 441 (December 18, 1049), at the age of 29 years.

Mawdūd was a good ruler and was famous for his generosity. Fāʾīl-i Mawdūd (the Arrow of Mawdūd) is called after him. It is stated that in his wars he used golden arrows so that if the victim was killed, the gold in the arrow would pay for his funeral, and if he was only wounded, it would defray the expenses of his treatment. He was a skilful general, and if his premature death put an end to all hopes of crushing the power of the Saljuqs.


(M. Nāṣīm)

**MAWDŪD** B. 'IMĀD AL-DIN ZANGI, KUTUB AL-DIN AL-ARABĪ, LORD OF AL-MAWLĀ. After the death at the end of Djamālī 1154 (Nov. 1149) of his elder brother Saif al-Din Ghazī I [q.v.], Mawdūd was recognised as lord of Al-Mawīl through the influence of the powerful vizier al-Djamāl [q.v.] and of the commander-in-chief of the army Zain al-Din ‘Ali. A number of emissaries negotiated with the third brother, Nūr al-Din Mahmūd, who lived in Halab, and it was agreed that Nūr and Mawdūd began preparations for war. The vizier however, who feared not only Saladin but also the Franks, succeeded in dissuading him, whereupon Nūr al-Din handed over Sindjīr to his brother and was given Hims and al-Jalīs instead. On other questions also Mawdūd followed his vizier’s advice; al-Djamāl however fell into disgrace and in 558 (1163) he was thrown into prison and replaced by Zain al-Din Kīlīk. In the next year Mawdūd joined forces with his brother Nūr al-Din in a war against the Franks, and in Ramaṭūn (Sept. 1164) the latter defeated the Christian forces and stormed Kafrāt Hārim. According to the most usual statement, Mawdūd died on 22nd Dhu’l-Hijja 565 (Sept. 6, 1170) aged about forty. He is described by the Oriental historians as a just and benevolent ruler. He was succeeded in Al-Mawīl by his son Saif al-Din Ghazī II.


(K. V. Zettlerstein)

**MAWKIF** (lah), *nomen laci* from *wābd* “to stand”. Of the technical meanings of the term two may be mentioned here:

1. a. the place where the *waṣaf* [q.v.] is held during the pilgrimage, e.g. *Arafat* [q.v.], and *Mawdūd* [q.v.] or *Damm*. In well known traditions Muhammad declares that all *Arafat* and that all Mawlāna is mawīl (Muslim, Hāfīz, trad. 149).

Abūl Dīwān, *Mawīl*, latb 56b, 63 fac.; cf. Handbuch of Early Mus. Tradition, s. v. *Arafat*. Snouck Hurgrono (Het mekkensche feest, p. 156) *Vergezichte Geschiedeniss*, i. 99) has conjectured that these traditions were intended to declare that the hills of *Arafat* and Mawlāna of their sacred character, which they doubtless possessed in pre-Islamic times.

b. the place where on the day of resurrection several scenes of the last judgment will take place; cf. al-Ḥāṣāṣ, al-Durrā al-Fāḥīha, ed. Gantier, p. 373, 653; m. 813; cf. *Kitāb Aṣwāt al-Riṣāla*, ed. M. Wolff, p. 65 sqq.

(A. J. Wiesinger)

**MAWLĀ** (la), a term with different meanings (cf. Linan al-ʿArāf, xx. 289 sqq.) of which the following may be mentioned:

a. Dārur, trustee, helper. In this sense the word is used in the Kūrān, Surā xlii. 12: “God is the mawā’il of the faithful, the unbelievers have no mawā’il” (cf. Surā iii. 143; xli. 62; viii. 41; ix. 52; xxii. 28; lxv. 2). In the same sense mawā’il is used in the Shīʿite tradition, in which Muḥammad calls *All the mawā’il of those whose mawā’il he is himself. According to the author of the *Lūnā*, mawā’il has the sense of *wābd* in this tradition, which is connected with Ghuṣir al-Khammās [q.v.]; cf. C. van Arondijk, De ophoornst van het Zuidtollitische innamaat, p. 18, 19). It may be observed that it occurs also in the *Mawā’il* of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (i. 84, 118, 119, 153, 389 sq.; iv. 281 sqq. etc.).

b. Lord. In the Kūrān it is in this sense (which is synonymous with that of *najjār*) applied to Allah (Surā li. 286; cf. vi. 62; xii. 17), who is often called *Mawīl* “our Lord” in Arabic literature. Precisely for this reason in Tradition the slave is prohibited from calling his lord mawīl (Bukhārī, *Qīsidah*, latb 165; Muslim, *Aṣwāt*, trad. 15, 16).

It is not in contradiction to this prohibition that Tradition frequently uses mawā’il in the sense of “lord of a slave”, e.g. in the well known *ṣīlah*: “Three categories of people will receive twofold retribution... and the slave who fulfills his duty in regard to Allah as well as to his lords” (Bukhārī, *Qīsidah*, latb 31; Muslim, *Aṣwāt*, trad. 45).

Compositions of mawā’il and suffixes are frequently used as titles in several parts of the Muslim world, e.g. mawā’il (mawā’il), “my Lord”, especially in North Africa and in connection with saints; mawā’il (mawā’il), “Lordship” (especially in India and in connection with scholars or saints).

The term mawā’il is also applied to the former lord (patron) in his relation to his freeman, e.g. in the tradition: “Who clings to a (new) patron without the permission of his (legal) mawā’il, on him rests the curse of Allah” (Bukhārī, *Qīsidah*, latb 17; Muslim, *Qīsidah*, trad. 18, 19).

c. Freed slave, e.g. in the tradition “the mawā’il counts as the people to whom he belongs” (Bukhārī, *Qīsidah*, latb 24, etc.). In this sense mawā’il, or rather the plural *mawā’il*, is frequently used in Arabic literature. The evolution of the idea as well as the position and the aspirations of the *mawā’il* have been expounded by von Kreuner (*Kulturgeschichte der Orientalen unter den Chasīn*, xii. 154) and by Goldhoffer (Mehmedkünstliche Studien, i. 104 sqq.), by the latter especially in connection with the *mawā’il* [q.v.]. On the position of the
manālli in the law of inheritance law cf. the art. MISĀHIL.

Bibliography: in the article; also Duotté in R.H.E. xlii. 30 sqq.; Littmann, in N.G.W., 1916, p. 102. (A. J. WENDELL)

MAWLAWI. [See MAWLAWI.]

MAWLAWIYA (Turkish pronunciation Mewlawiya), Order of Derishes called by Europeans Dancing or Whirling Derishes.

1. Origin of the Order. Its name is derived from mawlānā ("our master"), a title given per excellent to Djalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī (e.g. by the Turkish writers Sa'd al-Dīn and Fečesi, cited below), of which the Persian equivalent was according to the Mānihī al-Arifīn (translated by Huntress in Les Saints des Derishes Turques, Paris 1913–1914) bestowed on Djalāl al-Dīn [q.v.] by his father, with whom this hagiography commences. According to the same authority, (i. 162), his adherents adopted the name Mawlawīs, and indeed copyists of the Maṭnunād of the years 687 and 706 a. H. thus designate themselves (Nicholson's ed., i. 7 and iii. 11); yet Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited Konia after the latter date, asserts that they were styled Djalālīsya, and the word Mawlawī seems to have been used occasionally in the Mānihī in the sense of "scholar" which it ordinarily has in India. This work asserts that one Baḍr al-Dīn Guhārī (a historical personage, since he is mentioned in Ibn Bihī's chronicle of the Seljuqs of Asia Minor) built a college at Konia for the children of Djalāl al-Dīn's father, which was inherited by Djalāl al-Dīn. The Mānihīs (by Shams al-Dīn Ahmad al-Attār, 718–754 a. H.), however, so teems with anachronisms and extravagances that its statements must be used with great caution.

The European name is taken from the ritual of the ḍhikr, in which the derishes revolve, using the right foot as a pivot, to the tune of various instruments. Djalāl al-Dīn is said to have claimed that he had elevated the practice, but denied that it was an innovation (Mānihīs, ii. 79). Certainly "dancing" (raṣf) is mentioned as a Sufi practice in works earlier by some centuries than Djalāl al-Dīn's time, often with severe condemnation. The historian Sahāwi (al-Thīr al-Maṣūb, p. 220) in recording an edict issued in 852 against the practice at Egyptian cities mentions by one of the earliest Sahāwi in which the Sūfis who perform it are compared to asses and are bitterly reproached.

Dancing is indeed a natural accompaniment of music (aḍḥīq, x. 124) or poetry (rebūd al-Arīb, v. 131, 11), but the whirling of the derishes would seem to have for its purpose the production of vertigo rather than the presentation of an idea in rhythm. Of the various reasons which have been assigned for it the most interesting is that recorded in the Mānihīs (i. 190) as the excuse of Djalāl al-Dīn, viz. that it was a concession to the pleasure-loving inhabitants of Asia Minor, who might thereby be drawn to the true faith. The theory that the whirling was a reproduction of the motions of the celestial bodies is found in his Maṭnunād (ed. Nicholson, iv. 734), and the same view is offered in the much earlier Nīsāba of Ibn Ṭafṣīl (Cairo 1822, p. 75), where its hypnotic effect is emphasized. The anits in the Mānihīs are represented as able to maintain the exercise for many days and nights continuously, but the actual ḍhikr lasts only about an hour, with some intermission.

2. Relations with other Orders. Although the earlier mystics, such as Djinnaed, Bīāṭānī and Ḥallādī are mentioned in the Mānihīs with profound reverence, the treatment of founders of orders who came near Djalāl al-Dīn's time is very different. Abūl-Kādir of Ḩallād is ignored, Ibn 'Arabī mentioned with contempt, and Rifa'ī with severe condemnation. Ḥājjī Bektāsh is represented as having sent a messenger to inquire into the proceedings of Djalāl al-Dīn, and to have acknowledged the supremacy of the latter. At a later period the rivalry of the Mawlawi with the Bektāshi Order became acute.

It has been shown by F. W. Hasluck (Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, Oxford 1929, ii. 370 sqq.) that the environment wherein the Mawlawī Order originated was favourable to the Christians, and that throughout its history it has shown itself tolerant and inclined to regard all religions as reconcilable on a philosophic basis. He suggests that the veneration of the Muslims of Konia for the supposed burial-place of Plato (in a mosque which was once the church of St. Amphilochois) may have been intentionally favoured by the Mawlawi derishes, or possibly their founder, as providing a cult which Muslim and Christian might share on equal terms. In three other sanctuaries of Konia, one of them the mausoleum of Djalāl al-Dīn himself, he found evidence of a desire to provide an object of veneration to the adherents of both systems. It is not, however, easy to accept his inference that some sort of religious compromise on a philosophic basis was devised between the Mawlawi Sūfis and the local Christian clergy. It appears from the Mānihīs that the Order was frequently exposed to persecution from the ḍhikrīs in consequence of music and dancing; and they found an analogy in Christian services to the employment of the former. They are credited in recent times with having impeded the massacres of Armenians.

3. Spread of the Order. The Mānihīs attributes its propagation outside Konia to Djalāl al-Dīn's son and second successor, Sulaymān Bābā al-Dīn Walad who "filled Asia Minor with his lieutenants" (ii. 262). It would however appear from Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's narrative (ii. 282) that its following was not in his time extensive outside Konia, and was confined to Asia Minor. The story told after Sa'd al-Dīn by v. Hammer (G. O.R., i. 147) and others, that as early as 759 (1357) Sulaimān son of Orkhān received a cap from a Mawlawi derish at Belârī, has been shown by Hasluck (ii. 613) to be a fiction. The historians make no allusion to any attempt at attaching to the Mawlawi chief when Murād I took Konia in 1386 but when the city was taken by Murād II in 1435, peace was negotiated according to Sa'd al-Dīn (i. 358) by Mawlawi Hamza, but according to Nisāfī (quoted ibid.) by a descendant of Mawlawi Djalāl al-Dīn al-Kūmī, Arīf Celebi, "who united all the graces of worth and pedigree, and possessèd mystic attainments"; the rebellious vassal supposed that a holy man of the family of the Mawlawi would inspire more confidence. The same person performed a similar service in 1443 (Sa'd al-Dīn, i. 371). According to V. Cunet (La Turquie d'Asie, i. 329) Selim I when passing through Konia in 922 (1516) in pursuit of the Persians (†) ordered the destruction
of the Mawlāwīyah, at the instance of the Shāhīkh al-Islām; and though this command was repealed, the moral and religious authority of the head of the Order was gravely compromised. That the saints of Konia were highly revered was in the Ottoman Sphere later in the sixteenth century. The list of sacred objects, visited by Sāyid 'All Kapūs in 1554, which commences with those of the Usūl, brothers and his son (Pococke's History, 1283, p. 371). In 1564, Margul IV assigned the ḥabīn of Konia to the Cēlebi. Yet the first reference to ḍarwsha in Constantinople which Hašluk produces, is from the time of the Sultan Idrīsh (1540–1583). Cainet mentions three Mawlāwīs of the first rank and one ṭekye of the second in Constantinople and the neighbourhood; he gives the names of the saints whose tombs they contain, without dates. He mentions seven other Mawlāwīs of the first rank, at Konia, Manissa, Kaşarşīr, Bahriya, Egypt (Cairo), Galipoli and Brusa; and as the more celebrated of the second rank that of Şamsul Taβrīzī of Konia, and those in Medina, Damascus and Jerusalem. In these Hašluk adds ṭekyes at Canea (Crete), founded about 1880, Kanario, Rumelia, Tartar (in Thessaly) and possibly Tempe (for one in Salónica see W. M. W. 1922, pp. 877). Barnett, and for one in Cyprus that of Lukach cited below). It would seem that the Order was confined to the limits of the Ottoman Empire, and indeed to its European and Asiatic territories.

By a decree of Sept. 4, 1925 all the ṭekyes in Turkey were closed, and the library of the Mawlāwīyah of Konia was transferred to the Museum of the city (Oriente Moderno, 1925, p. 455; 1926, p. 584).

4. Political importance of the Order. Reference may be made to Hašluk's work (ll. 604 sq.) for refutation of the stories unscrupulously reproduced by Cainet and some less authoritative writers. In these the Shāhīkh of the Mawlāwī becomes first the legitimate successor by blood of the Seljūq dynasty, and secondly the real Caliph. Hašluk supposes these tales to be based on the supposed "traditional right" of the Mawlāwī Shāhīkh to gird the new Sultan with a sword. This right cannot be traced earlier than 1648, and appears to have obtained recognition in the nineteenth century. It would seem that reforming Şāfī used the Mawlāwī Order as a make-weight against the Bektāshī, who supported the Janissaries, and then against Qalāma, who supported the treatment of the Muslim community as a privileged community against the dhimmī. In recent times the Şāfī 'Abdu'l-Azīz and Meḥmēn Köşkūl were members of the Order.

5. The Ritual of the Order has been described by numerous travellers, e.g. J. P. Brown, The Derwašīyah, 1888, pp. 198–206; 1927, pp. 250–258; V. Cailet, loc. cit. W. M. W., 1922, pp. 877; and Lukach in the works cited; M. Hartmann, Der Seljūkische Orient, 1910, ill. 12; S. Anderson, M. W., 1923. The act consisted of a cap called šibbe, a long sleeveless skirt called tawšere, a jacket with sleeves called dast-far, a waistband called šēm, and a cloak with sleeves called chérk. thrown over the shoulders (in Lukach's description [Cyprus] "a violet gown worn over a dark green cassock"). The instruments employed according to the last writer (dealing with Konia) are six: reed-flute, sīrūn, rebbe, drum, tambourine, and one other. Cainet enumerates four, of which three agree with the above, the last being hāfl, vaqqa, a sort of small cymbal. Brown enumerates three, flute, violin, and kettle-drum. Those mentioned in the Mawlāwī are denominated by Hūrt, flûte, violon and tambour de bagourd. The service in Konia according to Lukach was held twice a month after the Friday prayer; in Constantinople, where there were several ṭekyes, they were held more frequently, to enable the members of different ṭekyes to join in.

6. Administration of the Order. The head of the Order, resident at Konia, had the title Mutlû Ḵambār, Ḥāfiz-i Pir, Cēlebi Mutlû, and Ḵazī Etendi. A list of persons who have held the office is given by Hartmann (loc. cit., p. 193) after the Ḥabīb-i Âḏẖār-i Mawlāwi, making 20 in all down to 1910; this list appears to be imperfect, and the Cēlebi whom Lukach found in Konia was uncertain whether he was the 39th or the 40th. The head of the establishment at Manissa counted as second in authority. Cainet enumerates seven officials subordinate to the Cēlebi at Konia, but the names of several seem seriously mutilated. Others mention a secretary (mekāli). An account of the discipline which those who would enter the Order had to endure is given by Hūrt (Konia, la Ville des Derwašiètes Timourides, Paris 1897). They had to perform mental service for 1001 days, divided into periods of 30; when this was over, they were clothed in the uniform of the ṭekye, assigned cells, and instructed in the exercises of the Order; and they had to remain thus occupied till they believed themselves able to enter into relation with the Deity by means of whirling, meditation, and music.


(On. S. MAŠALOŠTHO)
the Prophet as a holy day only begin at a late date; according to the generally accepted view, the day was Monday the 12th Rabi‘. The story which Wustenfeld originated, according to which the pious Shâfi‘i Karâhid (d. 343) observed this day by breaking his fast upon it, which he only did on one occasion however, the 7th of Dhu‘ al-Fitr (ahd. G.W.C., xxxvi., No. 126), does not seem to find any confirmation in the sources and is in contradiction to the general custom of fasting on Monday, as this day plays a special part in the life of Muhammad, as the day of his birth, of his Hijra and of his death (Ghazzali, Ḥiyâ‘ [Büyük], i. 363 and pass). On the Jewish origin of fasting on Monday, see Wessinck, Muhammad en de Joden, p. 126). But that on this day a special celebration was arranged, as distinct from private observation, one first learns for Mecca, where one would expect it earliest from the local traditions, from Ibn Dhu‘abir (d. 614; Travels, p. 113), who however is obviously referring to a custom which has already been a considerable time in existence. The essential feature of the celebration is however only a somewhat considerable increase in the number of visitors to the Ma‘awil or Nabî. An anticipation of the Ma‘awil celebration is found in Egypt as early as the middle and later Fatimid period. During the period of office of the vizier al-Mâḍal (487–513), we hear that the *four Ma‘awil* were abolished but a little later revived in all their old glory (Maqurid, al-Karâhid, i. 466; for the description of the festival: l. 432 sqq.). The celebration still took place in broad daylight and participation was practically limited to the official and religious circles of the city. There were not yet any preliminary celebrations; but we already have a solemn procession of all the dignitaries to the palace of the caliph, in whose presence — he sits, revered with a veil on one of the balconies of the palace — the khaṭam of Cairo (cf. above, l. p. 928) in succession deliver a religious address, during which a special ceremonial is observed. As to the matter of the discourses, we only know that they were like those delivered on the nights of the illumination so that they presumably dealt mainly with the occasion of the celebration. It is interesting to note that the Ma‘awil ceremonies here are not confined to that of the Prophet but the ma‘awil of ‘Ali, Fāṭima and even that of the reigning Caliph, the Imâm al-Mahdî, are similarly observed. As in the fundamental idea of these celebrations (Ma‘awil al-Imâm al-Mahdî), Siṭ’s influence can also be traced in separate elements of it. It had not yet come to be a festival of the common people in the time of the Fātimids. This no doubt explains why — except in Maqurid and Ka‘kâshandi — the great historians of Fātimid Cairo — there is hardly any reference to these celebrations in the literature emanating from Sunni circles, not even when writers like ‘Ali Pasha Mubarak are dealing with features peculiar to Cairo and deal very fully with the history of the Ma‘awil festival.

The memory of these Fātimid mawlid seems to have almost completely disappeared before the festivals in which Muslim authors unanimously find the origin of the Ma‘awil, the Ma‘awil which we first find celebrated in Arba‘a in 604 by al-Malik Musa‘far al-Din khôkhîr, a brother-in-law of Saladin. The fullest account is given by a somewhat later contemporary, the great historian Ibn Khalîlîkân (d. 681) on whom later writers continually base their statements (e. g. al-Suyûṭî, Hârîn al-Makâni [Broekelmann, G. A. L., ii. 157] and others). The personality of this ruler, his period so disturbed by the turmoil of the Crusades, and his milieu to which Ibn Khalîlîkân calls special attention, lead us to suggest marked Christian influence in the development of this celebration; his close relations with the Shî‘i movement on the other hand suggest the possibility of influence of quite a different nature. This is clear from the description of the celebrations. Preparations are begun long before and people come in from remote districts. The prince takes special care that the visitors are housed in splendid wooden huts especially built for the occasion for music, dancing and all kinds of amusements (shadows-plays, jugglers etc.). The streets of the town were for weeks as busy as on the occasion of an annual fair. On the eve of the Ma‘awil night a torchlight procession took place from the citadel of the town to the khânqâh, led by the prince after the maghrib salât. Next morning the whole populace assembled in front of the khânqâh, where a wooden tower had been erected for the ruler and a pulpit for the mawâlik. From this tower the prince surveyed not only the crowd assembled to hear the address but also the troops summoned to be reviewed on the adjoining mawādân. We are told nothing of the presence of the prince himself, but the address was to be reviewed on the adjoining mawādân. We are told nothing of the presence of the prince himself, but the address was to be reviewed on the adjoining mawādân. We are told nothing of the substance of the address. On its conclusion the prince summoned the distinguished guests up to the tower to give them robes of honour. The people were then feasted at the prince’s expense on the mawādân, while the nobles were entertained in the khânqâh. The following night entertainment was given to the prince by so many of the Sûfîs in sama‘ (Ibn Khalîlîkân, Büük 1299, ii. 550 sqq.).

In contrast to the Fātimid celebrations, what is specially striking here is the large share taken in the festival by the Sûfîs and the common people, a circumstance which is all the more notable, as it is probably in this association with Sûfism that we have the reasons for the later great popularity of the Ma‘awil. At the same time the torchlight procession, really foreign to Muslim sentiment, and borrowed from contemporary Christian customs at festivals deserves our attention; it is not found at the celebration in Cairo which was purely a day long ceremony, while the lavish entertainment of all present, especially with sweets, and the addresses are found in both cases and the hall is a large, available ceremonial, we seem really to have the foundation of all Ma‘awil celebrations. With the great political and religious movement, which we may call Sûfism very quickly took deep roots, thus preparing the way for an observance like the Ma‘awil, which is essentially kept up by popular religious sentiment.

The observance of the festival spread sooner
or later from here to Mecca where its old form was transformed. Its further progress was along the coast of North Africa to Ceuta, Tlemcen and Fés to Spain but it also went eastwards to India, so that ultimately the whole Muslim world is united on this day in a ceremonially, frequently of unprecedented splendour, but unlike everywhere in its main features. We have innumerable descriptions of the festival from all parts of the Muslim world, most fully for Mecca (Chroniken, ed. Wünschfeld, ii. 438 sq.; Ibn Hādjar al-Haitami, Mawlid (Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 386); for modern times: Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 37 sqq.), where the celebrations have always been famous, for Egypt (Muḥammad Tawfik al-Bakrī, Bait al-Sidīdah, Cairo 1923, p. 404 sqq.; Lane, Manners and Customs, 8581, i. 156 sqq.) and the Indies (Snouck Hurgronje, Achehneen, i. 207; do., Verzekerde Geschiedenis, ii. 8 sqq.; Herklotz, Qaumun u Islam, 1825, p. 233 sq.; Golsheier, Conte des saints, 1886, p. 133; here it is not the birth but the death of the Prophet that is commemorated). The Turkish element in Islam also has not restricted the advance of the celebration of the Mawlid (Turk.: Mawlid). Since Sulṭān Muḥammad III introduced it in 996 into the Ottoman empire, it has enjoyed increasing popularity. Nowadays it is no longer confined to the Moslem world, but is a very popular festival. Accurate descriptions of the festival as celebrated in the older period of the court of Constantinople (Mouradian d’Ohsson, Tableau général, Paris 1787, i. 255 sqq.; G.O.R., viii. 441) clearly reveal its relationship with the festivals of a more popular nature in other lands of Islam.

One element in particular is very prominent, and that is the most characteristic one of the later celebrations, namely the recital of mawlid’s i.e. panegyrical poems of a very legendary character, which start with the birth of Muḥammad and praise his life and virtues in the most extravagant fashion. The origin of these addresses is already to be found in the religious addresses in Fātimid Cairo and in Arbeia and perhaps in part at least go back to the sermon usual at Christmas festivals. The K. al-Tawfik, Rauh, al-Sabū, 373, which Ibn Diyya composed during his stay in the palace at the suggestion of Khālifah was already famous as a mawlid at this period (Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 316). It was not till later times however that mawlid became a predominant element in the celebration, along with torchlight processions, feasting and the fairs in the street, ever increasing in size. In Mecca, for example, at the present day they form the main feature of the celebration in the mosque; among the pupils they are the most popular evening entertainment for days before the celebration and teachers interrupt their lectures in order to deliver mawlid to the students and the people on the streets and in the coffee-houses find edification and entertainment in listening to them. The number of such mawlids is quite considerable. Besides the famous but not very popular Ḥāfiẓ Shāh’s of Kāh b. Zuhair of the older period, the Burda and the Hamayya of al-Shafiri and their numerous imitations, there are a whole series of regular mawlid, some of which are intended to instruct like that of Ibn Hādjar al-Haitami, others purely edifying like a shorter version of it, and notably that of Ibn al-Jawzī (G.A.L., i. 503) and al-Barrandjī (G.A.L., ii. 354). In addition to those in Arabic, there are a great many mawlid in Turkish (Irmg. Engelke, Sültemin Tschekelbī’s Lekt.

gedicht, 1926). It is significant of the part played by these poems, that they have passed from the mawlid celebrations to other festivals, so that the word has actually become a name for “festival” and particularly “feast” (Caftima; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 147, 154 and pass.; Becker, in M.R., ii. 1911, p. 19 sqq.). Quite apart from any festivals, the recitation of mawlid is popular, in Palestine for example in fulfilment of a religious vow (T. Canaan, in Journ. of the Pol. Or. Soc., vii. 1926, p. 55 sqq.; cf. also the introductory annunciation in the mawlid alleged to be by Ibn al-ʿArabi (G.A.L., i. 441)). Like the substance of these mawlid, the form is also very regular. Prose and poetry alternate, interrupted frequently by appeals to utter blessings on the Prophet. Dhikras are usually added at the end.

The Mawlid as the finest expression of reverence for Muḥammad has found almost general recognition in Islam, as fulfilling a religious need of the people and as a result of the strength of the Shiʿī movement. This must not however blind us to the fact that at that time there has also been vigorous opposition to it. This is found as early as the festival of Abūl ṭayy entertainments, i.e. Mawlid. The celebration is a bidʿa, a religious innovation, which is in sharp contrast to the Prophet’s teaching. Even some advocates of the festival confess this and the strictly orthodox, who adhere to the sunna, reject it most emphatically. But, as in so many other things, practice has here proved stronger than dogmatic theory. Once the festival had been thoroughly established in the religious life of the people, it was bound in time to find approval as an element of the ṣaʿīd. Its supporters found it easy to get this bidʿa legitimated, in theory at least, as a bidʿa ḥasanah. When the festival had been accepted by the consensus of the community, the essential thing had been done and legitimate ground for opposition had been removed. While the opposition thus finds itself reduced to combating the outer forms of the festival and its developments, its supporters are never tired of calling attention to the merit that lies in feeding the poor, in the more frequent reading of the Kurān and in the expression of joy over the birth of the Prophet and all that the day brings with it. It is significant of the character of the opposition that the opponents object to those very forms which show the influence of Shiʿism (dancing, ṣamman, ecstatic phenomena etc.) or Christianity (processions with lights etc.). The most interesting document of this kind is a ṣaʿīd by al-Sayyid (d. 911; Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 157; Husayn al-Maḥṣūlī fī Amāl al-Mawlid) which gives a brief survey of the history of the festival, then discusses the pros and cons very fully and concludes that the festival deserves approval as a bidʿa ḥasanah, provided that all abuses are avoided. Ibn Hādjar al-Haitami in his Mawlid and Ḥāfiẓ al-Dīn (Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, iii. 439 sq.) take the same view, while Ibn al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 737) in a more strict Millīkī condemns it most vehemently (K. al-Mudākhba, 1320, l. 153 sqq.).

Although the height of this struggle was apparently reached in the eighth—ninth century, it did not completely die down in later years; indeed it received new life with the coming of the Wahhābīs. The cult of the Prophet is in such contradiction in their fundamental principle, the restoration of the ideal purified primitive Islam, that we can understand that they should completely
disapprove of this, the most popular and most splendid expression of it. In doing this, they are only putting into action the protests of the extreme Ḥanbali Ibn Ṭamīyā (d. 748), the famous precursor of their movement, against innovations which are contrary to the sunna (Ibn Ṭamīyā against the holding of ḥajjām in the Mawlid night: Faṣlūd [Cairo 1326], i. 312). Similar ideas are still found to-day even where Wahhābīsm is rejected, notably in the school which Goldziher calls "Kulturwahhābīsmus", founded by the celebrated Muhammad ʿAbdal (d. 1905), who in connection with the worship of saints condemns the Mawlid also, in the periodical al-Mawlid (Goldziher, Rückentage der islam. Karamauneitung, p. 359 sqq.).

In the reverence shown to other Mālikī saints, the Mawlid also play a great part. Although the success of an appeal to a saint does not depend on particular days, yet certain days and birthdays in particular are regarded as particularly favourable. These celebrations are often connected with places, to which a certain saint is said to have been attached from pre-Islamic times (the Mawlid of Shaṭīḥ ʿAṣārān in Badāwī in Taḥṣīl: Goldziher, Mus. Stadl., ii. 338 sqq.). There are also Mawlid of nameless saints. In the derwīsh orders, next to that of the Prophet, the Mawlid of the founder is held in particular popularity. "Allāh ʿAbdul Mubārik (Abū Ḥafs Ḫudānī, i. 90; iii. 299 sqq.) mentions a large number of such festivities in modern Cairo, the characteristic features of which, he says, are the brilliant illumination of the town, the ceremonial procession (Makhlūfa; at the Mawlid al-Nabī: makhlūf; cf. F. Kahle, in Isl., vi., 1916, p. 155 sqq.) and the great feasts. One cannot now imagine the popular religion of Egypt without these feasts.


(H. FUCHS)

AL-MAWSIL. [See MUSUL.]

MAWSIM (Arab. "from the root m-w-s, 'to stagnate', 'to stagnate'; "market, festival"). In this sense the term is employed in Ḥadīth, especially in connection with the markets of early Arabia, such as those which were held in ʿUkāt, Madīnah, Ḥijr, Ḫudaydā, Taʿlīb, etc. (Bahārī, Ḥudaydī, b. 139; Taʿlīb, sūra 2, b. 34). At these markets the worst elements of Arabia gathered (al-mawsim yağus, ṭīlat al-mawsim). Advantage was also taken of these assemblies to make public proclamations and inquiries, e.g. in order to regulate the affairs of deceased persons (Bahārī, Ḫudaydī, b. 137; Manākib al-ʿAṣārān, b. 27). As the pilgrimage was at the same time one of the chief markets of early Arabia, the term mawsim is often combined with it (mawsīm al-ḥajj, Bahārī, Ḫudaydī, b. 150; Buṣīrī, b. 1; Abū Daʾwūd, Manākib, b. 6). Upon this basis the term mawsīm has developed chiefly in two directions; it has acquired the general meaning of (religious) festival (Daʾyī, Supplement, s.v.) and that of season. In the Lebanon mawsīm denotes the season of the preparation of silk (Bīrūzī, ʿUṣūl, s.v.).

In India and in European terminology referring to the regular returning winds and rain periods. Mawson, moseyon, mawson and other corruptions of the term are found in this literature.


MAWWAL. [See MAWLĪYA.]

MAWZŪNA, a small silver coin struck by the Sarifs of Morocco in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. It was the smallest silver piece and equivalent to 24 copper fulāns or a quarter dirham. Another name for the mawzūna was šāfur. In 1911 (1330) copper coins of the value of 10, 5, 2 mawzūna were issued, the mawzūna being now the equivalent of a centime. On recent issues the name mawzūna has disappeared and its place is taken by šāfur.

Bibliography: J. J. Marchal, Tableau général des monnaies ayant cours en Algérie, Paris 1844, p. 9, 36-40. (J. ALLAN)


C. Broekelmann

MAZAGAN (old Arabic name: al-Burâijida, "the little fortress"; modern Arabic name: al-Djaâlida "the new"), a town on the Atlantic coast of Morocco, 7 miles S.E. of the mouth of the Wadi 'Umm Rabih. Its population in 1926 was 19,159, of whom 14,141 were Muslims and 3,018 Jews.

Some writers think that Mazagan was built on the site of the "Dhâr al-Dhâr of Polcmery, or Forum Kusha of Pliney. The text however does not say that there was a town there, and there was only a roadstead frequented by ships. The situation seems to have remained unchanged throughout the middle ages. As to the name Mazagan, it seems to appear for the first time in al-Bakrî (eleventh century A.D.). This geographer, enumerating the ports of Morocco on the Atlantic coast, mentions a Marifin (de Salome's reading), which should not doubtlessly be amended to Marighan, a form attested by Idrisi (eighth century). The same place-name is found in a manuscript collection of edifying anecdotes relating to the great saint of Assamulâr: Sîdî Abû Shu'âib, who also lived in the twelfth century. Marighan appears here as a fishing village between Assamulâr and the Tibâṣî of Tâg [q.v.]. The vicinity of these two fairly important towns prevented it from developing. The roadstead is marked on a map of Morocco, which is valuable for historians and cartographers of the sixteenth century and the seventeenth (publ. by Ch. de La Roncière, Découverte de l’Afrique au Moyen Âge, 1925) which give the forms Messegan (1339 and 1737), Mashegan (1567), Masazung, intermediate between Marighan and the Mazagho of the Portuguese. The latter, from the end of the sixteenth century, used to come to the harbour of Mazagan for cargoes of the grain of Dâkkâla to supply the capital. In 1502, a squadron commanded by a Portuguese gentleman, Jorge de Mello, caught by a storm in the Straits of Gibraltar was driven to Mazagan and landed there. The Portuguese installed themselves in a deserted tower there to defend themselves against a possible attack by the inhabitants. Jorge de Mello soon returned to Portugal and obtained the king's permission to build a fortress at Mazagan. Although the story of these events is only recorded by writers of the sixteenth century, it must be in keeping with the facts, for letters patent of king Dom Manuel dated May 21, 1505, give Jorge de Mello the captnacy of the castle which he is authorised to build at his own expense at Mazagan. He did not however make use of his privilege for, when on Aug. 27, 1513 the Portuguese army sent to take Assamulâr under the command of the Duke of Braganza landed at Mazagan, there was neither town nor fortress there except the old ruined tower (al-Burâijida). The difficulty of entering the port of Assamulâr led the Portuguese to establish a more accessible base at Mazagan. During the summer of 1513 under the direction of the architects Diego and Francisco da Arruda, a square castle flanked by towers at each of the four corners was built. One of these bastions was formed by the old tower, al-Burâijida, the name of which survived among the natives as that of the Portuguese town. This early castle still exists almost in its entirety. Particularly striking is a magnificent subterranean hall, the vaulting of which is supported by 25 pillars. It was probably, rather than a salle d’armes, a huge granary built to hold the contributions in grain paid by the tribes subjected to the Portuguese protectorate. It was at a later date used as a cistern to hold supplies of drinking-water for the garrison, when the place blockaded by rebellious tribes had no longer any taxes in grain to collect, which happened in 1541. For ten years before, the situation of the Portuguese stations on the coast, in view of the religious and anti-foreign movement stirred up by the coming and successes of the Salûdian Sharifs, had been so bad that the king of Portugal thought of abandoning several of his fortresses. The taking of the town by the Bedouin chief of Agadir (Agadir) by the sharif (March 12, 1501) was a warning. John III decided to evacuate Safi and Assamulâr and to concentrate on Mazagan, a more favourable and more easily defended position, all the Portuguese forces he wanted to leave in the south of Morocco. The operation was carried through in the autumn (before Nov. 6). From the month of April onwards the work of putting the town in a state of defence had been going on. The work was actually pushed on during the last months of the year (1541) under the direction of the great architect João da Castilho, who used plans prepared by an Italian engineer, Benito of Ravenna. This was when the walls of Mazagan were built as they still stand to-day.

In retaining Mazagan the Portuguese wanted to keep a base on the coast to secure protection for the route to India. They also hoped that this fortress would serve them as a base for the conquest of Morocco, when a favourable juncture should arise, which however never happened. In fact for the more than two hundred years in which the Portuguese retained it, the possession of Mazagan only served them as a pretext to obtain from the Pope bulls of Crusades, which supplied the Papal Treasury with appreciable revenues. The tribes kept the town so closely blockaded that the inhabitants could not go outside its walls without military protection. The collection of wood and the cultivation of a few gardens, continually devastated by the natives, gave rise to continual skirmishes. The Muslims of the country round had built two little towns, a few miles from Mazagan, Fâya al-Zamân and Fâya Awâlî Dawaîlyh, where they entrenched themselves to keep up the blockade and where the devout, desirous of acquiring merit from participation in the holy war, used to come to discharge a few shots at Mazagan.

Badly supplied by sea, often a prey to famine and epidemics, the garrison and population however lived in sufficient security under their powerful walls, against which the tribes could do nothing. On several occasions however, they had to resist vigorous attacks. In April 1562 Muhammad, son
of the Sa'dian Sultan, 'Abd Allah el-Ghalib bi'llah, at the head of a vast horde of tribal warriors laid siege to Mazagan. Two assaults were repulsed and the besiegers lost heart. On Aug. 4, 1623, the place, attacked by 3,000 Muslims during the absence of the governor, who was led into an ambuscade, owed its safety to his wife who ordered the gates to be shut, organised the defence, distributed arms to the whole population, women as well as men, and sent them on to the walls. During the disorder which accompanied the decline of the Sa'dian dynasty, the governors of Mazagan seem to have succeeded in raising the blockade and resuming relations to some extent with the tribes. The mīnaštānd Sīdī Muhammad al-Alyāţahi, to put an end to this, attacked the Portuguese in 1639 and inflicted some losses on them. Mawlay Ismā'il, occupied with the siege of Cotta, never seriously tried to take Mazagan. The honour of retaking it belonged to his grandson Sīdī Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Mūsā. The latter came to besiege it in person at the end of Jan., 1769. The place held out successfully for five weeks but, the order to abandon it having arrived from Lisbon, the governor surrendered on honourable terms. The garrison and civilian population returned to Portugal with their arms and possessions. On abandoning Mazagan on March 10, 1699 the Portuguese exploded mines there which did great damage; the sultan entered a ruined town which he repopulated in part but it remained in so miserable a state that it was called al-Muhādīna "the ruined", until, in the reign of Sīdī Muhammad b. Hājjīm, in 1840 (1824-25) it was restored by Sīdī Muhammad b. Tāyīr b. Dukkāl b. Tāmānāa, who gave it the name of al-Dāridā by which it is generally known to Muslims.


MAZANDARĀN, a province to the north of the Caspian Sea bounded on the west by Gilan, on the east by the province of Āstarābād (q.v., formerly Gurgān).

The name, if Gurgān to the Iranians was the "Land of the Wolves" (vānī-nā-khā) the region to its west was populated by "Mazārin dēwān" (Bartholmæus, Altar, Winterholtz, vol. 1169 under mās-nāngā dāmān). Darmesteter, Le Zend-Avesta, ii. 373, note 32, thought that Mazāndarān was a "comparative of direction" (Mazāna-tāva; cf. māsh and māshāt) but Nöldeke's hypothesis is the more probable (Grundriss d. iran. Phil., ii. 175) who thinks that Mazāndarān = "the gate of Mazān" was a particular place, distinct from the part of the country known as Tapurīstān. [A village of Mesdaran (?) is marked on the Siāh's map 12 km. south of Firūzkūh]. In any case the name Māzandarān seems to have connection with ro dardān, which according to Furtkows, viz., ch. iv., was situated between Parthia and Aria (Hārtāt-rād) and was connected with Olshausen (Māzandarān and Māzandarān, Monatsberichte Ab. Berlin, 1877, p. 777-785) with Māzadān, a station 12 farsakhs west of Sāragh; cf. ibn Khudrīdīhī, p. 34; Muqaddāsī, p. 351 [cf. however the late source of 881 (1476) quoted by Dorn, Mālāngān asisat, vii. 42].

The Avestan and Pahlavi quotations given by Darmesteter, loc. cit., show to what degree the people of Māzandarān were regarded by the Persians as a foreign group and little assimilated. According to the Bundahīsh, xv. 28, transl. West, p. 58, the "Māzandarān" were descended from a different pair of ancestors to those of the Iranians and Arabs. The Skāh-nāma reflects similar ideas (cf. the episode of Kāla-kūn' war in Māzandarān and esp. Vallers ed., i., p. 332, v. 290: the war waged against Ahriman; p. 364, v. 792-793). Māzandarān is contrasted with Īrān; p. 574, v. 925: the bestial appearance of the king of Māzandarān). Among historical peoples in Māzandarān we have the Tapryes (Tāpran), who must have occupied the mountains (north of Sīmān), and the Anardars (Aqāzard), who according to Andress and Marquart have given their name to the town of Āmol (although the change of nd to n is rather strange in the north of Persia). These two peoples were defeated by Alexander the Great. The Parthian king Phra-dates I. (in 176 B.C.) transplanted the Mardes (Amdarzes) to the region of Xezaq (Khvār to the east of Warāmīn) and their place was taken by the Tapryes, whose name came to be applied to the whole province.

The Arabs only know the region as Tabaristān (< Tapurīstān, on the Pahlavi coins). The name Māzandarān only reappears in the Saljūq period. Ibn al-Athir, s. 34, in speaking of the distribution of fields by Alī Arān in 456 (1065) says that Māzandarān was given to the emir Inandāl Bajiha. Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 14, and Vākīr, p. 502-3, think that Māzandarān as a name for Tabaristān is of fairly modern origin (in Arabic?) but according to Zakariya Kāzimi, p. 230, "the Persians call Tabaristān Māzandarān", Hamdālāh Mustawfi distinguishes between Māzandarān and Tabaristān. In his time (1340) the 7 tumān of the "willayat of Māzandarān" were: Djiurdji, Mūsrate (?), Āstarābād, Āmol and Rustāndar, Dibhisān, Rūghād and Siyāh-rustak (?); on the other hand the diwān-āt kūnāt wa-Tabaristān included Sīmān, Dārmān, Firūzkūh, a town of Damāvand, Pirrit etc. We find a similar distinction in Khvāndāmir, ed. Dorn, p. 53.

Geography: The actual extent of Māzandarān (Rahim) is 300 miles from east to west and 48 to 70 miles from north to south. Except for the strip along the coast—broader in the east than the west—Māzandarān is a very mountainous country. The main range of the Elburz forms barriers parallel to the south of the Caspian, while the ridges running down to the sea cut the country up into a multitude of valleys opened on the north only. The principal of the latter ridges is the Mazār-ečīl, which separates Tabaristān from Tān-kūm. The latter is bordered on the south by the chain of the Elburz in the strict sense, which
separates it from the valley of the Shahrud (formed by the waters of the Alamut and Talapkan and flowing westward into the Safid-rud).

To the east of Mazarrud, a number of ranges run out of the central massif of the Elburz: 1. to the east the chain of Nür which cuts through the Hafta-pey and 2. to the S.E. the southern hilly which forms the watershed between the Caspian and the central plateau. Between the two, rises in isolation the great volcanic cone of Damavand (9,900 feet).

To the east of Damavand the southern burreis rejoins the continuation of the Nür and the new line of the watershed of eastern Mazendaran is marked by the ranges of Bandi-pey, Sawad-khū, Shāh-mirzād (to the south of Simān), of Harzadār (to the south of Dāmghān), of Shāh-khū (to the south of Shahrud) etc.

The rivers of Mazandarān are of two kinds. A hundred short streams run straight down into the sea from the outer mountains of Mazandarān. Much more important are the rivers which rise in the interior and after draining many valleys form a single great river system which breaks through the Caspian. Such are (from west to east): the Saltarān; the Ćāllūs; the Harzadār, which drains the region of mount Damavand and then runs past Amol; the Bāhāl (the river of Bāftfrū), the Saltār (river of Allāhbad); the Tūjin (river of Sīr) and the Nīl (or Apsnyēs) which flows from east to west, its valley forms a corner between the southern chain (cf. above) and the mountains which surround the Gulf of Astara-Bād on the north.

The historical geography of Mazandaran is still full of difficulties although Vaemser's very full study has considerably reduced their number. The matter is complicated by the fact that certain well-known names are used in different periods for more or less identical districts.

The eastern frontier of Mazandaran (Tabaristan) in the strict sense, with Astarbād (Gurdjīn) seems to have always run near Kuhenābī (in the river Kīrin; cf. Polonyi Xpānī) where there used to be a well (dāmr dāmr) which barred the narrow strip of lowland between the Gulf of Astarbād and the mountains; cf. Ibn Rusta (p. 149) who speaks of the brick wall (dūrwar) and of the Gate of Fanshū. Thāmsī, through which, however, he had to pass (cf. Ibn al-Fākhrī, p. 203). To the west the town of Shāliṣ (Cullās) was situated on the frontier of Dīlām (Ibn Rusta, p. 150, fi. nāšīfī Rāsunā) but later the valley of the Sarī-dārūd (Kārādāsh) seems to have been annexed to Tabaristan. Further west the coast of Tūnīkānān was governed sometimes with Mazandaran and sometimes with Gīlān.

The Arab geographers distinguished between the plain (al-sāhāliyya) and the mountains (al-dāḥaliyya) of Tabaristan (Iṣṭāḵṭar, p. 211, 271). The important towns of Tabaristan were in the lowlands: Amūl, Nāīn, Shāliṣ (Cullās), Kalā (Kalār), Mīrā, Taḍī (Tādī, Barqīrī), Aīn al-Humma, Māmārī (or Barsārāghī), Sārī, Tāmān (cf. Iṣṭāḵṭar, p. 207; cf. Mūkaddasī, p. 353). The principal town (madīna) of Tabaristan in the time of AḥĪʿābī, p. 276, and Sārīya [or Sārīyā, but in the time of Māsūdī, Tāmān, p. 179, Iṣṭāḵṭar, p. 211, and Ibn Hawkal, p. 271, the principal town (kūf) and the most flourishing one in Tabaristan was Amūl (larger than Kārīm).

The mountain area was quite distinct and its connection with the plain is not very clear in the Arabic texts; cf. the confused summary in Iṣṭāḵṭar, p. 204. Tabarār, iii., 1295 under the year 224 (938) distinguishes three mountains in Tabaristan; 1. the mountain of Wânīd Humrus in the centre (wusṭāj) 2. that of his brother Wânāsāndjān (xīw) b. Ailandi dīrī Kārīm and 3. that of Sharwīn b. Sarkhāb b. Thā. Now according to Ibn Rusta, p. 151, (the Kārīmī) Wânīd-Humrus lived near Dunbarān. On the other hand, the same writer, p. 149, says that during the rule of Tabaristan by Dājir b. Yazīd, Wânīd Humrus had bought 1,000 djārī of domain lands (zwāfīf) outside the town of Sārī; see above (dāmr) seem to correspond to the region round the sources of the rivers Tādīn and Nīk which in Persian is called Hasār-djārī. Later, the lands of Wânīd Humrus included the greater part of eastern Mazandaran. Wânāsāndjān seems to have ruled over the greater part of Mazandaran for his capital Mūn was the rallying point from which expeditions set out again against Dīlām. Finally the mountain of Shārwin comprised the S.W. part of Mazandaran, for according to Ibn al-Fākhrī, p. 305, it was close to Kūmīs.

In the time of Iṣṭāḵṭar, the three divisions of the mountains specified are: the mountains of Rûbāndj (of Fāṭālībān and of Kārīn. "They are high mountains (dīlah) and each of them (dīlah) has a chief."

Rûbāndj, according to Ibn Hawkal, lay between Ray and Tabaristan, Bartholdi, Olerus, p. 155 embeds the name of Rûbāndj and identifies it with Ḳūyān. Ibn Rusta, p. 149 says that Ḳūyān, near the lands of Ray, did not form part of Tabaristan but formed a special bīrī with the capital Kūjādja which was the headquarters of the Wali (cf. Kārānūsī in the bīrī of Kūjādja). According to this, Rûbāndj = Kūjādja is to be located in the S.W. part of Mazandaran (south of Ṭbardīn). In the Mongol period, Ḳāḏālākh Kāzwīnī, p. 160, is the first to mention Rustamār (on the Shāh-rūd). As Vaemser, loc. cit., p. 122—123, has shown, Rustamār later included all western Mazandaran between Sakkhasar (Ḡīrān) and Amol.
Rustamdar therefore included Ruyan, without the two terms being completely synonymous.

Djibal Karin had only one town Shahmar, a day's journey from Sariya. The local chiefs of the dynasty of Karien lived in the stronghold of Firrit which must have stood on the western branch of the river Tidjin, which later flows past Sari. The modern Iril in Firrit is in the Hazar-Djarb (more accurately in its western half which is called Duldang). According to Ibn Isandynyr, p. 95, the possession of the Karins included the mountains of Wandal-umun and the mosque of Amol came from this mountain.

Amol, Lahur (on the eastern source of the river Bihul which runs to Bariaghur and Firrit, which is called Kuh-i Karin). According to Vayk, iii. 283, the lands of the Karins included Djibal Shirvin (cf. above) which Pimak al-Saljana, Khojat al-Tarah, p. 42, identifies with Sawad-keth i.e., the sources of the Tallur (river of 'Amlah between Amol and Bariaghur); the pass leading to Sawad-keth is still called Shalnether.

The Djibal-Faraspan (ذوجبإ-فراسپان long wrongly read فراضسپان) lay a day's journey from Sari.

The district had no cathedral mosque; the chief lived in the village of Urum (Ibn Hawqal, p. 268, 19; Urum-khat, Aram). As Vaimer has shown, p. 172-175, this must be sought on the middle course of the rivers of Baraghur and 'Amlah (to the north of Laihr and near Shiryag).

Bibliography. B.G.A., i. v. Dafla, Tabariistan, Amol, Sariya etc. Ibn al-Fakhr, p. 301-314, in particular gives very detailed information about Tabariistan. Mas'udi, Murughi al-Dakhah, index; Idriis, transal. Janbert, ii. 169, 170-180. 333, 337-338 (of little originality); Zabariy Karsanw, Abhur al-Budlana (elme iv): Amol, p. 190; Billah al-Dafla, p. 221; Ruyan, p. 250; Tabariistan; Vayk, c.f. Dorn, Arusig, 1858, p. 2-45; where are collected all the articles relating to Tabariistan [but the text of Wisentfeld's edition is preferable]; Fardallah Karsaw, Nawar al-Balwah, G.M.S., p. 159 and 161; Dorn, Arusig aus 24 Moret, Die Schriftsteller betreffend Khojastan, Der, Mill., ii. 68-72, 322, 222, 52-92; and also the historical bibliography.

Europeans works: Spiegel, Eran. Altersum, 1874, l. 64-74; Dorn, Livre, 1875 (a mass of rather undigested information); Geiger, Ostasiatische Kultur, 1882, index; Rammhofer, Von Pontus bis zum Indus, Leipzig 1890, p. 73-93; Alibor and Mazanderan (the author seeks to explain the Persian geography from Sanskrit texts); Barthold, Lister-geog. Ober Iran, p. 1903, p. 138-141; Pers, transal., Teheran 1930, p. 289-295; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 368-376; Vayk, Die Erzurum etc.

History. The local dynasties of Mazanderan fall into three classes: 1. local families of pre-Islamic origin, 2. the 'Aliid sayids and 3. local families of secondary origin.

I. The local dynasties of the Sasanian dynasty, the king of Tabariistan and of Padaqhwyargar (Marquart, Erz-final, p. 120: "the district opposite the region of Khvar"); Pahalgwargar is a misreading of the name, which is also found in the Bandistich, xii, 17) was Gushan, whose ancestors had reigned since the time of Alexander. In 529-356 Tabariistan was ruled by the Sasanian prince Kayun, son of Kawat, Anshirwan put in his place Zarnmir, who traced his descent from the famous smith Kawa. His dynasty ruled till 645 when Gishan was (a descendant of the Sasanian Damis; son of Pheru) annexed Tabariistan to Gislan. These families, on whose coins might throw some light (cf. below), had descendants ruling in the Muslim period.

The Bawandila (who claimed descent from Kayun) provided three lines: the first 45-507 (665-907) was overthrown on the conquest of Tabariistan by the Ziyarid Karan b. Washington. At the same time, the second reigned from 456 (1073) to 606 (1210) when Mazanderan was conquered by Mahmand Khojistamah; the third ruled from 635 (1237) to 750 (1249) as vassals of the Mongols. The last representative of the Bawandila was slain by Arfisayy Caliaw.

The Karins (in the Kuh-i Karin) claimed descent from Karin, brother of Zarnmir (cf. above). Their last representative Mazur [p. v.] was put to death in 224 (839).

The Pudaspan (Puda Dasion) claimed descent from the Dasjon of Gislan (their eponym was the son of Gis Hanun; cf. above). They came to the front about 40 (660) and during the rule of the 'Aliids were their vassals. Later they were vassals of the Bawandila and Bawandila, who deposed them in 586 (1190). The dynasty, restored in 606, survived till the time of Timur, one of its branches (that of Kayun b. Kayumur) reigned till 975 (1565) and the other (that of Izanba b. Kayumur) till 984 (1574).

II. Alongside of these native dynasties the 'Aliids were able to establish themselves, principally in Tabariistan. In 250 the people of Ruyan, rebelling against the governor, sent to Ray for the Zaidi Sayid Hasan b. Zaid, a descendant of the Caliph 'Ali in the sixth generation. This (Hasanid) branch ruled in Tabariistan till 316 (928). The Husainid branch lasted from 364 to 537 (7). Another dynasty of Muraghay sayids ruled in Mazanderan between 760 (1358) and 860 (1458). The founder of this dynasty was Karam al-Din, a descendant of 'Ali in the twelfth generation. A third family of Muraghay sayids is known in Hazar-Djarb between 760 and 1005 A.H.

III. The noble families who enjoyed considerable influence, mainly in their fiefs, are very numerous. Rahim mentions the Khans of Chizuk (at Amol, Talasha and Rustamdar) between 795 A.H. and 909 A.H.; the Khans of Chizuk of Sari in 750-763; the house of Barzan in Sawadeh between 857 and 975; the Dino in the period of Shah Tahir in certain parts of Mazanderan; the Banu Ka'as between 857 and 957; the Banu Iskandar between 857 and 1066 and the different princes of Timurid, of Muyendurid, of Laidjum, of Muyendur, of Laihr etc.

Besides this confusion of fidal dynasties, a series of conquerors from outside has ruled in Mazanderan: the Arabs (their expeditions began in 22 = 644; the final conquest took place under al-Mansur in 141-144 = 757-761). The Banu Ka'as sent an expedition to Mazanderan in 923 (1521) but it was under Shah 'Abbais that the land was definitely incorporated in Persia in 1005 (1596). This monarch claimed hereditary
rights there from the connection of his family with the Sajiyid Kiwan al-Din Mar'sahi (Alamard, Tefehn, p. 354). Farahabad was founded in 1020 (1612) and in the next year Ashraf was built with its famous palaces.


European works: d'Ohsson, Hist. des Mongols, 1835; i, 2, 10, 44, 48, 106-109 (Cintimar governor in Mazandaran), 120-122, 193, 414-418 (Abaka); iv, 4, 44, 44-45 (Mazandaran sappen of Ghazan), 106, 124, 155, 159, 600 (Abi Sa'id in M.), 613, 623 (revolt of Yasawar), 685 (Hasan b. Coban in M.), 726, 730 (Taghua Timur, s. v.), 739 (the Sardabahs, s. v.); Meiganov, op. cit. (lists of the dynasties and 1200-1700 in Mazandaran); Rehatsek, The Tax and the Civilisation, J. Bombay Branch R.A.S., 1876, xi, p. 410-445 (according to Zahir al-Din, Mirkhod and the Moutakhab-al-Tawarikh); Howorth, History of the Mongols, index (publ. in 1927); Horn in the Grundz. d. uran. Phil., ii, 563 (Alidze); Lane-Poole, The Muhammad Dynasties, cf. the additions by Barhold in the Russ. transl., 1899, p. 290-293; Casanova, Les Isbeeshed de Ferim, in A. Volume . . . presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1822, p. 117-126 (the identification of Firim with Frakkil is wrong); Huart, Les Souverains, Min. de l'Acad. des inscr., xiii., Paris 1922, index; Barhold, La place des provinces oasisiques dans l'histoire du monde musulman (Russ.), Baku 1925, p. 90-100 (Tiusur in Mazandaran); Rabino, Les dynasties alamanides du Mazaristan, J. A., 1927, lcv, 53-77 (lists without references); Zambar, Manual de genial, et. de chronique, St. Honore 1927, ch. is. and tables C and P; Vamvas, Die Eurotoparabistan durch die Araber: Zeit des Chasifs al-Manfur, Islame, 1937, i/2, p. 86-150 (very important analysis of the Muhammadan sources); Rabino, Mazaristan and Astarabad, p. 133-149 (lists of dynasties and governors detailed but without references); Vazmer, Die Morgen d. Isbeeshed und Statthalter von Tabarestan (in preparation). On the Russian expeditions to Mazandaran see Dorn, Corpus; Kostomarov, Sveti Stadni Razina (1668-1669) in Sobranije sochinenii, St. Petersburg 1903, Kniga I, vol. ii, 407-505 (Persian sources call the Cosack chief Stenka Razin *latan Gurani*); Butkow, Sur les événements qui coururent en 1787 à la suite de la fondation d'un établissement russe sur le Golfe d'Astarabad (Russ.), Zorn. Min. Vnies, de rxxiii., 1839, p. 91; Butkow, Materiali dlia novogo dnia Kukush, St. Petersburg 1869, index (in the Persian sources the leader of the Russian expedition of 1787 Count Woinowicz is called *Karaf (= Graf-) Khan*).

Archaeology. Bode, On a recently opened annulus in the neighbourhoo of Astarabad, Archologia, London 1844, xxx. 248-255 (on the circumstances of the find made at Tarang-Tapa. cf. Bode,
Anonymous coins were also struck. The issue of these coins with Safavid types ended in the year 143 Tabaristan era (794, anonymous) but we have a coin of 161 (812) on the obverse of which is the name of the king's head, and that of a governor Safi b. Soltani (136 - 137) — there is a thumbprint with the puzzling Arabic letters ٥٥٥٥ and on the margin al-Faqil b. Sahel Djo'l-Riyāstānīn (in Arabic) is named; on the reverse, instead of the altar with its guardians are three parallel designs like fir branches, between them an inscription in four lines giving the Muhammānid creed in Kūfī and the date and mint of Pahlavi (Tümenhausen, Zap. varst. stud. arch. oběh., ii. 224).

We know dirhams of Tabaristan mint of the Caliphs of the years 102 (Lāvois), 147 (Brit. Mus. with the name of the governor Rāwī), 190 - 192, copper coins of the years 145 and 157 (Zamīnāvar, Namaz, Zivčer, xxvi, the latter with the name of 'Omār b. al-Ālā), at a later date, coins were struck there by the dātīs of the 'Alīs (Amūl, 253, 300 AV and 412), the Bidāy and Šiyārā (Amūl, Sāfī and Sārī), in 315, 316, 326, 37, 357, 404, and sometimes by the Sāfīs, (Amūl AV 341, 350, 353 - 357), still later by the Hūlāğūs, Serbārdā, Timurīs (Amūl, Sārī and Shāhās of Persia (Amūl, Sārī, Tabaristan, Māzandārān). In Amūl anonymous copper coins were struck from the xviith century onwards. On several pieces of this period the mint Tabaristan occurs. As these are all very rare, the issue must have been an occasional one. The dates are not preserved on any specimens. More common are copper pieces of the value of 4 šābek (16 - 22 grammes = 280 - 340 grains) with the lion and sun and mint Māzandārān, which belong to the xviith century. During the Russian occupation of Gilan in 1725 - 1732, to meet the shortage of currency provoked by the financial crisis in Russia at this time, Persian copper coins were overstruck with a Russian die (Cymbal-eagle) and circulated in the occupied provinces in place of Russian mithry. These coins are often called Māzandārān pieces but this is not correct, as only Gilān and not Māzandārān was occupied.

Bibliography: Olahusen, Die Pahlavi-Legenden auf den Münzen der letzten Sassaniden, Copenhagen 1843; Knütt, Wiman Jahrbiicher, xvi, Amtseitblatt, 1844; Mordtmann, Z.O.M.G., viii, x, xxiii, S.B. Busur, Ab. 1871; Dorn, Mazinga, Amtseitblatt, i - iii, vi, viii, Thomas, J.R.A.S., 1849, 1852, 1871. A new work on the Tabaristan Pahlavi coins is in preparation by R. Vasmer. For the later period: The coin catalogues by S. Lane-Poole and R. Stuart Poole; Markov, Inscriptionii Catalogis, Zambors, Namaz, Zivčer, xvi, 135; K. Vasmer, Shemik Entemāuā, ii. 119 - 132 (Russ.).

MAZĀR-I SHARĪF, a town in Afghanistan, south of the Amū-Daryā [q.v.], in the middle ages it was the site of the village of Khair, later called Khodja Khairān, 14 miles east of Balkh. On two different occasions, in the xiiith century after 530 (1135 - 1136) in the time of Sultan Sanjaris [q.v.], and in 885 (1480 - 1481) in the reign of the Timurid Sultan Husain, the tomb of the caliph "Ali was "discovered" here and its genuineness declared to have been proved. A place of pilgrimage (mazār) at once arose around the tomb with a considerable market; the second
tomb which is still standing (the first is said to have been destroyed by Cingis-Khan), was built in 885 (1481-1482). The second does not seem to have been of any particular importance during the time of the Ozbegs and is hardly mentioned although several Ozbeg Sultanis were buried there. In the first half of the sixth century, the place is usually simply called nazd by travellers, the name Mas'udi Sharif seems only to have arisen within the last hundred years. Abd al-Karim Burni (ed. Schefer, p. 4) does not mention Mas'ud at all among the towns of Afghanistan: in 1832 when A. Burnes passed through it, it was a little town with about eight hundred houses. In 1860, the Afghan governor Bab'Allah Khan, a Dathi, chose Mas'udi Sharif as his residence; since then Mas'udi Sharif has been the capital of Afghan Turkestan. In 1878 it was described by the Russian general Matveev as one of the best towns in Northern Afghanistan with about 30,000 inhabitants (Kostenko, Turkestan. Kraj, ii. 157).


al-MAZĀT, a name borne by over twenty Abhid writers or men celebrated for their poetry, among whom may be mentioned Abu 'I-Ka'im Sulaíman b. Yāhshaf al-Mazāt, a pupil of Abi 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Bakr. Celebrated for his learning and his virtues, he spent all his life in study and teaching and died in 474 (June 11, 1081-May 31, 1082) in a little town of the Banî Wudlu (wudūl), a clan of the tribe of Mazāt, which in those days occupied the lands between Gabès and the south of Tripoli. He wrote a book on the principles of law (madhî) entitled al-Mutâhef.


MAZAK, the apostle of a religion, which was founded two centuries before him by Zardasht, son of Khurr-rakhan, but spread in Persia only after his propaganda; it had great political influence in the country in the time of Kawadh (488-531 A. D. with an interregnum). The latter adopted it and even made arrangements for putting its teaching into practice but after his restoration he put Mazak and a large number of his followers to death. The best known feature of his teaching was the endeavour to remove every cause of covetousness and discord among men, and thus to purify religion, by making women and possessions common property.

It is not possible to reconstruct from the sources the Mazaki doctrine in detail nor to settle its relations with the other religions or sects of Persia. The main features will be indicated here.

The sources. Detailed narratives of the reign of Kawadh and some important references to Mazak and his teaching will be found in the contemporary Syrian and Byzantine writers (Joshua Stylites, Agathias, Procopius, Malalas, Theophanes). In Pahlavi literature there are few references to Mazak. The bulk of our information about Mazak and his relations with Kawadh come to us from Arab and Persian writers and go back mainly to the Khosrownameh of the Royal Sasaniian Chronicle, of which the best known Arabic version was that of Ibn al-Mu'azzam. Baron Rosen has shown that the other Arabic versions were not all dependent on this one, some of them having been prepared directly from the original. Some compilers also inserted historical or legendary episodes taken from other Pahlavi works and others attempted to harmonise different narratives and did a certain amount of retouching in their reconstruction of the original. The Persian and Arab writers who had these different versions or compilations at their disposal only very rarely mention their sources and endeavours in turn to reconcile the statements made. Noldeke has already distinguished two "Haupptquellen" for the various Arabic and Persian narratives (the first followed by Ibn Kutüba and Eutychius and a part of Šabari, the second by al-Ya'qubi and another part of Šabari). Christensen in his fundamental study thinks he can distinguish four lines of the tradition of the texts, and made by the Arab and Persian authors in the different versions or editions of it. Noldeke's two "Haupptquellen" correspond to the first two; a third is represented by al-Dinwari (Noldeke thinks his story is a harmonising of the two "Haupptquellen") and the Nikâyat al-tâlîb 'I al-Khâ outlined by Šâbaris wa l-i-Arab (J. R. A. S., 1900, p. 195 sqq.) the fourth presents features of its own, some of which are legendary in character and are found again in the Siyyâṣat-Nâma of Nâqâ al-Mulk, which is independent of the Khosrownameh. The common source of all these legendary features would be, according to Christensen, the Book of Mazak, a Pahlavi work of fiction (like the Khâlh wa Dinwa) which enjoyed great popularity and was translated into Arabic by Ibn al-Mu’azzam and into Arabic verse by A. A. al-Hämîd al-Hâlîbî. The elements of this fourth line of tradition are, according to Christensen, found in the Khâlh al-Hâlmî, al-Thallîkit, Firânâsi, al-Burql, Ibn al-Ashur and Abu ‘I-Fâdî. Some references in al-Musâ’id and al-Khârîzmi can also be traced to the book of Mazak.

Independent traditions would also be preserved elsewhere, for example by the Arabs of al-Hira. Al-Shahrastâni notes (to which some critics deny any historical value) might go back to books of the sect now lost. These are not found elsewhere and their immediate source was Muhammad b. Hârin Ahsu ‘Ib al-Warrâq, a Zoroastrian converted to Islam. The source of the notices in the Fihris is not known (it calls the Mazakists Zoroastrians), the Persian work of the xviiith century called Dakhshûn-ı Mazakhi, is probably a mere compilation of no value, from sources already mentioned and the pretended Mazakii book Dastvâd, which it quotes, is not genuine.

Doctrine. The fact that the majority of these sources emphasise the social aspect of the Mazaki reforms and do not mention special doctrines or beliefs of the sect (some like the Fihris and Ibn al-Athir connect it with Mazdaism) has convinced the majority of Orientalists who have studied this subject (e.g. Noldeke, Nicholson, F. Wessendorf) that the reforms must be considered as a social movement which aimed at purifying the Mazdaean religion: a communist system of which the precepts regarding women and property and those of an ascetic nature (like the prohibition of slaughtering
animals and eating their flesh) had however a religious aim, and were clearly distinguished by this character from modern socialism.

Christensen, in his work already quoted, comes to the contrary conclusion that Mazdakism was above all a religious movement and that its social precepts were originally a very secondary feature; it was, he says, a reform of Manicheism, already preached by Zarathushtra, two centuries before Mazdak. Christensen supports his argument by two well-known passages in Malaha, of which the first deals with the doctrines propounded at Rome under Diocletian by the Manichean Bundus in opposition to official Manicheism.

The second passage speaks of Bundus as having afterwards gone to Persia and there spread his doctrine there, which was called ma'as or maas (from the Pahlavi form ma'as, meaning followers of the orthodox faith). The other passage calls king Kawardh or Kawardh (an inaccurate form for kawardh), an epithet which contains an allusion to the Mazdak faith. A popular form of Bundus or Bundus is said to be the origin of the very corrupt forms of this surname, which are found in the Arabic texts and are due to the similarity of certain Arabic letters (al-Thabiti translates it as ma'as or Bundus, which presupposes a form ma'da'.) Christensen thinks these links sufficient to identify Zarathushtra with Bundus (Bundus would be an honorific title of the reformer, "the venerable", from the Pahlavi buzidh, hundag and defines Mazdakism as a Manichean apocrypha.

This theory is supported by al-Shahrastani's resumé, which gives us, along with the general character of the religious history of Iran, the best argument for this thesis, and those who hold the other view are forced to deny any force to the evidence of this historian of sects. Christensen also concludes that it is with good reason that the Byzantine historians call the Mazdakis Manichaeans; but it must be added that their classification of a doctrine so little known in the west (where on the other hand Manicheism was well known and was, so to speak, the typical heresy of Persia) is not of much value.

According to al-Shahrastani's expose, Mazdak's system resembled that of Mani; except that he said that the dark spirits did not act of their own will and without restraint (hi t-khaf an t-aghlaye), but blindly and by chance (hi t-khaf an t-aghlaye); that mixture is produced also (hi t-aghlaye an t-aghlaye); and liberation will be produced (hi t-aghlaye an t-aghlaye). In this connection we must remember that the same author in his survey of the Manichaeans tells us that the views of the Manichaeans on the cause of mixture were divided and that some of them said that it was produced (hi t-aghlaye an t-aghlaye); the opposite of what was laid down in the original cosmogony. Other Muslim writers allude to this point in dispute among the dualist sects: al-Mujahhar b. Tahir al-Makdisi says, for example, that mixture (hi t-aghlaye an t-aghlaye) is taught by the Sabians, a name which is sometimes applied to the Manichaeans. All this gives the impression that the mention that the Mazdaki teaching in this connection is quite in keeping with the conditions of polemics and debate. Perhaps the practical teachings of Mazdakism should be connected with the doctrine of mixture (hi t-aghlaye an t-aghlaye).

Al-Shahrastani also gives from another source other details on Mazdaki cosmogony (the four forces, which surround the object of worship as court dignitaries surround the king of Persia; the seven vizards, the twelve spiritual beings, the three elements, the director of good and of evil), details which have their parallels in other gnostic and dualist cosmogonies, which should be studied with their names from the point of view of the latest studies on Iranian syncretism.

Al-Shahrastani finally alludes to certain cabalistic speculations on the letters of the supreme name and mentions Mazdaki sects (like the Abü Muslim) still in existence in his time in Persia and far away as Sogdiana.

We may conclude that it is at least premature to deny all connection between Manicheism and Mazdakism; it seems that rather than put the question in the form of a rigid alternative between Manichean or Manichean influence, it would be better to regard Mazdakism as a form of gnosia upon which two powerful religious forces have exerted an equal influence, the official religion and the Manichean heresy, and some other elements also (just as Manichean gnosticism owes much to the national religion).

In any case, the feature which appears most clearly from the sources and which struck contemporaries was the general body of Mazdaki precepts with communist and humanitarian tendency and especially those which relate to community of women and property and were actually put into practice for a short time. The arcane prescriptions are quite in keeping with a gnostic character of the sect (the prohibition of slaughtering animals and eating their flesh) which with communist teachings would be the elements forming the path to gnosia and liberation.

The presence of an arcane strain in Mazdakism, as in Manicheism, is probable. The people naturally seized on these principles and eagerly attempted to put them into practice on a large scale. Thus excesses resulted which, at least in origin, were very far from the intentions of the reformers and the elite of his adherents. This explains why the religious character of the sect was forgotten and memory of its social teachings retained. Whether the founder and his leaders also abandoned themselves to the excesses of which the sources accuse them, one cannot say; we know that very frequently the initial good faith of reformers is disturbed by contact with reality.

It was natural to give a more practical value to this body of teaching, if we regard Mazdakism as a Puritan reform remaining within the Mazdean religion and not becoming an independent religion.

Contemporary sources also tell us of a bishop elected by the Mazdaks, named, according to Malaha, Indaraz (which Nölske connects with the Pahlavi word amāzagī = to advise; cf. the latin episcopus of the Manichean) who was slain with the other Mazdaks on the day of the massacre; according to Christensen, it is possible to identify him with Mazdak.

During the persecution which followed the massacre, all the Mazdaki books were destroyed. The Persian work of the seventh century, Dastīr-i Maqālak quotes a book called Dinakshi which is usually regarded as a forgery; all the notices of the sect professing to come from this book are
taken from the text of al-Shahrastāni and other sources, like the rest of the book. The Book of Mazdak, which enjoyed a great popularity and was translated into Arabic by Ibn al-Maḍţa and into Arabic verse by Abūn, b. 'Abd al-Ḥamid al-Lājījī was a work of entertainment and not of religious teaching (cf. above).

History of the Mazdak Movement in the Reign of Kawād. — The Massacre. We know very little about the life of Mazdak (also written Mazdāk). His father was called Bāmdāh (a Persian name like Mazdak) and according to Ṭabariz, they came from a town which Christensen is inclined to identify with Mādrāhāy, Isfahān, and Tafriz are mentioned as the birthplace of the reformer. According to some sources, he had been a Zoroastrian priest (mōdābdāh); al-Bīrūnī who sometimes follows a romantic tradition (cf. above), calls him mūmābdān mādābdāh. The details of his doctrine are not known but it is certain that it developed and spread the teaching of his precursor Zartosht of Pasargād, who lived two centuries before him. It is evident that the disturbed condition of Persia after the victories of the Hephthalites facilitated the spread of revolutionary doctrines; but it is difficult to see why the king (whose reign began in 488) became a convert to the new faith (and this is a question which also puzzled the ancients) and how he became connected with Mazdak.

The necessity of crushing the power of the nobility and higher clergy which he found annoying may have caused the king to use for his own ends a sect which aimed at destroying the privileges of these classes. Nābdeke (who thinks Kawād was a man of strong will) credits him with this plan. Christensen (who had accepted this thesis) now sees in the allusions of some of the sources proof of the sincerity of Kawād (whom, as he says, the contemporary sources do not credit with a "Machiavellian character"). Kawād, he thinks, was moved primarily by religious motives and attracted by the religious element in the new teaching, while ready to take advantage of any political advantages that the sect might be likely to gain for him. In any case it is evident that in his wars he was not restrained by any humanitarian prejudices, although one Arabic source with a hostile bias says that the king as a sanūfī feared to spill blood. Christensen likes to compare his attitude with regard to Mazdak morality with that of Constantine with regard to Christian teaching. In any case it is difficult to give a verdict on Kawād, in view of the varying prejudices of the sources and the tradition of the time of Khusraw which in general tends to elevate the figure of Anahid who was, at the expense of the others. There were numerous conversions among the upper classes, proselytizing among the common people was facilitated by the wretched conditions in which they lived, and of course also by the nature of the teaching which in every age has seduced the masses. Manichaeism thus became a remarkable force and permeated all the machinery of government. The practical effect of the king's favor was seen in the measures allied to in contemporary sources; but we do not know to what degree they realized the Mazdakist ideal, either as regards community of women (perhaps this was only an extension of regulations already existing in the Shāhīnian code?) or community of property (only taxes on the rich?). But what is certain is that Khusraw at the beginning of his reign had to take important steps to remedy the disastrous results to property and the organization of the family; such abuses were however not the direct result of the legal measure adopted by Kawād, but rather of the violent application of communism which was a later development.

The philo-Mazdak policy of the king and the growing power of the sect provoked a revolution in the palace and Kawād was deposed and imprisoned. Dājūn, his brother, was put on the throne in his stead. Kawād succeeded in escaping and took refuge with the Hephthalites and regained his kingdom with their assistance (498 or 499). In the meanwhile, in spite of the dethronement of the king, the sect had grown more and more and its power became disquieting. The people, urged on by their leaders and more alive to the practical advantages than to the religious elements of the reform, naturally abandoned themselves to all sorts of excesses and disorder broke out everywhere. The estates of the nobles were plundered, the women carried off, which, with a horror of communism, explains the violent language used by contemporary and Arabic and Persian sources against the sect. All this must have frightened the king on his return. Having revenged himself on his principal enemies immediately on his restoration, he now found it necessary to come to an agreement with the majority of the nobility and clergy in order to face the war with Byzantium. Prince Khusraw seeing his rights to the succession threatened by the activities of the sect, which, taking advantage of its power, was endeavouring to secure the election of Kawād's eldest son Padshahkhwâr Shâh (Pithasansaran). It is also said (in the sources of the third line; cf. above) that Khusraw was eager to avenge himself on Mazdak, who had refused to take as his wife the mother of Khusraw (offered to him by Kawād in recognition of the principles of the sect) until the prince humbled himself before him. Khusraw, who had already begun to display his remarkable political abilities, must have had considerable influence with his father, who was persuaded to have Mazdak and his followers massacred, after inviting them en masse to the court on the pretext that a theological dispute was to be held (or according to another story, for the public proclamation of Padshahkhwâr Shâh as heir to the throne). The massacre took place in 528. In 529, Arab writers wrongly put it at the beginning of the reign of Khusraw; this exploit earned him the title of Anāsharwān. The number of slain is unknown. Kawād died in 531 and after him Khusraw took special steps to restore order in the ownership of property and in the social organization which had been upset by the application of communism. The surviving Mazdakists were persecuted in a blood-thirsty fashion and their books burned.

Mazdakism after the massacre. It is not probable that Mazdakism disappeared with the persecution; perhaps the survivors sought refuge in the mountains, in different parts of Persia where we later find sects (e.g. the Kūršâr) whom Muslim writers do not hesitate to connect with the Mazdakists. Nīṣān al-Mulk, who in his manual on the art of government attributes great political importance to a knowledge of the various sects, is very clear on this point. According to some
orientalists Mazak elements can be discovered in Bāhtinian and Isma‘īlian. But the whole question of the relations between these sects (of which very often insufficient is known) and the old Persian religious forms must be examined thoroughly with a knowledge of the progress made in the study of these areas and sects. It cannot be dealt with here; cf. the articles Isma‘īliyya, Shi‘a, Rāmīya, Murājīyya, Mu‘ammarī, Mu‘ākka‘ī, Xawandīya, Simḥa‘ī etc.


**Mauzur, Mīrza Dāngānī, a. U. poet and eminent Sufi, of Turkish descent, was born in 1119 (1699) or 1113 (1701) in Kāhībāgh, Māhāw. His father Mīrza Miṣrān was an office of Avaranāb [q.v.], who, when the news of his birth was conveyed to him, said his father was Mīrza Miṣrān and hence his son should be called Dāngānī; though his father afterwards named him Shams al-Dīn, yet he is known by the name which the emperor had selected for him. He was received into the Nakhchivan order by Sayyid Mi Muhammad Šāh b. Bālti and later on by Mūtabar Mi Muhammad b. Samā‘ī. He died in Dīhil in the 10th of Muharram 1195 (January 6, 1780) as a result of a fight at him by some Shi‘a fanatic. His memoirs with some anecdotes about Mūtabar Mi Muhammad Šāh ‘Alī b. Karamān are edited by Mūhammad Beg Bālākhānī, Dīhil a. D. 1309, A. D. 1892. His biography, together with notices of his disciples, has been written by Mūhammad Na‘īm Allāh Bahrāīdī in Bihārīyāt Mauzurīya.


**Mazān**, the name of several Arab tribes which are represented in all the great ethnic groupings of the Peninsula; this finds typical expression in the anecdote recorded in Aḥkāmī, vii, 121 (= Yākūt, ed. Arabs, ii, 352–353), according to which the Caliph ‘Abd al-Wahhāb asked the grammarians Abū ‘Othmān al-Mazānī, who had come to his court, to which Mazān belonged: — if to the Mazān of the Tamīm, to those of the Ka‘b, to those of the Rā‘īya or to those of the Yemn.

The first are the Mazān b. Mālik b. ‘Amr b. Tamīm (Wustenfeld, Gen. Tahābul, L. 12), the second, the Mazān b. Manṣūr (D. 10), or the Mazān b. Fāzūr (H. 13); the third, the Mazān b. ‘Arrīya b. Dīhilī (C. 19), the last, the Mazān b. ‘Al-Nadīmī, a clan of the Khuray Ḍārān Ansār (19, 24). But alongside of these, many other tribes and clans bore this name. The Dījamār al-Anzilī of Ibn al-Kalbī gives no less than seventy, of whom the best known are the: Mazān b. Sa‘d b. Dāhl b. Iṣnālī (Ibn Kathīr, K. al-Mas‘ārez, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 36; more accurately according to the Tawāmil, MS. Br. Mus., Add. 23, 297, fol. 114 r-115 r: Mazān b. ‘Abd Manṣūr b. Bāk r b. Sa‘d b. Dīhilī, not given in the Tabāl ‘im; Mazān b. Sa‘d b. ‘Arrīya b. Bāk r b. Dāhl b. Iṣnālī (Ibn Kathīr, p. 42; Tabāl ‘im, H. 12); Mazān b. Kalbī b. Ghaṣṭānī (H. 10); Mazān b. Raḥīmu b. Zubair b. Mazān b. Al-Asad (11, 11). The large number of tribes named Mazān and their distribution over the whole of Arabia makes the hypothesis that we have here a single tribe which had been broken up into small sections impossible and we are led to suppose that the name Mazān, is a descriptive rather than a proper name; since the verb sawma means to "go away", one might suppose that Mazān originally meant "the emigrants" and was used in a general way of any ethnic group which became separated from its main tribe and was incorporated in a strong tribe. This etymology, like almost all those of the names of Arab tribes, is of course impossible.

The sources give a certain number of geographical and historical references to different tribes called "Mazān"; but they are generally very scanty, none of these tribes having attained sufficient importance to make it independent of the larger body to which it was attached. We have a few details about the Mazān b. al-Nadīmī, a fairly important group of Madinīe Khārājī (on the part played by them at the beginning of Islam see Castani, Annali dell’Islam, Index to Vols. i.—ii.), as well as about the Mazān b. Fāzūr who took part as members of the tribe of the Dīhilī, in the war of Dāhilī and al-Qahra (cf. Al-Mas‘ārez, ed. Arabs, xxvii, 27). Ibn Majā‘īya, himself a Dīhilī, directed a violent satire against them at the end of the first century A.H. (Jāḥiṣ, p. 102). As to the Mazān b. ‘Arrīya b. Dīhilī, to whom the grammarians Abī ‘Uthmān, belonging, we know from the anecdote above quoted that in their dialect,  as (initia!) was pronounced like b (ba‘wma‘a for ba‘wma‘a, what is thy name?), a peculiarity which does not seem to be recorded of the dialect of other Rā‘īya. Lastly the Mazān b. al-Asad, whose tradition makes migrate to the north, changed their name to (Bīsān [q.v.]) under which they became celebrated. It is only the Mazān b. Mālik b. ‘Amr b. Tamīm that we have fairly full information. Legend, which has developed with unusual detail around the sons of Tamīm [q.v.], gives Mazān a part in the story of his uncle ‘Abd Shamsh b. Sa‘d b. ‘Zaid Manṣūr b. ‘Amr’s fight against al-Anhar b. ‘Amr b. Tamīm (cf. Al-Mufadha‘l b. Salama, al-Shā‘r al-‘Aṣir, ed. Storer), p. 233 and the references given in the note). This tribe of Mazān of the great group of the ‘Amr b. Tamīm to which it belonged and dwelt with them in the lands in the extreme N.W. of Najd; their headquarters were around the well of Safār near Dhi Kār (Najāf), ed. Bevan, p. 48, note to line 17; Yākūt, iii, 955; Bakrī, p. 774, l. 1: 287–788); their principal subdivisions were the Bani Hūrāsh, Khāzān, ‘Aqrīm, ‘Arqām, ‘Ala‘īna, ‘Ulākhā and ‘Aqrām. In the Dījamārī, Mazān followed their parent tribe and we find them sharing in the
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MAYZADIS, a Muslima dynasty in al-Hilla. The Banî Maysad belonged to the tribe of Asad and lived west of the Tigris, from Kirkuk to Kirkuk. In the southeast, on the Kurdish frontier, the Banî Maysad held settled. When Abu 'l-Ghanâm Muhammad b. Maysad, who was related to the Banî Dubais, slew one of their chiefs with whom he had quarrelled, a war broke out between the two tribes (401 = 1010-1011). Abu 'l-Ghanâm fled to his brother Abu 'l-Hassan 'Ali; the latter set out against the Banî Dubais with an army, but was defeated and Abu 'l-Ghanâm fell in the battle. In 403 (1012-1013), 'Ali was recognized as emir by the Buedh Sulaimân al-Dawla. In Muharram 405 (July 1014), he undertook a campaign against the Banî Dubais, to revenge himself for the defeat he had suffered and slew Hassân and Nahhân, the sons of Dubais, but in Dumat al-Umar of the same year (Oct.-Nov. 1014) he was routed by their brother Mu'far. After 'Ali's death in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 408 (March-April 1018), his son Dubais succeeded him. The latter's brother al-Mukallad, with the help of Turkish mercenaries in Baghdad, endeavoured to seize the power for himself; but order was soon restored and al-Mukallad went to al-Mawqil to the 'Ukkaids. In a few years Dubais became involved in war with Karbâm b. al-Mukallad (q.v.) and he had also troubles within his borders. In the war between the two sons 'Abd al-Kalîm and Djalâl al-Dawla, the former was supported by Dubais and the latter by al-Mukallad. After the defeat of 'Abd al-Kalîm in 421 (1030), al-Mukallad with the help of the Banî Khâdirja and the troops of Djalâl al-Dawla invaded his brother's territory. Dubais had to take to flight and the land was laid waste. Peace however was soon arranged. Dubais was allowed to retain his lands but had to pay Djalâl al-Dawla a considerable sum. The third brother Thâbit allied himself with al-Basâiri, the military governor of Baghdad, and in 424 (1032-1033) they advanced against Dubais. The latter sent an army to meet them; but his troops retired and he himself had to take to flight. After receiving reinforcements he advanced against Thâbit; they met at Dja'farîsâ and after a fierce battle, Dubais had to cede a part of his possessions while al-Basâiri, who arrived too late to take part in the battle, returned to Baghdad. In Radjab 446 (Oct.-Nov. 1054) the Banî Khâdirja invaded the country but were soon driven away with the help of al-Basâiri. Two or three years later war broke out between al-Basâiri who was joined by Dubais, and the Sulaimân Sulaimân 'Othmân b. Thâbit, the son of Qâsim b. Thâbit (q.v.). Dubais died in Shawwâl 474 (March-April 1082) at the age of 80. His son Masâyûd succeeded him but died in Rabi' 1, 479 (June-July 1086). In the reign of his son and successor Saydâja (q.v.) the power of the Mayzadis spread over almost the whole of the 'Iraq. At first he was a stout supporter of Barkâfîrî (q.v.); in 494 (1100-1101) however he turned to his brother. The towns of Wasîl, Bâsra, and Talîn fell successively into his hands, but, as the commander appointed by Saydâja in Bâsra did not prove fit for his task, Muhammad seized the sovereignty of the town and installed a new governor. In Saydâja's reign the capital al-Dumat al-Umar was extended and fortified and given the name of al-Hilla (495 = 1100-1102). His steady increasing power however aroused Muhammad's suspicions and in spite of long negotiations, a rupture finally occurred between them. At the end of Rabi' 1 (Feb.-March 1108) Mayzadis himself set out from Bâsra against Saydâja. A section of the Arabs allied with him fled and Saydâja fell in the battle. His son Dubais was taken prisoner but the latter's two brothers escaped and were only able to return home after Muhammad's death.
(511 = 1118). In 529 (1135) he was treacherously murdered [cf. the article DURAI] and succeeded by his son Sadaqa. In the war between Sulaym Maṣʿud and his nephew Dāwūd, Sadaqa declared for the former. After Maṣʿud's victory, the troops scattered to seek booty and several emirs including Sadaqa were surprised and captured by the enemy and at once put to death (532 = 1137–1138). Sadaqa's brother Muhammad was then upon recognised as lord of al-Hilla. In 540 (1145–1146) however, the third brother ʿAlī went to al-Hilla, because he was afraid of the Sulaym and drove out Muhammad. After he had taken the town, but drove back the Sulaym's troops and it was not till 542 (1147–1148) that Sulaymkerd, one of Maṣʿud's generals, was able to expel ʿAlī. But in the same year he was defeated by the latter and had to abandon the town. In 544 (1149–1150) ʿAlī endeavoured to induce the caliph al-Muṭṭafī to abandon Maṣʿud but, as the caliph refused and summoned the Sulaym to his help, ʿAlī had to submit and the rebels who had joined him dispersed. ʿAlī died in the following year and al-Hilla was given as a fief to Sulaymkerd by Maṣʿud. On Maṣʿud's death in 547 (1152), the town fell into the hands of Maṣʿud Bilāl, the commander of Baghdaḍ. The latter however was driven out by the caliph's troops who occupied al-Hilla. When in 551 (1157) Sulaym Muhammad took the field against al-Muṭṭafī (q.v.), they had to withdraw and Muhammad put a garrison in the town. The Masyad submitted to his deputy but in 558 (1162–1163) the caliph al-Mustaʿṣfar sent an army against them which put an end to their power. 4,000 men were slain and the remainder outlawed so that they were scattered in all directions.


According to Zahir al-Dīn, p. 321, Masyār b. Kārīn ruled for 30 years (194–224 = 809–839) but on p. 167 the same writer says that his (tyrannical) government lasted 7 years (217–224). Taṣafi, iii. 1015, under the year 201, speaks of the conquest of Tābaristān of Abū ʿAlī b. Khuradāsth (sic) as a result of which the Bwand Sidrwin b. Sidrwin had to leave the mountains and Masyār b. Kārīn was sent to al-Maʿmūn. According to later sources,
Māzvār

Shāhriyār b. Shāhriyār had deprived Māzvār of his possessions. Māzvār sought refuge with his cousin Windūnād b. Windūnād-sapān, who hand him over to Shāhriyār. Māzvār however managed to escape, sought refuge with al-Ma'mūn and became a Muslim, assuming the name Muḥammad. After the death of Shāhriyār (210 = 1135; Tabārī, iii. 1093), Māzvār, returning to Tabārīstān, slied Shāhir b. Shāhriyār and seized the mountain (Tabārī, ibid.). (Ibn al-Fakhrī's story, p. 305–306, about the "son of Shāhriyār b. Shāhriyār," whom Māzvār assassinated treacherously, seems to refer to Shāhir; to alyse the suspicions of his victim, Māzvār had built a mosque in Fīrūn.) Māzvār assisted the Arab governor Mūsā b. Ḥāfṣ b. ʿOmar b. al-ʿĀli, to subjugate the mountain of Shāhriyār and al-Ma'mūn appointed him governor of Tabārīsān, Rūyān and Dūshmand with the rank of ḥāshābi (Balāḏūrī, p. 229; Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 309). At this time (Yaʿqūbī, Historia, ii. 582), Māzvār boasted the title of Ḥāshābi, ḥāshābi ṣaḥāḥīn Bihshār-Khurāsān (read Patīghār-i-ghānū, Muḥammad b. ʿArīn, ms. vandali (sic) amir al-mawāmin (i.e. "ally" instead of mawāʿil "clients")), which he did not have. Ḥāfṣ dād, Māzvār paid no heed to his son Muḥammad b. Mūsā. Complaints against Māzvār were taken to Baghdad by the Bawwādīs and by devout Muslims. But as al-Ma'mūn was setting out against the Byzantines (expedition of 216–218) Māzvār felt himself free from any control. In his turn he charged Muḥammad b. Mūsā with intriguing with the "Alids and on this imaginary pretext besieged Amūl. The town capitulated at the end of 8 months. Māzvār executed his enemies and imprisoned all the notables, including Muḥammad b. Mūsā, first at Rūd-bāst and then in his principal stronghold of Hurmuz-ābād. To judge from Tabārī, iii. 1289–1292, the piece must have been in the valley of the Tāhir, above Urm (Arum) at a distance of 8 farsakhs from Amūl and from Sāri (cf. the article Māzvārān). In the sixth year of the reign of al-Muṭṭasim (227) Māzvār openly rebelled (Balāḏūrī, p. 229: ḥāshābi mu-ḵadāra). The Ṭabārīsh ʿAbd Allāh, governor of Khurāsān, had denounced to the Caliph the "misdemeanors, tyranny and apostasy" of Māzvār. When al-Muṭṭasim's ambassador arrived, Māzvār would not listen to him. Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 157, even accuses him of having conferred honours on Bābak, Mazdak and other Magians who had ordered the destruction of the mosques and the obliteration of all traces of Islam. Māzvār's schemes. It is difficult to reconstruct Māzvār's programme from the sources, which are hostile to him, but the narratives of contemporary witnesses which Tabārī, iii. 1288–1303, gives under the year 224 contain a number of curious and important details. The extension of Māzvār's power (after the assassination of the Bawwādī Shāhir and the occupation of the mountain of Šahrūm) had brought him into conflict with the Tabārīshīs to whom he refused to give Khurāsān. It may be noted that Māzvār's very title ḥāshābi of Khurāsān (see variant given in Yaʿqūbī, E.G.A., vii. 376) must have been displeasing to the Tabārīshīs. On the other hand the celebrated Afshīn, who after his victory over Bābak was at the height of his glory, coveted Khurāsān. He therefore secretly encouraged Māzvār's resistance to his rivals and according to Tabārī, iii. 1269, played upon his sentiments as a man of noble Jewish blood (yanna-mlimūn dī ḫaldaḵnārīn). From the national point of view, Māzvār could recall the precedent of his grandfather Windūnād-Hurmux to whom late sources attribute the organisation of the massacre of the Arab garrisons. Māzvār, who came out of "the mountain" where he had only an almost unknown town (Iṣṭaḵīrī, 7100; Al-Ahwāzī), may have had ascendant at the urban elements of the great towns of the "plain" among whom Arabs and their clients (abādān) predominated. The landowning class was certainly hostile to him, as in order to weaken and even exterminate them, he had relied on the support of the peasants. Māzvār's actions were certainly very violent, for ten centuries later, Ẓahir al-Dīn, p. 167, quotes the proverb: "so and so has done an injustice such as not even Māzvār could have done". Coming out in open rebellion (probably before the year 224 under which Balāḏūrī and Tabārī relate the dénouement) Māzvār had homaged paid to himself, took hostages and levied khurāṣī at once. The doings of his governor Surkhāštān in Sāri are characteristic. He transferred all the inhabitants of Sāri to Amīl, where he shut them up in a fort; as to the people of Amīl, he took 20,000 of them away into the mountains of Hurmüz-ābād (cf. above). The walls of Sāri, Amīl and Tāhirān were rased to the ground "to the sound of fires and drums". Māzvār had given orders to the peasants to attack and plunder their masters (Tabārī, iii. 1269). The next passage (iii. 1270) seems to indicate that a cadastral survey was ordered (amara an yuvaḵša b-balad) and the lands were let out, the rental being 30/4 of the produce. As to Surkhāštān, he collected 260 nobles (ahna b-balwān), the bravest he could find, and on a pretext that the ahna were favourable to the Arabs and to the 'Abbaṣids, handed them over as dangerous individual to the peasants, who slew him at his suggestion. He even tried to provoke a massacre of all the imprisoned landowners, saying to the peasants "I have already handed over to you the houses of the landowners and their wives", but this time the peasants refrained from following his advice. The later sources retain the usual accusation of apostacy against Māzvār ("he once more assumed the girdle of Zoroastrianism", says Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 150 quoting the kāth of Amīl), Balāḏūrī, p. 229 and Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 309 also say that Māzvār "renounced the faith and committed treason", but this point is more obscure in Tabārī, where it only occurs in the list of charges made against Afshīn, iii. 1311 (transl. in Browne, "lt. Hist. of Persia", i. 334). The tone of the letter which Māzvār had addressed to his representatives, ibid., iii. 1351, is respectful to the Caliph, in form at least. But there is no smoke without fire, if we may believe the authors who mention the existence in Tabaristan of a Māzvārīya sect connected with the Khurramiyā [v. q.] or Muḥammadiya [v. q.] (i.e. followers of Bābak). Cf. al-Rāghūḏī (d. in 429), Fūrāk bān al-ṣāḥīf, p. 251–252; Ẓahir al-Iṣfardīnī (d. in 451), Taḥrīr b-ṣirāṭ [quoted in Pluget, Bābak, Z.D.M.G., 1869, p. 533] and Samʿamī, G. M.S., fol. 501a.

Māzvār's end. 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir sent against Māzvār his uncle Ḥasan b. Ḥusain to operate from the direction of Ḍūjūnd as well as
Hajjān b. Djbalā, who went with 4,000 horses via Kāmis towards Djibal al-Shawārīn (= Sawdākhīh; cf. the article مسجد الملک), at the same time the caliph al-Mu’āṣir sent considerable forces under the command of Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm who entered Rīyād (western ʿAbdarrāzīk) by Sālāmaha and Rukbbīś (Tabari, iii. 1264). Maṣūf b. Ḥasan, "lord of Dūnhāwānd", attacked from Ka‘īy while Abū l-Sādīd advanced via Lāriz and Dūnhāwānd.

The Arabs very skillfully exploited the rivalries and enmities in the entourage of Māzār. First of all his nephew Ḵānūn b. ʿAbdilahrīrīb (his representative in the mountain of Shawārīn = Sawdākhīh) went over to Hajjān, who marched on Sātīr and began to negotiate with Māzār’s brother Kūlhrīb. In the meantime Surkhātān’s army which occupied the Ţaṭība front dispersed and allowed the Fāqīh to advance. Kūlhrīb, who had been promised Māzār’s place, submitted to Ḥasan. Māzār seems to have lost his courage when he found himself surrounded by the Arabs and betrayed by his follower. He trusted Kūlhrīb, who had promised him the swāʿ, and came with him to Ḥasan (Tabari, iii. 1288—1291; dramatic story by an eye-witness) but Ḥasan did not even acknowledge his greeting, Māzār was handed over to Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm and sent to Sāmarrā. Here he was confronted with Aḥfīn and seems to have denounced the latter. The caliph ordered him to be given 400 lassas, under which he died and his body was exposed beside that of ʿAbd al-Baqī in 242 = 859.

Kūlhrīb’s treachery served him little. He was slain as a traitor by his cousin Surkhātān b. Māzūghān who commanded the Dūnnak in the service of Māzār.

Surkhātān was betrayed by the soldiers after the defeat at Ţaṭība and the other of Māzār’s generals, al-Durriš, who was fighting against Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm on the Rīyād front, died while attempting to reach Dūnnak (Tabari, iii. 1300).

Bibliography: Ya‘qūbī, ed. Houtman, i. 514; ii. 582; Bālakīrī, p. 229; Tabārī, iii. 1268—1303. — Among his authorities were Muḥammad b. Ḥafṣ al-Ṭabhkāfī al-Ṭabarī (perhaps related to the Arab warl Mī′ūn b. ʿAbd al-Ṭabhkāfī) and ʿAlī b. Sahl Rāhān “the Christian” [author of the Firdaws al-ṣūma, ed. Siddīkī, Berlin 1928], whom Māzār employed as his scribe, cf. al-Fīrārī, ed. ʿAlī b. Sahl Rāhān, p. 299; Tabārī is the source of the later epitomist Khāṭīb al-Ḍiyūrī, ed. de Jong-de Goeje, p. 399—405; Ibn Ṭabāna and al-Muθqil, vi. 520—516, 522—525; Ibn al-Ḍiyūrī, vi. 351—359, 363—364, 366 etc. Cf. also Ibn Rusta, p. 276; Ibn al-Faṭkhī, p. 304, 305—306, 309—310; Maṣūfī, B.G.A., vii. 137; Ya‘qūbī, ii. 608; Tabārī, iii. 284, 490, 506; Ibn ʿAsbān, trans. Browne, p. 14—154; Zahr al-Dīn, index (these two last local sources do not know Tabārī and contain a number of quite legendary stories); Well, Gesch. d. Chaliften, ii. 321—325; Justi, Iran. Namensbuck, p. 201—302 (bibliography); Marquart, Erdalbenk, p. 334.

(V. Minorsky)

MECCA.

On the eve of the Hijra. It is with the birth of Muḥammad — between 570—580 A.D. — that Mecca suddenly emerges from the shadows of the past and thrusts itself upon the attention of the historian. The geographer Ptolemy seems to know it only under the name Macoraba; but it must have been in existence long before his time. Mecca was probably one of the stations on the “incense route”, the road by which the produce of the East especially valuable perfumes, came to the Mediterranean world. It owes its importance to its position at the

Intersection of great commercial routes. The town that had grown up around the well of Zamzam and the sanctuary of the Ka‘ba was advantageously placed at the extreme eudos of the Asia of the whites and the Africa of the blacks, near a breach in the chain of the Ṣarrat, close to a junction of roads leading from Babylonia and Syria to the plateaus of the Yemen, to the shores of the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. By the latter it was in communication with the mysterious African continent. What advantages were offered by this situation at the boundary between civilisation and barbarism, at the point of contact between two societies, brought together by necessities more pressing than political ambitions or the quarrels of race and religion! This was the part played by the Palmyrans, situated between the Romans and the Parthians. It demanded an adaptability and diplomatic skill beyond the ordinary. The two societies were frequently at war; it required wits to deal tactfully with them. But if the position had its risks, it had the advantage of being able to fix the price for its services to the belligerents. In the delicate role of intermediary and broker between two world, the strength of will of the Ishmaelites and the tenacity that lay beneath his apparent complaisance assured his success from the first. Civilisation and barbarism might conclude peace for a time or be at war; he was able to trade on their agreement or exploit their dissensions with equal satisfaction to himself. Ambiguous and amphibious, the Meccan was able to have a foot in both camps without it being possible to discern where his sympathies really lay.

At an early date we see the Meccans opening negotiations with the states adjoining Arabia. They obtained from them safe conducts and capitulations, permitting the free passage of their caravans. This is what their chronicles call the “guarantee of Caesare and of Chosroes”. They also concluded agreements with the Negus of Abyssinia, with the principal shākhs of Naḍil, the šāls of the Yemen; with the patriarchs of Ghassān and of Ḫira. In the negotiations with the Greeks and Persians the principal of the “open door” was not admitted. Commercial transactions were carried through at posts on the frontier or in towns specially designated for the purpose. In Palestine these were the ports of Aila and Qarnah and perhaps also Jerusalem. In Syria, Bostra was their principal outlet, their great market.

Ṣūr civ. 2 mentions as a permanent institution “the double caravan of winter and summer”. The marṣūlīb, genealogists, record the names of the Kurash chiefs who had succeeded in obtaining by negotiation permits to trade. The countries open to commerce in this way were called waḥād, direction, marṣūlīb, region of trade. There were innumerable restrictions, limiting the extension of the privilege. Eastern governments did not permit free trade. Distrustful of merchants even when her own subjects, Byzantium showed herself still more
suspicious of foreigners, especially Bedouins, a slippery race which filled her with an unconquerable distrust. The latter had therefore to make heavy sacrifices, to pay onerous taxes, to pay continual customs-dues and tolls or to hand over hostages before negotiations could be begun. Mecca was not impressed by principles any more broad-minded; she took care to compensate herself from foreign traders and to levy various charges upon them, tithe, charges for permits to stay in the country, to travel about and to trade. Tithe had to be paid before entering Mecca. There was also, as at Palmyra, a "departare" tax or tax on exportation. In short, foreign merchants were entangled in a very intricate fiscal system, whether they settled in Mecca or only passed through it, especially those who did not obtain the ghirrār or guarantee of a local clan or notability.

The population. About the time of the Hijra, the people of Mecca claimed descent from a common ancestor. They called him Kūraish or Fīhr, sometimes also al-Nadr, surnamed Kūraish. The origins of the Kūraish were humble and little is known of them. They formed one of the less wealthy branches of those who went back to the main stock of the Kinda [q. v.]. At first they led a miserable existence in the wild mountains around the sacred territory of Mecca. A confraternity from the northern Hijāz, Kūsaif, is said to have installed them by force of arms in Mecca, which he took from the control of the tribe of Khuzay'a [q. v.]. Some ten main clans can be distinguished among them: Ḥāshim, Umaiyah, Nawfal, Zuhra, Asad, Talin, Makḥūt, 'Adi, Djugāb and Sahm. These occupied mainly the centre of the town, the bottom of the valley, the Bāṣṭa, where the water of the well of Zamzam accumulated, the hollow where the Ka'bah stood. Their living in this neighbourhood earned them the epithet of Abī Ḥāfiq, Abī Ḥāfiq or Kūraish al-Abī Ḥāfiq. This central quarter of the town was regarded as that of the aristocracy and of the oldest Kūraish families. Among these ten groups, some owe to Isāš a common inheritance. Such were the Tāmis and the 'Adi, rendered illustrious by the caliphs Abū Bakr and 'Umar. Other clans more vaguely connected with the eponymous ancestor were thrust towards the outskirts of Mecca, the lower slopes or in the gorges (dāhāf) of the hills which dominate the town. They were called the "Kūraish of the outskirts" (Kūraish al-Zawāhir). Held in less consideration than their fellow-tribesmen of the Bāṣṭa, these suburbanites had the advantage of being distinguished from them by their bravery. They supplied the Kūraish community with its best soldiers and never failed to cast this up to the Meccans "of the centre".

Government and Administration. It is not easy to discover definite indications of this. There must however been a rudimentary system of archives in which to preserve treaties of alliance and commerce, and later the equivalent of an office to take charge of the collection of taxes on foreign traders. Nowhere do we find any explicit allusion to the working of such administrative organisations. A tradition records the existence of purely honorary offices with no jurisdiction. But it does not agree either upon the number (ten or six) nor upon the functions of these offices. I imagine it was invented to satisfy the vanity of the great families. The only allusion to it is in the verses of a Mедине poet, Ḥassān b. Ṭahlī. The office of "pavilion and reins" has nothing to do — as has been supposed — with the art of war. This dignity, which was an ancient one and no longer understood, was a memory of the ritual processions held in pagan Arabia. The ghirrār was simply the pavilion or portable tabernacle, containing the fetish of the tribe and solemnly carried on the back of a camel. The chiefs and notables took turns at holding the reins of the animal bearing this precious burden. It is taking nothing from the glory of Kūhēl b. al-Walīd to say that he had not a monopoly of this privilege. Behind the legend of the Meccan dignities, we perceive the intention of glorifying the cradle of the Prophet. In giving it administrative institutions, an attempt was made to conceal the modest beginnings of the Ḥāshimīs and no less those of Abī Bakr and 'Umar. The onerous office of ḥāfiq, which had to pay compensation for murder and injury, was far beyond the financial resources of the modest citizen called Abī Bakr. The entrusting to 'Umar of the safra or diplomatic missions cannot be reconciled with his extreme youth and plebeian origin.

I have elsewhere, for lack of a better term, called Mecca "a merchant republic". If Abī Sufyān is called "Shāhīq and chief of the Kūraish", several of his contemporaries are given equally high sounding titles. There is not the slightest reason to think that he was a kind of Kūraish dux. The manner in which the events of the first eight years of the Hijra are recorded produces the fallacious impression that he held the power in Mecca in his hands. In reality, he was only the ablest and most intelligent of his peers, the chiefs of the Kūraish clans. As al-Fāṣî pertinently observes, all were equal: "no one exercised authority unless delegated or kindly permitted to do so by them". Did their chiefs constitute a regular official body? Yes, says tradition. Mecca is even said to have had a kind of Senate or Grand Council, the dīr al-ṣawāda. It met only in extraordinary circumstances. Usually, however, we find that it is in the ṣawāda, family groups or clans, the Nābi Ka'bah opening on the square of the Ka'bah — the forum and bourse of the town — that affairs of general interest were dealt with.

The Kā'bah cannot conceive of authority without a council of notables, without the muṣla. This institution is so frequently mentioned in the Kā'bah that the Prophet must have set it working before his eyes. We think then that Mecca was ruled by the oligarchy of the muṣla, the council resident in the town of the ṣawāda of the nomad tribe. This was an assembly of the chiefs of the wealthiest and most influential families. This is why Umaiyad and Makḥūtīs are most usually mentioned as composing the muṣla. Neither election nor birth could necessarily open the way to a seat on it, but rather the fame of services rendered, the prestige of ability and wealth. Thus it welcomed to its councils the very wealthy Ibn Djugāb, a member of the humble clan of Tāmis. An assembly of elders or if you like of senators, in conformity with the principle of seniority among the Arabs: its authority, purely moral, was limited to advising, studying, looking ahead and giving to the merchant community the benefit of the experience of its conscript fathers. In the absence of any coercive
powers, persuasion was the only force it had to make its wishes obeyed. Hence the importance of eloquence in a milieu like this, where every family and every clan claimed autonomy. The cause of peace was in continual conflict with their claims. Without infringing their prerogatives, the mullah was able to exert moral pressure when the general good required it. The system recalls, though remotely, the organisation of Palmyra and of Venice.

Site and climate. In the form of an elongated crescent with its points turned towards the flanks of the Kur'anic hill, the town was hemmed in by a double range of bare and steep hills. The centre of this ill-ventilated couloir coincided with a depression in the soil. The early town occupied the bottom of this; this was the old, the valley, the Kaaba Makka, the hollow of Mecca. The centre, the lowest part of this depression, was called al-Masjid (cf. above). Some buildings in this quarter were so close to the Ka'bah that in the morning and in the evening their shadows were merged in that of the sacred edifice. Between these houses and the Ka'bah (q.v.) a narrow esplanade (sharā) lay below the level of the surrounding soil. This open area formed the primitive masjid, a sanctuary open to the heavens. The pre-Islamic Batih knew no other. The ends of the little streets opening on this open space were called the "gates of the hearm or of the masjid". The so-called gates or openings took their names from the clan settled around the Ka'bah. Thus one regularly spoke of the "gate of the Banu Quraish". The walls of their houses served to mark the bounds of the masjid. It was on the ground floor of the buildings facing the sides of the Ka'bah that the masjid of the chief families met, those that formed the mullah (cf. above).

In the suburbs (pawθur), and at a later date in the ravines (al-tawq’ib) which had been dug by erosion out of the flanks of the hills, was a confusion of poor hovels, low and ramshackle hovels. The unpleasant features of a town of this kind are obvious. The geographer Makdisi has summed these up strikingly: "suffocating heat, deadly winds, clouds of flies". The continual difficulty was the dearth of water. The population was dependent on the variable output of the Zamzam. There were other wells, mainly outside the town. Those inside had a doubtful reputation. The scarcity of drinking-water is evident from the amount of precaution taken, when some thousands of pilgrims had to be supplied. In such deplorable conditions one can imagine what suffering the long days brought, randa. Makka "the burning of Mecca"; why the great families preferred to send their children to be brought up in the desert; why the Sira only incidentally mentions the plague of Makka (randa. Makka). Smallpox is mentioned only in connection with the enemies of the Prophet.

Rains are few and far between. Droughts sometimes last for four years. But when the winter season is wet, the rains may sometimes attain an unheard-of degree of violence. To the east of Mecca a rocky wall rises its steep barrier, a succession of strata and summits merging into the chain of the Sarit. These jagged hills collect on their flanks the surplus rains of the monsoon which brings fertility to the Yemen. All along these slopes, where no shrub interrupts the fall — at the bottom of each a soil is formed — the cataracts augmented by all these tributaries fall into the hollow of Mecca, a basin Makka, in which the Ka'bah occupies the bottom. The waters rush to this depression they force a passage through the *gates of the masjid" and flow over the area around the sanctuary. They fill it and rise to attack the Ka'bah. Before the Hajj, the Kur'ani cullayt seems to have paid no heed to the flooding or said they were powerless to prevent it. Efforts made by the caliphs yielded "only mediocre results".

This is why the misdeeds of the soil fill the annals of Mecca. On several occasions their violence has overflowed the Ka'bah and turned the court of the great mosque into a lake. As a result of the floods, epidemics broke out. The deposit of silt brought by the waters polluted the wells; graves left unburied formed centres of epidemic infection. The annalists avoid dwelling on this, troubled by the Tradition which says that the plague never reaches Mecca. The absolute sterility of the soil brought another scourge, that of famine. The slightest irregularity in the convey of grain from Syria or the Sarit was enough to cause it. It continues to figure along with the ravages of flood and plague in the monotonous annals of the town.

Economic life and finance. On examining closely the picturesque literature of the Sira and Hadith, one receives the impression of business, of intense activity busting out of the narrow and sterile valley of Mecca. The Kur'ani only strengthens this impression. All his life the Prophet retained the impress of his Kur'ani education and training. This fundamentally mercantile character is revealed at every turn.

Writing and arithmetic! One is amazed at their importance in the economic life of the town. Relying on the Kur'ani epithet maw‘ut, i.e., pagan, gentle, and on biased writers like al-Balatkhi, it has been held that, except for some fifteen individuals mentioned by name, all the pre-Hijrīan Kur'ani were illiterate. Alongside of the "book" of accounts, the scales always figure in the Meccan shops; not so much to weigh goods as to verify and check payments of all kinds including cash. Now, coins were not plentiful on the Meccan market; they were supplemented by the precious metals, ingots of gold and silver, by ibar, gold dust. Only the scales could determine the value. In the more delicate cases, recourse was had to the services of a muwair or professional weigher.

It would be difficult to imagine a society in which capital enjoyed a more active circulation. The sāfìr, business man, was not engaged in hoarding, in gathering wealth into his strong boxes. He had a blind faith in the unlimited productivity of capital, in the virtue of credit. Brokers and agents, the bulk of the population lived on credit. The sleeping partnership was much in favour (muqāraba), especially the "partnership for the half", which supposes 50% participation in the profits by the sleeping partners. Thanks to the development of these institutions the humbler sums could be invested, down to a gold dinar or even a mashik or half dinar. Such a flexible organisation stimulated even the humblist to take his share in commercial enterprises.

The coins brought to Mecca were of very different kinds: the demonius aureus of the Byzantines
and the silver drachm of the Sasanids and Himyars. These pieces often worn, rudely engraved, very unequal in weight and format, came from the most varied mints. Only the money-changer had the requisite flair, the eyes sufficiently trained to deal

with the confusion of currencies, to determine accurately the standards, values, and the kinds in circulation. In addition there were the complications caused by the difference of standard and the oscillations of exchange. The Byzantine provinces, Syria and Egypt, were among the khul al-jadhab or countries with a gold standard. Babylonia was khul al-wurr, a land with a silver, the Sasanian, standard. On the eve of the departure of the caravans for Syria, there were regular battues in search of dinars. The Meccan ṭağīr was not distinct from the financier. His first article of trade was money. When occasion arose, he invested his capital in business, in the organisation of large caravans. To the leaders of the caravans, to the traders and to the factors, he advanced the funds necessary for their operations.

Primarily a clearing house, a banking town, Mecca had customs and institutions peculiar to this kind of transaction and to finance. Sometimes it is ṭagīr, usury, in all its ugliness: dinar for dinar, dirham for dirham, i.e. 100\% interest. To the condemnation of ṭagīr in the Kurān, the Kuraich objected that they saw in it only "a kind of sale" (Kurān ii. 276), of letting out capital for a rent. Speculation too was rampant; on the rates of exchange, the load of a caravan which one tried to buy up, the yield of the harvests and of the flocks and lastly the provisioning of the town. Fictitious associations were formed and sales were made on which loans were borrowed. "Every Arab", says Strabo, "is either a trader or a broker". In Mecca, says the hadith, "he who was not a merchant, counted for nothing". In setting out on a military expedition the citizens always took merchandise along with them. This is what they did when going to relieve the Bād caravan. The first thing the Meccan muḥāfiz did on arriving in Medina was to ask the way to the market-place. The women shared these commercial instincts: Abū ʿUbayd’s mother ran a perfumery business. The activities of the ṭağīr Khudajī are celebrated. Hind [q.v.], the wife of Abū ʿUbayd, sold her merchandise among the Kalb of Syria. Like their husbands the Meccan women had financial interests in the caravans. On the return of the convoy they gathered round Abū Sufyān to know what their money and their contributions had earned and to get to share of the profits.

The Caravans. The organisation of a caravan was the subject of interminable palavers in the saḥāfī around the Ka’ba. Its departure and return were events of public interest. The whole population was associated with it. On route it remained in continual communication with the metropolis through Beduins met on the journey or special couriers. Abū Sufyān sent one of these messengers to describe the critical position of the Bād caravan. It cost him 20 dinārs, an enormous sum, but one proportionate to the value of the convoy in which Mecca had 50,000 dinārs invested. The Meccan caravans were of considerable size. Neither horses nor mules appeared in them. The number of camels on occasion rose to 2,500. The men (merchants, guides [daffil] and guards) varied from 100 to 300. The escort was strengthened on approaching areas infested by bandits (pō العب) or when traversing the territory of hostile tribes. The Bād caravan may be taken as typical. We do not know of another in which the capital invested attained such an amount. The greater part was supplied by the important Umayyad firm of Abū ʿUbayd b. ʿUmar. This firm had formed a company of the family, adding to their own considerable reserves the contributions of itssleeping partners. To their 30,000 dinārs the other Umayyad houses added 10,000. Four-fifths of the capital of the Bād caravan was therefore of Umayyad origin. We can understand why the direction and supreme control of the convoy was entrusted to Abū Sufyān, who was personally interested in the enterprise.

In the first place a caravan from Mecca carried skins and leather, sometimes also the ṣāḥī of ṯāffī, a kind of currant; then imports of gold and silver partly from the mines of the Bādū al-Sulaym and ṭāfu, gold dust from Africa. The texts frequently call it ṭafīma, i.e. a convoy laden with perfume and rare spices. Of the perfumes, the most esteemed came not from the Ḥijāb, but from southern Arabia, the "land of frankincense", or even from India and Africa. To these might be added aromatic gums and medicinal drugs, like the senna of Mecca, all objects of small bulk and purchased at higher prices by the luxury of the civilised countries.

From the Yemen the Meccan caravans brought back the products of India, the silks of China, the rich adānī cloths, so called from Ādam. Besides gold dust, the main exports of Africa were slaves and ivory. From Africa Mecca recruited her labourers and her mercenary soldiers, the ṣāḥībān or Abyssinians. In Egypt and in Syria, the Kuraich traders brought luxury articles, products of the industry of the Mediterranean, mainly cotton, linen or silk stuffs and cloths dyed in vivid purple. From Būṣān and the ʿUbar (Syria) came arms, cereals and oil, much appreciated by the Beduins.

The pace of the caravan was slow but the articles transported, leather, metals, scented woods, feared neither damage nor the delays of long journeys. The expenses were confined to the hire of the animals, the payment of the escort, the tolls and presents to the chiefs of the tribes. With such an economical organisation, the profits of 100\% were attained by our authors were quite usual. This was the case with the caravan of Bādī each dinār having brought back a dinār. Two years after this brilliant affair, the Companions of the Prophet who had sought refuge in Medina were able to carry out as profitable a transaction in the same field "since each of their dirhams gained a second dinār", that is to say a profit of 100\% again.

Fortunes in Mecca. We can now imagine how money had gradually accumulated in the chests of the Meccan financiers, who were naturally of a saving disposition. This explains Pliny the Elder’s ill-humour when he recalls "the millions of sesterces which the Arabs take annually from the Roman Empire giving nothing in return, nihil inveniorem redditum habuimus" (Hist. Nat., vi. 18). This last statement is an exaggeration, but it should be remembered that the Meccan caravan carried only articles of high value, and that with regard to the Empire the Arabs were mainly importers, so that the trade balance was always very much
in their favour. The 30,000 dinârs invested by the one house of Abû UbaïsCha in the Badr caravan suggests that H. Winckler is quite right when he tells us to think of the Palmira of Zenobia if we wish to get an idea of the financial capacity of Mecca. The fortunes of the Mâghâzim were no less than those of their Umayyad rivals. The Tânis. 'Abd Allah b. Djûzâ'ân must have been a millionaire if the poet thought of comparing him to Caesar. The principal organizers of the Badr caravan were also millionaires. The thousands of dinârs subscribed by them did not even represent all their fortune. Other portions of their capital were out at interest or put in other speculations. Among other millionaires we may mention the Mâghâzim Walîd b. al-Mughârîs and 'Abd Allah, father of the poet 'Umar b. Abî Râbah.

Next to these representatives of high finance come the well-to-do Meccans, like 'Abd Allah al-Râmnân b. 'Awf who had a capital of 8,000 dinârs and al-Hârij b. 'Amir and 'Umayya b. Khâlaf. In the case of the latter we have a second 2,000 dinârs in the Badr caravan. Lastly there were the small traders, brokers and shop-keepers who formed the petty bourgeoisie of the town. To their commerce a number added the supervision of some industry like ironwork or carpentry. The most typical representative of this class is given us by the future caliph Abû Bakr, a masseb, retailer of cloth. He belonged like Abû Djûzâ'ân to the plebeian clan of Tain, rich in men and women of initiative, like 'Aisha, daughter of Abû Bakr. He seems to have had a capital of 40,000 dirhams. 'Abbas, the uncle of the Prophet, is also mentioned among the rich bankers of Mecca, but we have no details about him. The other Mâghâzim lived in circumstances bordering on poverty. These Meccans most certainly must have been wealthy who paid without a murmur the enormous ransom demanded for their relatives after the defeat of Badr. After this disaster it cost them not less than 200,000 dirhams — the Meccan chiefs gave up their share of the profits in the Badr enterprise — some 25,000 dinârs — to prepare for the revenge. They did this 'nânân b'ânânus "with a good heart", with the easy grace of opulent financiers, used to running the risks of speculations on a large scale. One touching detail is recorded. They refused to touch the modest shares of the small contributors. This example shows how at Mecca, "the strong", al-ad-jumma (Wâjdîd), i.e., the patricians, were able in critical circumstances to realise a spirit of solidarity and of sound democracy.

Mecca before the Hijra had neither ships nor a port. It was only exceptionally that foreign ships anchored in the narrow bay in the shallow shore of the sea. It had a small shore. It was here that the Byzantine ships were wrecked, the wood of which went to build the terrace of the Ka'bah. It was to Shu'ailba that the first Muslim emigrants for Abyssinia went, no doubt on hearing that two merchant ships had touched there. More rarely sailings took place from the desolate shore of Djidda, which was nearer Mecca. From the time of 'Uthmân, Djidda took the place of Shu'alba and became the port of the Kuraish metropolis. When Muḥammad settled in Medina and cut their communications with Syria, the Meccan leaders never thought of taking to the sea but resigned themselves to the enormous detour through al-Nadîd. The creation of an Arab navy was the work of the caliph Mu'awiyâ.

2. After the Hijra. We need not rehearse the events of the first eight years of the Hijra. They are summed up in the biographies of the Prophet. This struggle and the ridda, the surrender of Mecca, were fatal to its economic prosperity. One after the other, the great families migrated to Medina, now the capital of Islam. This tendency increased under the first three caliphs, who made their headquarters among the Ansâr. 'Ali definitely left Arabia to settle in Kâfî. Richly endowed by the state, the leading Koraish, becoming generals and governors of provinces, lost interest in commerce. No more is heard about caravans or fairs in the Hijras. It was only at the period of the pilgrimage that Mecca became alive again and saw the caliphs reappear at the head of the pilgrims. The conquest of the 'Iraq dealt the last blow to the economic decline of western Arabia. The Indian trade resumed its old route by the Persian Gulf and the valley of the Euphrates. Direct communication was established by land with the markets of the middle east.

Umayyâd period. The situation improved with the coming of the Umayyad dynasty. Mu'awiyâ took an active interest in his native town. He erected buildings there and developed agriculture in the environs, dug wells and built dams to store up the water. Under his successors, especially the Marwânids, Mecca became a city of pleasure and ease, the rendezvous of poets and musicians, attracted by the brilliant society formed by the sons of the Companions of the Prophet. Many people returned to live in Mecca after making their fortunes in the government of conquered provinces. Contact with foreign civilisations had made them refined and fastidious. They had become accustomed to baths, a luxury which presupposes an abundant water-supply. Water had to be procured from the hills of the Sûr, Khâlid al-Khawâ's [q. v.] name is associated with this undertaking which changed the aspect of the town. To meet the scourge of flood, the caliphs 'Umar and 'Uthmân had called in the aid of Christian engineers, who built barrages in the high-lying quarters. They also secured the area round the Ka'bah by making dykes and embankments. The Umayyad caliphs continued and completed these works. They dug a new bed along the course of the sa'il and endeavoured to break its violence by barriers built at different levels. Their great anxiety was to protect the depression of the Bâthah where the Ka'bah stood. The skill of the engineers of the period did not succeed in overcoming the topographical difficulties nor in averting the ravages of the winter rains, regular flooding of the sur. They were not able to cover the whole area with the stone slabs of the ground, still further aggravated by the unnatural shape of the Bâthah, a basin with no outlet. The houses on the bank of the sa'il were taken down and the alleys adjoining the Ka'bah removed. Each modification of the old plan meant the sacrifice of more buildings. These clearances in time changed the traditional aspect of Mecca, where the sa'il continued to sow destruction.

Along with these precautions against flooding an endeavour was made to enlarge the religious court round the Ka'bah. Islam aspired to possess a temple in keeping with its worldwide claims. Successive expropriations begun by 'Umar and finished
by Wālid I prepared an exclamation. The plan of the great mosque [cf. AL-MASJID AL-HARĀM] with its galleries, a vast courtyard with the Ka'ba in the centre, is the work of the Umayyad caliph. He had the assistance of Christian architects from Syria and Egypt to carry it out. The important governorship of the Ḥijāz with its three cities, Medina, Mecca, and Ta'if, could in principle be given only to a member of the ruling family. Among the most celebrated of these Umayyads may be mentioned Sa'īd b. Aṣ, the two future caliphs, Marwān b. al-Hakam and 'Umar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. When no Umayyad was available the choice fell upon an official of tried capacity like ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm b. al-Kaṣīr. At first they were given Ta'if and then transferred to Mecca. It was only after this probation that the three towns were entrusted to them. But even then the centre of government remained in Medina, which under the Umayyads eclipsed Mecca by its political importance and by the fact that it was the home of the new Muslim aristocracy.

Under Yazīd I, the rising of ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] brought Syrian troops to Mecca. The rebel had made his headquarters in the court of the great mosque. A scaffold of wood, covered with straw, protected the Ka'ba. The carelessness of a Meccan soldier set it on fire. Ibn al-Zubayr rebuilt the edifice and included the Ḥijār within it [see KABA]. When Ḥajjāj had overthrown the Zubairid anti-caliph, he restored the Ka'ba to its former dimensions which have since remained unaltered. In 747 a Ḥajjājī rebel from the Yemen seized Mecca without meeting opposition. He was soon defeated and slain by the troops of the caliph Marwān II. In 750, Mecca passed with the rest of the caliphate under the rule of the ʿAbbasids.

I. Mecca under the ʿAbbasīds down to the foundation of the Sharifate (750–966).

Although the political centre of gravity in Islām now lay in Baghādā, this period at first presents the same picture as under Umayyad rule. The ʿAbbāsids are as a rule governed by ʿAbbāsīd princes or individuals closely connected with them (Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 181 sqq.). Sometimes Mecca and Ta'if were under one ruler, who was at the same time leader of the Ḥajjājī, while Medina had a separate governor of its own.

Arabia had however from the first century A.H. contained a number of ʿAlīd groups, who, as was their wont, fished in troubled waters, lay in wait as brigands to plunder the Ḥajjājī caravans and from time to time hoist their flags when they were not restrained either by the superior strength or by the bribes of the caliphs. We find al-Maʾmūr (156–157 = 754–755) already having trouble in Western Arabia. Towards the end of the reign of al-Mahdi (156–160 = 774–778) a ʿAbbasīd, ʿAbd al-Rahmān, set up his authority in Ḥijāz, and Ḥabīb b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, grandson of ʿAbd al-Rahmān, took Mecca in 786. ʿAbd al-Rahmān then advanced to Ḥijāz with a huge army and plundered Mecca in 789. ʿAbd al-Rahmān was supported by Persia, and the ʿAbbāsīd government of the Ḥajjājī was restored. But ʿAbd al-Rahmān was finally defeated and killed. The ʿAbbāsīd government of the Ḥajjājī was consequently restored. This was the end of the ʿAbbāsīd period, which lasted until 966.
regular custom for a number of rulers to be represented at the Ḥajj and to have their flags unfurled; the holy city was rarely spared fighting on these occasions. The safety of the pilgrim caravans was considerably affected; it was very often ‘Alids who distinguished themselves in plundering the pilgrims.

The ‘Alid cause received an important reinforcement at this time by the foundation of a Hassânid dynasty in Tabaristân (Tabari, iii. 1523-1533, 1538-47, 1682-1685, 1695-1704, 1840, 1850, 1884-94, 1904-). In Mecca the repercussions of this event was felt in the appearance of two Hassânids (Chron. Mekkâ, i. 343; ii. 10, 195, 239, 329.), Isamî b. Yâsuf and his brother Muhammad, who also ravaged Medina and Dîdâda in the way that had now become usual (255 = 865-866).

The appearance of the Karmâniyas [q.v.] brought still further misery to the country in the last fifty years before the foundation of the aṣfarate (Tabari, iii. 2124-2130). Hard pressed themselves at the heart of the empire, the caliphs were hardly able even to think of giving active support to the holy land, and, besides, their representatives had not the necessary forces at their disposal. From 910 onwards the Karmâniyas barred the way to the pilgrim caravans. In 930, 1,500 Karmâniya warriors RAIDED Mecca, massacred the inhabitants by the thousand and carried off the Black Stone to Bahrein. It was only when they realised that such deeds were bringing them no nearer their goal — the destruction of official Iklân — that their zeal began to relax and in 950 they even brought the Stone back again. Mecca was relieved of serious danger from the Karmâniyas. The following years bear witness to the increasing influence of the ‘Alids in Western Arabia in connection with the advance of Fâtimid rule to the east and with Bûyid rule in Baghdad. From this time the Meccan ‘Alids are called by the title of Shari‘ which they have retained ever since.

2. From the foundation of the Shari‘ate to Kâthâda (c. 350-598 = 960-1200).

a. The Músâwits. The sources do not agree as to the year in which Dżfar took Mecca. 966, 967, 968, and the period between 951 and 961 are mentioned (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 205 sqq.). ‘Alids had already ruled before him in the holy land. It is with him however that the reign of the Hassânids in Mecca begins, who are known collectively as shari‘s, while in Medina this title is given to the reigning Hassânids.

The rise and continuance of the Shari‘ate indicates the relative independence of Western Arabia in face of the rest of the Islamic world from a political and religious point of view. Since the foundation of the Shari‘ate, Mecca takes the precedence possessed by Medina hitherto.

How strongly the Meccan sharifate endeavoured to assert its independence is evident in this period from two facts. In 976 Mecca refused homage to the Fâtimid caliph. Soon afterwards the Caliph began to besiege the town and cut off all imports from Egypt. The Meccans were soon forced to give in, for the Hâjj was dependent on Egypt for its food supplies (Ibn al-‘Athîr, Kâmîl, viii. 407. Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 355). The second sign of the Shari‘a’s feeling of independence is Abu ‘l-Futûh’s (384-432 = 994-1039) setting himself up as caliph in 1011 (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 207; Ibn al-‘Athîr, Kâmîl, ix. 233, 217). He was probably induced to do this by al-Ḥâkim’s heretical innovations in Egypt. The latter however was soon able to reduce the new caliph’s sphere of influence so much that he had hurriedly to return to Mecca where in the meanwhile one of his relatives had marred the power. He was forced to make terms with al-Ḥâkim in order to be able to expel his relative.

With his son Shukr (433-483 = 1039-1089) the dynasty of the Músâwits, i.e. the descendants of Mûsá b. ‘Abd Allah b. Mûsá b. ‘Abd Allah b. Hassan b. ‘Ali b. Abi Talib came to an end. He died without leaving male heirs, which caused a struggle within the family of the Hassânids with the usual evil results for Mecca. When the family of the Banî Shâhîb (q.v.; the Shibís) went so far as to confiscate for their private use all precious metals in the house of Allah, the ruler of Yemen, al-Sulâbi (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 208, 210 sqq.; Ibn al-‘Athîr, Kâmîl, ix. 422; x. 19, 38), intervened and restored order and security in the town. This intervention by an outsider appeared more intolerable to the Hassânids than fighting among themselves. They therefore proposed to al-Sulâbi that he should install one of their number as ruler and leave the town.

He therefore appointed Abu Ḥâşim al-Muhammad (455-487 = 1063-1094) as Grand Sharif. With him begins the dynasty of the A. Ḥâşim (455-598 = 1063-1200), which takes its name from Abu Ḥâşim Muhammad, a brother of the first Sharif Dżfar; the two brothers were descendants in the fourth generation from Mûsá II, the ancestor of the Músâwits.

During the early years of his reign, Abu Ḥâşim had to wage a continual struggle with the Sulâmiyy branch, who thought themselves humiliated by his appointment. These Sulâmiyyas were descended from Sulâmiyya, a brother of the Mûsá II above mentioned.

The reign of Abu Ḥâşim is further noteworthy for the shameless way in which he offered the suzerainty, i.e. the mention in the khutba as well as the change of official rite which is indicated by the wording of the sajjân, to the highest bidder i.e. the Fâtimid caliph or the Salûk sulûk (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 253; Ibn al-‘Athîr, x. 67). It was very unwelcome to the Meccans that imports from Egypt stopped as soon as the official mention of the Fâtimid in the khutba gave way to that of the caliph. The change was repeated several times with the result that the Salûk, tired of this comedy, sent several bodies of Turkomans to Mecca.

The ill-feeling between Sulâk and the Sharif also inflicted great misery on pilgrims coming from the ‘Iraq. As the leadership of the pilgrim caravans from this country had gradually been transferred from the ‘Alids to Turkish officials and soldiers, Abu Ḥâşim did not hesitate occasionally to fall upon the pilgrims and plunder them (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 254; Ibn al-‘Athîr, x. 153).

The reign of his successor is also marked by covetousness and plundering. The Spanish pilgrim Ibn Dżhâir, who visited Mecca in 1183 and 1185, gives hair-rising examples of this. Even then however the Ḥâşim was no longer absolutely the own masters. As early years before, the Aysîhîyad dynasty had not only succeeded to the Fâtimids in Egypt but was trying to get the whole of nearer Asia into their power.
Saladin's brother, who passed through Mecca on his way to South Arabia, abandoned his intention of abolishing the sharifs that the place of honour on the Hadj belonged to the Ayyubids and their names were mentioned in the ghuṣra after those of the 'Abbasid caliph and the sharif (Ibn Djabir, p. 75, 95). The same Ayyubid in 1186 also did away with the Shī'ī (here Zaidi, for the Sharifs had hitherto been Zaidis) form of the adhīn (Chron. Mecca, ii. 314), had coins struck in Saladin's name and put the fear of the law into the hearts of the sharif's bodyguard, who had not shrunk from crimes of robbery and murder, by severely punishing their misdeeds. — A further result of Ayyubid anarchy was that the Shafi'ī rite became the predominant one.

But even the mighty Saladin could only make improvements in Mecca. He could abolish or check the worst abuses but the general state of affairs remained as before.

3. The rule of Kātādī and his descendants down to the Wahhabī period (c. 1200—1788).

In the meanwhile a revolution was being prepared which was destined to have far-reaching consequences than any of its predecessors. Kātādī, a descendant of the same Mihās (see above) from whom the Mūsamīs and the Ḥāwāqīm were descended, had gradually extended his estates as well as his influence from Ṭāubah to Mecca and had gathered a considerable following in the town. According to some sources, his son Hamza made all preparations for the decisive blow on the holy city, according to others, Kātādī seized the town on the 27th Radjab when the whole population was away performing a lesser ṣaḥa in memory of the completion of the building of the Ka'bah by 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair, which was celebrated on this day along with the festival of Muhāmmad's ascension to heaven. However, it came about, Kātādī's seizure of the town meant the coming of an able and strong-willed ruler, the ancestor of all later sharifs. He steadfastly followed his one ambition to make his territory an independent principality. Everything was in his favour; that he did not achieve his aim was a result of the fact that the Hādīs was once again at the intersection of many rival lines of political interest.

Kātādī began by ruining his chances with the great powers; he ill-treated the son of the Ayyubī al-Malik al-'Adīl (540—615 = 1145—1218) in brutal fashion (Chron. Mecca, ii. 369). He roused the ire of the caliph by his attitude to pilgrims from the 'Irāq. He was able however to appease the latter and the embassy he sent to Baghdād returned with gifts from the caliph. The caliph also invited him to visit Baghdād. According to some historians, however, the sharif turned home again before he actually reached Baghdād. On this occasion, he is said to have expressed his policy of the "splendid isolation" of the Hādīs in verse, as he did in his will in prose (see Snouck Hurgronje, Qādīnābād's Policy of Splendid Isolation etc. in Rich.).

On the other hand, Kātādī is said to have vigorously supported an Imām of Ḥasanī descent in founding a kingdom in the Yemen. After the reconquest of this region by a grandson of al-'Adīl, the Ayyubīs of Egypt, Syria, and South Arabia were mentioned in the khutba in Mecca along with the Caliph and Sharif.

Kātādī's life ended in a massacre which his son Ḥasan carried out in his family to rid himself of possible rivals (Chron. Mecca, ii. 315, 325 sqq.; Ibn al-Athir, Kâmīl, xii. 362 sqq.). The Ayyubī prince Ma'dūd however soon put a limit to his ambition and had Mecca governed by his generals. On his death however power again passed into the hands of the sharifs, whose territory was allowed a certain degree of independence by the rulers of the Yemen as a bulwark against Egypt.

About the middle of the xiiiith century the world of Islam assumed a new aspect as the result of the advent of persons and happenings of great importance. In 1358 the taking of Baghdād by Hülagū put an end to the caliphate. The pilgrim caravan from the 'Irāq was no longer of any political significance. In Egypt power passed from the Ayyubīs to the Mamlūkīs; Sultan Barbars (658—676 = 1260—1277) was soon the most powerful ruler in the lands of Islam. He was able to leave the government of Mecca in the hands of the sharif, because the latter, Abū Nūr al-Ašūrī, was an energetic individual who ruled with firmness during the second half of the xiiiith century (1254—1311). His long reign firmly established the power of the descendants of Kātādī.

Nevertheless the first half century after his death was almost entirely filled with fighting between different claimants to the throne. 'Abd al-Ra'ūf's reign also (1346—1375) was filled with political mirest, so much so that the Mamlūk Sultan is said on one occasion to have sworn to exterminate all the sharifs. 'Abd al-Ra'ūf introduced a political innovation by appointing his son and future successor Ḥāfiz al-Ḥakam co-regent in 1361 by which step he hoped to avoid a fratricidal struggle before or after his death.

A second measure of Ḥāfiz al-Ḥakam also deserves mention, namely the harsh treatment of the Mūsamīs and Imām of the Zaidīs; this shows that the reigning sharifs had gone over to the predominant rite of al-Shafi'i and forsaken the Zaidī creed of their forebears.

Among the sons and successors of Ḥāfiz al-Ḥakam special mention may be made of Ḥasan (1396—1426) because he endeavoured to extend his sway over the whole of the Hijāz and to guard his own financial interests carefully, at the same time being able to avoid giving his Egyptian suzerain cause to interfere.

But from 1425 he and his successors had to submit to a regular system of control as regards the allotment of the customs.

From the time of Ḥasan, in addition to the bodyguard of personal servants and freedmen, we find a regular army of mercenaries mentioned which was passed from one ruler to another. But the mode of life of the sharifs, unlike that of other Oriental rulers, remained simple and in harmony with their Arabian surroundings. As a vassal of the Egyptian Sultan the sharif received from him every year his tawqîf [q.v.] and a robe of honour. On the ceremonies associated with the accession of the sharifs see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i. 97 sqq.

Of the three sons of Ḥasan who disputed the position in their father's lifetime, Barākāt (I) was chosen by the sultan as co-regent; twenty years later, he succeeded his father and was able with slight interruptions to hold sway till his death in 1455. He had to submit to the sultan sending a permanent garrison of 50 Turkish horsemen under an emir.
to Mecca. This emir may be regarded as the pre-
cursor of the later governors, who sometimes at-
tained positions of considerable influence under
Turkish suzerainty.

Mecca enjoyed a period of prosperity under
Barakát's son Muḥammad (Chron. Mekha, ii.
341 sqq.; iii. 250 sqq.), whose reign (1455—1497)
coincided with that of Kāfībey [q.v.] in Egypt.
The latter has left a fine memorial in the many
buildings he erected in Mecca.

Under Muhammad's son Barakát II (1497—
1525) who displayed great ability and bravery in
the usual struggle with his relatives, without getting
the support he desired from Egypt (Chron. Mekha,
ii. 342 sqq.; iii. 244 sqq.), the political situation
in Islam was fundamentally altered by the Otto-
man Sultan Selim's conquest of Egypt in 1517.

Although henceforth Constantinople had the
importance for Mecca that Baghdad once had and
there was little real understanding between Turks
and Arabs, Mecca at first experienced a period of
peace under the sharifs Muḥammad Abū Nu-
amuy (1525—1566) and Ḥasan (1566—1601). Under
Ottoman protection the sharifs were extended as far as Kāfīr in the
north, Hālī in the north and east into Najd. Dependency of Egypt still existed at
the same time; when the government in Constantinople was a strong one, it was less perceptible, and
vice versa. This dependence was not only political
but also a material and religious side. The Hijāz
was dependent for its food supply on corn
from Egypt. The foundations of a religious and
educational nature now found powerful patrons in
the Sultan of Turkey.

A darker side of the Ottoman suzerainty was its
intervention in the administration of justice. Since
the sharifs had adopted the Shī'ite madhhab, the
Shī'ite kāfīr was the chief judge; this office had
also remained for centuries in one family. Now
the highest bidder for the office was sent every
year from Constantinople to Mecca; the Meccans of
course had to pay the price with large interests.

Hālī and Najd, which had a new period of confusion and
civil war began for Mecca. In the language
of the historians, this circumstance makes itself
apparent in the increasing use of the term Dhawī ...
for different groups of the descendants of Abū Nu-
namuy who dispute the supremacy, often having
their own territory, sometimes asserting a certain
degree of independence from the Grand Sharīf,
while preserving a system of reciprocal protection
which saved the whole family from disaster (Snouck
Huurgrunde, Mekha, i. 112 sqq.).

The struggle for supremacy, interspersed with
disputes with the officials of the suzerain, centred
in the xviiith century mainly around the 'Abādilla,
the Dhawī Zaid and the Dhawī Barakat.

Zaid (1631—1666) was an energetic individual
who would not tolerate everything the Turkish
officials did. But he was unable to oppose success-
fully a measure which deserves mention on account
of its general importance. The ill-feeling between
the Sunni Turks and the Shī'ī Persians had been
extended to Mecca as a result of an order by Sultan Murad to expel all Persians from the holy
city and not to permit them to make the pilgrim-
age in future. Neither the sharifs nor the upper
classes in Mecca had any reason to be pleased
with this measure; it only served the mob as a
pretext to plunder well-to-do Persians. As soon
as the Turkish governor had ordered them to go,
the Sharīfs however gave permission as before to
the Shī'īs to take part in the pilgrimage and to
remain in the town. The Sharīfs likewise favoured
the Zaidi, who had also been frequently forbidden
Mecca by the Turks.

The further history of Mecca down to the coming
of the Wahhābi is a rather monotonous struggle of
the Sharīfī families among themselves (Dhawī
Zaid, Dhawī Barakat, Dhawī Mūsam) and with the
Ottoman officials in the town itself or in
Djidda.

4. The Sharīfīs from the Wahhābī
period to its end. The Kingdom.

Although the Wahhābis [q.v.] had already
made their influence perceptible under his prede-
cessors, it was Ghālib (1788—1813) who was
the first to see the movement sweeping towards
his territory like a flood; but he left no stone
untouched to avert the danger. He sent his armies
north, east and south; his brothers and brothers-
in-law all took the field; the leaders of the Syrian
and Egyptian pilgrim caravans were appealed to
at every pilgrimage for help, but without success.

In 1801 Ghālib made a treaty with the emir of Darāya,
despite the boundaries of their territories were
pursued, with the stipulation that the Wahhābis
should be allowed access to the holy territory.
Misunderstandings proved inevitable however and in
1803 the army of the emir Sa'ud approached the
holy city. After Ghālib had withdrawn to Djidda, in April Sa'ud entered Mecca, the inhab-
habitants of which had announced their conversion.
All kubbahs were destroyed, all tobacco pipes and
musical instruments burned, and the agūlah purified of praises of the Prophet.

In July, Ghālib returned to Mecca but gradually
became shut in there by enemies as with a
wall. In August the actual siege began and with it
a period of famine and plague. In January
the following year, Ghālib had to submit to acknow-
ledging Wahhābi suzerainty while retaining his
own position.

The Sublime Porte had during all these hap-
penings displayed no sign of life. It was only after the Wahhābis had in 1807 sent back the
pilgrim caravans from Syria and Egypt with their
mamals, that Muḥammad ʿAlī was given
instructions to deal with the Hijāz as soon as he was
finished with Egypt. It was not till 1813 that
he took Mecca and there met Ghālib who made
cautious advances to him. Ghālib however soon
fell into the trap set for him by Muḥammad ʿAlī and
his son Tūsūn. He was sent to Sidon and,
where he lived till his death in 1816.

In the meanwhile Muhammad ʿAlī had installed
Ghālib's nephew, Yāhūd b. Saʿūd (1813—1819)
as sharīf. Thus ended the first period of Wahhābī
rule over Mecca, and the Hijāz once more became
dependent on Egypt. In Mecca, Muhammad ʿAlī
was honourably remembered because he restored
the pious foundations which had fallen into ruins,
revived the consignments of corn, and allotted
stipends to those who had distinguished themselves
in sacred lore or in other ways.

In 1827 Muḥammad ʿAlī had again to interfere
in the domestic affairs of the sharīfīs. When Yāhūd
had made his position untenable by the vengeance
he took on one of his relatives, the viceroy
deposed the Dhawī Zaid and installed one of the 'Abādilla,
Muhammed, usually called Muhammed b. Awn (1827–1851). He had first of all to go through the traditional struggle with his relatives. Trouble between him and Muhammed Ali's deputy resulted in both being removed to Cairo in 1836.

Here the sharif remained till 1840 when by the treaty between Ali and the Porte the Hijaz was again placed directly under the Porte. Muhammed b. Awn returned to his home and rank. Ottoman suzerainty was now incorporated in the person of the wali of Djidda. Friction was inevitable between him and Muhammed b. Awn; the latter's friendship with Muhammed Ali now proved of use to him. He earned the gratitude of the Turks for his expeditions against the Wahhabi chief Faizal in al-Riyadh and against the Ash tribes. His raids on the territory of Yemen also prepared the way for Ottoman rule over it.

In the meanwhile the head of the Dhawi Zaid, Abd al-Muttalib (1851–1856), had made good use of his friendship with the grand vizier and brought about the deposition of the Ashids in favour of the Dhawi Zaid. Abd al-Muttalib however did not succeed in keeping on good terms with one of the two pashas with whom he had successively dealt. In 1855 it was decided in Constantinople to cancel his appointment and to recall Muhammed b. Awn. Abd al-Muttalib at first refused to recognise the genuineness of the order; and he was supported by the Turkphobe feeling just provoked by the prohibition of slavery. Finally however, he had to give way to Muhammed b. Awn, who in 1856 entered upon the Sharifate for the second time; this reign lasted barely two years. Between his death in March 1858 and the arrival of his successor, Abul Allah in October of the same year took place the murder of the Christians in Djidda (June 15) and the atonement for it (cf. 1211H), and Saouck Harrounje, Ein rechter der wissenschaftlichen universiteit, in Brijvagen e. d. Tijd, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned. Indie, 5° voelt., deel II, p. 381 sqq., 399 sqq.

The rule of Abul Allah (1858–1872) who was much liked by his subjects, was marked by peace at home and events of far-reaching importance abroad. The opening of the Suez Canal (1869) meant on the one hand the liberation of the Hijaz from Egypt, on the other however more direct connection with Constantinople. The installation of telegraphic connections between the Hijaz and the rest of the world had a similar importance. The reconquest of Yemen by the Turks was calculated to strengthen the impression that Arabia was now Turkish territory for ever.

The brief reign of his popular elder brother Husain (1872–1880) ended with the assassination of the sharif by an Afghan. The fact that the aged Abd al-Muttalib (see above) was sent by the Dhawi Zaid from Constantinople as his successor (1880–1882) gave rise to an obvious suspicion. Although the pasha saw something of a suit in this old man, his rule was soon felt to be so oppressive that the notables petitioned for his deposition (Saouck Harrounje, Mekba, i. 204 sqq.). As a result in 1881, the energetic Othman Nafi Pasha was sent with troops to the Hijaz as commander of the garrison with the task of preparing for the restoration of the Abbadids. Abd al-Muttalib was ostracised and taken prisoner; he was kept under guard in one of his own houses in Mecca till his death in 1886.

Othman Pasha, who was appointed wali in July 1882, hoped to see his friend Abdillah, one of the Abbadids, installed as Grand Sharif alongside of him. Awn al-Rafik (1882–1905) was however appointed (portrait in Saouck Harrounje, Bilder aus Mekba, p. ). As the wali was an individual of great energy, who had ever done much for the public good and Awn, although very retiring, was by no means insignificant, may even tyrannical, trouble between them was inevitable, especially as they had the same powers on many points, e.g. the administration of justice and supervision of the safety of the pilgrim routes. After a good deal of friction Othman was dismissed in 1886. His successor was Djamal Pasha, who only held office for a short period and was succeeded by Safwat Pasha. Only Ahmad Rithib could keep his place alongside of Awn and that by shutting his eyes to many things and being satisfied with certain material advantages. After Awn's death Abdillah was chosen as his successor. He died however before he could start on the journey from Constantinople to Mecca. Awn's actual successor was therefore a nephew 'Ali (1905–1908). In 1908 he and Ahmad Rithib both lost their positions with the Turkish Revolution.

With Husaia (1908–1916–1924), also a nephew of Awn's, the last sharif came to power. But for the Great War his sharifate would probably have run its usual course. The fact that Turkey was now completely involved in the war induced him to declare himself independent in 1916. He endeavoured to extend his power as far as possible, first as liberator (mumizli) of the Arabs, then (June 22, 1916) as king of the Hijaz or king of Arabia and finally as caliph. Very soon however, it became apparent that the Sultan of Naj'd, Abd al-Azn Al Sa'ad, like his Wahhabi forefathers, was destined to have a powerful say in the affairs of Arabia. In Sept. 1924 his troops took Taif and in October Mecca. King Hussain fled first to Aqaba and from there in May 1935 to Cyprus. His son 'Ali retired to Djidda. Ibn Sa'ad besieged this town and Medina for a year, avoiding bloodshed and complications with European powers. Both towns surrendered in December 1925.

Since January 1926, Ibn Sa'ad has been king of the Hijaz; the official title of his kingdom now is Hijaz, Naj'd and dependencies. A political unit has thus been formed which covers a larger area than the sharifs ever ruled and possesses greater internal strength than has been seen in Arabia since the end of Abbadid power.

By the organisation of the Naj'd warriors (ikhsán) as agriculturists also, by the maintenance of a strict discipline among the Beduins, by the creation of a military police, which is held in awe, a security has been created such as Arabia has perhaps never known and secure foundations laid for traffic, especially of the pilgrims.

With the representatives of foreign governments in Djidda the king maintains friendly relations. Recently several states have raised their consulates there to the rank of an embassy. Treaties have been concluded with a number of states.

By making use of modern technical skill, the king is endeavouring to counteract the natural poverty of the land. The automobile has become of importance for the pilgrim traffic, agricultural machinery is being imported and cisterns built to hold the rain water. A project for examining the
ground to prospect for minerals has been drawn up as well as a plan for a quay in the harbour of Ljidda.

Wahhābiyya — or as they prefer to call it in Arabia: Islam according to the Ḥanbalī rite — is the state religion. But it has advanced scantily in comparison with the profane culture attitude at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The external symbols of veneration for saints and the dead have been removed; Muhammad's tomb in Medina has however been spared. The maqām [q.v.] no longer comes to the ḫālij; the new covering for the Ka'bah is made every year in Mecca. The pilgrim traffic again shows high figures and even ḥajis are admitted again to the pilgrimage.

The religious and economic life of the city has from the earliest times centred round the pilgrimage (cf. the article Ḥajj and the Mosque cf. Al-Masjid al-Haram). The character of Mecca as the metropolis of Islam is reflected in the great variety of its population. Besides the original Meccan nucleus we have numerous Arab elements — among which the Ḥajrams are particularly prominent on account of their energy — and converts of foreigner's from all parts of the Muslim world who have out of worldly or religious motives taken up their abode permanently in the capital. Among these, special mention must be made of those from the Malay Archipelago who are known collectively as Ḥāwā; with them it is exclusively religious motives that have caused them to take up permanent residence in Mecca.

Even at the present day, slaves mainly African, form an important element in Meccan society. Abyssinian slave girls have always been highly esteemed as concubines. The slave-market however is no longer of the importance it once was. Freedmen rise from the slave caste and their dwellings, hats put together of every conceivable material, are on the outskirts of the city.

Artisans are, or at least down to the end of the sixteenth century were, organised in guilds. Among these guilds that of the pilgrim guides (muraqawaf, q.v.), who have agents in Ljidda and outside Arabia, is the most important; it lives entirely on the pilgrim traffic.

This is true in a way of the whole population, which has arranged to let houses to the pilgrims for a considerable portion of the year. By the eighth month, tens of thousands of these visitors are in the town. Their number increases till the twelfth. In Maharram, Mecca resumes its usual appearance.

During the last few hundred years — except for the first World period — the cult of saints in Mecca has steadily increased. Numerous places have sacred memories of Muhammad and his family, the most prominent muḥājirīn and later saints; numerous  khôlas were built over their graves and hawāls and muktabas were celebrated in their honour. The Wahhabī have done away with a great deal of this, how much is not exactly known.

Mecca is the seat of the government, although the king's residence is in Riyāḍ. The official gazette Um al-Kurā appears weekly. There are also printing presses, which mainly print Wahhabī or Ḥanbalī literature.

List of the Shaykhs of Mecca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ijdār</td>
<td>ca. 961—ca. 980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th.</td>
<td>ca. 980—994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū l-Futūḥ</td>
<td>994—1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th.</td>
<td>1039—1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ijdār</td>
<td>1061—1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His son</td>
<td>till 1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abū Numayl I</td>
<td>1254—1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His son</td>
<td>till 1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Adīyān</td>
<td>1346—1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His son</td>
<td>till 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abū Numayl II</td>
<td>1596—1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His son</td>
<td>till 1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>1631—1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1666—1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhawi Barakat</td>
<td>1672—1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhawi Barakat</td>
<td>1684—1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhawi Zaid</td>
<td>1704—1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tour</td>
<td>1717—1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarūr</td>
<td>1773—1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghālib</td>
<td>1788—1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā b. Sarūr</td>
<td>1813—1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>1847—1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abīd al-Muṭṭalib</td>
<td>1851—1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
<td>1856—1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abīd al-Muṭṭalib</td>
<td>1858—1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>1877—1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abīd al-Muṭṭalib</td>
<td>1880—1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abīd al-Muṭṭalib</td>
<td>1882—1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abīd al-Muṭṭalib</td>
<td>1906—1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEDEA, a town in Algeria (department of Algiers), 60 miles S. of Algiers, in 36° 15' 50" N. Lat. and 2° 45' E. Long. (Greenwich). Medea lies at an altitude of 3,870 feet on the northern border of the mountainous massif which divides the high plateaus from the Mitidja. Down to the French occupation, it could only be reached by a saddle-path over the Munia pass (3,870 feet). The building of a road through the gorge of the Ghiffa, alongside of which a railway now runs, has made access to it easier. The town itself is built at the foot of slopes covered with vineyards which yield wines of superior quality and orchards in which, as a result of the temperate climate, fruit trees grow very well. In the neighbourhood a number of European villages have grown up in which the cultivation of cereals is combined with that of the vine. There is also a fairly busy market but it is losing in importance since the railway has been extended to Djelfa at the southern end of the high plateaus. The population (census of 1946) is 13,810 of whom, 2,125 are Europeans, almost all French and 11,591 natives.

Medea occupies the site of the Roman settlement of Lemidia, on the ruins of which Belugine b. Zet in the tenth century built the modern town. The district in which it was built was a dependency of the Emirate of Ifrikiya and was granted to Ibn Khaldun (Berroza, trans. de Stane, ii. 6), inhabited by the Sanhadja tribe of Lemidia, whence no doubt the name Lemuida taken by natives of Medea. Of the history of the town itself we know hardly anything. Lassalonius (Bk. iv., ed. Schefer, iii. 66) and following him Marzouk (Affrika, ii. 594) only tell us that after having belonged to the sultans of Tlemcen who had a garrison there, it passed into the hands of the sultans of Tlemcen, and then of the Turks when the Barbarossa establishments themselves in Algiers. Under Hasan Khabir al-Din, Medea became the capital of one of the three provinces (beyliks) of the Regency, the beylik of the south of Titter, to which a later date was added the lower valley of the Sebou in Kabylia. Down to about 1770 we therefore find the bey of this province living alternately at Medea and Bordj-Sebou. It was not until this date that the region of Sebou having been incorporated in the Dii al-Saltun governed by the bey, the bey of Titter settled permanently at Medea where he was in a better position to control the nomadic tribes of the piazzas. He had however no authority over the inhabitants of the town itself, who were under the authority of a Muhassil appointed by the agas of Algiers. The population, which did not exceed 4,000—5,000 among whom were Malagasy and Turks, retired from the service, became wealthy through its trade with the south. Caravans brought thither the produce of the Sahara and negro slaves who were sold to the citizens of Algiers.

During the years which followed the capture of Algiers, the French on several occasions (Nov. 1830—May 1831—April 1836) occupied Medea, without taking permanent possession. Abd al-Kadir however placed a bey in it and had its ownership of it recognised by the treaty of Tafna (cf. Abd al-Kadir). The outbreak of hostilities in 1840 between the Emir and the French led to the final occupation of Medea by the latter on May 17, 1840.


MEDINA. The Arabic word medina "town" (cf. ALOMEDINA) has survived in Spain in a number of place-names. The principal are Medina de las Torres in the province of Badajos, Medina del Campo and Medina de Rioseco, in the province of Valladolid, Medina de Pomar, in the province of Burgos, Medina del Campo, in the province of Soria, and Medina-Sidonia, in the province of Cadiz. The Arabic place-names Medina al-Zahra and Medina al-Faraj correspond to Valladolid (q.v.) and to Guadajava respectively (from the second Arabic name of this town: Wad Al-Hijara) (cf. above II. 177), and it may be added that the town took its name from a known individual, Millik b. Abd al-Rahman Ibn al-Faraj, according to Ibn al-Khatib, Hâjjar, MS. in the Escorial, i. 189).

(M. LEVA-PROVENCAL)

MEDINACELI, a little town in the N.E. of Spain on the railway from Madrid to Saragossa, about halfway between these two towns, some 350 feet above sea-level on the left bank of the Jalón. In the Muslim period it was called Mudainat-Saliq, which is not to be confused with Medina del Campo, B. al-Saliq, or Ibn al-Saliq, in the Seville district (Ibrâ, Dicr. de l'Espagne, 174/205 and note 5, 177/115), the modern Grajasena in the province of Cádiz.

The Arab geographers give brief descriptions of Medinaceli. According to Idriß, it was a large town built in a hollow with many large buildings, gardens and orchards. Abn 'I-Fidâ' says that this town was the capital of the Middle March (al-Madâ'âr al-mawt). Târîkh adds that 'Uthmân (q.v.) founded the town in ruins at the conquest of Spain but it was repopulated under 'Uthman and became a prosperous town.

Through its geographical position, Mudainat-Saliq was of considerable strategic importance for the Umayyads from the fourth century onwards. It was on many occasions, as the last stronghold on Muslim territory, the point from which forces assembled at Cordova finally started for expeditions against the Christians of the N.E. of the Peninsula to which they retired. Though somewhat decayed down to the reign of 'Abd al-Rahman III al-Nâṣir, it was rebuilt, if we may believe the detailed evidence of a chronicler quoted by Ibn 'Idhir, in 353 (961): this ruler put the work in charge of his client, the general Ghalib, and all the garrisons of the country lent their aid in the work.

This Ghalib remained governor of Medinaceli and all the Middle March until the power was seized by Abn Munšir Ibn Abn 'Adim (q.v.). It was in Medinaceli that this famous Ghalib died on 27th Ramadan 392 (Aug. 19, 1002) on returning from his last expedition against Saragossa. In the following century Medinaceli was frequently taken by the Christians and retaken by the Muslims, before being finally incorporated in the Kingdom of Castile.

Bibliography: Ibrâ, Hist. al-Andalus, ed.
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The Medjidieh of Maimon. — The Medjieh of the Medjidieh contains 100 articles, a number of which (275 articles) are already elaborated by Ibn Nadhum and his school; then follow sixteen books (Bokh), beginning with the Bokh of Ibn Nadr; the last four books deal with process matters. The whole has 1,307 articles. The first part of each book gives definitions of the technical legal terms used, and most of the articles are followed by examples taken from the collections of fatwas. The Introduction and the first book contained the imperial sanction on the 8th of Muharram 1266 (April 20, 1849) and the last two books on the 20th of Shaban 1383 (September 16, 1867).

The text of the Medjidieh is to be found in the big Code collection (Dawiyah al-Kunun) in the Introduction and book I, in vol. vii. of the book. In vol. iii., in vol. vii., and books vi. and xvi. in vol. vii., it has been published several times with a commentary, as the Medjidieh of Abdali's (tabl.) by H. M. Djam al-Din (Der-e Se'adat 1311) and a work under the same title by the in his time famous jurist 'Afif Bay (Der-e Se'adat, in different parts from 1328 to 1339; most parts had a second and the first part a third edition); the latter commentary, however, does not go beyond art. 1448. A full French translation is found in C. Young: Le Code des Dahirous Osmanis, vol. vi., Oxford, 1906, pp. 170-426.

Since the Great National Assembly has adopted, February 13, 1826, a new civil code (Kâlidâ-ı-secadi); al. Orientis Modernis, vi, 134 sqq.), which is substantially the Swiss civil code, the authority of the Medjidieh has disappeared.

MEHMET [See Miehmet.]

MEHMED PASHA. [See KAMALI Mehmed Pasha.]

MEHMET, MEHMET, MEHMET, MEHMET. [See MÜHÈMMEI.]

MEHMET PASHA. [See KANAMAI Mehmed Pasha.]

MEHRI, the language of the Mahr country in South Arabia, which with Shewari (spoken in the mountains northeast of Zafa) and the dialect of the island of Socotra forms a separate branch of South Semitic; the relation of the branch to the now extinct languages found in the inscriptions of the Sabians, Mezmets and (Bajmarwan) has not been accurately determined. Mehri itself as a spoken language in South Arabia is seriously threatened by the steady advance of northern Arabic. The Mahr people are already almost all bilingual and their native idiom is very much influenced, especially in vocabulary, by northern Arabic; for example, of its old numismatics it has preserved only the first ten; all higher numbers have been replaced by the northern Arabic forms. It is therefore not always easy to distinguish with certainty old words which are also found in southern Arabic from later borrowings.

As regards orthoepies, the Mehri consonants are in general agreement with Arabic and Ethiopic. Of the laryngal element of 'ain, which will surmount

1. In this article the author's system of trans-literation is retained for philological reasons.
vives in Shbawi, is characteristic of Mehri. The
vular passive / seems always to be voiced; of the
palatals that / which still survives in Shbawi,
is always liquidized, as in northern Arabic, to /q.
The case of the sibilants is particularly characteristic.
The original Semitic $ seems to have been preserved
as such; but in many words as in northern Arabic,
the original Semitic $ has coalesced with it. This
sound, which is preserved in Shbawi as well as
in Canaanite and Aramaic, has often been replaced
by $ in genuine Mehri words, initially for example
in battle (he) "hears" (compare המדה "ear-
muscle") and medially inמהו "forgotten"; in this
final position it may be dropped, as in $ as a "little
goat", $a "head". But when we find alongside of $ to "obstruct" same "to carry
over, to come to an agreement", which is connec-
ted with the Arabic sound "straight, correct", the
latter can only be regarded as borrowed from the
Arabic. This is however also found in words like $ak$ (he) "put on" and in the pronouns of the
third pers. fem. or $en, etc., in which such
borrowing is highly improbable; these must therefore belong to a dialect for which the phonetic law $-$ did not hold. The primitive Semitic $ has also survived: where a following $ was
asimilated to it, even when the consequent doubling
was dropped, as in the prefix to the causative reflexive $a$. A primitive Semitic sound seems
also to have survived in the $ in to which John
has given the same "lateral", and which is trans-
literated in the Vinman texts by /; it corresponds
eymologically to the Arabic $, and therefore to
the $ in Canaanite and Old Aramaic. Whether the
position of articulation was exactly the same cannot
of course be decided, but the description of the sound
as "lateral" probably means the same as the
pronunciation with flattened tongue which is assumed
for Canaanite and Aramaic. Among the dental
the we find alongside of $ and $ also the fricatives
$ and $ in native as well as loanwords; but in both:
the groups the fricative pronunciation has fre-
quently been dropped, e.g. in the case of $ regularly
in the demonstratives; alongside of $ $ we have $ in.
See "behind" $ appears instead of the $ in the Arabic $ (track), probably under the influence of $, like
$ in the Eth. $ instead of the $ which we should expect. So also in the case of $ the
fricative has in many cases become a positive $ under conditions still to be explained, as in $ "moon", $ "grand" = Arabic $, $.
The voiced $ has a lateral articulation differing from the
Arabic in the labial, as in Arabic, the voice-
less fricative / corresponds to the voiced explosive
$. Of the liquids, $, when in proximity to velars and palatals, is frequently more nasal than in
Arabic. $ and $ before consonants frequently lose
their own sound and merge in the preceding vowel,
as $ "all" from $ = $, $ "untranslated"
*he carries her from $ (by dissimilation in $ that
"night", bottle every night), $ $ "horn", $ $ "belly".

The vowels are frequently prefixed with the
laryngal fricative instead of the laryngal passive,
but we often have $ for $ as $ As in Ethiopic
and probably also in primitive Semitic, only two
short vowel sounds, $ and $, are distinguished,
while of long vowels we have $, $ and $.
The old distinguish between $ and $ are contracted to $ and $. These
basic vowels are however more strongly affected
than in Arabic by the predominant articulation of
consonants. The distinction between $ and $ is therefore
characteristically, in the vowel assimilation of long vowels to accented ones, whereby $, if it is not retained by laryngal
emphatic (i.e. pharyngalized) consonants preceding
$ (which often passes into $, open sounds ad-
joining it however become $, $, $), Assimilation
of vowels in adjacent syllables is frequent. Original
long vowels after laryngals and emphatic consonants
become $, $ and $.

Of the phenomena of sound-shifting and
sound-change in combination, a characteristic
feature is the tendency, paralleled in the vowel
assimilation just described, to bring voiced and
unvoiced sounds into agreement (Jahn, Grammatik,
p. 8). On this is based the transformation of Arabic
$ "other", the root of which poetic language retains in $ (to be delayed), into $ with metathesis of the initial sound $ being replaced by $ (cf. $ (thereupon), the "voice of the Arabic, which Bittner,
Studien, i. 15, compares with this, is to be regarded
as distinct). The tendency to the assimilation of
$ in $, as in Arabic, usually considered by the
necessary of maintaining the verbal system. Although
the disappearance of vowels produced by stress
sometimes produces double consonants initially, this
is frequently avoided at the end of words by the
insertion of an epenthetic vowel, e.g. $ $ alongside of $ "earth". Such additional syllables are found
medially also before consonants as in the subj. $ after laryngals as in $ and velars as
in $, $, $, etc. Dissimilation, especially before consonants $, $ from $, becomes
$ "time"; Hein, p. 117, 2), haplography as in
$ $ $ $ (fem.) and strong metatheses like $ $ $ $ (fem.) are.

The pronouns has preserved very archaic forms.
The first personal pronoun $, $ can probably not be equated
as Bittner, Studien, ii. 7 suggests), to $ in Accadian $, as the change $ $ is not found elsewhere in Mehri, but must be connected with the
primitive Semitic $ (with aspiration of the initial vowel — see above). It is also improbable that
the 2nd pers. pronoun $, $ should preserve in the singular, with assimilation of the $, the initial syllable $ was found
in the other Semitic languages, but reject it in the plural. It is perhaps more probable that the initial
sound of the 2nd pers. has been assimilated to
that of the 1st and 3rd. The 1st plur. $ reveals a
form of the primitive Semitic $ (in Hebrew,
the 3rd pers. alone among Semitic languages pre-
served the original difference in the initial sounds,
in $, $, $, $, $, $; on the other
hand, the double distinction through the vowels
has been dropped. Among the suffixes may be
noted the distinction of gender (genitive) found also in
some North Semitic dialects, in the 2nd pers.
$ $, $, $, with palatalization ik into as in Shbawi
$ (Muller, ii. 113, 4) and Sib, $ (Muller,
i. 227, N°. 2), "her", in place of the suffixes,
the independent pronouns may also be used with
the genitive particle as in $, my farm";
$ "my sheep".

The demonstrative pronouns end in the
sg. in $ (in place of $) and distinguish the
The feminine ending at takes the accent in nominatives with short stem vowels and therefore appears as at, at; or with assimilation to close front vowels as at, as in kahrmat. *rain*, pagh/ at, harshit/ *shamblng*; after long stem vowels however, it is unaccented, as in ahiit/ "flag", tawir/ "rise", quirit/ "palm-wood", especially in loanwords from the Arabic, while in true Mehti words the vowel in the unaccented syllable usually disappears and the vocal of the now closed root syllable is subordinated, as in ahiit/ (Yemen) ahiit/ "town, village", eit/ "worm", hariit/ "meat", at the same time showing assimilation of the final consonants: quirit/ (from quirit/) "good" (fem.), hariit/ (from hariit/) "usual" (fem.).

Another feminine ending i, which still occasionally appears unsuppressed in Arabic and Aramaic, is here found, as in most Semitic languages, only in combination with the usual ending i as a regularly accented ti, e.g. in the participles, and again in simple noun-stems, corresponding to the masculine ending s, e.g. tawir/ "rise", in the derivative stems like noun/ "mother", noun/ "father", noun/ "meater", noun/ "loved one", which is found also before some nouns which are trilingual in the other Semitic languages, like noun/ "fear"; noun/ "rope", noun/ "well", which Littmann explained by metathesis, noun/ "temple" = noun/ "great, elders," = noun/ "as". noun/ "old she-camel, head of a family", noun/ "water-skin" = noun/ "old, ancient, Axadad. noun/ as" noun/ "in a valley" (Müller, iii. 24, 25) this syllable (here assimilated only to the beginning of the next word) serves as an indefinite article, which has lost its significance in the above words and become a component of the stem, so that it also appears in the plural. noun/ etc., but originally however must have been identical with the numeral noun/ which is still used as an indefinite pronoun. noun/ "uncle," and noun/ among others: tawit/ "he weakened to be, A. Emheb, in Zetzcir, f. ag. Spr. u. All. li. 118, 136, compares these nouns with the assimilated stems with prefixed noun/ in Egyptian discussed by Sehe, ibid., xvi. 50, note 2.

Of other nominal forms we need only mention the diminutives, sometimes with internal formation similar to Ar. noun/ (see Rhodokanakos, Zur Formenlehre, p. 53), as, for example, noun/ "little child," sometimes also with the ending noun/, which here always appears as in under the influence of the diphthong of the basic form noun/ (Rhodokanakos, ibid., unw. khatit/ "short time").

The feminine ending at takes the accent in nominatives with short stem vowels and therefore appears as at, at, or with assimilation to close front vowels as at, as in kahrmat. *rain*, pagh/ at, harshit/ "shambles"; after long stem vowels however, it is unaccented, as in ahiit/ "flag", tawir/ "rise", quirit/ "palm-wood", especially in loanwords from the Arabic, while in true Mehti words the vowel in the unaccented syllable usually disappears and the vocal of the now closed root syllable is subordinated, as in ahiit/ (Yemen) ahiit/ "town, village", eit/ "worm", hariit/ "meat", at the same time showing assimilation of the final consonants: quirit/ (from quirit/) "good" (fem.), hariit/ (from hariit/) "usual" (fem.).

Another feminine ending i, which still occasionally appears unsuppressed in Arabic and Aramaic, is here found, as in most Semitic languages, only in combination with the usual ending i as a regularly accented ti, e.g. in the participles, and again in simple noun-stems, corresponding to the masculine ending s, e.g. tawir/ "rise", in the derivative stems like noun/ "mother", noun/ "father", noun/ "meater", noun/ "loved one", which is found also before some nouns which are trilingual in the other Semitic languages, like noun/ "fear"; noun/ "rope", noun/ "well", which Littmann explained by metathesis, noun/ "temple" = noun/ "great, elders," = noun/ "as". noun/ "old she-camel, head of a family", noun/ "water-skin" = noun/ "old, ancient, Axadad. noun/ as" noun/ "in a valley" (Müller, iii. 24, 25) this syllable (here assimilated only to the beginning of the next word) serves as an indefinite article, which has lost its significance in the above words and become a component of the stem, so that it also appears in the plural. noun/ etc., but originally however must have been identical with the numeral noun/ which is still used as an
ending in (see above) or it may be, as Rhodockanskaia (q6. cit, p. 8) suggests, the other plural ending ən, as in Accad. anūtum "all." In the formations and use of the broken plural, Mehri adopts a mean between Arabic and Ethiopic. Characteristic are a number of formations from plurals of the plural, with or without the ending ən, also in Arabic. e.g., ḍariq "a place of wood," plural ̄iyat, ḍariṣṣat and the phrase ḍariq ḍariq (Rhodokanskaia. p. 11 sqq.). Double plurals also arise through the addition of the masc. pl. ending ən in ḍariqat "wood," ḍariṣṣat "tails," wābīn "bows," to which the original plurals ḍariq, ḍariṣṣ, wābin are then taken as singulars (Rhodokanskaia. p. 9), and again with vowel reduction after the accented syllable in ḍariqām "bitches," ḍariṣṣīm "daughters," in which however Rhodokanskaia (p. 15) sees the ending ən.

The case inflections, except for a few remains of the accusative in some adverbs, have completely disappeared. The genitive is expressed by the simple juxtaposition of two nouns, more frequently by the relative, sometimes with a demonstrative suffix, as in ḍariṣṣa ḍariṣṣat "a pair of bows," ḍariq ṭełoṣ "the skin of the steer, the young of the cow." Here, p. 15 sqq., alongside of ḍariqat ənne "the young of the cow," ḍariq, p. 3 sqq.

Determination and indetermination are never indicated. Noun only survives in some adverbs, like ḍariqat ənne "in front," ḍariṣṣīm ənne "behind," ḍariṣṣat ənne "later.

The prepositions of Mehri are for the most part new formations, some of uncertain origin. Of the old, descriptive prepositions, only li (bi, bi), hēn, hēn ən, le ən hēn and li ən, and mei have survived; ən, ḍariq ən li ən only mean "with." The place of li has been taken by li ən, which Bittner traces to the first syllable of li ən, but this is not very probable. The other prepositions have been replaced by words indicating place, like ḍariqat ənne "in front," ḍariṣṣat ənne "behind," ḍariqat ənne "on" (properly a T-words connected with Arabic maštir "to be near," rather than with Syriac ənne, as Bittner considers), ḍariqat ənne "below," (properly "depresión"); but Sokčeti, mei (Mei, li, li ən, li ən, li ən, li ən), or parts of the body, like ḍariq ənne (lit. "in the bosom"; Christian) and ṭeṭr, ṭeṭr ənne (properly "back").

The verbs distinguish from the simple form, which is found in the active as ḍariqat ənne and passive as ḍariqat ənne "was clothed," an intensive which has never dropped the doubling and thus coincides with the passive ḍariq ənne, which is the imperfect also sometimes has the same form as the intensive (e.g. ḍariqat ənne to tend a sick person," impf. int. ḍariqat ənne, subj. ḍariqat ənne, and ḍariqat ənne "to remedy," impf. int. ḍariqat ənne, subj. ḍariqat ənne). The causative has very often a passive sense, like the simple intensive verb, with which it is often conjoined as an inner causative. To each of these stems there is a reflexive with inserted ṭeṭr to the simple verb in double form as ḍariqat ənne or ḍariṣṣat ənne, or with assimilation to the vowels of the simple verb ḍariqat or ḍariṣṣat, to the passive ḍariqat ənne "to go to law," ḍariqat ənne "to quarrel." In contrast to the perfect (quoted above as the normal form), which expresses a fact as such, there is an imperative in the active ḍariq ənne "break," in the passive ḍariqat ənne "put on," in the intensive ḍariqat ənne "wear," in the causative ḍariqat ənne "cause to write," in the reflexive ḍariqat ənne; ḍariṣṣat ənne, in the case, ḍariqat ənne and ḍariqat ənne. From these imperatives is formed the affective mood (Bittner's substantive), like ḍariqat ənne "that he caused to write," ḍariqat ənne "that he made," ḍariqat ənne "he writes," ḍariqat ənne "he travelled," ḍariqat ənne "he turns," ḍariqat ənne "he travels," ḍariqat ənne and ḍariqat ənne, etc. ḍariqat ənne. In the infinitive and sometimes in the reflexive shows an ending corresponding to the Arabic -yin, as in ḍariqat ənne "he travels," ḍariqat ənne and ḍariqat ənne, etc. ḍariqat ənne. In the infinitive, the affective mood serves also to indicate that an event is happening at the present time (as so called indicatives); on account of the relations of the intran. to the case and red. already referred to this formation, but now for the indicative only, is transferred to these forms in ḍariqat ənne (alongside of ḍariqat ənne), ḍariqat ənne (from ḍariqat ənne). To these is added the called perfect in active verbs, the stress remains in the second syllable of the stem with the exception of the 3rd fem. sg. the ending of which is, as in the nouns, attached to itself (ṭeṭr). The 3rd pl. has lost the ḍariqat ənne and replaces them only in the masc. by ḍariqat ənne, which comes from the pronoun. The consonantal terminations have lost their vowels, but the double consonant at the end of a word is separated by the insertion of an apenthetic vowel only before the numeral of the 1st pers. pl. (ṭerṭeṭrī); before other terminations the vowel of the stem remains short. As in Ethiopic the initial of the 2nd pers. is assimilated to that of the 1st (y); as in the suffix, the 2nd fem. sg. appears in the palatalized form ənne. The infinitive, the exception of the 3rd fem. sing., retains the stress on the first syllable of the stem, the vowel of which is assimilated to that of the second (ṭeṭrī). In the intensive the lengthening of the a to ə is found only in the forms which do not add a termination. In the imperative in the transitive simple verb as well as in the causative there is no distinction of gender in the singular. In the transitive form however, the vowel of the second accented syllable of the stem was assimilated to the feminine ending ən, so that even after it was dropped the distinction between m. ḍariqat ənne and ḍariqat ənne was retained, similarly in the reflexive ḍariqat ənne, ḍariqat ənne.

Accordingly, in the intensive and its reflexive and in the causative reflexive the distinction of gender is expressed also by changing the accented vowel: m. ḍariqat ənne, f. ḍariqat ənne, m. ḍariqat ənne, f. ḍariqat ənne, m. ḍariqat ənne, f. ḍariqat ənne. In the plural the genders are distinguished by the endings in -iən, -iən. In the imperative simple form however, the vowel of the second accented syllable of the stem was assimilated to the feminine ending ən, so that even after it was dropped the distinction between m. ḍariqat ənne and ḍariqat ənne was retained, similarly in the reflexive ḍariqat ənne, ḍariqat ənne.

Out of the imperative arises the so-called subj.
of the imperfect by means of the same personal prefixes as in all Semitic languages and with the endings -e for the 2nd and 3rd pers. In the corresponding imperative the distinction of gender is expressed in the second person by internal vowel change, m. tethé, f. teth in and on, and in the addition of the plural endings the short vowel (yitithe etc.) is restored. In the infinitive, the prefix 

The participle is in the singular (subj. khesiper, t. khesiper, subj. m. khesiper, t. khesiper); before the endings, the vowels are short and the mood endings give way to the plural endings so that the 3rd pers. f. sg. and pl. are the same: taheker.

The infinitives are in the same form as the active infinitive, t. khesiper (see above), and m. makhéter, i.e. the infinitive stems as in e.g. intensive mekhabter, t. makhéter, cam. mekhéter, t. miyum in the passive they follow the model of the simple verb, makhéter "enlarged" (in the intensive only when borrowed from the Arabic like meghabder "chief").

The infinitives are the same as the verb forms of the form makhéter "to be ill" in y惆kham to take (infrequently with med. lac.), with prefixes, like makhéter "work," or with the prefix like makhéter "to forgive" in the intensive and yitithe "to cool down," in the causal and the reflexive with the ending -e (2) in as m. hakheker, kakeker, kachker.

In the verbs with laryngal as second radical, the perfect is in e.g. gísham "he went"; it is therefore, as in Ethiopic, the intransitive scheme with the type of the transitive making itself felt; the imperfect is therefore infused as in the intransitives without distinction of mood. As a 1st radical, a laryngal frequently produces intransitive syllables, e.g. in subst. yisham to say; "to hear."

In the 3rd pers. as 2nd radical, acts in the same way, e.g. vsamad "let him become sick" (cf. Arabic wasma, not Hebrew ñáam as Bitter supposed), while an original khesiper disappears, as in yimer "let him say." As asecond radical no dis appears, but keeps a in the perfect of the simple verb unchanged, as the unrest (past tense) with the 

In the verbs with third aim, unlike Ethiopic, trans. and intrans. formation is distinguished in the simple verb, whereby the perf. of the trans. coincides with the niter verb (the causal); in the intransitives, the moods distinguish the moods of the imperfect exactly like the transitives.

In the verbs with first am, the primitive Semitic formation of the bilateral stem is dying out. It is true, we still find the imperative laryngal "give" with the subst. yisam and yisham come in with the subst. yewsh, but yesh is already limited to the feminine and the masc. yesh formed from it; we have besides the reduplicated imperatives: yismem, yisemem, as well as yisham and yisham to load; and with vowel lengthening yisham to call, and yisham to be called. In transitive formations the m. disappears from the root in some forms of the reflexive, like misham *to go in the afternoon*, imp. ind. yischam, subj. yischam, inf. yisham and yisham be awakened, imp. ind. yischam, subj. yischam, inf. yisemem. For the rest the first-passive verbs inflect regularly, and the few first-passive verbs follow them.

The third-singular verbs very often coincide with the third-singular passive. In the transitive in the simple form we have a throughout and in the intransitive e.g. yisham (and yisham) in the present active voice, which in the perfect in the forms with consonantal endings changes with the stem, e.g. yisham "he found," but x and x. c. nisham and nisham "he saw," but nisham. In the 3rd pl. m. besides the original khesiper, we have also khesiper with secondary vowel differentiation, and with a new formation on the model of forms like khesiper also khesiper. In the imperfect and subj. the form of the third-singular, like khesiper, khesiper has predominated; in the indic. the unaccented final vowels disappear except in the x. f. sg. (khesiper). The determinative khesiper to hang" from ker. *saun" follows completely the strong paradigm khesiper, only the t. of the x. sg. is also found in the 3rd. e.g. khesiper, along with khesiper and khesiper (Müller, lv. 11 i). In the genitive stems only the 3rd m. sg. of the perf. in the cases (hakham) and its refl. (gísham) is formed after the trans. simple verb, in all other forms the paradigm of the third-singular is followed (híti, híti, kíti etc.). But the final vowel is lost in the imperfect and in the subj. of the reflexive sometimes (kíti hide thyself) subj. yísham, but gísham, subj. kišam, and both forms lose it regularly in the causative and its reflexive kíti, yísham, sometimes with lengthening: kíti *get up*, kísham, sháth [Jahn, p. 113] at *give heed*, písham.

The model s and f verbs are, as in Ethiopic, to a great extent assimilated to the plan of the strong verbs, yish and makhéter being treated as consonants. Only in the simple form of the med. a is the old Semitic inflexion retained in principle. But the old form yismem (frequently yismem) has become indicative, and a new subj. has been formed with vowel change, yisemem, followed by the reflexive, yisham. As in the intransitives, the ending of the verb is the same as the perf. of the transitive, e.g. m. hakheker, kakeker, kachker; in the imperfect, m. hekheker, kakeker, kachker; and in the causative m. yisham, yisham, sometimes with lengthening: kíti *get up*, kísham, sháth [Jahn, p. 113] at *give heed*, písham.

The model s and f verbs are, as in Ethiopic, to a great extent assimilated to the plan of the strong verbs, yish and makhéter being treated as consonants. Only in the simple form of the med. a is the old Semitic inflexion retained in principle. But the old form yismem (frequently yismem) has become indicative, and a new subj. has been formed with vowel change, yisemem, followed by the reflexive, yisham. As in the intransitives, the ending of the verb is the same as the perf. of the transitive, e.g. m. hakheker, kakeker, kachker; in the imperfect, m. hekheker, kakeker, kachker; and in the causative m. yisham, yisham, sometimes with lengthening: kíti *get up*, kísham, sháth [Jahn, p. 113] at *give heed*, písham.

The model s and f verbs are, as in Ethiopic, to a great extent assimilated to the plan of the strong verbs, yish and makhéter being treated as consonants. Only in the simple form of the med. a is the old Semitic inflexion retained in principle. But the old form yismem (frequently yismem) has become indicative, and a new subj. has been formed with vowel change, yisemem, followed by the reflexive, yisham. As in the intransitives, the ending of the verb is the same as the perf. of the transitive, e.g. m. hakheker, kakeker, kachker; in the imperfect, m. hekheker, kakeker, kachker; and in the causative m. yisham, yisham, sometimes with lengthening: kíti *get up*, kísham, sháth [Jahn, p. 113] at *give heed*, písham.

The model s and f verbs are, as in Ethiopic, to a great extent assimilated to the plan of the strong verbs, yish and makhéter being treated as consonants. Only in the simple form of the med. a is the old Semitic inflexion retained in principle. But the old form yismem (frequently yismem) has become indicative, and a new subj. has been formed with vowel change, yisemem, followed by the reflexive, yisham. As in the intransitives, the ending of the verb is the same as the perf. of the transitive, e.g. m. hakheker, kakeker, kachker; in the imperfect, m. hekheker, kakeker, kachker; and in the causative m. yisham, yisham, sometimes with lengthening: kíti *get up*, kísham, sháth [Jahn, p. 113] at *give heed*, písham.

MEKRA (Meknes and Meknés, North Africa), a town in Morocco, one of the residences of the Sultans. The old French name Meknès or Meknès has not prevailed against the form inspired by the Arabic.

Situated in 3° 50' W. Long., (Greenwich) and 33° 55' N. Lat., at an average height of 1,700 feet above sea-level, Meknes is 80 miles east of Rabat and 40 west of Fès. It occupies the centre of the transitional zone which lies between the Middle Atlas, 50 miles to the south, and the Sefrou, 110 miles to the north. Its climate is characterized by the dry, hot summer, and the cold, wet winter. At Meknes intersect the roads from Rabat to Fès, from Tafilalet through the land of the Rif Mutfid and Azrou, from Marrakesh through the Tafilalt. Meknes at the present day is commercially connected with Tafilalet.

The temperature rarely exceeds 30° C., or falls below 5°. The rainfall (351 mm. in 1929) is remarkably equid from one year to the other. The excellent water supply of the plain of Meknes and the quality of its light soil, resting on a subsoil of permeable limestone, make it one of the best agricultural districts of Morocco.

The population at the last census was 30,000, of whom 10,000 were Muslims and 5,000 Jews. Casual in 1902 put it at 20,000 of whom 9,000 were Moroccans and 3,000 Jews.

Meknes is built on the flank of a mountain spur. The ruins of the Aghna of Moulay Isma'il lie to the S. E. of the native town, and give to the old town, surrounded by walls of clay, a considerable extension, of which the Medina itself only covers about a fifth. Beyond the existing mud wall the Wadi Bhi Feikran the European town has been laid out and is being built. The appearance of the native town, dominating the ravine and placed upon a terrace plateau, is striking. The houses of the medina, often substantial, are always quite simple. There are only fifteen or so houses of any artistic interest. These elevations for the most part from the reigns of Sultan Muhammad I. and Alā al-Dīn and Moulay Isma'il. The suburbs of the town look like the streets of a country village. The only, which lie between the Mekness...
considerably. The colonists, most of whom have come from Algeria, cultivate mainly wheat, of which they are obtaining increasing yields. The cultivation of the vine is increasing each year. The region of Moulay Idris is one of the principal centres of olive-growing in Morocco (400,000 trees). The native farms are laid out in the district, covering 83,000 hectares. Official colonisation has not yet disposed of almost all the reserved lands, which have been distributed since 1927 by private colonisation. The native farms (130,000 hectares) are still working and are not yet disappearing as they have in the past.

The government of Meknes, which is a modern town, is in the hands of a sheikh. He is also sheikh of the Berbers, who have retained a part of their past greatness in a special capacity. The town (800 men according to L. Chatelard) is a place of refuge and the capital of a very considerable area. It was from here that the military operations in the Central Atlas were directed. Although this part of the country is now more peaceful, Meknes is still a military command, and its administrative region, although greatly reduced, still stretches to Meknes. Situated in the centre of Morocco at the junction of important roads, Meknes is a market town for one of the strong places of the country in the future: a military camp is being laid out at al-Idjeb.

The population of Meknes consists of many distinct elements: Shofa, Boughrara, Berbers and Jews. The shofa, who have played their part in the history of the town and retain privileges (the number of descendants of Moulay Idris, only the families residing in Fas and Meknes are allowed to show in the income of the shofa of Fas and the Idris shofa), have many privileges of their own, forming a kind of aristocracy, generally possessive. The Boughrara, descendants of the sheikh of Meknes, up to 1912, formed an unreliable element, which was always full of trouble. Since that date they have been taking up the trade of merchants and farmers. They live close to the town of old kasbas and gardens which belong to the sheikh and in the old kasba of Meknes (Meknes). In the 19th and 20th centuries. Their houses, studded with tchad, look like African enclaves. But it is the Barbare (Barber) element, which predominates at Meknes and gives it that desire for independence, a feature which has for centuries been a nationalism of Fas. It is the Barbare of the mountains who give it its tone: when they come down to the town, their women give colour to the streets of Meknes with the broom, their skirts, their baskets, their toilet and their wide trousers. The barber elements of the plains are much more mixed, having undergone many vicissitudes since the days when Moulay Muhammad is. Abi Allah inaugurated the policy, considerably extended by his successors, of transferring tribes.

A considerable part of the population of Meknes consists of floating elements who come, usually between harvest and the passing of arts, and when the harvest is over, usually between harvests, to work as artisans. These immigrants, almost all come from the south, from the Ifni in particular (pottery, tanneurs and porters),
from Sidi (procers), from Tind (oil-makers), from Figiy and Daqa (masons). The Rifians and Ifallas supply most of the agricultural labourers. A small number of Fasans, who have in recent years merged into the population of the town, are cloth-merchants, old-clothes-dealers and shoemakers.

Jews form a quarter of the native population. Foucault estimated the mūsāliā of Mekez to be half that of Fas. Chénier remarked on its prosperity. It has increased since his day as elsewhere and the position of the Jews is greatly improved since the establishment of the French Protectorate.

Religious Life. From the presence of the Idrāwi and Hassani niyabot, the proximity of the sanctuaries of Mawki Idris and the religious event of the celebration of his naẓar (class. marāsi), every year, Mekez is one of the most important centres of shriftism. At the same time for the Berber population it is a centre of marvellous rites of the most elementary kind. All the brotherhoods that have naẓariya in Morocco are represented in Mekez. The most important are those of the Kādiriya, Tulānīya, and especially Himākās who are the largest, the ṭāissen, in which half the population are attached. Mekez, whose patron saint is Sidi Muhammad b. Ġst and which contains his tomb under the šabbah erected by Mawki Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh, is the capital of the order. This saint came here at the end of the 17th century. His teaching at first met with a vigorous resistance, which he overcame so completely that, when the governor of the town sought to take steps against him, the people protected him. Before his death he acquired an estate, constituted it šabbah and set it aside as a cemetery. It is still used and many men of religion are buried there. The celebration of his naẓar on the first day of the mawṣur (nerusāli) festival is the great event of the year. The preparations for it begin forty days before and become all-absorbing ten days before the festival. On the day before or the preceding day delegations flock in from all parts of Morocco, following the traditional routes. The most generous hospitality is given to the pilgrims by the descendants of Shaikh al-Kamīl, who are the mawki (Brunei). The excesses committed on the occasion of this pilgrimage have been frequently described. Many other special cults are observed in Mekez. He Šekri is the patron of the gravers, and Mawki Said of the Zāhdh is the patron of the tanners, weavers and butchers (Māgiɣ). There is even the cult of a living holy man, Mawki Ahmad Warzānī. As it was his custom to sit in the public way in a very simple costume, he was in 1927 granted clothes and a šubbah at the request of Mawki Yūnuf. The šubbah is at the entrance to a dispensary and the admittance of the saint come there daily to keep him company.

History. We know nothing certain about the history of the region in the Roman period nor in the centuries which followed. The most advanced Roman stations were on the slopes of the Zāhdh guarding the plain, out of which the warriors of the Central Atlas might debouch, and perhaps throwing out a serene as far as the plateau of el-Hadhja.

We do not know at what date the people here had their first contract with Yūzima, but even if it was not till the Hilāli invasion that Yūzima became securely established here, the Berber tribes of the Sa-ī and Sebī made the most of the fertility of their country. A tradition records that a fire destroyed the gardens there in 917. It was at this period that the country was covered, from Tānī to Mekez, by the migration of a Zenata tribe, the Minkas, a section of whom, who received the name of Minkas al-Zaṭṭa, to distinguish them from the Minkas Tānī, who lived farther to the east and established themselves securely in the plain. The Ṭurkis met with a vigorous resistance from the Minkas. They always found in their opponents whom they could not overcome in spite of several campaigns, and who were the medium of Umayyad intervention.

The Kāfir records that a governor of the district, al-Mahāl b. Yūsuf al-Kazārī, having joined Vahd. b. Taqfīn, was assassinated by the hitherto, and the terrified citizens hasted to disown the murder. At this date a few villages stood on the site of Mekez. One cannot say at what date, perhaps in the tenth century, they were grouped together to form the Tāmath mentioned by Idrīsī (Taqaṣrī, according to the Kāfir al-Isbīhānī). The population seems to have been more numerous in the Almoravid period than later, and prosperous. Enclosed by a wall, Mekez looked like a pleasure resort, with its gardens, cultivated fields, its mosques, its baths and water channels.

The Minkas vigorously opposed the Almohads onslaught. When passing through this region in 1132—34, Ibn Tūmāt preached here but he was not well received. Twenty years later, 'Abd al-Ma'min said siege to Mekez but it was not he who took it. He left it to enter Fas, leaving the conduct of the siege in the hands of Yahwī b. Yaghīm. The Kāfir says the siege lasted seven years. The town fell in 1150. It was plundered, the defences dismantled, a part of its wealth confiscated, and all its garrison put to death, except the governor Yadder b. Ullūū, who is said to have gone over to the Almohads before the surrender in order to save his head. On the site, or beside the ruins, Mekez rapidly rose again under the shelter of the fortifications built by the Almohads. At the end of the 12th century, it had regained some importance and the mosque of al-Nadžīrān was finished. This is the oldest mosque in Mekez: in 1755—57 Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh had it restored and built the present minaret. The Almohads brought water hither from Tadjarra, five miles away. In 1152 the šubbah was said in five different places in Mekez and there were six gates in the wall which surrounded the town.

In the course of the following century, the intrigues of the Banū Matts (q.v.) disturbed the country, so that the fighting that accompanied the fall of the Almohads was particularly lively. In 1234—35, al-Ma'mīni had to intervene against the Banū Fārīs and Miskīna, who were ravaging Mekez. In 1250—57, as a result of the Martīdī success in the battle in which al-Sa'īd's son was slain, Abū Bakr entered the town. This occupation was only temporary but the Almohad emigration was not secure. In 1245—46, the governor left there by al-Sa'īd was slain in a rising in the market in favour of Abū Zakariya'ī, the Ḥafṣī. Al-Sa'īd again returned victorious, causing Yalūū b. Abū al-Hāṣim to fly to Tānī. The Martīdī had only two years to wait; after the death of the Almohad governor, he returned to Mekez to occupy it definitely.

The first period of greatness for Mekez dates from the Martīdī. They set out to make it beautiful
like Rahat and Fas. Abū Yūnus moved from Fas to Meekes, which owed to him a mosque (1276). Abū 'l-Ḥasan improved its water-supply, built bridges on the road to Fas and began the Madrasa Djiñada which Abū 'l-Ṭān was to finish. It bears the latter's name and is still the most notable building in Meekes, in spite of the Indirect Restorations carried out in 1872–1873. Other madrasas, 'Agārīn and Filktu, were built by the Marinids.

During this period the political organisation of the country had developed into a much different direction. The Istind shortlived, having assisted the Marinids to gain power, prepared to take advantage of the organisation which the latter had given them. Thus the foundations were laid for the movement which was to end in the partition of Morocco in the last years of the thirteenth century into practically independent divisions. The shortlived were numerous in Meekes. When the weakening of the Marinids and the decline of their prestige made it possible, they supplied leaders. History has preserved the name of Mawārī Zayān. The Wazīrus only once intervened, it appears, when the beginning of the fourteenth century. Mawārī b. al-Naṣir, having rebelled against Muhammad b. al-Ḥarīrī, found an asylum at Meekes. The Sultan besieged the town and took it, then installed his brother al-Naṣir al-Raḍīdī there, who however did not prove faithful to him. The few years of independence enjoyed by Meekes were not particularly glorious. They mark, however, an epoch in the history of the town destined at other periods to be only the prey of anarchy or the playing of a tyrant.

The rise of the brotherhoods of the fourteenth century found a favourable soil among the Marinids. The akwīs Tjarīla was established there, as in other places in Morocco. A few years later, Muhammad b. Isā was teaching there.

Meekes was thus well-prepared to welcome the Sufis. When Muhammad al-Shāfi'i approached in 1502, he entered the town without much trouble. The Marinid al-Naṣir al-Raḍīdī is said to have agreed to hand over the town in return for the liberty of his father Ahmad b. Zayān, and the marabout, to have demanded the conclusion of such an agreement. Muhammad al-Shāfi'i however took a sufficiently sure method to establish his authority when the Khātā Abū 'l-Ḥasan! Abū 'l-Harīrī, having once preached against him, he had him sentenced to death. When he returned two years later, he was welcomed with gifts. The estimates of travellers of this time put the population of the town at 8,000 to 10,000. It was only the town in the region. The Sufis took little interest in Meekes which never attracted their attention. The country was well in hand and the Berber tribes peaceful to such a degree that the road from Marrakesh by the Tiskār was regularly used. It was the practice to make Meekes the residence of one of the sons of the Sultan. There was however no important command attached to it. Leo Africanus credits it with a revenue equal to half that of the viceregality of Fas, which is astonishing. Under Ahmad b. Mārīq, Abū 'l-Ḥasan! Abū 'l-Ṭān lived there and then, after the second partition, Zayān and, lastly, Mawārī al-Shāfi'i, but as a prisoner in the last years of his father's life.

The civil war which broke out on the death of al-Maṣūr placed Meekes at the mercy of the Berber rising and marabout intrigues. Mawārī Abū 'l-Ṭān was at the head of a large band of marabouts and finally found refuge in al-Ḳasr al-Kabīr. In 1619, his brother Muhammad defeated him near Meekes. The chronicler mentions for the next year the rising of an individual who called himself the Sharīf Amghār. In the midst of this disorder an authority gradually made itself felt, that of the awliyā, and especially the Hanūn of Dīrī. In 1640–1641, Muhammad al-Ḥarīrī was even able to seize the sovereign power and get himself recognised by the Marinids after his victory over Mawārī Muhammad al-Shāfi'i b. Zayān. He gained the title of being of the Berber tribe, and Mawārī al-Raḍīdī in 1666. found a new ally in his alliance with the Dīrī's Abū 'l-Ṭān, Abū 'l-Ṭān, who had to fight them again in 1668. Mawārī al-Raḍīdī seems to have been interested in Meekes, the Kāshā of which he restored. In burying him in the mausoleum of al-Ḥarīrī, Mawārī Tamān said he was fulfilling the last wishes of the deceased. But the most important event was that al-Raḍīdī sent Mawārī Tamān to Meekes. The latter lived before his accession in the Almohad Kāshā, as a landed proprietor managing his estates. In his choice of a capital, we see the attraction of a rich district like this. He wished to be in his own image and realised this idea. For fifty years Meekes was simply the framework for his splendid, the scene of his extravagances.

He at once decided to build himself a palace and at once a grandiose scheme was projected. He began by clearing a space. The houses adjoining the Almohad wall east of the town were surveyed, and their owners forced to carry the debris off to a site which has retained the name of Hadim, then to rebuild on a site which the sharif enclosed by a wall to the N.W. of the medina. The site which he chose for himself was also separate from the town. His palace was built, and one even more splendid for his women. The first edifice, Dar Khuša, was finished in 1579. It was a series, without intelligible plan, of vihās embellished with fountains, paved with marble, surrounded by galleries which were supported by columns of marble; the apartments opened on to three galleries. The sovereign's palace was in two suites, that of his ladies in four and larger than his. His four wives and his favourites were equally splendidly housed. The other conclaves, of whom he had 500 of all nations, were housed in rooms along the passageway. At the end was a common hall, on a higher level, which gave a view over the gardens through iron grilles. The reception pavilions were planned on the same scale; one of them had forty rooms. The palace comprised in all 45 pavilions and twenty khābis. The whole was surrounded by a camelled wall pierced by two main gates. It was triple in the N.E. with a round road all round it and could be defended equally well against an interior of the gūsha. The battlements supported batteries of gunpowder and matchlocks. The women being subject to rigorous confinement and Mawārī Tamān living very merrily in the performance of the duties of religion, a mosque was set aside for them. Another had been begun in 1577, communicating with the town by the Khāṣa. Lastly the palace with its dependencies contained four mosques; two are still in use, the Dīrī al-Aḥṣār and in the quarter of the maws, very broken down, the Dīrī al-Rauš. To the south was a garden, the area of which is equal to that of the present suburb, an
orchard in which olive trees predominated. Further on were the stables to which the Sultan admitted only picked horses; to the number of 1,200; two parallel rows of arched about 100 feet apart. In the centre ran running water. Each animal had its stall and a shelter for its equipment. Opposite was a storehouse, the berti, which supported a supplementary palace with twenty pavilions. Between the palace and the stables was the garden, forty feet high and big enough it was said, to contain the whole harvest of Morocco. At the side was a pond for irrigation purposes and also subterranean reserves of water in case of a siege.

The buildings did not stop here. To the south west of the town lay a city of pleasure, Mâdânat al-Riqâ', where the officials had palaces, where Mawâli Isâm'î himself lived in his mosque, his madrasa, his hammâma, his fondâ'eh and the offices of the umara', the Treasury, with the shops of the Sharzâr tailers. In 1732-1733 Mawâli 'Abîd Allah on returning from an unsuccessful expedition into the Sûs, had the Mâdânat al-Riqâ' destroyed by Christian slaves. There is nothing left of it today except the Bani al-Khamis, dated 1667, one of the finest and best proportioned gates in the city.

Lastly a site was reserved for the troops. To the west of Meknes a large dâvar was settled with soldiers and their families. To the east of the Dirâ al-Melhâmâm, five jâ'âif for the 300,000 men of the army were gradually incorporated in the great kasbah.

After fifty years of unorganised but superhuman effort, the buildings were not yet completed. It was in 1731-1732 that Mawâli 'Abîd Allah finished the surrounding wall and the Bab Maussul, the most finished example of the Isâm'îs' pavilion, of proportions by no means perfect but imposing, of which the Bab al-Sandâ'in and the Bab al-Nâsir are the two other finest examples at Meknes at the present day. This name of a renegade, Mânûr al-Fârîlî, was no doubt that of a keeper of the gate. Mawâli Isâm'î directed all the operations himself. During the first twenty-four years of his reign he never spent twelve months on end at Meknes. But he returned there after each expedition; in preparation for his ambition and his power increased, his despotism and the needs of his government, his army and his family grew, his schemes became more and more grandiose; the work done was found unsatisfactory, modifications were made, buildings taken down and the work began all over again. The result certainly was sumptuous and imposing but also odd and sad.

All the country helped in the work. Mawâli Isâm'î collected materials wherever he could. Volubilis, Chalsa, Marràkès were plundered. If he destroyed al-Bâdi' it was perhaps out of jealousy of Ouedian work, or perhaps simply to get material. Like Ahmad al-Maâgîrî, he procured marble from Fès. One day when a corvée ship had stranded near Tangier he ordered the Glânsi to bring the stone from it by unaided manual labour. When he died the cargo of marble which were still on their way were left on the roadside.

Labour was recruited by similar means. The Sûs imposed days of labour on the tribes, levied forced labour as he pleased; sent his ministers to the workshops, but relied mainly on renegades and Christian slaves who were his permanent workmen. From 1680 the work was pushed on frantically. All the Christians in Morocco were collected there. The Târitâris of Fès joined them. The slaves were at first housed in slums near the building-yards, then they were moved to the Dirâ al-Melhâmâm, then to near the stables, under the arches of a bridge, where their lot was particularly miserable, finally to the interior of a forest, east of the town along the north wall of the Dirâ al-Melhâmâm. They were able to organise themselves a little there, to build themselves a church, to have chapels, a convent and infirmaries. A physician was made not a maximum, the "Christian decoction"; this was the name by which humane relations were established with the natives, even with the dwellers in the palace. Their last historian has reduced the number of Christian prisoners in the service of Mawâli Isâm'î to its real figure: they did not as a rule reach a thousand and the Sultan, in the course of over fifty years, himself killed only one hundred and nine (Koehler).

The emperor revealed in his palaces his extravagance and his opulence; he accumulated wealth as his old buildings, but only to hide it. The ambassadors and envoys who came to negotiate the ransom of captives he received with a mixture of bounteously and splendour. Frequent mention is made of the cruelty and the terror which this enter inspired; he loved to torture his women and cut off heads to show his skill. His summons to be in the same of a similar character; he liked to shoot with his falâs at the deer in his menageries then to finish them off with a spearthrow. Let us avert our eyes from all these horrors which make nature shudder, says Chéne.' Following his example his household of the terror in the town. He had six hundred children, a nursery of slaves, "who might have had a happier lot if he had loved them as much as his horses". On the approach of any of these, "every one hid all that he might take a fancy to", and the old in their turn, negroes robbed in bright colours, went about bullying in the name of their master at first and then in their own.

All his work was to collapse at his death, but he was able to keep it up in his lifetime. From the troubles that broke out when he disappeared from the scene, one can judge of the energy of this man of eighty who maintained order among his hordes of negroes and in this country, bestowed by God on anarchy. The âbâs of Zarhûn, the khâsa of Auzi in the middle of the Central Atlas, deserted Meknes on North and South. He was also able to preserve it from other sources; when an epidemic of plague broke out, the old were simply given orders to kill any people who came from Fès. Mawâli Isâm'î was buried like his brother in the mausoleum of Sîhî al-'Abîd al-Râmân al-Mâtû'î, a morastal altar of the sixteenth century. His sons, the rebel Mawâli Ma'mân, killed at Târûst in 1706, and Mawâli Zîdîn in 1707, had already joined Mawâli Ramîlî. In 1859 the palace of Mawâli 'Abîd al-Râhimî was also depopulated there.

On the death of Mawâli Isâm'î, the半个月 and the soldiers of the 172nd stirred up a palace war which lasted twenty years. Mawâli 'Abîd Allah last and regained his throne six times. But however great this struggle was, the other threat was still the greatest; having got rid of the garrisons of the Isâm'îs' khâsa, the Bedouins, armed, came down from the mountains. The problem for the sultan was to choose the lesser evil; they
declined to disband the *ahid and to the struggle which naturally arose between these and the Berbers raised more on the former. The civil war extended to the tribes of the plain and the garrisons of Fayy, especially the *Uqayyia; pretenders stirred up the flames, readily giving the signal to players and, in the rivalries of races and tribes, easily finding a party to support them. Gradually the Berbers took in mistreatment. It was in vain that Mawlā *Abd Allāh asked his sons to expend the treasure of Mawlā *Abd Allāh (Abu l-Faris Mawāfi) for them. The worst of it for Mawlā *Abd Allāh was that every one entered or began by hindering it.

Mawlā *Abd Allāh almost re-established order and restored to the town its past glory. He did a great deal for it: he palaced Dar al-Balīd, the severe architecture of which, not without charm, can still be seen in a part of the extra-grove of al-Hammūya; in the Kāshālān, he built the *Laylāt al-Amūzaq and in the souq, the unseen of the *Dhīlān al-Naṣrāt, the khāba of Sīdī Muḥammad b. *Isa, and several mosques (al-Achār, al-Badīlīn, Masīha, Sīdīya and Sīdīya al-Mubānī). It was also able to make the 13,000 books of the library of Mawlā *Abd Allāh's endowment for the benefit of all the mosques of Morocco. As regards the tax, his policy was to break them up. He transformed many of them and tried several repressive measures. The end of his reign was marked by the success of the Berbers whose attacks had been resumed about 1775.

Soon nothing was left of the work of Mawlā *Abd Allāh. The Christian community and its Franciscan mission in the reign of Mawlā *Abd Allāh had developed and did not survive the persecution of this shihr. The earthquakes of 1755 had destroyed their church, convent and hospice. The monks, who had gathered together at Kāshālān Carrājīl, were gradually absorbed.

The novel state was again acute from 1811. Communication with Fayy was continually being cut and it was nothing to boast of for the subjand to go out of Meekas. Mawlā *Abd Allāh (Sahlīn), who had undertaken to restore the Kāshālān and rebuild the bridges on the road to Fayy and who would have liked to get rid of the the Berbers, decided to settle in Fayy. His walls were his only defence at the time. Mawlā *Abd Allāh al-Khalīfī, who was Dāra's unfair and who built a mosque in Dar al-Amūzaq b. Halīm, left the Berbers in semi-independence and was lastly dismissed the head without even granting those who remained in Meekas the character of Meekas troops. His son carefully avoided all quarrels.

Mawlā *Abd Allāh revised the tradition of the great rivals and made his authority felt. He was able to enter Meekas after his ascension only by crushing the power of the Berbers. In 1829 he conducted a campaign against the Beni *Mūza. In 1837 he forced his way through the country of the Beni *Maghīd in his campaign against the Rīm. On his death the Berbers regarded their independence. If they retained their *khalīfa it was because the latter cast off all allegiance to the Kāshālān. After the fall of Mawlā *Abd Allāh al-Khalīfī, Meekas recognized the competences in succession. It was Mawlā *Abd Allāh who proclaimed *Abd al-Ḥafīz, who had come via the Berbers of Tādīl in 1908, in 1909 called the shihr al-Katrām and in 1912 rallied to Mawlā *Zain. It was in this

that General Monnier entered Meekas and two years later Colonel Henry under the direction of General Lamy pacified the Beni *Mūza country.


MELLĀH, the name given to the quarter in Moroccan towns which the Jews are compelled to inhabit. Being *ābī al-Ḥamīma, the Jews have a right to the special protection of the government which allows them a particular quarter in which to live in, situated very often quite close to the *khalīfa (al-Kutaba) where the governor of the town resides. Moreover, the pretenders and governors liked to have at hand "their" Jews who were frequently of use to them as clever diplomats.
agents and often gave them valuable financial support. All the towns of Morocco, even the large ones, did not necessarily have a mellāḥ. Thus at Tangier there are certain quarters particularly inhabited by Jews but they are not set aside for them and we also find Muslims there. As to Rabat, its present mellāḥ was established only in 1808 by Sulīmān Mawliy Sulīmān; formerly the Jews lived together in the al-Bahaira quarter (el-Bāḥāra) where there were also Muslims. When he founded Fās in 805, Idris 11 compiled the Jewish refugees who flocked into the capital to reside in the northern part of the ‘Adwat al-Kassawān (Aqqān quarter as far as the gate called Bāb Ḥasan Sa‘dūn); this was undoubtedly the first Moroccan ghetto; and the present Fondāt el-Tarādī (“the Jews’ warehouse”) apparently preserves its memory. But at the end of the 13th century the Marinids, wishing to create a new capital, founded alongside of Old Fās (“Fās al-Bāḥil,” “New Fās” (“Fās al-Djādīa”) or “White City” (“al-Madīnat al-Baladīa”). In the first half of the 14th century, the town of Ḥīnṣ was built close beside Fās and at first occupied by the Ghuran archers who formed a part of the regular Marinid army; after the suppression of this force in 1320, it became the quarters of the Christian mercenaries whom we find there in 1567. Later, probably at the beginning of the 16th century, and with no doubt as the result of massacres, the Jews of Old Fās were ordered to settle in Ḥīnṣ; this town was built on a site known as al-Mellāḥ, the “salt spring,” or “salt marsh,” and the new ghetto became known by this name. From a proper, this became a common noun, and passed from Fās to the other towns of Morocco as the name for the quarter assigned to the Jews. The etymology proposed by Dossy in his Supplement (al-mellāḥ < al-maḥall “quarter”) is therefore to be rejected, as are the explanations as “salted, accursed land,” or “quarter of the Jews who were forced to salt the heads of decapitated rebels”. In Morocco in the 13th century, el-Mellah, in speaking, the expression el-maḥall (class, “class,” “quarter”) is often used by anti-phrases, lit. the “not-salted”.

The mellāḥ of Fās is therefore the oldest in Morocco in every way. For a long time it was also the most important; in the middle of the 13th century, al-Bakrī says that Fās is the town with most Jews in the Maghrib, which has given rise to the proverbial saying: Fās baḥād bītā nās. “Fās, a town where there are no people (worth mentioning)”. But the constitution of Marrakṣ, in 1663, resulted in the foundation in southern Morocco of a new Jewish center which was to attract to it the Jewish and pseudo-Jewish peoples of the Atlas. The term el-mellāḥ however appears only in the second half of the 13th century (cf. E. Fagnan, Extrait de livres relatifs au Maghreb, p. 409). At the present day the mellāḥ of Marrakṣ and the Jewish town of Mogador form the most important Jewish centres of Morocco.

The name: el-mellāḥ is peculiar to Morocco; there, however, it is applied not only to the Jewish quarter in a town but also to little mountain villages exclusively inhabited by Jews. At Tlemcen the term derb el-bāḥil (class, “class, of the al-Bāḥīla”) is used; at Constantine rekhṣātari and in Algiers, Tunes and Tripoli el-ṭūrā.


(GEORGE S. COLIN)

MELILLA (in modern Arabic: Millīya, Berber Tamurilt, “the white”; in the Arab geographers: Millīla), a seaport on the east coast of Morocco on a promontory on the peninsula of Gezaya at the end of which is the Cape Tres Forcas or the Three Forks (Rūs Ḥark of the Arab geographers, now Rūs Wālī). Melilla probably corresponds to the Rūsaddir of the ancients (cf. Rūsaddir oppidiu at portus [Pliny, v. 13], Rūsaddir Colonia of the Antoninian itinerary). Leo Africanus says that it had belonged for a time to the Goths and that the Arabs took it from them, but in reality we know nothing of the ancient history of the town.

It is only at the beginning of the tenth century that Melilla appears in the Muslim history of Morocco. In 930, the Umayyad Caliph of Spain, 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Nāṣir il-Dīn Allāh succeeded in detaching from the Fātimids the famous Mūsā chief Muḥām b. Abī l-‘Ikāfīya, who had established his authority over the basin of the Moulaya and the district of Tāf, having seized Melilla, al-Nāṣir built ramparts around it and gave it to his new ally, who thus had at his command a base of defence (maṭṣī) against the Fātimids of Is’āfīya and a port which made communication with Spain easy. Later on, the descendants of his son, al-Būrī b. Mūsā, rebuilt the town, which remained one of the strongholds of the Mīknsa in Morocco down to the time of the decline of the power of the tribe, who were definitely defeated and scattered by the Almoravid Yūsuf b. Tāḥṣīn in 1070. But the Mīknsa must have abandoned it before their dynasty was crushed by the Almoravids; for al-Bakrī shows us that by 1067 a descendant of the Mīknsa chief Idrīsīd of Spain had been summoned to Melilla and recognized as ruler by the people of the district.

At the period when al-Bakrī wrote (1068), Melilla was a town surrounded by a wall of stone; inside was a very strong citadel, a great mosque, a hamam and markets. The inhabitants belonged to the tribe of the Banū Wartātī (or B. Wartātī); a branch of the Šanṭhājī group of the Banū Bāṭīya. Melilla had a harbour which was accessible only in summer. It was the terminus of a trade route which connected Sūditān with the Mediterranean through the valley of the Moulaya and Agariz (French: Garriṣs). The trade must have been considerable; the principal exports were no doubt those mentioned by Leo Africanus: iron from the mines of the mountains of the Banū Sa‘īd and honey from the Khaddāna country; we may also add pearls which were taken from oysters found in the harbour itself. Al-Bakrī notes that the inhabitants made money by granting protection to merchants. The environs of the town were occupied by the Banū Wartātī who also occupied the stronghold called Kûnīl Gārī, the Matafnas, the Abī Kābdān, the Mārtīna of the “White Hill” (al-Kuñīyat al-Hafīd) and the Ghassās of the massif which ends in Cape Tres Forcas (Rūs al-Ḥark). All this region was then independent and had no political
link with the kingdom of Fás or that of Náhir. But in 1080 the Almoravid sovereign Yúsuf b. Tashfin took Melilla and added its territory to the Almoravid empire. In 1141—1142, in the course of the Almoravid pursuit of the Almohads, a body of the latter set out from Támánsaín to lay siege to Melilla, which was taken and plundered. In 1272, the Marinid Sultan Ya'qūb took Melilla from the Almohads and Ibn Khaldūn simply mentions it as a fortified place. It seems in fact that these three captures of the town had destroyed its commercial importance to the advantage of another town on the west coast of the peninsula of the Geğgya: Ghassāna also called al-Kudrāt al-ḥaṣa, the Almohad of the Portola; in the thirteenth century it is this latter town that appears as the Mediterranean port of Fás and Tás, and it was through it that political and commercial relations with eastern Spain and Italy (Genoa and Venice) were carried on.

Leo Africanus says that in 1496, hearing that an attack on it was planned by the Spaniards, the inhabitants abandoned the town and fled to the mountains of the Bağhgya; to punish them for this the Wāṣṣād Sulīn had the town burned down; when, in Sept. 1497, the Spaniards arrived they were thus able to disembark without resistance and occupy the town, abandoned and half destroyed. The occupation of Melilla enabled the Spaniards to attack the port of Ghassāna by land and it was taken in April 1506. The Moroccans recaptured it in 1533 but the dangerous proximity of Melilla henceforth deprived it of importance. The commercial activity of this region was moved farther west to the port of al-Maziuma (Spanish: Aljucenas, Fr.: Alzouzème), and the centre of Muslim resistance in this part of Morocco was henceforth the strong hold of Támánsaín, which after having been the capital of the Marinid sultan of the Banū Wāṣṣād became that of a practically independent leader of a holy war. After passing into the hands of the Spaniards, Melilla was continuously besieged by the Muslims, mainly by the force of the leaders of holy war established at Támánsaín and at Māna’in (the Mayyaf of Leo Africanus). Occupied by the Christians, the town naturally became one of the places in Morocco in which Muslim pretenders and rebels found asylum and support against the central power, especially at the beginning of the Sa’dian dynasty. In 1549, it sheltered the dispossessed Wāṣṣād Aḥḥa Sāliḥ, the king of Rūdi; in 1550 it welcomed, with his family the Mawlay Ama‘r, the king of Dehdī. It was from Melilla that in 1595, the pretender al-NAṣīr b. al-Qallāl brilhīṭ set out against his uncle Sultan Ahmad al-Maṣūfī.

Later Melilla only appears in history in connection with sieges which it had to suffer: sieges by Mawlay ‘Abd al-‘Azzī in 1687 and 1693; siege in 1774 by Mawlay Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh; Spanish-Moroccan war of 1893 (Sidi Wāṣṣāaf affair). From 1903 to 1908 the region of Melilla was the scene of struggles between the pretender al-Qalīfī al-Ruṣī, established in the ḫafīfa of Sərwā, and the troops of the Sultan ‘Abd al-‘Azzī; defeated and receiving no support, the latter had to take refuge in Spanish territory and be repatriated. Still more recently, in 1921, the same district witnessed the sanguinary battles between the Spaniards and the Rifians under ‘Abd al-Karīm (Anwāl dami). Melilla is for Spain “a place of sovereignty,” like Alhucemas, Peñón de Vélez and Ceuta. Before the establishment of the French protectorate, Melilla, constituted a free port, was the landing-place for all the European merchandise (cotton, sugar, tea) intended not only for eastern Morocco but also for the Saharan regions of Morocco and Orania. It has now lost much of its commercial importance.
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**MENDEREZ**, the name of two rivers in western Anatolia.

1. **Büyük Menderes** (called by al-‘Umari Menores, by Per Reis, Mendíra or Menderdz), the ancient Maeander, the Meander of the Crusaders. It rises in the district of Germiyân in a little lake, the Huwiran Gölü (Saklı) above Diner (according to Abū Bakr b. Bahram in a spring called ‘Aqīla, a day’s journey from Homa), flows past Homa at some distance off, then through the plain of Ashkül and the kajis of Bağlan and Cai. In the kaş of Çarşamba (capital Buldan) it is joined by the Banas Cai (called Murad Dagh by Abū Bakr, Bahram whose statement that it flows past ‘Aqīla is wrong). It rises in the Murad Dagh and flows past Banas. Further down its course, in the plain of Demirkali, it receives the Çitük Su, the ancient Lykos Fl. Further on a ruined bridge called ‘Emirtaş Köprüsî is marked the frontier between the two old livas of Germiyân and Afdin; according to Abū Bakr a warm spring rising in its foundations had contributed to the destruction of this bridge.

In the territory of Afdin the Büyük Menderes flows past at a distance the villages of Orakçı, Nazilli, Sülünkhisar, Köskh and Güzehşir Afdin, breaks up into several arms in the plain of Balas (Patlia, the ancient Miletus) and feeds a lake full of fish (al-‘Umari) there, which is now called Bafı Defisi (Lake of Patlia, the ancient Αρειστία). A little below Balas, it enters the sea.

Al-‘Umari who, generally speaking, is inaccurately informed about the course of the waters Defisi and Birgi on it, i.e. brings the Caystrus into its basin and makes it flow into the Black Sea) compares the Maeander for its site at low level with the Nile, in flood however with a sea. According to him, it is navigable and the people on its banks are protected from its mouth on military or commercial enterprises. Western writers also speak of the trade borne on the Maeander in the late middle ages. The main centre of trade on the Maeander and also on the land routes through the valley was Paläis (Balas, the ancient Miletus); in later times, however, the caravan route down the Maeander valley ended in Scalanova (Kuşh Adası).

2. **Kuçuk Menderes**, the ancient Caystrus. The central part of its course runs in a wide plain on the northern edge of which is Birgi, on the southern edge Tınır, the old capital of the Iml of Afdin. A little below Ayasalough, the ancient Ephesus, it enters the sea.

In the middle ages the centre of trade with the hinterland reached by the Cayster was Alshüno (from *Ayas* θύρας), the ancient Ephesus (Tark. Ayasalough, now called Selçuk); later Scalanova (Kuşh Adası). In the Ottoman period Smyrna attracted all the trade of the Aegean Sea with the Anatolian hinterland. The caravan routes which
came down the river valleys opening on the Angasan thus ended in Smyrna, just as at the present day the railways which utilize these valleys start from Smyrna.


MENF. [See MANIF.]

MENGÜÇEK (MENGÜÇEK), a Turkish emir, who after the capture of Romanos Diogenes in 1071 A.D. seized various places in the northwest of Asia Minor and transmitted his power to his descendants. We find them in Erzijân, Khorosha (Colonia, Carmen-Sagari), and Divrigi (cf. the genealogical table in von Zambur, Manuel de Genealogie, etc., p. 146). Little is known of their history. It is incidentally mentioned in Michael Syrus (ed. Chabot, Ill. 205) that Ibn Mengüçek, being threatened by the Ordokal Balâg, made an alliance with Theodore Gabara, the Byzantine commander of Trebizond, but was taken prisoner in battle along with the latter (1118). He was, how again released by the Danishmadin Emir Ghazi, whose daughter he had married, while the Greek had to pay a heavy ransom. His name is not mentioned but, from the genealogical statements in the inscriptions of his descendants, he was called 1Î88. The same story is given elsewhere but not so fully. Better known is his grandson Fakhr al-Dîn Bahramgih, who ruled for many years in Erzijân and died in 622 (1225). To him the celebrated poet Nîshân dedicated his poem Mâ'ûn an-Àrâf, which was composed in 1198 or 1199. He was on the best of terms with the Sâlihîya of Konia, with whom he was unconnected by marriage, but when these relations were altered under his son ìllü al-Dîn Dâwûd, the rule of the Mengüçeks was ended. At the end of 625 (1128) he was forced to cede Erzijân to Kalâbâbâd, and his brother Murâfâr al-Dîn Muhammad who ruled in Khorosna met a similar fate. A collateral line established in Divrigi and ruling there in the name of the Sâlihîya held out for a few more years, perhaps till the coming of the Mongols into these regions in 675; only a few scraps of information about this line have been gleaned from inscriptions and coins.


(M. TH. HOUTZEMA)

MENŞEŞE-ELI, a little principality in Anatolia. The boundaries of the territory of the Menşese-eli's [q.v.] are given by Münadżîdîm-bîsh (cf. Fr. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 457 sqq.) in his Sevâlî al-Abîn (Stambul 1285) as marked by Mûqâla, Bâlîq, Bâzû-yüklî, Mîlû, Bardîn, Mûnûn, Cine, Tawba, Bornâr, Maktûb, Gâdî, Pîdâ and Mermere. They thus correspond approximately to those of the ancient Caria. The origin of the name is uncertain, but it can confidently be ascertained that the opinion, presumably first put forward by P. Emininski (Lectiens, iv. 737) and quite recently upheld, that the district takes its name from the Mûnûn (Munuse in Strabo) of the ancients is not worthy of credence. Several of the places above mentioned play a not unimportant part as centres of scholarship and literature in the earlier period of Ottoman intellectual life. Thus in the time of the Menşese-eli Mehmed I (775—777) a certain Mahammad b. Mahammed b. Bardîn composed a Büyük Namus which was published by J. v. Hammer-Purgstall under the title "Feithârîzâ" (Pest 1840) from the Milan MS, and rightly described as one of the earlier documents of the Ottoman language. In many of these places there were academies where an active intellectual life flourished, so that the share of the district of Menşese in Ottoman literature is strikingly large.

(Fr. Babiner)

MENŞEŞE-OĞLU'LARI, a petty dynasty in Anatolia. The princes of Menşese first appear in history after the break up of the Seljuk empire. The founder of the family is said to have been a certain Menşese Beg b. Behâr al-Dîn Kardî. He had his court at Mîlû (Munuse) in the ancient Caria, and not far from it his stronghold Paštûk (Petsona). His descendants also lived in Mîlû until they moved their court to Milûs. The son of Menşese was Urtakîn Beg, who is known from an inscription on a building in Milû and from Ibn Battûta who visited him in 1334 in Milû (cf. Ibn Battûta, Voyages, ed. Dufrenoy, Paris 1854, II, 278 sqq.). Urtakîn's successor was his son Ibrahim, who built a mosque in Mûqâla in 745 (1344) and left two sons, Ahmed Ghazi and Memmed. The second succeeded him in 755 (1354), but succeeded in the struggle for the throne to his brother Ahmed, who took Eskî Hijar in 755 (1354), in 777 (1375) founded an academy at Kardîn and at the end of Ljummir II, 780 (Oct. 1378) consumed the Ula Ĩsmî in Milû. Ahmed Ghazi died in Shaban 793 (July 1391) and was succeeded by his nephew Ilyâs. The Ottomans had in his reign already taken possession of several principalities in the neighbourhood of Menşese-eli, such as that of the Germân-eli [q.v.] and of the Hamîd-eli [q.v.], and now seriously threatened the existence of the Menşeses. Immediately after the accession of Ilyâs Beg, Bâyazîd I, who had just become Sultan, deprived the lords of Menşese of the last vestiges of independence. They sought refuge with the ruler of Sinope, Bâyazîd Kötûrüm, and later with the conqueror of the Ottomans, Timur-Lenk. Ilyâs Beg, who built a mosque in Milûs, regained possession of Menşese-eli in 1402. On 24 July 1405, he concluded a treaty with the Sultanate of Crete, Marco Faileri (publ. by Max Lattre, at the end of his essay, Commece d'Epiphan et de Milet, moyen âge en la Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes, Sec. vi. Vol.vi. Paris 1864, p. 226 sqq.) and with
the admiral Ser Pietro Civran on 17th Oct. 1414 (cf. Diplomatarum Viciis-Levantinum, ii. 305–
and 203; for more, see W. Heyd, Historie du commerce du Levant, i. 353, etc.). The reign of Ilyas Beg,
which lasted for forty-three years and was ended in 824 (1421) when his lands passed to
the Ottomans, who continued until 831 (1428) in which he was killed. The title of Sultan,
which had previously been held by the Ottomans, was now bestowed on the ruler of Menteşe.
Ilyas Beg, who was the son of the last ruler of Menteşe, was one of the most powerful rulers of the	
Ottoman Empire, and his reign was marked by a period of peace and prosperity. He is remembered for his
buildings and the many monuments in Menteşe, including his beautiful mosque, the Mevlâna Mosque.

The relationship between the various princes is based on coins and inscriptions.

Hâdîl Behêr al-Din Kurdi,
Governor of Swây under the Seldjûks

Menteşe

Shudja al-Din Urkûhâ
(c. 730 = 1330)

I. Ithâm
(c. 745 = 1344)

Tâdji al-Din Ahmed Gâhâ
777 (1375)
793 (1391)
755 (1354)
Mugaffar al-Din Ilyâs
L. 793 (1391)
II. 805–24 (1402–21)

Latîr Uważ Ahmed Faţma
824 (1421)

823 (1420)
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Beitrag zur Früher sowie ausländischen Baukunst, in der Fechte von der Hunderstauf der Technischen Hochschule Karlsruhe (1925).

FR. BAHENGER

MERDAWIJ: [See Mirdawiyya.]

MERDAWIAH. AR. MERDAH, from the Latin Merida, a town in the south west of Spain, in the modern province of Badajoz, where it is the capital of a partido, on the right bank of the Guadiana. Now somewhat decayed, it has only 11,585 inhabitants. It is on the Madrid-Badajoz railway and is also connected by rail with Cáceres in the north and Seville in the south.

The ancient capital of Lusitania, Augusta Emerita, was founded, in 23 B.C., and under the Roman Empire attained remarkable importance and prosperity. Numerous remains of Roman buildings still testify to the position it held in the Iberian peninsula in those days: a bridge of 64 arches, a circus, a theatre, and the famous aqueduct of los Milagros, of which there are still standing ten arches of brick and granite. Merida under the Visigoths became the metropolis of Lusitania and according to Rodrigo of Toledo was fortified and strongly defended, which explains why the Muslim conquerors led by Nadir b. Nusair [q.v.] had some difficulty in taking it. The Arab army, under the command of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah, captured it in June 713. From Merida, Nadir b. Nusair continued his advance to Toledo.

Under the Arab governors, Merida seems to have very soon become a rallying point for a large number of rebels of Berber and Spanish origin. It was there that Yusuf al-Afi'îh endeavoured to organise a movement against that organized for his own benefit by 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Mahdi in 141 (758). At a later date, Abul 'Abbas b. 'Abd Allah b. Wâsâd rebelled there against al-Hakam I in 190 (805) and the emir of Cordova had for the next seven years to undertake summer campaigns against him before bringing him to reason. Another rebellion broke out in Merida in 213 (828) and the town had to be besieged in 217 and again in 254 (868). In the reign of Emir 'Abd Allah it was the headquarters of 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Murwân al-Djifilî (the Gallican), an Arabic name which concealed that of a Christian nationalist leader. Merida definitely returned to its allegiance in the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâsir when it submitted in 316 (928) to the 'abd Allah b. Aylas.

From the 9th century, Merida began to decline in favour of Badajoz, especially when the latter town became the capital of the independent little kingdom of the Alfajus [q.v.]. It remained in the hands of the Muslims till the beginning of the 11th century. In 1328 it was retaken by Alfonso X of Leon but never recovered its former importance.

The Arab geographers who mention Merida, describe its Roman ruins in detail; they also mention the Muslim citadel, the foundation inscription of which has been preserved. It was built in 220 (835) by the governor 'Abd Allah b. Kulaib b. Thâhâ, on the site of the Umayyad Emir 'Abd al-Rahmân II.

Bibliography: The Arabic historians of
UMAYYAD SPAIN (Ahlül-Bayyín, Ibn 'Idhārī, Buyūk, Ibn al-Atlīr, Nūrān, Muḥarrar, Anasīs, Ṣunnī [r. 762-775]), Hishām, a descendant of the Umayyads, became the first caliph of the Umayyad dynasty. His rule was marked by military campaigns and the expansion of the Islamic empire. He was succeeded by Al-Hakam I, who continued the expansion of the empire.

ALMOHAD SPAIN (Ahlul-Bayyin, Ibn al-Atlīr, Nūrān, Muḥarrar, Anasīs, Ṣunnī [r. 762-775]), Hishām, a descendant of the Umayyads, became the first caliph of the Umayyad dynasty. His rule was marked by military campaigns and the expansion of the Islamic empire. He was succeeded by Al-Hakam I, who continued the expansion of the empire.

In 1145, the Almohads began their conquest of al-Andalus, the Iberian Peninsula, which was then under the rule of the Almoravids. The Almoravids were a Berber dynasty that had previously conquered the Muslim territories in Spain. The Almohads were able to conquer a large portion of al-Andalus, including the city of Córdoba, which was the capital of the Almoravids.

The conquest of al-Andalus by the Almohads had a significant impact on the region. The Almoravids were known for their tolerance and patronization of the arts and sciences, which contributed to the cultural and intellectual life of the region. The Almohads, on the other hand, were more austere and focused on enforcing strict religious practices. This change led to a decline in the cultural and intellectual life of the region.

The Almohad rule was characterized by a strong central government and a strong military. The Almohads were able to maintain their rule over a large portion of al-Andalus for several decades, until the end of the 13th century. However, the Almohads were eventually overthrown by the Nasrid dynasty, which established the Kingdom of Granada in the late 13th century.

The conquest of al-Andalus by the Almohads had a significant impact on the region. The Almoravids were known for their tolerance and patronization of the arts and sciences, which contributed to the cultural and intellectual life of the region. The Almohads, on the other hand, were more austere and focused on enforcing strict religious practices. This change led to a decline in the cultural and intellectual life of the region.

The Almohad rule was characterized by a strong central government and a strong military. The Almohads were able to maintain their rule over a large portion of al-Andalus for several decades, until the end of the 13th century. However, the Almohads were eventually overthrown by the Nasrid dynasty, which established the Kingdom of Granada in the late 13th century.
The 'Abd al-Wâdhids very soon lost hope of unannexing territory in the west. If, as we have seen, they were a thorn in the side of the Merinids who desired to cross into Spain, this policy was of brief duration. Very soon they had to confine themselves strictly to the defensive. On many occasions, the kingdom of Tlemcen was invaded and the Tlemcensiens shut up within their walls. For example for eight years and three months, from 698 (1299), they were blockaded, during which period the Merinids established a permanent camp which became the town of al-Manşûra [q. v.]. In addition to numerous other works of circumvallation, Tlemcen however did not fall till later. In 732 (1337) Abû 'l-Hassan took it; he and his son Abû Inan were to hold it for 22 years. For these two princes, whose reigns mark the apogee of the dynasty, Tlemcen was only a first stage towards Ifrîqiya. The dream of recreating the empire of the Almohads was to be realised by annexing the Ifshid kingdom.

Constant relations, in which each hoped to gain some advantage, united the two states of east and west, Banû Hafs and Banû Marin. To a contemporary observer like the Egyptian al-'Umari, the Banû Marin alone counted as a military power, but the Banû Hafs, descendants of the Almohad caliphs, had a prestige which the Banû Marin could not claim in spite of the title of Amûr al-Mmelunis which Abû Inan arrogantly assumed. This explains why, from the very first, the Banû Marin in annexing the towns of the Magribi declared themselves mandatories of the sovereigns of Tunis and why they married Ifshid princesses. On their side, the Banû Hafs did not think it wise to refuse their daughters; they dealt tactfully with the Moroccan sulûts, who might be useful in protecting them against the sulûts of Tlemcen. In a word, they hoped to see the Merinids attack central Magribi but not to become complete masters of it, which would directly expose Ifrîqiya to the attacks of the conquerors.

This is what actually happened in 1347. Taking advantage of the usurpation of the throne of Tunis and of the troubles which followed it, Abû 'l-Hassan invaded Ifrîqiya and sought to impose his authority there as in his own kingdom. The situation here however was far different from what he was familiar with in the Magribi. In Ifrîqiya, the Arabs were still very strong. Abû 'l-Hassan came to grief against the Arab tribes united against a foreign master and near Kairâwân they inflicted a disastrous defeat on him in Maharram 749 (April 1348). This disaster even endangered the position of the Marinids in the Magribi itself. An attempt by Abû Inan, son of Abû 'l-Hassan, to reconquer Ifrîqiya proved fruitless.

In spite of the collapse of Marinid aims, the period of these last sulûts was nevertheless one of the greatest in the history of Muslim Barbary, one of those which has left us most memorials of its magnificence.

The Merinids were vigorous builders. In 1276, Abû Yusuf had founded New Fès, west of the old town, to make it his official capital; but it was during the first half of the xivth century that the greatest building activity was displayed. The majority of those that have come down to us date from this period. Works of considerable artistic value, they are at the same time evidence of the military activity and religious ardour of the Banû Marin, like the ramparts and the mosque of al-Manşûra, the walls and necropolises of Chella, the medersas of Fès and Sâli, the different buildings erected near Tlemcen around the tomb of the great ascetic Sûltân Bî Madyan. Piety in the form of mysticism was the dominating note in the intellectual life of the Magribi. We must however not forget that the court of Fès was frequently visited by men like 'Abd al-Rahîm b. Khâlidîn, Fès al-Khârijî and Ibn Batûtah, who have left a name in the field of literature and profane learning.

The failure of the attempts upon Ifrîqiya and the disaster at Kairâwân may be taken as the beginning of the decline of the Merinids. As a result of these military failures, the troops stationed in some parts of the Magribi had to be withdrawn. The passes of the Atlas being no longer guarded, the Arabs of Sîs and Tafîsîlî, excited by the rumours from Ifrîqiya, began to display their turbulent spirit. The tribes who paid taxes now paid only at longer and longer intervals under the threat of expeditionary forces sent against them. There was still a graver cause of decline: the power of the viziers vastly increased.

An aristocracy of high officials related to the royal family handed down offices from father to son, backed by powerful clans, and ended by usurping the power to dominate the new sovereigns. To keep them in tutelage, they used to choose for the throne a minor or a weakling. When the Sûltân displayed some desire to rule in person, they did not hesitate to dethrone or assassinate him. Thus in 762 (1361) Abû Sûlîm was decapitated by a soldier of the Christian militia; his successor Tâslîn, an idiot, was deposed and replaced by Abû Zâliân, who was found strangled and drowned in a reservoir.

In the midst of these palace revolutions the unity of the kingdom was destroyed. We find the prince who governs Siqîlûnells, fighting with the sultan reigning at Fès. The vizier who has control of the legitimate sovereignty pretends against him, who end by dividing up the country among them. Marrakesh fights against Fès. At one time, the traditional enemies of the dynasty, the 'Abd al-Wâdhids of Tlemcen, endeavour to profit by the occasion to resume the aggressive policy of Yahmûrûn. But Tlemcen was itself too weakened to attain success. Besides, it was attacked in the rear by the Arabs of the Central Magribi, instigated from Fès. One of the shaykhs of the Siwaûd Arabs is called the "friend and patron of the Marinid dynasty." The Banû Marin had another means of neutralizing Tlemcen; this was to support pretenders of the 'Abd al-Wâdhid family. To sum up, in spite of the weakness of the Banû Marin, the state of 'Abd al-Wâd, whose lands had for the most part passed into the hands of the Arabs, cut a still sadder figure and could not resist when attacks from the west were resumed. From 1389 all the sulûts of Tlemcen ruled under the suzerainty of Fès.

But grave events were to turn the attention of the Merinids from the affairs of the Central Magribi. In 1401, King Henry III of Castile landed in Barbary to take vengeance for outrages of the Muslim corsairs and destroy Tetwân. This attack, which produced considerable commotion in the Magribi, and the taking of Ceuta by the Portuguese in 818 (1415), provoked a vigorous reaction by the religious element. The threat from abroad, combined with its weakness in meeting this critical
sick of a fever (cf. Ewliya Celebi, i. 372; J. v. Hammer, Constantinopolis, i. 503; d. O. G. K., ix. 95, No. 495; following the Hadżat al-Djânûnî, loc. cit.). Beside it is the cell (niyya) of Merkès Efendi, of which wonderful stories still circulate among the people. He had many pupils, including his son Ahmed, famous as the translator of the Kamât, his son-in-law Muslih al-Din (cf. Ewliya, i. 372), the poor Ramadân Efendi, called Bîhişt and many others.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text, Tâhirî, Şâhâb al-Nu'mâniyya, transl. Medjdî, p. 522 sq.; Brussâl Mehmed Tahir, Othmanî Müellifi, i. 160; Mehmed Tahir, Şîkâtî, i. Othmanî, iv. 353; F. Babinger, O. G. W., p. 44, note 1.

**MERSİNA, an Anatolian sea-port on the south coast of Asia Minor.** Mersina, the port and capital of the former sandjak of the same name (with an area of 1,780 sq. m.) in the vilayet of Adana [q.v.] on the south coast of Anatolia, is 40 miles from Adana, to which a railway runs. The name Mersina comes from the Greek mýrroîn (μύρροιν), myrtle, because this tree grows in large numbers in this region. The regularly built town, founded only in 1822, with about 24,471 inhabitants (1927), is only of importance as a port for the export of silk, corn and cotton. The climate is very unhealthy in summer. The old name of Mersina was Zephyrium; in the vicinity (8 miles S.W.) lie the ruins of Soloi or Pompeiopolis. The town which is quite modern is of no Muslim historical interest.

**Bibliography:** V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, ii. 50 sq. (Fr. Babinger).

**MERTOLA, A. Murúdis and Mirúla, a little town in the south of Portugal on the Guadiana, 35 miles above and north of the mouth of this river, at its junction with the Ózira.** This place, the Myrrha of the Romans, was of some importance in the Muslim period. It was in the district of Beja and according to Yâhûbi was the best defended stronghold in the whole of the west of the Peninsula. At the end of the ninth century it was the headquarters of an independent chief, 'Abd al-Malik b. Abi 'l-Daghâwâ, who was in alliance with the lords of Badajoz and Osornoba and held his own against the Cordovan emir 'Abd Allah. Bibliography: M. Cistare, Description de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne, ed. Dory and du Goeuc, text, p. 175, 179, transl. p. 211, 217; Yeğen, Murâdî al-Bulûtân, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 714; Ibn 'Idârî, al-Bay‘ân al-mu‘tâlîî, ii., text, p. 1, 140, transl. p. 253. (E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL.)

**MERWA, a British district in Râjdânâ, lying between 25° 24’ and 26° 11’ N., and 73° 45’ and 74° 29’ E., has an area of 641 sq. miles and a population (1901) of 109,459.** The local name of the district is Magra, or “hill.” Beyond the fact that between 1138 and 1232 (1725 and 1816), several unsuccessful attempts were made by Râjdâs and Mârahhs to subdue the country, the history of Merwa is a blank up to 1234 (1818), when the British appeared on the scene. The District was at one time an impenetrable jungle, inhabited by outlaws and fugitives from surrounding states. The population known under the name of Mârs originally comprised a mixture of castes, Çandea, Gujarâ, Bhât, Râjdâs, Brahman and Mînas. It is said that Nasîdîw, the
Mehi, the capital of the Persian province of Khurasan (q.v., ii, p. 966), the greatest place of pilgrimage for the Shi‘ites in Persia. It lies 3,000 feet above sea level in 58° 35' E. Long., (Greenw.) and 16° 17' N. Lat. in the valley from 10 to 25 miles broad of the Khezef-Rud, which runs from N. W. to S. E. This river, also called Ab-i Meshhed (the "river of Meshhed"), rises about 12 miles N.W. of the ruins of Tus (q.v.), in the little lake of Chegans-i Gili (cf. Frager, op. cit., p. 550; Khanikoff, op. cit., p. 110; Yule, op. cit., p. 315) and joins the Heri (Hasti)-Rud (q.v., and cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 407 sq.) about 100 miles S.E. of Meashid on the Russian-Persian frontier. Meshhed lies about 4 miles south of the bank of the Khezef-Rud. The hills which run along the valley rise to 8,000 or 9,000 feet at Meshhed.

In consequence of its high situation and proximity to the mountains, the climate of Meshhed is in the winter rather severe, in the summer, however, often tropical hot; it is regarded as healthy.

Meshed may in a way be regarded as the successor of the older pre-Muhammadan Tusa (q.v.), and it has not infrequently been erroneously confounded with it.

The fact that Tus is the name of both a town and a district, together with the fact that two places are always mentioned as the principal towns of this district, has given rise among the later Arab geographers to the erroneous opinion that the capital Tus is a double town consisting of Taharan and Nukan; e.g. Yafa'i, iii. 560, 5 (correct at iv. 824, 83) and in the Lusab of Ibn al-Athir (q.v.) quoted by Abu l'Fida' (op. cit., p. 456): Khawatim (Ahmad ibn Bidar, ed. Wustenberg, p. 275, sq.) next made the two towns thought to be joined together into two quarters (ma'ajid). This quite erroneous idea of a double town Tus found its way into European literature generally. Sykes (J. R. A. S., 1916, i. 1135-1140) and others (cf. P. K. M.) have rightly challenged the untenable idea. The older Arab geographers quite correctly distinguish between Taharan and Nukan as two quite separate towns. Nukan, according to the expression testimony of the Arabic sources, was only 1/4 parasang (farshik) or one Arabic mile from the tomb of Harun al-Rashid, and 'Ali al-Rida (see below) and must therefore have been very close to the modern Meshhed. The ruins of Taharan-Tus and Meshed are about 15 miles apart.

As to Nukan (often wrongly vocalised Nawas) it is sometimes called more precisely (e.g. Yafa'i, ii. 153, sq.) Nukan Tus, and occasionally (e.g. Iskakhri = H. G. A., i. 257, 5; Hamd Allah al-Mustawfi, op. cit., p. 157, sq.) included with Sanabadh. The distance between these two towns is put at an Arabic mile (Yafa'i, iii. 153, sq.) or what is practically the same, 1/4 farshik (e.g. Iskakhri, op. cit.; Ibn Hawkal in Abu l-Fida', op. cit., p. 451). Nukan must have lain to the east and northeast of the modern Meshed and a small part of it is the northeastern quarter of the latter town.

In Nukan or in the village of Sanabadh belonging to it two distinguished figures in Muslim history
were buried within one decade: the caliph Hārūn al-Rāshīd and the 'Alid 'Alī al-Riḍā b. Mīrāb. When Hārūn al-Rashid was preparing to take the field in Khurāsān, he was stricken mortally ill in a country house at Sanābād, where he had stopped, and died in a few days (193 = 809). The caliph, we are told (Tabari, **op. cit.,** iii. 737; 15-16), realising he was about to die, had his grave dug in the garden of this country mansion and consecrated by Kūrān-readers. The three available accounts differ at first sight as to the house in which Hārūn spent his last hours. Two of them are given by Tabari: according to the first (iii. 736; 15-16; 737; 4) it was on the estate of Dānimā b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. the caliph that stopped; the second story (iii. 735; 15-16; 736; 14-15) says that Hārūn lived in the mansion of Humnād b. Abī Ghānim. A third story in Yaḥṣub (iii. 566) says that the tombs of Hārūn and of 'Ali al-Riḍā were in one of the houses of the house of Humnād b. Kāṯībā. Now there is not the slightest doubt that the references to the house (dār) of Humnād b. Kāṯībā and to that of Humnād b. Abī Ghānim are to the same place, Humnād b. Kāṯībā must be the same person as Humnād b. Abī Ghānim; they are both described as of the tribe of Taly. As to Tabari's second story, which substitutes a dār b. 'Abd al-Rahmān for a dār Humnād, it may be observed that Dānimā b. 'Abd al-Rahmān held the office of governor of Khurāsān under the Umayyads (caliphate of Hārūn) from 111 to 116 (729-734) (on him cf. above i. 1100 sq.; ii. 357; Weil, **op. cit.,** l. 629-631; E. v. Zambur, **op. cit.,** p. 47). Dānimā probably resided as a rule not in Nāšīpur or Tūs but in the palace at Sanābād which he had probably built. One of his successors, Humnād, also chose to live here and seems to have enlarged the place. This would explain how our sources call the same house the house of Dānimā and of Humnād. Perhaps the extension became the property of the 'Abdādāls on the death of Humnād. About 10 years after the death of Hārūn, the caliph al-Ma'mūn on his way from Merv spent a few days in this palace. Along with him was his son-in-law 'Ali al-Riḍā b. Mīrāb, the caliph designate, the eighth imām of the Twelvers. The latter died suddenly here in 205 (818); the actual day is uncertain (cf. Strothman, **Die Zweifels-SchaERE,** Leipzig 1926, p. 171). On 'Ali al-Riḍā and his death cf. above i. 298, 298; iii. 2224; Weil, **op. cit.,** ii. 225; Fraser, **Narratives of a Journey into Khurasan,** London 1825, p. 449-451 (gives the story current in Meshhad of the imām's death); Yate, **op. cit.,** p. 340-344; Sykes, **The Glory of the Shahnameh,** London 1910, p. 255-258; W. Jackson, **op. cit.,** p. 265-266. It was not the tomb of the caliph but that of a highly venerated imām which made Sanābād (Nūkān) celebrated throughout the Shi'a world, and the great town which grew up in course of time out of the little village actually became called al-Mashhad (Meshhad) which means "sepulchral chapel" (primarily of a martyr belonging to the family of the Prophet). Cf. on the conception of Mashhad, ill. 323 and v. Berchem in Dietz, **Kurator schifische Baukunde,** l. (Berlin 1918), p. 89-90. Ibn Hawqal (p. 313) calls our sanctuary simply Mashhad, Yāmī (ill. 153) more accurately al-Mashhad al-Riḍawī = the tomb-chapel of al-Riḍā; we also find the Persian name Meshhad-i muqaddas = "the sanctified chapel" (e.g. in Ḥamd Allāh al-Maṣjāwī, p. 157). As a place-name Mashhad first appears in al-Maḳaddasī (p. 352), i.e. in the last third of the tenth century. About the middle of the xivth century the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (iii. 77) uses the expression "town of Mashhad al-Riḍawī". Towards the end of the middle ages the name Nūkān, which is still found on coins in the first half of the xivth century under the Ilkhanīs (cf. Cudrington, **A Manual of Muslim Numismatics,** London 1904, p. 189), seems to have been gradually ousted by al-Mashhad or Meshhad. At the present day Meshhad is often more precisely known as Meshhad-i Riḍā, Meshhad-i muqaddas, Meshhad-i Tūs (so already in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, iii. 66). Not infrequently in literature, especially in poetry, we find only Tūs mentioned, i.e. New Tūs in contrast to Old Tūs or the proper town of this name; cf. e.g. Muhammad Mahdī al-ʿAlawi, *Ṭuzh Tahkīm al-ʿAlawi,* Baghdad 1926, p. 3. The history of Meshhad is very closely dealt with in the work of Muhammad Ḥasan Khaṭṭār al-Dawālī entitled *Maṭlaʿ al-Shams* (3 vols., Teherān 1301—1303). The second volume is exclusively devoted to the history and topography of Meshhad; for the period from 428 (1036) to 1302 (1885) he gives valuable historical material. On this work cf. Yate, **op. cit.,** p. 313—314 and E. G. Browne, *A History of Pers. Lit.,* Cambridge 1924, iv. p. 455-456. The *Maṭlaʿ al-Shams* forms the chief source for the sketch of the history of the town in Yate, p. 314—326. Cf. also the chronological notes in Muhammad Mahdī al-ʿAlawi, **op. cit.,** p. 13—16. The importance of Sanābād—Meshhad continually increased with the growing fame of its sanctuary and the decline of Tūs. Tūs received its death blow in 791 (1389) from Mīrāngāh, a son of Timitr. When the Mongol noble who governed the place rebelled and attempted to make himself independent, Mīrāngāh was sent against him by his father. Tūs was stormed after a siege of several months, sacked and left a heap of ruins; 10,000 inhabitants were massacred (see Yate, **op. cit.,** p. 316; Sykes, in *J. R. A. S.,* 1910, p. 1118 and Browne, **op. cit.,** iii., p. 190). Those who escaped the holocaust settled in the shelter of the "Alid sanctuary. Tūs was henceforth abandoned and Meshhad took its place as the capital of the district. As to the political history of Meshhad it coincides in its main lines with that of the province of Khurāsān [q. v.]. Here we shall only briefly mention a few of the most important events in the past of the town. Like all the larger towns of Persia, Meshhad frequently saw risings and the horrors of war within its walls. To protect the mausoleum of 'Ali al-Riḍā in the reign of the Ghānawīd Maʿṣūd [q. v.], the then governor of Khurāsān erected defences in 1037. In 1121 a wall was built round the whole town which afforded protection from attack for some time. In 1161 however, the Ghūz [q. v.] succeeded in taking the place, but they spared the sacred area in their pillaging. We hear of a further visitation by Mongol hordes in 1296 in the time of Sultan Ghāzān [q. v.]. Probably the greatest benefactors of the town and especially of its sanctuary were the first Timurid Shah Rukh (809—850 = 1406—1446; see vol. iv. 265 sq.) and his pious wife Daghbar-Šāhīd.
With the rise of the national Safavid dynasty \( [q.v.] \), a new era of prosperity began for Meshhed. The very first Safi of this family, Isma‘il I (1501—1524; \( [q.v.] \), established Shi‘ism as the state religion, and, in keeping with this, care for the sacred cities within the Persian frontier, especiallyMeshhed and Kāshān, became an important feature in his programme as in those of his successors. Pilgrimage to the holy tombs at these places experienced a considerable revival. In Meshhed the royal court displayed a great deal of building activity. In this respect Tahmāsp I, Isma‘il’s successor (1524—1576; \( [q.v.] \), and the great Shah Abbas I (1587—1627; \( [q.v.] \), were especially distinguished.

In the xvith century the town suffered considerably from the repeated raids of the Ōbegehs (Uzhehs). In 1507 it was taken by the troops of the Shaibānī Khān (cf. Shaibānīs); it was not till 1528 that Shah Tahmāsp I succeeded in repelling the enemy from the town again. Stronger walls and bastions were then built and another attack by the same Ōbegeh chief was foiled by them in 1530. But in 1544 the Ōbegehs again succeeded in capturing the town and plundering and murdering there. The year 1589 was a disastrous one for Meshhed. The Shahābīd ‘Abd al-Mu‘min after a four months’ siege forced the town to surrender. The streets of the town ran with blood and the thoroughness of the pillaging did not stop at the gates of the sacred area. Shah Abbas I, who lived in Meshhed from 1583 till his official ascent of the throne in Kāshān in 1587, was not able to retake Meshhed from the Ōbegehs till 1598.

At the beginning of the reign of Tahmāsp II \( [q.v.] \) in 1622 the Afghan tribe of Abdāl (\( [q.v.] \) invaded Khurāsān. Meshhed fell before them, but in 1626 the Persians succeeded in retaking it after a two months’ siege. Nādir Shah \( [q.v.] \) (1736—1747) had a mausoleum built for himself in Meshhed.

After the death of Nādir Shah \( [q.v.] \), the city was once again in the hands of the Afghans. In 1797 the Afghans attacked the town and burnt it. The town was later rebuilt by the Afghans and the Persians.

In 1825 Khurāsān suffered greatly from the raids of Turkoman horsemen and the continual feuds of the tribal leaders. (cf. Conolly, \textit{op. cit.}, i. 288 and Yate, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 53.) To restore order the crown prince ‘Abbās Mirzā entered Khurāsān with an army and made Meshhed his headquarters. He died there in 1833. The most important political event of the xixith century for Meshhed was the rebellion of Ḥasan Khān Kāshānī, the prince-governor of Khurāsān, a cousin of the reigning Shah Muḥammad ‘Abbās. For two years (1847—1849) he held out against the government troops sent against him. At the time of the accession of Nāṣir al-Dīn (1848) Khurāsān was actually independent. It was only when the people of Meshhed, under pressure of famine, rebelled against Khān Ḥusain al-Saljūqi’s army succeeded in taking the town.

In 1911 a certain Yūsuf Khān of Herāt declared himself independent in Meshhed under the name of Muḥammad Ḵān ‘Ali Shāh and for a period disturbed Khurāsān considerably with the help of a body of reactionaries who gathered round him. This gave the Russians a pretext for armed intervention, and on March 29, 1912, they bombarded Meshhed in gross violation of Persia’s suzerain rights and many innocent people, citizens and pilgrims, were slain. This bombardment of the national sanctuary of Persia made a most painful impression on the whole Muslim world. Yūsuf Khān was later captured by the Persians and put to death (cf. E. G. Browne, \textit{The Persian Poets of Modern Persia}, Cambridge, 1914, p. 124, 125, 136; Sykes, \textit{History of Persia}, London 1927, i. 436—447). Meshhed is now the centre of eastern Persia, the capital of the province of Khurāsān which, since its eastern part was taken by the Afghans in the xvith century, is barely half its former size (cf. Le Strange, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 383 sq.; \textit{ibid.}, xi. 108 sq. and above, i. 966). In the middle ages it was not Tūs, Meshhed’s predecessor, but Nāşībūr (modern Persian Naḵšūār) that was the capital of this extensive and important province. A royal prince has usually been governor since the fall of the Nādirids. Since 1845 the lucrative and influential post of Mutawalli-Ḵān, the controller or treasurer of the sanctuary of the Imām, has usually been combined with the governorship (cf. Yate, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 372).

The plan of the town is irregular and has a more or less rectangular form. It has a circumference of about 5 miles. The greatest breadth is about a mile, and the length not quite two miles measured along the main street which runs right through the town.

Like most Persian towns Meshed is enclosed by a great girdle of walls, which gives it a very picturesque appearance. The line of the wall. The line of the wall and the broad ditch around outside. are now in ruins and in places have completely disappeared.
The citadel (or) in the southwest part of the town is directly connected with the system of defences. It is in the form of a rectangle with four great towers at the corners and smaller bastions. The palace began by 'Abdū Mīrāt but finished only in 1876, with its extensive gardens, is connected with the fortress proper, now fallen into disrepair (cf. Yate, op. cit., p. 327). It is the governor's residence. The whole quarter of government buildings which, according to MacGregor, occupies an area of 1,200 yards, is separated from the town by an open space, the Mahān-i Tōp (Cannon Place) which is used for military parades.

There are six gates in the city walls.

The town is divided into six great and ten smaller quarters (nazābdān) (see Yate, op. cit., p. 328). The six larger bear the names of their gates; see al-Mahdī al-ʿAlāwī, op. cit.

The principal street which divides the whole town into two roughly equal halves, the Khīyānān, is a creation of Shāh 'Abdū I who did a great deal for Meshhed (1587-1627; see Yate, op. cit., p. 319; cf. the pictures in Sykes, The Glory of the Shīa World, p. 231). This street, a fine promenade, is, being the main thoroughfare, filled all day with a throng of all classes and nationalities, including numerous pilgrims, and caravans of camels and asses; the bustle is tremendous, especially in the middle of the day.

The canal, which flows through the Khīyānān in a bed about 9 feet broad and 5 feet deep is fed, not from the Keshgī Rūd (see above) which runs quite close to Meshhed, as it has too little water, but from the Čehmīn-e Gūsū which menaced it which needed to provide the Tūr with water. When this town had been completely abandoned, Shīr 'Abī, the sifter of Soltān Ḥusain b. Maqūt b. Bāhīrāt (1468-1506; on him see above, l. 343; l. 594), at the beginning of the xvith century had the water brought from this source by a canal 45 miles long, thus sealing the ruin of Tūr; cf. Yate, op. cit., p. 315; al-Mahdī al-ʿAlāwī, op. cit., p. 15.

The making of this canal (see Yate, op. cit., p. 315; Mahdī al-ʿAlāwī, p. 13) contributed essentially to the rise of Meshhed; for the greater part of its inhabitants rely on it for water, although after entering the town, the canal becomes muddy and marshy (which was often a subject of satire; cf. Ḥabīb al-Kaft, op. cit., p. 74), and not for drinking, washing and religious ablutions without hesitation. There are also large and deep reservoirs before the main gates. The water is saline and sulphurous and therefore has an unpleasant taste (cf. Conolly, l. 333-334; Khanjīkhī, p. 105; Curzon, l. 153).

The sacred area divides the principal street into two parts: the Bālī (Upper) Khīyānān in the N. W. and the Pirm (Lower) Khīyānān in the S. E., of which the former is about 3 times as long as the latter. The sacred area covered by the sanctuary of the Imām al-Riḍā is usually called Bālī (cf. above, l. 709). The name Haram-i Shāhī or Haram-i Māhānād or Haram-i al-Riḍāw (al-Riḍā's Haram) is often also applied to it; frequently it is called simply, "Imām" as in Persia as in the Iraq this title is applied also to a building of place of ground sacred to an Imām. The Bālī, a rectangle of 700 feet by 700 feet, is in the lower half of the Khīyānān. With its courts, mosques, sanctuaries, madrasas, caravanserais, bazaars, dwellinghouses etc. it forms a town by itself; a wall around it cuts it off completely from the rest of Meshhed. The main entrances from the Khīyānān are two great doors on north and south, but they are barred by chains so that no vehicle or riding-beast can enter; for the ground of the Bālī is holy and may only be trodden on foot. Animals which get in by accident become the property of the administration of the Imam. The Bālī also has the right of asylum (whence the name Bālī). Debtors who take refuge in it are safe from their creditors; criminals can only be handed over by order of the Māwatwalli-Bābī, which is now usually done after three days. In the whole of the sacred area strict discipline is maintained by its own police; there is a special prison for thieves (see the plan in Yate, p. 332, No. 75; cf. also Conolly, l. 203; Khanjīkhī, p. 98; Bassetti, op. cit., p. 224; Curzon, l. 153-154; Massy, op. cit., p. 1006; Yate, p. 334).

Entrance to the Bālī is strictly forbidden to all non-Muslims. In earlier times the rule does not seem to have been so strict, for Clavigero (see Bk)[1] in 1404 was able to visit the sepulchral chapel of the Imam al-Riḍā. In the sixteenth century (1822, 1833), Conolly (1830), Bunsen (1832), Ferrier (1845), Eastwick (1862), Vāmbērī (1863), Colonel Doulmage (in the sixties) and Massy (1893) visited the sacred area. Only Fraser, Conolly, Doulmage and Massy actually entered the sepulchral chapel itself. Vāmbērī and Massy were dressed as Muslims while the others retained their European dress. Except Doulmage, all these travellers have given more or less full descriptions of the sacred area. The full and accurate description given by Sykes in the J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1120-1148 and in The Glory of the Shīa World is based on information supplied by the attachè to the British Consulate, Ėlim Bayāhdīr, Ahmad Din-Khān (cf. J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1113 and The Shīa World, p. iii.; see also Curzon, l. 154 sq. and Mahdī al-ʿAlāwī, l. 17-22.

The most detailed plan of the Bālī is in the already mentioned Muṭṭla al-ʿĀlamī of Sām al-Dawla (1855); also given in Yate, op. cit., p. 332. A plan on a somewhat smaller scale was prepared by the Persian architect Muʿāwwīn Suwayyīya (cf. Sykes, Glory of the Shīa World, p. 240) and was published by Sykes in the J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1128 and in Glory of the Shīa World, p. 100. The latter differs in details not inconsiderably from Sām al-Dawla's plan; which is right we have not the means of telling.

The history of the sanctuary of al-Riḍā is pretty well known from inscriptions and literary sources (cf. especially the references in Yate, op. cit., p. 317 sq.). Sykes, J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1120 sq. and Mahdī al-ʿAlāwī, p. 14 sq.). According to local legend, Alexander the Great built a wall around the site as he lay there in a dream that it was destined to be the tomb of a saint (cf. Fraser, Narrative, p. 449; Sykes, op. cit., p. 1130). As early as the second half of the tenth century, as Ibn Hawḵal tells us (R. G. A., l. 313), the 'Alīd sanctuary had a strong wall built around it, within which devout men who wished to lead an ascetic life (fīlīfī, q.v.) took up their abode. The almost contemporary account of al-Muhallabī in Abu J. Fīlī, p. 452 is similar. A few decades later, Soltān Maḥmūd of Gharrā (998-1030) as a result of a dream enlarged the
buildings of the tomb and provided a new wall around them (see Sykes, p. 1130). The sanctum at a later date seems to have fallen somewhat into decay: for about a century later it was restored by the Sultān Sādīq Sultān Sa’dīq (q.v.), out of gratitude, local tradition says, for the miraculous cure effected on his sick son there (see Frazer, op. cit., p. 451; Napiers, J. R. G. S., xli. [1876], p. 50 sq.; Sykes, op. cit., p. 1141-1142 and in Glory of the Skin World, p. 238 sq.). It is to this event that an inscription of 512 (1186) inside the chamber of the tomb refers (see in Sykes, p. 1140-1141 and cf. Mahdī al-Alawi, p. 18). There is also a second inscription (in Sykes, p. 1142-1143) which records a restoration undertaken in 612 (1215). The existence of these two inscriptions, the oldest in Mehsbed, shows that the Mongols of Shoqiz-Khān, if they may have swept over Khurštān in 1220, did not strip the sanctuary, spared the buildings. We hear of another restoration of the buildings in the reign of Sultān Ulugh-Bīn Khudābān (1439-1465); cf. Sykes, J.R.G.S., 1910, p. 1111; cf. Mahdī al-Alawi, p. 18). From the middle of the sixteenth century we have the somewhat fuller description of the ‘Ali al-Ridżī by Ibn Batūta (B. 77-79). Timūr’s son Shīr Rūsh (1406-1446) and his wife Diwājar Shāhīn did a great deal for the Haram. The latter built the splendid mosque to the south of the tomb which still bears her name. The Dar al-Siyāda, the hall west of the tomb, and the adjoining chamber, the Dar al-Hurūf, are also due to this queen. Under Timūr’s grandson Sultān Husain Bilārī (1469-1506) (q.v.), the vizier Shīr ‘Ali erected the southern part of the Sāh-ī Kuhna, “the old court”, with the imposing porch; see the inscription reproduced in Sykes, p. 1133.

With the coming to power of the Šaftwīs a new and brilliant era dawned on Mehsbed. The rulers of this dynasty vied with one another in the development and adornment of the sanctuary of ‘Ali al-Ridżī, which they raised to the level of the religious centre of their kingdom. In this respect Tahmāsp I, ‘Abbās II, and Sulaīmān I deserve special mention. Tahmāsp I (1544-1576) erected a minaret, covered with gold in the northern part of the Sāh-ī Kuhna, adorned the whole dome of the tomb with sheets of gold and placed a golden pillar on the top of it. The Osłob came on this rich adornment on their visit in 1569. ‘Abbās I the Great did most of all the Šaftwīs (1537-1627) for Mehsbed. ‘Abbās II (1641-1666) devoted his attention mainly to the further decoration of the Sāh-ī Kuhna. The inscription in harām in Sykes, p. 1133 (cf. also Khānīkhānī, p. 172), was written by the master hand of Muhammad Ridżī ‘Abbās (on him cf. Sarre and Mittwoch, Zeichnungen aus Rīsāl Bābāz, Munich 1914, p. 15-16). Sulaīmān I (1666-1691) paid special attention to the restoration of the dome of the Imam’s tomb; see Mahdī al-Alawi, p. 19 (cf. also Yate, p. 343; Sykes, p. 1137).

Foreign potentates also gave great gifts to the Alīd sanctuary in the Safavid period, such as the Emperor Akbar of India who made the pilgrimage to Mehsbed in 1615 (cf. Yate, p. 319) and in 1612 the Khej Šab of the Dakhkan.

It was Nādir Šāh (1736-1747) who did most for the town of Mehsbed in the eighteenth century. Although a very strict Sunnī, he devoted a considerable part of the enormous wealth which he had brought back from his Indian campaign to the embellishment of the great Sāh-ī Kuhna, the place of pilgrimage. He restored thoroughly the southern half of the Sāh-ī Kuhna built in the reign of Sultān Husain Bilārī. He decorated the portico richly and covered it with sheets of gold so that it is still called “Nādir’s Golden Gate” after him. In 1730, before his accession to the throne, Nādir erected a minaret covered with gold in the upper part of the Sāh, as a counterpart to that erected by Tahmāsp I on the south side of the “old court”, cf. on Nādir Šāh’s activities at the sanctuary of al-Ridžī: Muhammad ‘Ali Hasīn Ta’ākh Mānūsh ‘Alī Khān (Memoirs, ed. Baldwin, London 1831, p. 272).

The rulers of the Kādīr dynasty of the sixteenth century, Fath ‘Ali (1707-1734), Muhammad Šāh (1734-1748) and Nādir al-Dīn (1848-1896), faithfully followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, as regards attention to the Lānī’s sanctuary.

In spite of the number of times which the ‘Alīid sanctuary has been plundered in course of time, it still has countless treasures within its buildings and put in, the shade, as regards wealth and the extent of its buildings and courts, all the other great Muḥammadan sanctuaries, except perhaps Mecca, but including the much admired Nadjaf and Kerbela.

A detailed and accurate description of the Haram and an account of its architectural history based on its present state cannot be given because the strict prohibition of admission to members of other faiths has prevented non-Muslim scholars from examining thoroughly and reproducing the buildings. Relying on description of the sacred area prepared by Europeans and Orientals and on the valuable data contained in inscriptions (the latter were first noted by Khānīkhānī, p. 103-104; more important: published by Sykes assisted by Khān Bahādur Aḥmad Ūn, in J.R.G.S., 1910, p. 1131 sq.), we can assume with considerable probability that, except the tomb, proper, which in its present form (excluding the later dome) according to the inscription (512 = 1186) dates from the beginning of the sixteenth century, only insignificant remains of the older mediaeval period have survived. The Haram in its present form is in the main a creation of the last 500 years, as is briefly outlined in the above, short historical sketch of the sanctuary.

The dome of the tomb with its various annexes rises in the centre of the sacred area and is bordered on the north and east by two great rectangular courts, the Sāh-ī Kuhna and the Sāh-ī Naw, while in the south it is adjacent by the extensive buildings of the Diwājar Shāhī mosque.

The most popular entrance to the Haram is the gateway in the Bālā-Khejūhār, barred by a chain. The road runs for 250 yards through this street filled with shops and ends at a great gateway through which the Harām, the “old court” is entered. Its northern part dates from the time of Šāh ‘Abbās I, while the southern is as old as the second half of the sixteenth century (reign of Sultān Husain Bilārī), but was completely restored by Nādir Šāh. Four great towers with niche-like halls (hence called “minārān”) admit to the court. The simplest of them are the west and east towers built by Šah 1; the former has the clock tower, while the platform of the latter is used as a ṣafār-ābān i.e. a music-
example of the so-called round hand (thuluth) in Arabic epigraphy (cf. v. Berchem in Diez, Chauravan, Handbucher, i, 97, note 8). These enable us to place the building of the present chamber in the beginning of the xivth century, while the dome 65 feet high covered with sheets of gilt copper was built only in 1607 by 'Abbas I and renovated in 1675 by Sulaiman I, according to inscriptions on its outside. As the thread of tradition regarding the site of the Imam's grave can hardly have been broken, it may be assumed practically with certainty that the present dome is built on the true site. There is no longer any trace of Harun's grave; it probably was in the centre of the mausoleum, whence the tomb of the 'Alid who died later was put in a corner of the same place.

Of the other chambers and isolated buildings belonging to the system of the Haram proper, we shall only mention here the Gumbad (dome-shaped) of Ali ibn Waddi Kham, which lies to the N.E. and takes its name from its builder, a famous general of 'Abbas I (cf. Conolly, i, 271; Sykes, The Glory of the Shis World, p. 266; see also the picture in Diez, Persien; Islam, Bankunt in Chauravan, p. 54).

Leaving the sacred chamber by the eastern door one reaches, after traversing two adjoining rooms, the "Golden Gate" of Nashir al-Din, which leads into the New Court (Saheb-i Nam; its northside is bounded by the Pash Khiyaban, Faith Ali Shah began this court in 1818. His two successors continued the building, which was completed in 1855.

If one turns southwards from the Dar al-Siyada already mentioned, one soon enters the area of the charming mosque endowed by Sultana Djawhar Shah and bearing her name. Like the Sultana Kuhna this older court, an oblong running N. to S. about 100 yards long and 90 broad, is broken in the middle of each of its four sides by a small hall (amun), while the unbroken part is divided by two walls, with rows of arcades fitted up as dwellings. The largest and finest of these four iwans of the mosque, the Loon-i Maksun in the south (for Maksur means stall, cf. iii, p. 336), is used for prayers; in it is a wooden pulpit in which the Mahdi will one day show himself to the faithful. The entrance hall is covered by a blue dome which surpasses that on the tomb of the Imam in height and width, and is flanked by two high arcades covered with blue glass tiles. The centre of the court is occupied by the Mangij-i Pir-i Zam = "Mosque of the Old Woman", a square unroofed area surrounded by a wooden balustrade around which runs water in a deep stone channel.

The Djawhar Shah mosque is the noblest and finest building in the sacred area: cf. the opinions of Fraser, Narration, p. 447; Vanden Audenaerde, Mein Wanderungen etc., p. 323 and Sykes, T.R.A.S., 1910, p. 1145. — Pictures of the mosque in Sykes, The Glory of the Shis World, p. 263; Vate, p. 344 (Ahwaz-i Maksun and Mangij-i Pir-i Zam); Diez, Persien; Islam, Bankunt, p. 45-48.

Of the various small sanctuaries which the pilgrim visits in the Haram, only two need be mentioned here, the Ziyarat Kadam-i Muhammed or Shari' = "the place of pilgrimage of the blessed or excellent soul" also called Dabi Sang-i Chakar-i = place of the foot-stone" (see the plan in Vate, p. 352, No. 16), a circular space covered by a dome (east of the north awan of the Djaw-
not a few of them make a living by supplying official documents sealed with the seal of the Imam (see the picture in Sykes, *Glory of the Shir World*, p. 378) which deal among other matters with the answering of petitions made by the pilgrims at the sacred tomb (cf. Khondkoff, p. 99).

On the administration of the sanctuary of Meshhed cf. Fraser, *op. cit.*, p. 455—456; Curzon, l. 162—164; Massy, p. 1006 and especially Yate, p. 344—346.

As we know from medieval Arabic sources, pilgrimage to the tomb of All the Al-Ridha began at an early date. We occasionally hear also of royal visits from the eleventh century onwards.

As to the number of pilgrims who visit Meshhed annually we have different estimates for the sixteenth century but as exact figures can hardly be kept and the numbers vary greatly, they can only claim reliability to a very limited extent.

While Yate (p. 334) gives the annual number for the last decade of the sixteenth century at 30,000, earlier travellers, except Marah (1872: 20—50,000), give much higher figures, e.g. Bellows (1875: 30,000—50,000; Ferrier (1845): 50,000; Khanizadeh (1858) and Eastwick (1862): over 50,000; Curzon 1859 even gives 100,000, but this is certainly too high.

The numbers go up considerably when special religious ceremonies are going on, e.g. at the anniversary of All the Al-Ridha’s death (cf. the pictures in Désa, Persian etc., p. 46) and during the first third of the month of Muharram at the Tusya (q.v.) in memory of the tragedy of Kerbela.

We have a full description of the Muharram festival of the year 1839 by Connolly (see his *Journey etc.*, l. 267—284, 335—336) and a shorter one of 1894 by Yate (op. cit., p. 144—148); cf. also the illustrations in Yate, p. 146 and the drawing by the painter All the Al-Ridha Abad of a Meshhed pilgrim at the time of the Muharram festival in Sarre and Mittwoch, *Zeichnungen des Risu Abbasi* (Munich 1914), Plate 1 (thereon p. 23, 40 and 1st, l. 216 sq.).

Every pilgrim who arrives has a right to free maintenance for three days (according to Vambery: six days). In the sacred quarter, south of the Bala Khiyabani (see the plan in Yate, p. 332), there is a special kitchen used exclusively for pilgrims, which gives out 5—600 free meals every day (cf. Vambery, op. cit. p. 333; Goldsmith, *Eastern Persia*, l. 364 and Curzon, l. 163).

On the ceremonies which the pilgrims have to perform at their visit to the tomb of All the Al-Ridha, we have accounts by Massy, *op. cit.*, and the notes supplied by Khan Bahadir Ahmed al-Din Khan in *Sykes, T.R.A.S.*, 1910, p. 144—45 and in the *Glory of the Shir World*, p. 240 sq. Special mention may be made of the three circumambulations (panuf [q.v.] of the tomb and the curving of all enemies of the Imam three times, especially the Caliphs Hārūn and Ma’mūn.

Every pilgrim who has performed the pilgrimage to All the Al-Ridha’s grave in the prescribed fashion is entitled to call himself Meshhed-i.

Meshhed occupies first place among all the places of pilgrimage in Persia. Among the great sanctuaries of the Muslim world, Meshhed stands second in the view of Shi’a theologians, coming after, not only Mecca and Medina, but also the four specifically Shi’a sanctuaries of the *īrāq, Nadjaf, Kerbela, Sāmarra* and Kāfāma, in this order (cf. *Sykes, The Glory of the Shir World*, p. xiii). According to a version current in Shi’a
circles which Curzon (p. 150) gives, Meshhed is entitled to the sixth place, coming between Kārīmābād as fifth and Sāmārār which is put seventh. The longing of every Shi'ī to find a last resting place in the shadow of one of the beloved Imams caused extensive cemeteries to be laid out at an early date at the great centres of pilgrimage. Thousands of corpses are brought every year to Meshhed, mainly of course from Persia, but also from all the Shi'a lands, particularly India, also Afghanīstān and Turkestan. Nowhere in the whole of Persia are there so many tombs as at Meshhed. As the ground of the cemeteries must be used over and over again, the graves change their occupants every few years. Fine solid tombstones are not used, but simply rough blocks of granite or soapstone from the quarries of the neighbourhood (cf. also Conolly, i. 345-4 and Khanikoff, p. 105). Graves within the sacred quarter itself are naturally most desired. Every available space there is used for the purpose; the pavingstones in the courtyards are often tombstones for the dead below. The fees for graves within the Bāst, which vary with the distance from the Mausoleum of ‛Alī al-Riḍā, bring a not inconsiderable revenue to the authorities.

Of the large cemeteries (māzarāns) outside the Bāst the most important is the Maškāra Khatl-i Gāh ("place of the killing") lying north of the sacred area. East of it is that of Sāliyād Aḥmad in which three children of the seventh Imām, Mūsā al-Kāẓim, are buried (cf. Mahdī al-Alawī, p. 8). In the Pān Khān Khānān quarter is the Maškāra Pir-i Pāshādār. S. E. of the citadel is the cemetery of Gumbād-i Sārī ("green dome") which takes its name from a half ruined mausoleum there, now inhabited by devishes (cf. Yate, p. 326; Mahdī al-Alawī, p. 9).

In the Nūkān quarter is the Maškāra Shīh-e Dāvood (see Mahdī al-Alawī, p. 8). We may also mention that outside the Nūkān gate on the site of the old town of Nūkān (see above), are visible the remains of a gigantic cemetery on which, according to Sykes (J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1116), there may be found stone sarcophagi with inscriptions carved upon them dating from 760 to 1099 (1359-1688).

Outside of Meshed a good half hour's journey to the south, on rocky ground is the cemetery of Mīrzā Ibrahim al- ‘Imārzā (see Mahdī, op. cit., p. 8) and still further from the town, 3 miles north of it, that of Khvāndīn Rābī (cf. Sykes, op. cit., p. 1124, and Ibn Sād, v. 2, p. 127 sq.). According to the popular view, he was a Sunnī in spite of his relations with 'Alī and is therefore in a way regarded as the patron of the Sunnis in Khvāndīn, of whom those who live in Meshhed are usually buried near his tomb. Rābī’s mausoleum is one of the most interesting in the whole of Khvāndīn: it is a large octagonal building crowned by a dome but new it is in a half ruined condition.

Meshed is the centre of Muslim theological and legal studies in Persia. A number of colleges (madrasas) there are devoted to teaching these subjects. Lists of them with dates are given by Fraser (p. 456-460) who mentions 14 of the present 16 madrasas, also by Khanikoff (p. 107) who gives 13, and by Mahdī al-Alawī (p. 9-12). The latter observes that there were 20 older colleges, of which he gives 15, and a number of more modern ones. Fraser also gives brief notes on the possessions of the various madrasas and the clergy (muazzins) attached to them. Yate (p. 329-330) simply mentions six of the best known. From these lists, which supplement one another in welcome fashion, we get the names of 20 colleges. From the dates of foundation we find that the oldest of the madrasas still standing in Meshed is the Madrasa Dīdār, which was built in 823 (1420) by the Timūrid Sultan Shāh Rukh and restored by Sulaimān I. Under the same ruler was built the Pīršāla Madrasa which was completely remodelled by Sulaimān I. From the time of 'Abbās II date the two almost contemporary colleges Khārsāl Khān (1058 = 1649) and Mīrzā Dīfār (1059 = 1650). The majority of the older colleges, fewer than nine in number, date from the time of Sulaimān I, who also restored some buildings (1666-1694). As to the Kādeh, one was founded in the reign of Fath 'Ali Shāh and two in that of Naṣir al-Dīn, who also restored two that had fallen into ruins.

From the artistic point of view, the finest is the Madrasa of Mīrzā Dīfār which was built and richly endowed in 1059 (1650) by a Persian of this name who had made a fortune in India. It is generally regarded as the third finest building in Meshed, next to the Mausoleum of 'Alī al-Riḍā and the Dżwahr Shāh Mosque. In its plan, with vaulted halls and court yard with niches, and its rich decoration, it follows the style of the courts and mosques of the sacred area above described, typical of the ecclesiastical architecture of Persia (cf. above, iii. 439, 447 sq. and also Fraser, p. 460-467). Not only the Madrasa of Mīrzā Dīfār but also other richly endowed colleges, like that of Pām-Pā (both of the time of Sulaimān I) owe their origin to Persians who had made fortunes in India (cf. on the foundation of the two last named colleges: Fraser, p. 457-459; Sykes, The Glory etc., p. 267-269). The most esteemed colleges are in the Bāst, namely the three already mentioned as the oldest, Dīdār, Pārzān and Khvāndīn Khān, also Pāsāzār and 'Alī Naṣîr Mīrzā. Others, like the above mentioned Mīrzā Dīfār Madrasa and the Mustaṣṣāf Mādrāsah have doors communicating with the Şah-i Kūhān of the Haram quarter.

Students also live in the madrasas, their maintenance being provided for by pious endowments. While in Khanikoff's time (1838) there were no outstanding teachers there and the number of students was small, the reputation of the Meshed colleges went up again in the second half of the eight century so that Sykes (The Glory etc., p. 267 sq.) in 1910 puts the attendance at 1,200 students, who came from Persia, India and other Shi'a regions. The student who wishes to take a higher theological training after the nine years' course at Meshed must go to Meshed 'All (Nedjel, q.v.) and attend the lectures of the teachers there, who are the first authorities on Shi'a theology.

We have no details of the libraries of the Meshed colleges. Of the rich Fāṭimī-Khān Madrasa, Fraser only says (p. 457) that it has a valuable library. The administration of the Haram also has a large and valuable collection of books (on its location see the plan in Yate, p. 332, N°. 65 and cf. N°. 29), founded in the first half of the xvth century by Sultan Shāh Rukh. The treasures accumulated under him and his successors were for the most part lost when Meshed was sacked by
After his death their position became a miserable one, especially after the catastrophe which overwhelmed them in 1839. When in this year, during the celebration of the Muslim Kurban festival, a Jewess on medical advice placed her hand, which was suffering from an eruption, in the bowl of a freshly slain street dog, the Muhammadans took this for an insult to their religious observances. The excited mob, resenting the excuse, fell upon the Jewish quarter, plundering and murdering as they pleased and destroyed the synagoge. The outraged Jews had to adopt Islam. These Jewish converts are called Ljadjid, more fully Ljadjid al-Islam = “new-comers to Islam”, because their forced conversion is of recent date. The change of faith was only an external one; it is true that these Ljadjid to avert suspicion regularly attend the mosque, but not a few of them are said to observe their old rites in secret. The number of Judeo-Muslims in Meshhed at the present day who are small traders, physicians, etc., was put by Basset (1878) at 300 families, by Yate at 260. On the Jews of Meshhed and their persecution in 1839 cf. Trulliher, p. 373; Conolly, l. p. 350 sqq.; J. Wolf, Narrative, p. 177, 394–396; Ferrer, p. 122–123; J. J. Benjamin (see Rissi), p. 189–190; Vambéry, Wanderungen, p. 324–325; Basset, p. 230–233; Yate, p. 322.

The clerical element is strong in the Muslim population; everywhere one sees mullahs, jolnas (students) and dervishes. The town swarms with sayids (alleged descendants of Ali) among whom the Khwaja, who claim descent from Ali al-Ridha, enjoy special privileges. Meshhed is not only one of the most fanatical cities in the whole Muslim world, but also one of the most immoral in Asia. 

Prostitution, the so-called pilgrim marriage (Pers. ghaleh; cf. muta’ and iv., p. 353, 355), sanctioned by the Imami group of the Shiites, thrives here. Most pilgrims take advantage of this institute of temporary marriage (cf. Khaniukoff, p. 98; Conron, l. 164–165; Ibrahim Beg, p. 45; Yate, p. 419; Allemanii, iii. 86–87).

The people of Meshhed are described as very superstitious; see especially Basset, p. 228 sqq. and the Meshhed Stories in Conolly, l. 516–518. Many stories are told of miracles wrought in the Alid sanctuaries; see Fraser, p. 451–452; Basset, p. 426–427; Massey, p. 493–495. Yate, p. 345, 357.

The population of the town lives partly by catering for pilgrims and partly on local industries and commerce.

The industries, once very flourishing, have now declined. The famous manufacture of sword blades, introduced by a colony of workers transplanted by Timur from Damascus, has now almost entirely disappeared (cf. Trulliher, p. 375; Fraser, p. 124; Ferrer, p. 468; Conron, l. 166).

A specialty of Meshhed is the manufacture of decorated vessels (household utensils, like jugs, pots, dishes etc.) out of serpentine and dark grey soapstone (Meshhed stone), from the quarries 1½ hours south of Meshhed. This stone industry is old and the Arabic sources of the middle ages mention it as native to the district of Tis and especially to the town of Nīkān (the predecessor of Meshhed); cf. B.G.A., l. 258; ii. 313; iii. 324, 326; al-Muḥallabī in Abū l-Fālid, p. 452; Abū al-Rahmān al-Gharnāsī, in J.A., 1925, p. 203; Yāqūt, iv. 524 and cf. G. Le Strange, op. cit.
For the sixteenth century cf. Trulliher, p. 274-275; Fraser, p. 469; Ferrier, p. 124; Bellow, p. 366—367; Baker, p. 184; MacGregor, l. 291—302; Basset, p. 254; Curzon, l. 167.

The celebrated turquoise mines east of Nishāpūr (about 1 1/2 days’ journey distant; cf. Wādīzān and Le Strange, of. cit., p. 368; Fraser, p. 409-420; Ferrier, p. 106—107; Khankhoff, p. 90—92; Basset, p. 216—217; Yate, p. 399—408) at one time were of special significance in Meshhed’s trade and industry. Meshhed was the centre of the turquoise trade; for the whole output of these mines came to it and they were controlled by Meshhed merchants. The turquoise were sorted in Meshhed and put into commerce there. Now however, the finest specimens are usually sent directly abroad from the mines and only pieces of inferior quality come to Meshhed, to be worked there by the still very skilful stone cutters into ornaments and souvenirs for pilgrims. On the turquoise industry of Meshhed cf. Trulliher, p. 274; Bellow, p. 367; Goldsmid, l. 565; Baker, p. 184.

Weaving is another important industry in Meshhed. The carpets produced here were at one time of immensely greater value than those of the present day, which are produced in factory fashion. The modern shawls of Kasmir style are especially prized and known as Meshhed, as are the velvets, which in Fraser’s time were regarded as the best in Persia. On weaving in Meshhed cf. Fraser, p. 468; Ferrier, p. 124; Goldsmid, l. 365; Baker, p. 184—185; Curzon, l. 167; Ibrahim Beg, p. 47; Schweinitz, p. 27—28; Allemagne, l. 110.

Until the second half of the sixteenth century, Meshhed was one of the first emporia of Eastern Iran. At the intersection of important caravan routes, it was the entrepôt for the trade of Central Asia and especially of Afghanistan. Since however Russia has become established in Tarkistan and built the Transcaspian railway, Meshhed’s trade through has much declined. Nevertheless the town must still be described as an important centre of traffic and trade, not least on account of the numerous pilgrim routes that lead to it. Meshhed is 150 miles from the Russian railway station of Ashkhabad [q. v.], the capital of the Transcaspian area; there is a good road between the two towns.

For the housing of the numerous pilgrims and other strangers who come to Meshhed, a considerable number of caravanserais are available. In Fraser’s time (1822), there were at least 25—30 such places in use, apart from some that had been abandoned and allowed to fall into ruins (see Fraser, Narrative, p. 460). Khankhoff (p. 107—108) gives 16, four of which, intended for pilgrims only, were inside the bazaar; of these latter the oldest is the Salāt Caravansarai, built by Tāhmasp I; others date from Sulaimān I.


As to descriptions of Meshhed by Europeans we owe the first full description to Fraser (1822); Conolly (l. 260) and Burns (l. 78) both say it is thoroughly reliable. Valuable notes on the town are given by Conolly, Ferrier, Khankhoff, Eastwick, MacGregor, Basset, O’Connor, Curzon, Massy, E. Dier, and especially by C. E. Yate and Sykes, each of whom spent several years (1893—1897 and 1905—1912 resp.) in Meshhed as British Consul-General for Khurasan.

of C. E. Yate), Travels with the Afghan Boundary Commission, Edinburgh 1889, p. 367-384; G. Radde (1886), Transkaukasis und Nordpersien, in Petermann's Geogr. Mitteil., Erg.-H. 126, p. 174-178; G. v. Curzon (1889), Persien and the Persian Question, London 1892, i. 148-176; H. St. Massy (1893), An Englishman in the shrine of Imam Reza in Mashhad, in The Nineteenth Century and after, London 1913, i. 999-1007; C. E. Yate (1885, 1893-1897), Khuraran and Sistan, Edinburgh 1900, p. 40-50, 53-140-149, 249-346, 406-418, 421 (with pictures); P. Sykes (1903, 1905-1912), Ten Thousand Miles in Persia, London 1902, p. 24-26, 256, 301, 357, 385, 401; do., Historical notes on Khuraran, in T. A. E. A., 1910, p. 1114-1148, 1152-1154; do. (and Khân Bahâdûr Ahmad Din Khân), The Story of the Sák World, London 1910, p. 227-269 (with pictures); Ella C. Sykes, Persia and its peoples, London 1910, p. 88-105; H. K. Allemagne (1907), Du Khuraran au pays des Bakhtiaris, Paris 1911, iii. 75-114 (with very fine illustrations); W. Jackson (1907), From Constantinople to the House of Omar Khayyâm, London 1911, p. 263-277; H. H. Graf von Schweinitz (1908), Orientalische Wanderungen im Turkestân und im nördl. Persien, Berlin 1910, p. 15-28; E. Dies (1913), Chosranische Bauhüttenmänner, vol. i., Berlin 1918, p. 52-61, 66-69, 76-78, 85-86 with index; il. 19-20, 25-29, 36-2, 32, 38; do., Persien: Islandische Baukunst in Chosran, in Hagen i. W. 1923, p. 43-79, 91, 154; O. von Niedermyer, Dschadzau, 1925, p. 207. — In the general works of K. Ritter, Erdkunde, viii. (1883), p. 11, 238-308, 310; il. (1840), p. 904 and G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 358-391, 431. Ibn and Meshehd are not satisfactorily distinguished; cf. above. (M. STREIC) MESHHEH 'ALI. [See NEJAF.] MESHHEH HUSAIN (Kerbela), a place of pilgrimage west of the Euphrates and about 60 miles S.S.W. of Baghdad, is on the edge of the desert (Vâkkâ, Ma'âlû, ed. Wüsstenfeld, iv. 249). It lies opposite Kassar Ibn Hitnara (al-Istakhri, B.G.A., l. 85; cf. al-Balkhi), Fawâf, ed. de Goeje, p. 287; al-Makhdûn, B.G.A., i. 121. The name Kerbelâ is probably connected with Aram-Kerbelâ (Daniel, 3, xi) and Assy. Karbalatû (a kind of headress) (G. Jacob, Türkische Bibliothek, xii. 35, note 2). It is not mentioned in the pre-Arab period. After the taking of al-Itra, Khânî B. al-Walid is said to have encamped in Kerbelâ (Vâkkâ, iv. 250). On the 10th day of the month of Muharram 61 (Oct. 10, 658) the Imam Husain b. Ali (cf. ii. P. 339) marched from Mecca to the Iraq, where he intended to enforce his claims to the caliphate, fell in the plain of Kerbelâ in the district of Nusawî (al-Tabari, iii. 2190; Vâkkâ, iv. 870; now according to Massîn: Khûmân, Khoirân, in a battle with the troops of the governor of al-Kufa and buried in Mâkâr (Vâkkâ, iv. 188-197; al-Tabari, iii. 752; E. Herzfeld, cf. above, li. p. 221). The place where the decapitated body of the Prophet's grandson was interred (on the site of the great place which was cut off and sent to Damascus to Varîd ibn, cf. van Berchem, Fäste der Moslem. Gesch., Berlin 1915, p. 298-310), called Kahr al-Mashhad, soon became a celebrated place of pilgrimage, for the Shi'is (cf. art. A'I'A). As early as 65 (684-685) we find Sulaimân b. Surâd going with his followers to Husain's grave where he spent a day and a night (al-Ta'ifîn, ed. de Goeje, ii. 545 sqq.). Ibn al-'Ather (Tarikh, ed. Tornberg, v. 184; is. 338) mentions further pilgrimages in the years 122 (739-740) and 436 (1044-1045). The priests of Mêshehd Husain at quite an early date were endowed by the pious benefactions of Umm Müsûm, mother of the Caliph al-Mahdi (al-Tabari, iii. 735). The Caliph al-Mutawakkil in 236 (851-855) destroyed the tomb and its annexes and had the ground levelled and sown; he prohibited under threat of heavy penalties visiting the holy places (al-Tabari, iii. 1407; Hamd Allah al-Mustawli', Nuzhat al-Kullûh, ed. Le Strange, p. 52). Ibn Hawâqi (ed. de Goeje, p. 166), however, mentions about 977 a.d. a large 'meshhad' with a domed chamber, entered by a door on each side, over the tomb of Husain, which in his time was already much visited by pilgrims. Dâbû b. Muhammad al-Asadi of 'Ain al-Tamm, supreme chief of a number of tribes, devastated Mêshehd al-Hârîn (Kerbela) along with other sanctuaries, for which a punitive expedition was sent against 'Ain al-Tamm in 569 (979-980) before which he fled into the desert (Ibn Miskawaih, Taghibt al-'Umam, ed. Amâdres in The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate, p. 338, 414). In the same year, the Shîa Bâyâd 'Aqûd al-Dawla (cf. above, i. 143) took the two sanctuaries of Mêshehd 'Ali (al-Nadîjâf) and Mêshehd al-Husain (M. Hârî) under his special protection (Ibn al-Âthîr, viii. 518; Hamd Allah al-Mustawli', loc. cit.). Hassan b. al-Fadîl, who died in 414 (1023-1024), built a wall round the holy tomb at Mêshehd al-Husain (Ibn Taghibt al-Dawla, Nuzhat, ed. Popper, ii. 123, 141), as he also did at Mêshehd 'Ali (Ibn al-Âthîr, ix. 154). In Râbi' al-awwal 407 (Aug./Sept. 1016), a great conflagration broke out caused by the upsetting of two wax candles, which reduced the main building (al-Kubba) and the open halls (al-Arwiq) to ashes (Ibn al-Âthîr, ix. 209). When the Sâliht Sulîh Malik Shâh came to Baghâd in 479 (1086-1087) he did not neglect to visit the two Mêshehds of 'Ali and al-Hasain (Ibn al-Âthîr, x. 103). The two sanctuaries at this time were known as al-Maghâfûrân (al-Bundari al-Istakhri, Tanwîrkî, al-Sâlihtû, ed. Houtouza, in Revue des études islam., ii. 77) on the analogy of the large al-Iskâmû, al-Bužinû, al-Hirânî, al-Mirân etc. The Ikhân Ghûzân in 1303 visited Kerbelâ and gave lavish gifts to the sanctuary. He or his father Arghûtû is credited with bringing water to the district by leading a canal from the Tigris (the modern Nahâr al-Husainiyâ) (A. Noldeke, Das Heiligtum al-Husain u. Kerbelâ, Berlin 1909, p. 49). Ibn Sûriûta (ed. Defrénelle and Sanguineti, ii. 99) visited Kerbelâ in 727 (1326-1327) from al-Hilla and describes it as a small town which lies among palm groves and gets its water from the Frit. In the centre is the sacred tomb; beside it is a large madrasa and the famous hostel
(al-Sa‘idwa) in which the pilgrims are entertained. Admission to the tomb could only be obtained by permission of the gate-keeper. The pilgrims kiss the silver sarcophagus, above which hang gold and silver lamps. The doors are hung with silken curtains. The inhabitants are divided into the Awlād Rakhīk and Awlād Fāysa, whose continual feuds are detrimental to the town, although they are all Shi‘is.

About the same date, Ḥamid Allāh al-Mustawfi (cf. cit.) gives the circumference of the town as 2,400 paces; he mentions there also the tomb of Ḥurr Rīyā (b. Yazid), who was the first to fall fighting for Ḥusayn at Kerbela.

The Ša‘awīd Šah Ismā‘īl I (d. 950 = 1544) made a pilgrimage to al-Najaf and Meşhēd Ḥusayn. Sultān Sulaimān the Magnificent visited the two sanctuaries in 941 (1534-1535), repaired the canal at Meşhēd al-Ḥusayn (al-Ḥusaynīya) and transformed the fields which had been buried in sand into gardens again. The Manṣūrat al-ʿAbbād (see below), formerly called Enquça-Gī Vār, was built in 952 (1547-1548). Mansūr III in 991 (1583) ordered the Wālī of Baghdad, ʿAlī Wādsī b. Alwand, to build or more correctly restore a sanctuary over the grave of Ḥusayn. Soon after the capture of Baghdad in 1623, ʿAbbās the Great won the Meşhēds for the Persian empire. Nādir Şah visited Kerbela in 1743; while he is credited with gilding the dome in Meşhēd ʿAbbās, he is also said to have consecrated endowments intended for the priests of Kerbela.

The great prosperity of the place of pilgrimage and its large number of inhabitants is emphasised on the occasion of the pilgrimage of ʿAbbās al-Kurīm, a favourite of Nādir Şah. Rədiya Sultān Bəğum, a daughter of Şah Ḥusayn (1694-1722), presented 20,000 ṣaddās for improvements at the mosque of Ḥusayn.

The founder of the Šāzpār dynasty, Ağa Muḥammad Khatḥ, towards the end of the eighteenth century, presented the gold covering for the dome and the menāra of the sanctuary of Ḥusayn (Jacob in A. Nöldke, cf. cit. p. 65, note 4).

In April 1801, in the absence of the pilgrims who had gone to al-Najaf, 12,000 Wāhākkā under Şahīḥ Saʿūd entered Kerbela, slew over 3,000 inhabitants there and looted the houses and bazaars. In particular they carried off the gilt copper plates and other treasures of the sanctuary and destroyed the shrine. But after this catastrophe contributions poured in for the sanctuary from the whole Shi‘i world.

After a temporary occupation of Kerbela by the Persians, Nadjīd Pāša in 1843 succeeded by force of arms in enforcing the recognition of Turkish suzerainty over the town; the walls of the present old town were now for the most part destroyed. The governor Midług Pāša in 1871 began the building of government offices, which remained incomplete, and extended the adjoining market place (references for the history of Meşhēd Ḥusayn are given in A. Nöldke, cf. cit. p. 35-50).

At the present day, with over 50,000 inhabitants, Kerbela is the second largest and perhaps the richest town of the Irak. It owes its prosperity not only to the great number of pilgrims who visit the tomb of Ḥusayn, but also to the fact that it is the most important starting point for the Persian pilgrimage caravans to al-Najaf and Mecca, and through its situation on the edge of the alluvial plain it is an important “desert port” for trade with the interior of Arabia.

The old town with its tortuous streets is surrounded by modern suburbs. About half to three quarters of the citizens are Persians, the remainder Shi‘is Arab. The most important tribes among them are the Bani Sa‘ud, Salalime, al-Wustūn, al-Talāmīz and al-Nāṣirīya. The Dede family is the richest; for constructing the Nahr al-Ḥusaynīya it was rewarded with extensive estates by Sulṭān Selim.

The name Kerbela strictly speaking only applies to the eastern part of the palm gardens which surround the town in a semi-circle on its east side (Musil, The Middel East, p. 47). The town itself is called al-Meşhēd or Meşhēd al-Ḥusayn.

The sanctuary of the third Imām lies in a court yard (pāhā) 354 x 270 feet in area, which is surrounded by iwans and cells. Its walls are decorated with a continuous ornamental band which is said to contain the whole Qur‘ān written in white on a blue ground. The building itself is 156 x 138 feet in area. The rectangular main building entered by the “golden outer hall” (picture in Grothe, Geogr. Charakterbilder, pl. Lxxvii, fig. 156) is surrounded by a vaulted corridor (now called jamā‘ī; A. Nöldke, cf. cit. p. 20, 3), in which the pilgrims go round the sanctuary (jarmīd) (Wellhausen, Rel. arab. Holdentum, p. 109-112). In the middle of the central domed chamber is the shrine (pandīb) of Ḥusayn about 6 feet high and 12 long surrounded by silver mawṣūdīya work, at the foot of which stands a second smaller shrine, that of his son and companion-in-arms ʿAlī Akbar (Mas‘ūdī, Khatāb al-Tambīk, ed. de Goeje, B. G. A., viii. 303).

“The general impression made by the interior must be called fairy-like, when in the dusk — even in the daytime it is dim inside — the light of innumerable lamps and candles around the shrine, reflected a thousand and again a thousand times from the innumerable small crystal facets, produces a charming effect beyond the dreams of imagination. In the roof of the dome the light loses its strength; only here and there a few crystal surfaces gleam like the stars in the sky” (A. Nöldke, cf. cit. p. 25 sqq.).

The sanctuary is adorned on the Khiba face with magnificent and costly ornamentation. Two minarets flank the entrance. A third, the Manṣūrat al-ʿAbbād, rises before the buildings on the east side of the Ṣan‘ā; south of it the face of the buildings surrounding the court recedes about 50 feet; on this spot is a Sunnat mosque. Adjoining the Ṣan‘ā on the north side is a large medrese the courtyard of which measures about 85 feet square with a mosque of its own and several mihrābs (on the present condition of the sanctuary; cf. A. Nöldke, cf. cit. p. 5-26, on its history p. 35-50 and on its architectural history, p. 51-66).

About 600 yards N.E. of the sanctuary of Ḥusayn is the mausoleum of his half-brother ʿAbbās. On the road which runs westward out of the town is the site of the tent of Ḥusayn (Khāmisun). The building erected there (plan in Nöldke, pl. viii.; photograph in Grothe, pl. Lxxviii, fig. 145) has the plan of a tent and on both sides of the entrance there are stone copies of camel saddles.

On the desert plateau (hammānd) west of the town stretch the graves of the devout Shi‘is. North of the gardens of Kerbela lie the suburbs, gardens
and fields of al-Djârâ, N.W. those of Ktara, S. those of al-Qibâlitija (Yaḵût, iii. 768). Among
places in the vicinity, Yaḵût mentions al-ʿÂr (iii.
693) and al-Nawâší (iv. 816).
A branch line diverging north of al-Hilla con-
nects Kerbelâ with the Baghdad–Balârat railway.
Caravans roads lead to al-Hilla and Naṣāf. The
sanctuary of Ḥusain still has the reputation of
securing entrance to Paradise for those buried there,
wherefore many aged pilgrims and those in failing
health go there to die on the holy spot.
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**MESSHED-I MİSİRİYÂN**, a ruined site in
Transcaucasia (Turkmenistan). N.W. of the
confine of the Atrak and its right bank tributary
the Sambar, or more exactly, on the road
which runs from Cat at right angles to the road
connecting Cikîqîr with the railway-station of
Ayrîl. The ruins are surrounded by a wall of brick
and a ditch and have an area of 300 acres. The
old town, situated in the steppes which are
now peopled by Turkomans, received its water
from a canal led from the Atrak about 40 miles
above Cat. Near the latter place the canal diverged
northwards from the river, crossed the Sambar by
a bridge and finally followed an embankment
6 feet high on which the bed of the canal was
1 foot broad.

The ruins of a fine mosque can still be seen,
the gateway of which, decorated with filigree,
have an inscription according to which this ǧârî
was built by ʿAllî, the Dârâly wa ʿl-Dîn Dîwâr al-Islâm
wa ʿl-Musulûmîn ǧârî Allâh; b. ʿl-A último Sülûm
Muhammad b. Sülûm Tâhirâk Bûrânî Amir al-Muʿminîn.
The Khârizmshâh Muhammad in question reigned
1200–1220. On one of the two towers (minaret?)
is written: hałîmülâk min ʿAllî
minma amara buh ʿAllî Dîwâr Ablay wa ʿl-
Aızâqbar ǧârî al-râbî, dəstakub ʿulâ, ʿulâ, ʿulâ,
All K R, . . . (I). The identity of this Ablay is
unknown but the title "lord of the ribât" which he
gives himself, confirms the fact that M.-Misriyan
was a frontier fortress (ribât). Near the east gate
stood another white mosque.

Tradition (Conolly) ascribes the destruction of
Misriyan to the "Kâmaq Tatars". The appearance
of the Kalmaks in these regions may be dated
1600.

The name Meşhed-i Misriyan (variants: Meş-
storan, Meş-Dovran, Meş-Dovran, Meştoran)
is obscure, unless Meşstoran is explained as
*Meštoran* "Nestorian Christians"; it may be
recalled that during his campaign in the Cîl
(*çül), to the east of the Caspian, Yezadagî II
persecuted the Christians (Hoffmann, p. 50;
Labouret, *Le christianisme dans l'Empire Persien*,
1904, p. 126).

The site of the ruins (to the north of Djarqân)
is given the name Dîhistan in Muslim sources,
which recalls the name of the old Scythian people
Daha who led a nomadic life on the Atrak (Grek
Aza and Azaş; cf. Tomasechek in Panly-Wissowa,
*Real-Encyl.*, 3, iv, col 1945). From the Dahan clan
of the Farmî was descended the Arabshid dynasty
which imposed its authority on the Parnithans (cf.
p. 50).

The basin of the Atrak (the ancient Zápou)
is at the extreme limit of the lands described in
the classical and Muhammadian geographers. The sources
mention several settlements in Dîhistan but in a
somewhat confusing fashion. As the analysis by
Hoffmann and by Barthold has shown, a distinction
must be made between: 1. the settlement on the
sea-shore, 2. the town of Dîhistan and 3. the ribât
Dîhistan.

1. The first of these was built on a promontory
(dokhîa) behind which ships could shelter. Mar-
quart, *Erzähler*, p. 136, reads the name concealed
in the variants in ʿIṣ̄ṭakhrī, p. 219, note b, as
*Dîhistân Bayâzîn* which he connects with the
district of Bayâzîn mentioned (in Djarqân) by
Tabarti, ii. 1330; Balâghari, p. 337 and Ibn Khur-
dâdbish, p. 35. The *notolet* al-ʿĀlam mentions a
peninsula of Dîhistân-Sur on the coast of Dîhistân.

This may be an echo of the name of the
Turkish (i) princes (also Hoffmann, p. 251)
who attacked Djarqân from the north (Ibn an-
Āthîr, iii. 33). Lastly Tabarti, ii. 1325, locates an
island of Bayâzîn 5 faraqî from Dîhistân. Barthold
identifies all these names with the cape of Ḥasan-
Kall which shelters the bay into which the Atrak
flows. [Cf. also the article *Tûkîr*, on the Din-
Alâqîn mentioned in the *Şâbîn-i-nâmâ*].
A difficulty is raised by Lezakhri (p. 219) who puts at 50 farshaks and p. 226 at 6 marbola (each of 87/4 farshaks) the distance between Ahsan Khan at the mouth of the river Dijnjakin, now Gümüşhâgay, and the cape of Dihistan in question. If we follow this double indication literally, we ought (with Hoffmann, p. 279, who reads the name “Dihistan” “Tâbâshir”) to move the cape of Dihistan considerably to the north, in the bay of Krasnowodsk, which is certainly a very important place. In this case the cape would be a different one from Buhaira = Hasan Kuli (Hoffmann, p. 278).

2. The town of Dihistan, according to the Middle Persian list of the towns of Erân, was founded by a certain Nasrâbâd, the Arzâkarid (Marquart, Erâszk, p. 75) and according to the Naqsh al-Kâmil, p. 166, by the Siyâyân Kâbâl b. Fîrât. According to Mâcadass, the town of Dihistan was called Aghân. Tabâshir locates the town of Dihistan 25 farshaks from the river of the Dijnjakin and, as we have seen, 5 farshaks from Buhaira. This latter distance is by the way less than the canal distance between Hasan Kuli and Meshhed-i Meshîyân.

3. The ruins of Meshhed-i Meshîyân (as the inscription on the mosque suggests) must correspond to the ribât of Dihistan which Mâcadass, p. 385 (cf. also p. 312, 367, 372) mentions distinct from Aghân. This ribât situated on the borders of the steppes had fine mosques and rich markets. Relying on Yahtî, l. 39, Barthold thinks that in the ninth century the ribât (not Aghân) to the east of the Dijnjakin-ribât road was the capital of the district of Dihistan.


(M. MINORSKY)

MESHÎ (originally ‘Ist), an important Ottoman poet of the time of Bayazid II. Born in Frigista in northern Albania, he came as a youth to Constantinople where he became a savāf (theological student) and distinguished himself as a calligrapher. In the end he won the favour of the grand vizier Shahâd al Paşa [q. v.] and became his devan-secretary. But his irregular life and carelessness in the performance of his duties frequently irked his patron (“Ali Paşa, called him Şehir aghchek”). He held his post, however, till the death of “Ali Paşa in 1511 in battle against the Shî rebels under Shah Kuli. Meshî wrote an elegy on his death, full of the deepest emotion.

His attempts to find a new patron failed. He had to be content with a miserable fief in Bosnia where he soon died in 1512 (1512), poor and forgotten but still quite young.

According to Ahmad Paşa [q. v.] and Negdî (d. 1514 = 1509), Meshî was regarded as the third great Ottoman poet and the greatest lyric poet before Bâkî. He is a most artistic and original figure. His output was not extensive, but of lasting influence. His Divân has not yet been printed, a fact common to nearly all important Turkish poets. In his lyric poems he is above the average of contemporary poets. In addition to the grace and delicacy of his diction, there is a certain novelty in his style. New images and pictures are introduced with great boldness, perhaps a result of his Albanian blood. The best-known of his poems, in Europe is his Ode to Spring (wehrîs) which Sir William Jones published with a Latin translation: Poesis Asiaticae commentariaiorum liber, Leipzig 1774 and has been repeatedly reprinted (by Toderni, by Wieland in the Deutsche Lieder, by J. von Hammer etc.). His Divân is also of importance linguistically, for it bears the stamp of the Rumelian dialect.

Meshî’s most original work is his Mecnevarî, Şehir-oğzis (the “Thrilling of the Town”), which is also the most original work in Turkish literature down to Meshî’s time. It is one of the subject also, as it did not have a Persian model. It introduced quite a new style of poems, which was frequently imitated. Şehir-oğzis represents the first attempt at humorous verse in Turkey, and its language is very close to the spoken speech. Here Meshî could write Turkish to his heart’s content, while in other forms he had to use the learned jargon. He laments in one passage that without Persian and Arabic there would be no room for him as a poet, even if he had come down from heaven.

Şehir-oğzis is a lurid catalogue of the beautiful “boys” of Adrianople—it is interesting to note that they are all Musalmans and became popular on account of its unadulterated speech. As a product of his activity as a secretary, we have also a collection of inşâ’î, experiments in epistolary style, not without historical interest, entitled Gâbî Sâd Berg (the hundreleaved rose). I have a manuscript of this work, which seems to be rather rare, of 901 (1583) entitled İmât-i Meshî.

Bibliography: Sahl, Hecht Bihlí, Constantinople 1325, p. 109; Latifi, Tâbâshir, Constantinople 1314, p. 309–311; Thurey, Şefkât-ı Elâmî, Constantinople 1311, iv. 369; Sefni, Kâmil, Constantinople 1316, vl. 4286; Ahmad Râfi‘, İmât-i Meshî, Constantinople 1500, v. 80; H. Hâsâm al-Din, Amasîa Târîkhî, Constantinople 1427, ii. 260; Negdî ‘Asim, Meshî Divânî, T.O.E.M., i. 300–308 (Notes historico-sociologiques, séries du divan de Meshî), Melhem Tâhir, ‘Oddât-ı Meşhed-i İftîfârî, Constantinople 1335, iv. 410 (the Divân in the Hamidyâ-Library is numbered No. 483 [no 473]; I could not find the copy of the İmâtî in the Cat. of the Nîr-ı othmânye); Hammer, G.O.E., l. 297–302; G.O.E., l. 679; Smirnov, Oterk istorii, St. Petersburg 1891, iv. 477 (Korsh); Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, London 1902, ii. 246–256; the Catalogues by Pertsch (Berlin, Gotha), Rieu a. q. (TH. MENZEL).
METAWILA. [See MUTAWALLI.]

MELWLANA HUNAKAR, a title of the head of the Mawlawi Order [see MawlAWo.]

The second word is the Turkish form of the Persian خیل‌النافور, the equivalent of mawlâ, which according to Aflâkî (Saints des Dervîches Tarihi, I. 59) was bestowed on Qâlid al-Din by his father. Şâmi in his Turkish Lexicon states that the word, besides being used for "Saltîn", "King", is applied to certain saintly personages, in such combinations as şîn hañkar or mawlî hünkâr. The underlying idea of such a title is probably that the saint has had committed to him the government of the world, if he choose to undertake it, an idea elaborated by Ibn 'Arabi (Fatihât, Mattakya, I. 262; II. 407), who regards such a saint as the true Saltîn. The title teherî is more generally recognized as that belonging to the head of the Mawlawi Order (Şâmî, loc. cit., p. 5190).

(Đ. S. MAKROJOULI)

MEZZOMORTO, an Ottoman Grand Admiral whose real name was HÜSEÎN HUSEIN PASHA.

Hâddîjî Hussein Pasha, known as Mezzomorto, i.e. "half-dead" because he was severely wounded in a naval battle, came from the Balsaric Islands, if A. de la Motraye's statement (Voyages, The Hague 1727, I. 206) that he was born in Mallorca is right. He probably spent his youth sailing with corsairs on the seas off the North African coast. He first appears as a desperate pirate in the summer of 1682 in the Barbary States. When France was preparing to deal a decisive blow at the pirates of Algiers, whose arrogance had passed all bounds, he was handed over as a hostage to the French after the bombardment of Algiers, but managed to return there, and to strike down with his own hand, in a mutiny of the mercenaries which he had stirred up, the Day of Algiers Sâla Hasan, who was ready to make peace and to fight his way to the head of the state (summer of 1683, cf. Zinkeisen, G.O.R., v. 51 sq.). Hussein Re'is in the following year concluded with Louis XIV of France a truce for a hundred years, which however was only of brief duration. His own rule over Algiers was not long. either (till 1688; cf. A. Bernard, L'Algérie, Paris 1929, p. 159). About ten years later, in Muharram 1107 (Aug. 1695), Hussein Re'is, who had already distinguished himself as commander of a galley (çasnak, kajmâd), was appointed Grand Admiral of the Ottoman fleet (kupadînî derya) in succession to 'Amâdîjasde Hussein Pasha, who was appointed governor of Adana after the taking of Chios. He owed his promotion to his skilful seamanship at the capture of Chios where he distinguished himself in the battle with the Venetian fleet (spring of 1695). In 1697 Hussein Pasha inflicted a disastrous defeat on the Venetian Captain General Alessandro Molino off the island of Lemnos, and in the following year in a naval fight on July 6 with Molino's successor, Giacomo Cornaro, near Mytilene it was doubtful whether the Crescent on the Lion of St. Mark gained the victory (cf. Zinkeisen, G.O.R., v. 183, from the account by the inquisitore Garzonì in his Istoria della Repubblica di Venezia, Venice 1705, p. 644 sqq.; 691 sqq.; 748 sqq. and 775 sqq.). Ottoman authorities and the historian Rashid (fol. 231; cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., v. 635) credit the victory to the Ottomans. In 1113 Mezzomorto was dismissed from his rank and replaced by 'Abd al-Fattâh Pasha. He retired to Chios, where his adventurous life came to an end in the same year on the 13th Safar 1113 (July 20, 1704, according to Safvet, sp. cit.), on the 14th Safar 1114 (i.e. July 9, 1705) according to others. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., vi. 766 and vii. 624, gives the date as 15th Rabî' 1113 (Aug. 20, 1701). One of these dates is probably that of his dismissal.


MI'DHANA. [See MANABA.]

MI'DHAT PASHA, Ottoman statesman, twice grand vizier.

Mi'dhat Pasha was born in Stambul in Safar 1238 (beg. Oct. 18, 1822), the son of Hüddîjî 'Ali Efendi-Zade Hüddîjî Hâfi Mehmed Emin Efendi, a native of Rusçuk. The family seems to have been professed Bektaşîyya and Mi'dhat Pasha also had a leaning towards them. His earliest youth was spent in his parents' home at Wildin, Lofoš (Bulgaria) and later in Stambul, where his father held judicial offices. In 1850 he was working in the secretariat of the grand vizier and later he filled confidential posts in various governorships (including two years in Damascos), in 1844 he came to Konya and in 1849 became second, in 1851 first secretary to the Council (месґlıис-мал). In 1854 the grand vizier Kihrîj Mehmed Pasha gave him the difficult task of pacifying the provinces of Adrianople and the Balkans and clearing them of robber bands. Here he displayed for the first time his special talents for administration, which were not unnoticed by the Porte and soon afterwards brought him the appointment of governor of the Danube districts (Wildin, Siliistra). In 1858 he spent six months travelling for study in western Europe, including Vienna, Paris, Brussels and London. In 1861 he was appointed governor (蒐集) of Niş of Phrygia with the rank of vizier, where he earned distinction by his pacification of the country, so that, when the new organization of willyets was carried out in 1864, he was given the model province, Danube-Bulgaria (Тuна Wildyêl). During his four years' governorship, he raised the province to a level rare in Turkey, although it was only under his successor that the people learned to thank him for it. He built schools and educational institutes everywhere, created funds to make advances to and support useful undertakings, built hospitals, granaries, roads (2,000 miles) and bridges (1,400) and improved communications in every way. As he required money for all these progressive undertakings, which the government could not give him and he would not raise by abuse of taxation, he raised the necessary funds by "voluntary contributions" from the people. The Bulgars, with whom for nationalist reasons he had no sympathy, suffered not a little from the enterprising spirit and unrestrained love of work of the young governor who, of unbending will and inexorable severity, was of a nature not attractive, but rather arrogant and conceited. At the same time he was quite modern in his views and had no scruples about
introducing absolute equality between Christians and Muslims in his province. He proceeded ruthlessly against aggressors and rebels, dismissed incompetent officials and brought extortionists to book. His most rigorous steps were directed against the Russian Pan-Slav intrigues, the leaders of which he ruthlessly hanged. Although in a few years he made the Danube province the richest in Turkey without it costing the state a pistare, in 1869 Midhat Paşa, who had incurred the hostility of the Russians, was deprived of his office and sent to remote Baghdad as governor and commander of the 9th Army Corps. Midhat Paşa was not dismayed, but went to work with renewed energy to develop his new governorship. He laid roads, started horse-tramways, built a technical school, founded a savings bank, instituted regular steamship traffic on the Tigris between Baghdad and several harbours on the Persian Gulf and urged the building of a "Euphrates railway". Under the pretext that he had taken part in a conspiracy against the Sultan, Midhat Paşa, who had already earned the gratitude of the Baghdad province and also won Nadjib for the Ottoman empire, was summoned to Stamboul where his enemy, the grand vizier Mahmud Nadjib Paşa, had chosen him for the office of wali of Adrianople. Instead of this, on the fall of his rival, Midhat Paşa was appointed grand vizier on Aug. 5, 1872, only to be dismissed on October 19. It is clearly shown that his real strength lay in provincial administration. All possible elements combined to bring about his fall: Sultan "Abd al-"Aziz could not endure him because he opposed his mad whims; the Old Turks regarded him as an infidel because he planned his measures regardless of dogmatic objections; he was most unpopular with the Russians because he had taken sharp measures to deal with the Slav Bulgar intrigues. Midhat Paşa retired into private life as pereus ingrata. In the grand vizierate of Fuad Pasha, he became minister of justice on March 15, 1873 and held this office still under his successor Shihwani-ziade Mehemmed Rüştü Pasha till Sept. 29, 1873. In the following October, the governorship of Salonika was given to him which he only accepted with reluctance and held for barely two months. On Feb. 17, 1874 he was again dismissed and retired once more to private life. He used the leisure thus forced upon him to work out the schemes which he later unfolded and which meant a decisive change in the orientation of the Ottoman empire. In August 1875 his old enemy Mahmud Nadjim Paşa, who had again received the imperial seals, appointed him minister of justice but by November he had handed in his resignation, which was accepted. The empire was then in a state of complete confusion, rising, famine, an empty treasury and a half mad sultan. Midhat Paşa then composed his famous memorandum of March 9, 1876, which was to have such momentous results. On May 20, 1876 he entered the cabinet of the grand vizier Mitterdim Mehemmed Rüştü Pasha as minister without portfolio. In the night of May 30, Sultan "Abd al-"Aziz was deposed and Murad V. raised to the throne of his fathers. On July 15, a proclamation issued in the name of the new sovereign used for the first time the word "constitution". Midhat Paşa was the soul of the new movement and he worked ardentely with a few kindred spirits to give Turkey a constitution. Sultan Murad V. became insane and was replaced by his brother "Abd al-Hamid; on December 18, 1876 Midhat Paşa became grand vizier for the second time, and five days later, the constitution was solemnly proclaimed. The reactionary party and a powerful camarilla never ceased its endeavours to bring about the fall of Midhat Paşa and to bring his progressive schemes to nought. Under the pretext of high treason he was dismissed on Feb. 5, 1877 and banished to Europe. He was put upon a steamer and went via Rome and Paris to England. He was only permitted to return in 1878 and then only to Crete. In November 1878 under pressure from England, he was appointed governor-general of Syria. In 1880 he was transferred to Smyrna as governor. Here "Abd al-Hamid's wrath overthrew him. In May 1881 he was arrested and brought to Stamboul. The ludicrous charge of having caused the assassination of Sultan "Abd al-"Aziz was brought against him. Midhat Paşa was condemned to death but the sentence was not carried out. He was banished for life to Taif in Arabia. After repeated attempts to poison him, he was strangled on April 10, 1883 (Radjap 29, 1301) in prison. In this tragic fashion ended the life of one of the most notable and best statesmen of Turkey, perhaps the most important administrator that the Ottoman empire has produced in modern times. Midhat Paşa had a son, 'Ali Haidar, Midhat Bey, who after his death conducted a campaign to clear his memory and wrote a very full life of his father.

Leipzig 1878, p. 52 sqq. [Gg. Dempwolff, Siwad
und Hohe Pforte, Vienna 1879, p. 237 sqq.;
Carl v. Sax, Geschichte des Macherpalastes
der Türk'en, Vienna 1908, p. 375 sqq.]. But the
western sources have mainly to be used with
cautions, as the very varying statements about
his origin, date and place of birth show.

MIDILLÜ, Turkish form for Mittleman, name
of the island of Lesbos, which in the middle
ages had already taken the name of its capital.
The island is about 650 sq. m. in area and has
two large gulfs, the Gulf of Kalloni (Kalânía)
and that of Jeros (Kelemia).

When the Muslims first became acquainted
with the island, it belonged to the Byzantine empire.
Its conquest in the reign of the emperor Alexios
Comnenos in 484 (1094) by the Emir of Smyrna,
Tsachas, fathes-in-law of the Seljûk Khârîş Arous I
in Sulamân, was only temporary. After the conquest
of Constantinople by the Latins (1204), the island
passed for a time to the Venetians. In 1335, the
emperor John Palaeologos, on the marriage of his
son with the Genoese Francesco Gattiliano, granted
the island to the latter as a fief. It belonged
to this family when Mehmed II the Conqueror
took Constantinople in 1454. The islands of the Aegean
had to pay tribute to the Turks, to which the
Gattiliano in the hope of retaining their position
readily agreed; and when the grand vizier Hânum
Paşa in 1456 anchored off Lesbos on the voyage
to Rhodes, the prince Dorino Gattiliano sent rich
gifts to the Turkish commander through the histo-
torian Ducas. After the death of Dorino, his son
and successor Domenico sent an embassy under
the same Ducas to try to gain the good graces of
the Sultan, but the Turks imposed rather harsh
conditions. In 1458 Domenico was slain by his
brother Nicolas who had escaped from Lemnos
and the latter seized the island. On the pretext
that he had given shelter to the pirates who
harassed the Asia Minor coast and had committed
other acts hostile to the Sultan, Mehmed in 1462
sent out against Lesbos. The grand vizier Mahmid
Paşa conducted the siege of Lesbos. It was then
after 27 days' bombardment and the Sultan
received the surrender of the island in person
(Aštîk Pasha Zâde, ed. Giese, Leipzig 1929,
p. 156 sqq.; Hudîdji Khalîfê, Täbişte al-Khatrî
et Esfar al-Rûhî, Constantinople 1141 [1728-1729],
fol. 62; Hammer, ii. 15, 67; Zinkeisen, ii. 226,
239 sqq.). A mosque in the citadel of Midilli
was built by Fatîh; cf. Newton, i. 117; Koldeway, p. 11.

Attempts of the Venetians under Orsato Giusti-
nani (1404) to take the island from the Turks
failed (v. Hammer, ii. 83 sqq.). An expedition against
the island in 1500 of the allied French and Venetian
flots was thwarted by the Turkish forces (v. Hammer,
ii. 327; Hudîdji Khalîfê, op. cit., fol. 104).
Since that date the island had been in undisturbed
possession of the Turks until during the Balkan
War it was handed over to the Greeks on Nov. 24,
1912 and finally conceded to them by the Peace
of London of May 30, 1913, although with certain
reservations by Turkey.

The island, the largest in the Archipelago,
belonged to the "wilayat of the Archipelago" (İzzet-i
Başr-i Eşref) and formed in it the sandjak of Midilli, with 5 kâzâs: Midilli (with the
capital, in the east of the island); Plomary (Plomary, in the south), Molowa (Molova, the an-
ocient Mothyuma, in the north); Sighri in the west of
the island; and lastly the Junda Islands (Mokosami)
east of Midilli; cf. Stamm, Dârul-Âlâm, col.
1694, 444; Caimet, La Turquie d'Aasie, i. 449-
472; cf. also: Sulaimân Pâkî, Rehîb-i Derya, i.
(Sinbül 1399), p. 55-59. — According to Bar-
deker 1914, the island has 140,000 inhabitants
of whom 7/10 were Greeks and 1/10 were Muhammadans.

Bibliography: On the island in ancient
times and most of the questions connected with
it, see the very full article by Burchner on
Lesbos in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, xii. (1925), col.
2107-2133.

A full description for the earlier Turkish
period is given by the Tur Piri Kems in his
Bahriye written in 1521; this section has been
translated by Maximilian Flitner in Paul Mor-
ner, Der heutige Lesbische Dialekt (Beih. zu den
Schriften der Basel-Kommission, iii.), Vienna 1905,
col. 579-584 and in my ed. of the Bahriye of Piri
Kems (Berlin and Leipzig 1926), chap. ix.: Midilli,
text p. 21-26, transl. p. 32-42.

The most important later descriptions are those
by Pococke, Description of the East, i, ii. London
1745; Newton, Travels and Discoveries in the
Levant, London 1805, i. 37 sqq.; A. Conze,
Reise auf der Insel Lesbos, Hanover 1865 and
R. Koldewey, Die antiken Bauwerke der Insel
Lesbos. In Anfängen der Kaiserlich-Deutschen
Archäologischen Institute untersucht und aufge-
nommen, Berlin 1890. This book gives details of
early explorations of the island and accurate
maps on a larger scale of sections of it.
(P. Kahle)

MIDJARA, the censer, from djanâra, "glowing coal"; the Arabic name for the con-
estellation of the Altar which lies south of
the Scorpion (fersân in Aratus, ara in Cicero,
Masullus etc.) or censer (bozatland in Polynesi,
turhulum in Gemini).

Bibliography: al-Kazwînî, ed. Weitzenfeld,
i. 41; L. Leder, Untersuchungen über den
Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sternnamen,
Berlin 1809, p. 280; A. Hauber, Planetenbilder
und Sternbilder, Strasbourg 1916, p. 193-
199.

MIDRÄM BANû. [See SÜHÂLMA.]

MIHNA (A.), noun derived from the root m-h-n, appearing in the Arabic verb mânâna, "to smooth", and in some Anthrope derivations, trial (e. g.
the trials to which the prophets and especially the
family of Muhammad, the 'Alîs, are exposed in
this world; cf. Goldziher, Verkömmungen, p. 212 sq.
261), inquisition. In the latter sense it is
usually applied to the Mu'tazilite inquisition and
persecution extending from 218-234 (833-848).
On the viâl form of the verb, mânâna, "to
torture", cf. especially Quatremère, Histoire des
cultes mohammedans, i, ii., p. 81, note 101.

The first Mu'tazilite inquisition was instituted
towards the end of his reign by the 'Abâsîd caliph al-Mu'tâm (q. v., 198-218 = 819-833),
who was a Mu'tazilite by conviction, especially
with regard to the creation of the Kurân (cf. the
articles AL-KURÂN and MU'TAZILITES). He sent a
letter to the governor of Baghdad, 'Isâb b. Dzhâmîn,
ordering him to cite before him the 39î's under
his jurisdiction in order to test them with regard to
their opinion on the Kurân (Talanî, iii. 1112
transl. by Patton, q. cit., p. 57-61; Kitâb
Baghdîd, p. 338 sqq.; cf. Abu l-Mahâsin, i. 636
Ee.; Fragmenta Hist. Arab., p. 465). Those who declared their opinion in conformity with that of the caliph, should cite the legal witnesses under their jurisdiction and institute a similar inquisition.

This letter was sent to the provinces. In Egypt, it was forwarded to the caliph. In Damascus, the latter, probably by his own hand, sent a copy to Asia Minor, personally determining the testing of the doctors of the town.

In a second letter he ordered Ḣāḍir b. Ibrāhim to send him seven of the leading theological authorities of Baghdād, that he might test them himself. The name of the chief champion of the orthodox view, 'Abd al-Mu'tamid b. Ḥanbal [q. v.], which was first in the list, was cancelled at the instance of the chief Ḥāḍir Ḥāmid b. Abī Duḍ'ad [q. v.], the most vigorous advocate of the miḥna under al-Ma'mūn and his successors. Among the seven who were summoned to the court was Ṣa'd ibn Ḥāmid [q. v.], the secretary of al-Wāqi'd [q. v.], and author of the Kitāb al-Tahfiz. All of them gave way to the pressure, assented to the view forced upon them and were sent back to Baghdād, where Ḥāḍir b. Ibrāhim had them repeat their confession before the theologians (Tabari, iii. 1116 sq.; Kitāb Baghdād, p. 343 ssqq.). The success of the caliph moved him to cling to the method inaugurated by him. In a third letter which is interwoven with theological arguments (Tabari, iii. 1117 sqq.; Patton, op. cit., p. 65 sqq.) he enjoined Ḥāḍir b. Ibrāhim to test all the Ḥāḍirs under his jurisdiction, who in their turn should test all witnesses and assistants in matters of law. Ḥāḍir b. Ibrāhim cited before him a number of the most notables of Baghdād (Tabari, iii. 1121 sqq.; Patton, op. cit., p. 69 ssqq.), among them Ḥāmid b. Ḥanbal. The result of the test was that some of them yielded and others remained steadfast; Ḥāmid b. Ḥanbal belonged to the group of the latter.

In a fourth letter to Ḥāḍir b. Ibrāhim (Tabari, iii. 1125 sqq.; Patton, op. cit., p. 74 sqq.), the caliph discussed the attitude of each of the doctors in connection with his character and way of life, and ordered those who had given unsatisfactory answers to be sent to his camp in Tarās. After a further examination by Ḥāḍir b. Ibrāhim two of them only remained steadfast, 'Abd al-Mu'tamid b. Ḥanbal and Muḥammad b. Nihāy. They were sent to Tarās as prisoners. On the way, the report of the caliph's death reached them. They were sent back to Baghdād; Muḥammad b. Nihāy died before he had reached the capital.

'Abd al-Mu'tamid b. Ḥanbal remained in prison. Although he was urged to make use of zajfān [q. v.] as others had done, he stuck to his attitude. Cited before al-Ma'mūn's brother and successor al-Muṭāzil (218-227 = 833-842), there originated lively debates on the nature of the Kurān and other theological subjects between him, the caliph, 'Abd al-Mu'tamid b. Abī Duḍ'ad and others, which lasted three days. No change, however, being brought about in 'Abd al-Mu'tamid's attitude, he was scourged at the order of the caliph, and afterwards, from fear of an insurrection (for 'Abd al-Mu'tamid was very popular), set free. Little more is heard of the miḥna under al-Muṭāzil (Abu Ẓ-Ẓahir, l. 649; Patton, p. 113), who had neither the interest nor the training of his predecessor in theological matters.

His son al-Wāṭik b. Ẓallāh (227-232 = 842-847) who succeeded him, returned to the methods of al-Ma'mūn (Abu ʿl-Maḥāsin, l. 683; Patton, p. 115 ssqq.), although it is said that he had restrained his father from prosecuting the miḥna any farther. He ordered the governors of the provinces to institute the notables under their jurisdiction. Little is known of the consequences of this order. 'Abd al-Mu'ṭāzil b. Ḥanbal in the meanwhile had become a favorite teacher; when, however, he heard of the renewed activity of 'Abd al-Mu'tamid b. Abī Duḍ'ad he refrained of his own will from teaching, and was beneficently left alone.

Al-Wāṭik personally intervened in the trial of one person of note, the theologian 'Abd al-Mu'tamid b. Ḥanbal. Mīlīk al-Khūṣā, who had more over taken part in a conspiracy (Well, ii. 341; Patton, p. 116 sqq.; cf. Tabari, iii. 1343 sqq.; de Goeje, Fragmenta hist. ar., p. 529 sqq.). Questioned about the Kurān, al-Khūṣā replied that he believed it to be the word of God. The trial had not proceeded much farther, when the caliph put an end to it and personally made an attempt to befriend his victim, in which he did not succeed without the assistance of some one more skilled than himself (ibid., 231 = 846).

Other persons of note who remained steadfast under al-Wāṭik were Nu'ai m b. Ḥammād and the well known Abū Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā b. 'Umdat, the pupil of al-Shāfi'i and editor of some of his works (Patton, p. 119). Both died in prison. As an instance of the fanaticism of 'Abd al-Mu'tamid b. Abī Duḍ'ad it is related that, when in 231 (846) it was proposed to ransom 4,600 Muslim prisoners from the Byzantines, he proposed to abandon those who would not admit the creation of the Kurān; this was actually done (Tabari, iii. 1351 sqq.; Fragmenta hist. ar., ii. 532; Abu ʿl-Maḥāsin, l. 684; Patton, p. 120). It is said that al-Wāṭik gave up his Mu'tazilite views before his death. The miḥna continued to exist during the first years of the reign of his successor al-Mutawakkil (233-247 = 847-861), but in 234 this caliph stopped its application and forbade the profession of the creation of the Kurān on pain of death.

MIHRAB, the seventh month of the Persian solar year which runs from Sept. 17 to Oct. 16 and therefore begins the autumn. Mihr is also the name of the 16th day of each month. To distinguish between the month Mihr and the day, the former is called Mihr Māh and the latter Mihr Rūz. On the 16th Mihr, the day when Mihr Māh and Mihr Rūz coincide, called Mihr-gān, one of the great feasts begins, which is also called Mihrgān and lasts till the 21st of the month. The first day of the feast is called Mihr-i ḍūmāna, the general Mihr, the last Mihr-i ḍūmilā, the special, proper Mihr. The associations of this feast relate to the beginning of autumn, partly to the sun, whose name the month indeed bears, and partly to hortoc legend: Mihrgān is the feast of Ferdūn's ascension after his victory over Dašt Ṭāh. On the rites observed at the feast see the sources mentioned below.


MIHR-I MĀH SULTĀN, daughter of Saleīm the Magnificent. Mihr-I Māh (sometimes also written Mihr-o-Māh): cf. Karakalčūlā, Nawūdt al-ʿIrār, p. 458) was the only daughter of Saleīm the Magnificent (q. v., as well as F. Bahinger, in Mittheil der Politiken, ii, Berlin 1925, p. 39—65). While still quite young she was married to the grand vizier Rustem Paşa (cf. F. Bahinger, G. O. R., 2, p. 81, n. 1) in the beginning of December 1539 (cf. J. H. Montmarte, in M. S. O., Year xxxii, Part 2, p. 37), but the marriage does not seem to have been a happy one. She used her enormous wealth — St. Gerlach in 1576 estimated her daily income at not less than 2,000 ducats (cf. Taugbuck, Frankfurt 1674, p. 266) — for many pious endowments. Among these the most important were the two mosques built by her, one in Stambol at the Adrianople gate (Edirne Kapu Qubīr; cf. Ewliya, Ṣeyhü-l-nâme, i, 165; Hāfiẓ Hüseyn, Hadīlāt al-Dawlah, i, 24 and, v. W. Brandt, G. O. R., i, 25, N. 84) near the landing-stage in Sancarli. The second was the work of the great architect Sinān (q. v.) who built it in 954 (1547) and also erected a palace for Mihr-I Māh in Sancarli near this mosque. After her husband's death (July 8, 1561) Mihr-I Māh Sultan intervened in political matters on several occasions; for example she continually urged upon her father that the conquest of Malta should be one of the main undertakings of the Holy War and offered to equip 400 galleries for this campaign at her own expense. She was still alive at the reconciliation with her brother Selim and his accession. The correct date of her death, Jan. 25, 1578 is given only by Gerlach, Tüzmeck, p. 449; the date in Karakalčūlā-āde, op. cit., p. 458, namely Elba 908 (Jan. 20—Feb. 18, 1577), is a whole year out. She was buried beside her father in his türbe (tomb-mosque) in Stambol. From her marriage with Rustem Paşa two sons and a daughter. Aḥsa Khanım was born; the latter married the grand vizier Ahmed Paşa.

Bibliography: In addition to the references cited in the text, cf. Mehmededdī Tharayī, Siyāṣī-āste ṭūbīmān, i, 33; J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii, 393, 425 and pass.; a description of the circumcisions festivals of her sons Ḏaḥangīr and Bāyazīd is given in the Turkish MS., N. 34, fol. 452 sqq. in the Pruss. State Library (cf. W. Persisch, Versammlung, 66). (E. Babinger)

MIHRĀB (see also MASHRQ, I, D. c.) Derivation of the niche. The mihrāb niche has been given a twofold origin by Orientalists and historians of art: from the Christian apses and the Buddhist niche. "Tout ce qui reste de la basilique dans le sanctuaire de la mosquée c'est la niche, sorte d'abside strophée" says M. v. Berchem in his Notte d'archéologie avant (J. A., vol. xxvii, 1891, p. 427). The introduction of the niche mihrāb into the mosque is no doubt rightly ascribed to the Omayyads, who were the first to build mosques of any size, under the influence of the Christian architecture of their lands. The simple Arabian and Persian village mosques have no niches even at the present day. According to tradition, Walīd i, when he visited the mosque built for him with the help of Byzantine masons in Medina, was reproached with having built the mosque in the style of Christian churches (Wüstefeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, Abb. G. W. Göt., i, 1861). When Omar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in his Syrian buildings had the kibla made in the form of a niche, he provoked the opposition and anger of the seals on account of the similarity which was thus produced between the mosques and churches. H. Lammons has collected a number of references, in which the mihrāb is roundly asserted to be copied from the Christians and to have become naturalised only with difficulty and not till the second century (Ziyya, p. 94, note 1 quoted by C. H. Becker, Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus, Islamstudien, p. 493). Perhaps the custom of placing several niches in the kibla wall of large mosques was also a gesture against the appearance of imitating the Christian custom. On the other hand it should not be forgotten that the semicircular niche was one of the most widely disseminated forms of ornament in Mediterranean architecture and its adoption was much more natural than an imitation of the much later Christian apses. The derivation of the mihrāb from the Buddhist or Hindu niche for idols has as much or as little to favour it as the other. For it was only exceptionally that the Indian idol stood in a niche, but regularly it was in a separate quadrangular cell. The separate phenomenon of the eastern polygonal mihrāb developed by the Turkish peoples, which was brought by the Seljūqs and other Turkish peoples to Asia Minor and is found in Mesopotamia from the end of the twelfth century can only be explained satisfactorily by a deliberate creation of its makers. As the heart of the house of worship, the mihrāb forms the culminating point in the equipment of the mosque, and as the carrier of the varied forms of decoration and continually changing systems of Muslim decorative art through the centuries is of considerable importance in the history of art. As a barometer of culture and art the mihrāb, if properly read, shows the prevailing tendency of art and its changes as a result of social changes. The writing of its history is a task for the future and it can only be outlined here.

History. The kibla was originally indicated not by a niche but by some mark such as a strip of paint or a flat stone marked in some way. Ac-
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cording to Abū Hurairā, it was introduced into the first mosque of the Prophet in Medina. Instead of a mihrāb or prayer niche a block of stone directed the congregation; at first it was placed against the northern wall of the mosque and it was removed to the southern when Mecca became the Kiblah" (R. F. Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, 1874, ii. 72). The oldest mosque of Amr in Fustāt of 21 (643) had no niche, but the kiblah, accurately calculated, was marked (Corbett, J.R.A.S., 1890, p. 757-500). The Arabian use of slabs to indicate the kiblah instead of a niche survived, alongside of the mihrāb and in spite of it, for several centuries within and without Arabia. The mosques in Arabia proper are still unknown and only a few buildings on the borders enable us to draw some conclusions. The ruins of the 8th—12th century on Bahrain (Dias, Eine orientalische Moschettten auf der Insel Bahrain, Jahrb. d. mus. Kunst, 1925, II. Halband) and the mosque of Kūsimā in Zaunābar (J.R.A.S., 1922, pl. iii.) show examples of a type later well known. Such slabs of stone or stucco were frequently built into the front pillars of the ḥaran down to the 13th century to indicate the kiblah. They are to be found in Mōṣul (Herzfeld, Arch. Reis., ii. 277, 280) and they would certainly have been found in Baghhdād for example had the old mosques survived there. They gave the caliph and his representatives the opportunity, so limited in Islam, of perpetuating their names and boasting themselves helpers of Islam by presenting such flat mihrābs. Examples are the richly ornamented stucco slab presented by the vizier al-ʿAfsān in the name of the Caliph al-Mustansir (F285 = 1092) in the mosque of Ibn Ṭalīn and its counterpart ordered by Sulṭān Lādūn (696—698 = 1296—1298) (illust. in F. Flügge, Die Ornamente der Hākim- und Āshar-Moschētten, 1914, pl. xvi.). When Muslim architecture is deliberately developed on a grand scale however we find the mihrāb in the 11th century as a semi-circular shell-shaped niche flanked by pillars, and this is the form that has survived essentially with local variations to the present day.

Mesopotamia. The oldest example here is the mihrāb of the Dāmī al-Khāṣṣā in Baghhdād. It consists of a single marble block: 5' 4 1/4 inches high and 3' 11 3/4 broad; with a semi-circular niche in it 12' deep. The columns have spiral grooves in them and Corinthian-like capitals upon which the horn-shaped shell is directly placed without an abacus. The niche under otherwise smooth base has in the central axis a perpendicular strip of ornament as its sole decoration, which is quite devoid of any structural function and is quite in the textile-like style of later Islamic decoration. Herzfeld supposes that this mihrāb was brought by water about 145 A.H. for the newly founded Baghhdād from North Syria or Diyar Bakr and suggests for this and similar mihrābs of Northern Mesopotamia, the similar niches in Christian churches as models (ibid., i. 35 sq.). The Khaṣṣātī type of mihrāb is found again in the walls of Amīd, which were built in 297 (1010) by al-Muktaḍur (M. v. Berchem, Inschriften aus Syrien etc., coll. by Fr. von Oppenhammer; De Beytie, Prome et Samarra, fig. 42; v. Oppenhammer, Ashīda, fig. 12, 293, pl. 111 sq.). The change in the pointed arch however took place here probably by the tenth century, certainly in the 12th A.H. Instead of the semicircular we find also flat niches cut in the form of a rectangle e.g. in the tomb of a holy man in Abū Hurairā (Sarrē-Ḫarrēf, Arch. Reis., i. 133 sqg.). The use of stucco, which is easily worked, hastened the development of the form of the niche in the 12th century. In the mausoleum of the Forty Faithful (al-Arbaʿīn) in Takrit there is a stucco mihrāb of 660 (1261—62) with a stepped arch in profile. The tomb of Zānāb in Sīndjār of about 657 (1258) contains a richly decorated stucco mihrāb completely covered with ornaments and scrolls (Arch. Reis., p. 308 sqg., pl. iv.). This wealth of decoration may in turn have reacted on the niches of stone, as the rich mihrāb of the great mosque of 543 (1148) and other niches in Mōṣul show (Arch. Reis., pl. xvi. xxii.). In contrast to Persia, stone remained the usual material here. We now find twisted little pillars with vase bases and vase capitals, zigzag arches and richly fluted bands with plumed fascinations (mihrāb of Badr al-Din in Mōṣul). The geometric mosaic shell, so far as it still survives, lost its naturalism by turning the sphinkeric structure into ornament. The rectangular frame of the arch of the niche completed the adaptation of an originally Hellenistic type to the oriental spirit of architecture. In the vacant field below the couch we here frequently have a mussel shell carved in relief. We find variations like the flat rectangular niches with the base of the couch protruding as in the Dāmī al-ʿAṣṣārī (Arch. Reis., pl. cxxxv.). When however we find in Pandjāb ʿAlī in Mōṣul in 686 (1287) i.e. under the Ilkhān Arḡūn, a polygonal mihrāb with stalactite canopy, we have apparently eastern, Sōmār influence, which produced the abstract geometric crystallisation of the details and general form. Their seeming structural function is taken from the flanking pillars by direct continuation around the arch. Finally we may mention the occurrence of corner mihrābs in Mesopotamia when the kiblah demanded it and it was not possible to orient the whole building properly. Such examples were confined to sepulchral domes (Masāḥhad Imām ʿAwū al-Din in Mōṣul; cf. Herzfeld, Arch. Reis., pl. cxxxv.).

Syria. The Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus has twelve mihrābs in all (cf. the plan by A. Dickie, supplemented by C. Watzinger and K. Wulzinger, Damascus, Die islamische Stadt). If systematically studied, they would probably give a connective of the development of the mihrāb in Syria. Only the principal mihrāb appears, at least in its architectonic development, if not in its embellishment to go back to the time of the foundation of the mosque. The other niches were put up mainly in the 10th century and later (F. A., 1896, ser. vii., p. 185). The two favourite styles of decorating the walls in use among Byzantine workmen under Āl-Walīd were ṣajin black and glass mosaic. They must have been used almost exclusively for the early mosques along with carved moldings. The description by Ibn Ḫīṣām, who visited the mosque in 580 (1184) i.e. not till after the first great fire of 461 (1069), gives us an idea of the mihrāb as it then was, probably still predominantly Omayyad. The mihrāb wall was covered with marble slabs; the arch of the niche had inscriptions in gilt letters on a blue ground, probably in mosaic, and had a quadrangular frame. The wedges between arch and frame were decorated with the famous "vineyard of Walīd," as we may safely assume, in mosaic. The vaulting of the niche was probably adorned in the same way. The frame
of the mihrāb was crowned by a miniature arceding of marble, a motive which with others was taken to Spain (see below) and above this the wall was adorned with views of celebrated towns and trees in mosaic, the Kalâbî in the centre. Remains of these mosaics still survive and the mosaics discovered a few years ago in the mosque by the French give an idea of the splendour of their colouring. The mihrāb destroyed in the fire of 1293 had a miniature arceding (Illustr. in Saladin, Manuel, fig. 35); it had also an arch encircling it above, which also suggests an Omâyâd origin. (According to Mârquis, La mosquée d’el-Wal’d à Damas et son influence sur l’architecture musulmane d’Occident, R.A.A., L., where the dependence of the mosque of Cordova on that of Damascus is discussed, in Damascus an arch was originally horseshoe-shaped — and as in the rebuilding — arranged in two stories as we see from old descriptions.) Of the mihrāb of the Djiânî al-Abâzî we know that it was covered with marbles in 583 (1187) by order of Saladin. It has a wide niche formed of segments, with a pointed arch. The two sets of pillars with acanthus capitals are earlier than Saladin (Saladin, op. cit., fig. 28). Le Bon mentions two peculiar mihrāb niches in the suspension of the mosque (La civilisation arabe, p. 28, and fig. 68). Under the Ayyûbids the use of interlacing patterns in stone was popular in Northern Syrian architecture. They are sometimes rectilinear, sometimes rounded interlacings of textile origin which were used on the fronts of doors and prayer niches either in profile or as bands of stone in alternating colours. The decoration of the ribas thus received a remarkable stimulus. The prayer niches of the Madrasa al-Sulṭâniya and the Dîmârî and Madrasa al-Firdâwa of 633 (1235), both in Aleppo, and the mihrāb restored by Baibars of the Kubbât el-Sihâle in Jerusalem, show (picture in Creswell, The Works of Sultan Baibars, B.I.F.A.O., pl. xxviii., pl. 28, 29). Another peculiarity of the Syrian mihrâb is the occasionally found adornment of the vaulting of the niche with — it is true very modest — views of buildings and trees in opus sectile, as an example of which we may take the mihrâb of the great mosque of Tripoli founded in 693 (1294)(pict. in M.F.P.A.O., vol. xxv, 1909, pl. 5). The later Syrian mihrâb continued the traditional enunciating with different coloured marbles to which Turkish influence added the stalactite cochin.

**Egypt**. The principal mihrâb of the oldest mosque that has survived in Cairo, the mosque of Ahmad b. Tulfîn, is thought to be the original one in its general structure. The mosaic frieze with inscription at the level of the capitals and the marble covering below belong either to the restoration by Kâlîbîn or more probably to that of Lâmi, Thus a type was created in Cairo in the middle of the third century which is characterized by the double stepping of the niche between the two pillars on each side, in this case taken from old Christian buildings and by the stilted pointed arch and rectangular frame, this form became the Egyptian model. In place of the Mesopotamian cochin, the top of the niche is smooth and probably, as in Kairâân, pointed. The narrow top continued through the Fatimid period while the double recess of the niche beneath the pillars gives it later a more intricate character. A stucco mihrâb Cairene mihrâb is characterized by a stucco mihrâb.

**Maghrib**. The history of the mihrâb in the
western lands of Islam begin with the prayer niche in the great mosque of Kairuân. It was not the direct model for the later mihrāb — this was reserved for the portal of the library of this mosque — but with its wide semi-circular niche and the slightly rounded but still pointed arch it forms the transition to the western form of mihrāb. The pillars of mottled red and yellow stone rest on late antique bases and support pseudo-Byzantine porphyry capitals the abacuses of which are decorated with Kufic inscriptions. The wall of the niche is covered with marble slabs, some perforated, some carved in relief, the frames of which also bear inscriptions. Behind is a recess. The vaulting of the niche still shows traces of having been painted with vine tendrils arranged in circular patterns, which remind one of Mahāta (pls. in G. Marçais, Corpus et plagio de la Grande Mosquée de Kairouan, 1925, pl. viii.). The frieze separating the recess and the vaulting of the niche, and the surrounding walls are covered with the famous lustre tiles made, some in Baghādād and some by a Baghādād artist in Tunis, and presented in 281 (894) by İbrahim b. Aghlab. This remarkable mihrāb of the early period, when Islam was still in search of a style, thus combines all that the empire could produce in decoration, sculpture, painting, both richly brightened by gold and mosaic tiles. The fully developed western style is found a century later in the mihrāb of the Mosque in Cordoba. This mihrāb, built by Abd al-Malik (about 970), consists of an isolated hexagonal space 12 feet broad and 23 to 26 feet high. One side is formed by the wall containing the door. The floor and walls are covered with rectangular pieces of white marble, above are two friezes of inscriptions and the cornice, on which a richly carved niche wall with clover leaf arch is covered by a single piece of marble in the shape of a semicircle. In the inscription on the outer wall the artist is mentioned: "the work of Badr ibn Al-Kāhiyan [Kalijān]." The historically important part here is the entrance wall to this chamber, which consists of a horseshoe-arch gateway with rectangular frames and miniature arching at the top. This form of wall, which now becomes typical for mihrābs and portal walls in the western lands of the Maghārib and shows its own course of development, has been traced to the portal wall of the library of the great mosque in Kairuân as the earliest model, or both go back to a common Syrian original (cf. Marçais, Manuel, 1. 264 sqq.). In Cordoba we meet with a special shape of the mihrāb recess, the origin of which is doubtless different from that of the niche, and go back to an original with special functions connected with the cult of relics and the dead. According to tradition, a relic of the Prophet was actually preserved in this space, and the believers used to pay reverence to it in a sevenfold circumambulation. A quite singular, similar, isolated mihrāb is found in the medina in Kharṣūrī, Khaṣṣān (cf. Marçais and below Persia). Whether here we have the influence of the precedings of the Indian cult of relics cannot be settled. The circumambulation of altars, tombs of saints, or other sacred objects was of course a widespread custom in northern lands also). Horseshoe-arches, multiple rectangular border and miniature arcades are the typical elements of the horseshoe-canonical mihrāb wall. The wedge-shaped stones of the horseshoe arch are not serrated in complicated fashion, as in Egypt and Syria, but usually alternate in colour and are all smooth, as in Cordoba, or alternately smooth and carved in relief. In Cordoba the spandrels are still filled with palm-branches and arabesque-like tendrils in relief and the two borders decorated with Kufic inscriptions (cf. R. Amador de los Ríos, Inscripciones arabes de Córdoba, Madrid 1894). The niches of the miniature arcading with clover-leaf arches are covered with mosaic (pl. in Kühnel, Meinrichte Kunst, K. d. O., pl. 13, 14). The shape of the pentagonal mihrāb niche in the great mosque of Tunisia of about 1135 A.D. is similarly formed (pl. in Kühnel, op. cit., pl. 24). But we already find here in the spandrels the isolated rosettes which first appear on the mihrāb of the Aljīfera in Saragossa of the second half of the eleventh century (pl. in Marçais, Manuel, fig. 213). The mihrāb wall of the Almoravid mosque in Timmâ, the Atlas (1153 A.D. shows, instead of the tendrils, a worse pattern such as is often found on carpets (pl. in Marçais, op. cit., fig. 216); and in place of the miniature arcading we have round arched windows alternating with flat niches. A divergence from the canonical type is found in the mihrāb of the mosque in Tossur built in 1190 (1194) in the oasis of Ḏirīd (pl. in Marçais, op. cit., fig. 218). It has a double arch and profuse ornamentation, on the wall of the niche also. Marçais explains the divergence by saying that the mosque was built by a conqueror of Almoravid descent in the Almoravid period by workmen from Andalus. The niche bears the stamp of hurried improvisation. The mihrāb here reproduced, in the Sīdī Otha mosque in the Sībān oasis at Biskra which is considered the oldest mosque in Algeria, may be regarded as an example more in the popular tradition, therefore particularly interesting. The date is unknown. The decoration belongs to the field of Kleinarchitektur. Under the dynasties which succeeded the Almohads from the XIII.—XV. centuries the Cordoba type remains the model in principle. Only the proportions are more slender, the horseshoe arches more elegant and, instead of the miniature arcading, windows with coloured glass in a stucco framework have become naturalized. The isolated mihrāb chambers have given place to semicircular or polygonal niches. Examples are the mihrāb of the mosques in Taza, Sīdī b. Ḥasan and al-ʿUbayd ibn in and near Tlemcūn, in Fez and the Hamah of Granada, the latter covered with mosaic (pl. in Marçais, op. cit., fig. 336—338 and P. Ricard, pl. x, xi). In Tunis of the XV.—XVIII. century also the mihrāb with flat round niche and horseshoe arch of alternately coloured and ornamented stones and rectangular frames continued to predominate. The pilasters are regularly covered with marble or tile, while the niche vaultings are fluted like a mullion shaft. Persia, Turkestan, Afghanistan. The two earlier prayer niches (of Persia, so far as is known, are in the mosque at Nāīmān, east of Iṣfahān, of the 13.—14. century A.D. (Völtel and Flury in Syria, 1921, pl. xxx. and S. Flury in Syria, 1930) and in the Zāwī at Ḏirīd, Kharṣūrī, of the 15th century (Diez, Chdaughterische Bändermäler, pl. 39). In spite of these different ornamentations, these
Fig. 8. Mihrāb of the Djawhār Shīd Mosque in Meshhed.

Fig. 9. Mihrāb of the Udsjaatu Khudabanda Mosque in Isfahān (1310 A.D.).

Fig. 11. Mihrāb of a Mosque in Isfahān (xviiith century A.D.).
Fig. 120. Persian frieze with Insira decoration.
two stucco mihrabs are very similar. Both are rectangular niches flanked by inset τ/4 pillars with leaf capitals, with pointed arches diagonally set and thickly decorated with tendrils in a rectangular frame. The back wall under the porch presents a repetition of the architecture of the niche so that we have a niche in a niche. In Persia, therefore, if Flury is right in his early dating, perhaps as early as the third (ninth) century, a rich double framed style of mihrab had been developed, which lasted down to the sixteenth century, as is shown by the next surviving monument of this group, the stucco mihrab in the Markaz-i Djam'an in Isfahan of 710 (1310) (Dietz, K. v. d. Volker, p. 4 and ed., p. 85). In the interval, however, the decoration, at first purely floral, had become mainly epi-

cratic, a transition that can be followed up by step from the sixteenth century. The stucco mihrab of the mosque of Djiyli-i-i Ast in Cairo of 458 (1065) is also of importance for this sequence of development (pict. in Flury, Ornamente etc., pl. xvii).

But in Persia a second type developed alongside of the stucco mihrab, the mihrab decorated with lustre faience, with which this part of the decoration of the mosque and with its Persian faience reached its zenith. The lustre mihrab of Kāshān of 624 (1226) in Berlin (pict. in Springer's Kunstgeschichte, vi. 438) and a similar niche from Yezdābād in the possession of the firm of Kelsak (Cat. of the Exhib. of Persian Art, London 1931) may be quoted as examples. These mihrabs show the same double niches as their stucco counterparts but are flatter, more framework-like niches. In place of the rectangular arch, the pediment is a rectilinear gable, a change in shape probably mainly due to the material. The colours are predominantly a light blue ground with letters in dark blue relief and decorations in brown lustre. By the combined effect of the colours and the profuse ornamentation, these mihrabs have a truly fairy-like suggestion and reach the highest ideal of Islamic decorative art. The mihrab assumed a new form in the Timurid period. Instead of the semi-circular or flat rectangular niche we now find under Turkish influence the polygonal — pentagon constructed out of an octagon — of larger dimensions than previously, broader and deeper. The ornamentation proceeds parallel with the usual Timurid wall decoration. In the same way the pilasters are covered with polygonal tiles and the walls above usually with flat miniature arcading, which pass into blind muqarnas painted or covered with tiles. Finally the frames and the scrolls of inscription filling them are frequently inlaid with that finely executed tile-mosaic which forms the glory of Timurid architectural ornament. As examples may be mentioned the mihrabs in the prayer chambers of the madrasa in Kshgīdar (Dietz, Chor. Kaukenmüller, pl. 32, 1), the mihrab of Xizāret Ahī Wāli near Herāt (Niedermayer-Dietz, Afghanis-


tan, fig. 174), the splendid prayer niche in the mosque of Zāvār-Zāde in Māhbad (Dietz, K. v. d. Volker, p. 146 and 161) all of the fourteenth century (1381-87). The mihrab in the splendid mosque in Herāt, now destroyed, must have been similar to that in Māhbad, here reproduced, having been founded by the same princes and probably built by the same architect (cf. above iii. p. 387v). In the Safawid period, we find alongside of mihrabs with mosaic and muqarnas also painted niches, which show intertwining tendrils standing out in white from a brick red ground. Mihrabs like this are to be seen in the ruins of the Masjīd outside tābār-e Iranān and in Rūdāb, Khamāsān (fig. Dietz, Chor. Kaukenmüller, pl. 22, 2). They seem to have been widely disseminated. It may be mentioned in conclusion that in place of a prayer niche in the Kshgīdar madrasa in Kshgīdar there is a rectangular windowless chamber, accessible by a doorway through the inner. The similarity with the mihrab chambers frequently found in the Maghrib is remarkable and is discussed under Spain in India. No mosques earlier than the eleventh century have survived in India. In the mosques of the ninth—twelfth centuries the prayer niches are built in Indian fashion, that is to say flanked by decorated Indian pillars and adorned with Indian ornamentation. The gable-shaped panels over the niches are particularly ornamental. The wall of the niche is usually adorned in relief with a lotus rosette and a pendant vase out of which grow tendrils. Numerous niches of this kind are to be found in mosques of Gudjarat and Ahmadābād of the eleventh—twelfth centuries. An Indian peculiarity is the placing of three to five, sometimes even seven mihrabs in the kibla wall in keeping with the architectural units of the main building, each marked by a dome (Djamāl Masjīd in Bānūs, and Champaneri, Gudjarat etc.). There are also masjīds with mihrab chambers, which we can assume with Haveli to be adaptations of the former cells for idols (Dībhā, Gudjarat, Khana Masjīd and Ahmadābād). It is therefore not impossible that isolated mihrab chambers outside of India, as in Kshgīdar, Persia, or even in the Maghrib, should be traced to Indian influence, although this feature is not found in the earliest mosques in Adjar and Delhi. In Gudjarat however these chambers might have been used as mihrabs in the oldest mosques and provinces with a sea coast and international trade may have had influence abroad (cf. Arc. Saracy of India, Western India, vol. vi, 1915, Gudjarat, Ahmadābād). When Persian influence began to be felt under the Mughul emperors, the Indian elements gradually disappeared from the mihrabs and their place was taken by the polygonal niche in the wall incised with coloured marble. Under the Gāzīkhān, Indian detail still survived. The arches of the mihrab of the great mosque in Fāṭīpūr Sīkri, for example, are edged with a lacework of carved palmleaf friezes; the material is stone but the inlay work imitates the Persian tiled mihrab (pict. in V. A. Smith, A History of Fine Art in India and Asia, K. v. d. Volker, p. 239 and p. 141). In the court mosques of Agra and Delhi we find a dazzling white marble mihrab with coloured intarsia of flowers. The most splendid mihrab in India and indeed in all the lands of Islam is the niche of the Friday mosque in Bābāpur, the former capital of the Adil-Shāhs in the Dekkan. The capital of the Adil-Shāhs in the Dekkan. The capital of the Adil-Shāhs in the Dekkan. Framed by a gigantic arch resting on double pillars, the pentagonal niche in the recess constructed out of an octagon goes deep into the wall on whose surfaces the motif of the niche is three times repeated. The central of the three niche areas is mysteriously marked by a gilt eight-pointed star as the real kibla. In gigantic letters of gold the two sacred names Allah and Muhammad in the quadrants of the arch impress themselves on the hearts of the worshipper, and chime in
afresh in the drumshaped flanking pillars, which in Byzantine decoration are frequently used as conventional ornament but are here of structural importance. Monuments such as domes crown the structure and their principal motive is again a niche in the centre. This imposing decoration is carried out in shallow relief and is painted with red, blue and black colours heightened with gold. In the rectangular niches on both sides and in the arches are inscriptions on bands and in medallions of which we give Consens translation of one because it sums up Muslim philosophy in a nutshell:

"Place no trust in life: it is but brief"

"There is no rest in this transitory world"

"The world is very pleasing to the senses"

"Life is the best of all gifts but it is not lasting"

"Malik Ya'qub, a servant of the mosque and the slave of Sultan Muhammad, completed the mosque".

This gilding and ornamental work was done according to the Sultan Muhammed 'XIII Shah, 1043' (1636 a.d.).

Asia Minor, Armenia and Turkey. The mihrab took a development quite of its own among the Seljuk Turks. Instead of the descendant of the high, Hellenistic round niche, we find here a prayer niche which rather resembles a heath and is probably to be explained as an adaptation of the prayer carpet to this form of building. The appearance of these niches, which are thus of no structural significance, is however made up for by their stereometrically crystallised cone-shaped vaulting formed of cells. The Turkish art of the Seljuk brought as its dowry to the art of the Muslim world the Mamluk, the suggestion of which, it turn owed to Buddhist art, for the Seljuks came from Central Asia where Buddhist art had long prevailed. During the short period of Seljuk architecture in Asia Minor, the 11th century, the form of the niche remained unaltered. They are low rectangular shallow niches with pillars built in without bases, which bear rhomboidal crystal bodies as capitals and come to a point with the conical cells of the vaulting. The spandrels and frames are inlaid with the usual Seljuk white, blue and black tile mosaic (pict. in Lütvrot, Sarre, Springer-Kühnel and Dids, p. 63, et al.).

The most important change undergone by this early Turkish mihrab in Ottoman architecture was the raising of the supporting niche to its full height. The niche assumed polygonal form, i.e., it has three or five faces constructed out of the octagon, such as we find in India and Persia from the 14th century; it was however raised higher and looks more slender and regularly ends in a mugharnat like a cone. The decoration consists mainly of marble and Turkish tile. A gold-plated tile or frieze formed the usual frame work for the whole. The combination of Byzantine and early Turkish elements in the hard, fast and a certain rationalism in execution give these mihrabs that cold appearance which is peculiar to Ottoman art.

Worthy of mention is the splendid mihrab of the Ulû Dârî in Wâdi in the Persian style with mosaics of green brick terracotta reliefs and inscriptions; a niche with a mugharnat (Seljuk—11th century, pict. in Bachmann, Kirchen und Moscheen in Armenien, pl. 63).

**Bibliography**: The references given under


**MINĀRÉ**, the name given by Muslim writers to the **INDUS** (Samkhit Sindhu), called by the Greeks Σελήν and *θέσπος* by the Romans *Sidus and Indus*, and by early Muslim writers *Abi Sind* (the Water of Sind). The name is more particularly applied to the lower reaches of the river, after it enters Sind. Flury, writes of "Indus, indus Indus appellatissimum".

The Indus rises in 34° N. and 81° E., receives the Kâbîl river almost opposite to Atak, and the Panjnad, the accumulated waters of the five rivers of the Pandjâb, just above Mathânak. Near Kâłmor, in 28° 26' N. and 69° 47' E., the river enters Sind, and below Bakkar is locally known as Dory, the "Sea". It falls into the Arabian Sea in 24° 58' N. and 64° 30' E. Its drainage basin is estimated at 372,700 square miles and its length at a little over 1,800 miles.

The courses of the Indus and its tributaries have undergone, even in historical times, extensive changes of which it is impossible to give details in this article, and which have misled historians who have disregarded them. They have been minutely and elaborately described in *J. a. S. B.*, vol. lxxii. (1892) by the late Major H. G. Ruxton, who has illustrated his scholarly monograph by a series of admirable maps.

**MIHRGÂN. [See MIHR.]**

**MIHRĪ KHAṬūN** (originally Mihr-i Mâh), an important Turkish poetess of the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries. She belonged to Amanâ, the producing a number of poets, and spent her whole life there. She was one of the family of Pir Ýlâg. Her father was a *šâh* and wrote poetry under the makhâkî of Belâbî. She inherited from him poetic gifts and also
received from him the poetical and theological training ascribed to her by Ewliya.

Not much is known of her life. This is in part to be explained by the reticence of the East regarding women. That in the East boys rather than girls are sung of in love songs is due not so much to a preponderancy of paederasty as to a disinclination to talk of women at all. She died in 912 (1506). Her tomb in Amasa is a place of pilgrimage. She belonged to the literary circle of prince Amad, the second son of Sultan Bayazid, who was governor of Amasa in 886-918 (1481-1512). Of a circumcission festival in the konak of the prince in 911 (1505), it is recorded that Mihrî was the chief of the ladies present.

In spite of the love affairs credited to her and sung of her (with Iskender, son of Sinân Paîsha, with Mu'âliyâzâde [born 860 = 1456] and others), the Turkish biographers emphasize besides her beauty her virgin life, in spite of the glowing fervour with which she described her nights of love. Her nature was evidently not quite clearly understood by the rest of the Orient. Contrary to the Oriental custom, Mihrî remained unmarried in spite of many wooers. It is not improbable that the experiences described by her are not quite inventions but evidence of her passionate nature which drove her to unhallowed love. Mihrî's great merit is that she did not suppress her femininity, so that in her poems she reveals a truly womanly soul. In this respect, she is the most personal among Turkish poetesses.

As a woman she found it doubly difficult, in view of the restrictions on her sex at the time, to win a place as a poet, as the study of the Persian poets was absolutely necessary for this. The energy with which she managed to achieve this is remarkable. Her chief model was Nefîzi (d. 914 = 1509), the most important poet of the period, with whom she tried to compete. Most of her pieces are written in Nefîzi's manner. She is not very original, but very few Turkish poets are. In language and in images she is conventional. But her freshness, directness and passionate feeling, in which no other poetess equals her, are remarkable. Her eloquence and brilliant style were proverbial.

She left a Divan (edition in preparation by Martinozzi) and several treatises in rhyme. A number of her poems have been made accessible to us by Smirnow. According to Ewliya's statement (in MSS. not in the printed text), she also composed rivâdas on Ñafî's and Ñâfî's.


MIKLÎ, the archangel Michael [cf. MAŁÁK], whose name occurs once in the Qur'ân, viz. in aţâra ii. 92: "Whoever is an enemy to Allah, or his angels, or his apostles, or to Gabriel, or to Michael, verily Allah is an enemy to the unbelievers." In explanation of this verse two stories are told. According to the first, the Jews, wishing to test the veracity of the mission of Muhammad, asked him several questions, on all of which he gave the true answer. Finally they asked him who transmitted the revelations to him. When he answered, Gabriel, the Jews declared that this angel was their enemy and the angel of destruction and penury, in opposition to Michael whom they said should be their protector and the angel of fertility and salvation (Tabari, Tafsir, i. 324-325).—According to the second story, 'Umar once entered the synagogue (mîdâsâ) of Madina and asked the Jews questions concerning Gabriel. They gave of that angel as well as of Michael an account similar to the one mentioned above, whereupon 'Umar asked: What is the position of those two angels with Allah? They replied: Gabriel is to His right and Michael to His left hand, and there is enmity between the two. Whereupon 'Umar answered: If there have that position with Allah, there can be no enmity between them. But you are unbelievers more than asses are, and whoever is an enemy to one of the two is an enemy to Allah. Thereupon 'Umar went to meet Muhammad, who received him with the words: Gabriel has anticipated you to the revelation of: 'Whoever is an enemy' etc. (aţâra ii. 92; Tabari, Tafsir, i. 327; Zamanî 'Alî, p. 92; Baizâvi ad aţâra ii. 97).

We do not know of any Jewish traditions which ascribe to Gabriel a hostile attitude towards the Jews.

For the statements regarding Michael as communicated above, there is sufficient literary evidence. In Daniel xii. 1 Michael is called the great prince, the protector of the people of Israel; cf. Targum Cantis, v. 11: "Michael, the lord of Israel;" Daniel x. 13, 21 where Michael is said to have protected the Jews against the kings of Persia and Greece; further in Ezek xx. 5 where he is called the protector of the best part of mankind; Testamentum Livii, xv. 6: Test. Dam., vi. 2.

In Vida Adae et Evas, chap. xii. 499, it is Michael who ordains Satan and the other angels to worship Adam. Although the story is mentioned several times in the Korân [cf. ma'lâ], there is no trace in Muslim literature of the role ascribed to Michael in Vida Adae et Evas; the only mention of Michael in the Muslim legend is that he and Gabriel were the first to worship Adam, in opposition to Iblîs who refused to do so (al-Kisâ', p. 27).

Neither does Muslim literature seem to have preserved other features ascribed to Michael in Jewish Apocrypha (mediator between God and mankind, 1. Enoch xi. 97; Test. Dam., vi. 2; 3. Baruch, xii. 2); or in the New Testament (Ep. Jude, vs. 9: Michael disputing with the devil about the body of Moses; Revelation xii. 7): Michael and his angels
fighting against the dragon and the final discomfiture of Michael as the protector of mankind (the Jews, the Christians) may be found in the tradition according to which Michael has never laughed since the creation of Hell (Abûmad al-Ḥanbal, iii. 224). Further, however, Michael is rarely mentioned in Kūškū (Bukhārī, Buhār al-Āthār, b. 7, where he, together with Mīlīk, the guardian of Hell, and Gabriel, appears to Muhammad in a dream; Naṣiḥ, Ṣafīnāt, b. 37 where Michael invites Gabriel to urge Muhammad to recite the Kūškū, according to seven ahrāf).

Al-Yaḥyā mentions a story of which we have no counterpart in Jewish or Christian literature either, which is not amazing, the story bearing an unspoken Shī'ite tendency. One day Allāh announced to Gabriel and Michael that one of them must die. Neither however was willing to sacrifice himself in behalf of his partner, whereupon Allāh said to them: Take 'Ali as an example, who was willing to give his life on behalf of Muḥammad (the night before the Khāja; Yaḥyā, ii. 39).

Michael is further mentioned by name as one of the angels who opened the breast of Muḥammad before his night journey (Ṭabarî, ed. de Goeje, i. 1157—59; Illa al-Āthār, ed. Törmö, ii. 17, 31), and as one of those who came to the aid of the Muslims in the battle of Badr (Ibn Sād, ii, 91, 92).

In the text of the Kūškū as well as in a verse cited by Ṭabarî (ed. de Goeje, i. 329), the form of the name is Mišāl as if it were a mif'āl form from wukhla (Horovitz). A direct reminiscence of the Greek, probably also of the Hebrew and Aramaic, forms of the name is to be found in the tradition preserved by al-Kisā'ī (p. 12), which calls Mišāl the attendant of the second heaven, in contradistinction to Mišāl, who is the guardian of the sea in the seventh heaven (p. 15). Other forms of the name are Mišāl, Mišāl, Mišāl, Mišāl and Mišāl. It is hardly necessary to say that in the magical use of the names of the archangels that of Mišāl is on the same level as that of his companions (e.g. Zwemer, The Influence of Animism on Islam, p. 193, 197).


MIŠĀL (mif'āl-form from wukhla), plural wukhal, appointed or exact time. In this sense the term occurs several times in the Kūškū (ṣūra ii. 189, 145, 139, 154; xxvi. 37; xxxv. 40; xlv.- 50; lxix.- 17). In Ṣafīnāt and Ǧāfi the term is applied to the times of prayer and to the place where those who enter the haram are bound to put on the ihram. For the latter meaning of the term cf. Ǧūram, l.

Although some general indications for the times at which some palats are to be performed occur in the Kūškū (cf. ṣūra ii. 239; xi. 116; xxvii. 30; xxxv. 29), it may be considered above doubt that during Muḥammad's lifetime neither the number of the daily palats nor their exact times had been fixed and that this happened in the first decades after his death.

A reminiscence of that period of uncertainty is preserved in those traditions which apply a deviating nomenclature to some of the palats. The palāt al-ḥadrī, e.g. is called al-adhrī al-nabī; the palāt al-maḡribī, 'ṣībih; the palāt al-maṭālah, 'ṣīmah; the palāt al-ḥṣīfī, 'ṣīmīth (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣṭ, bābi, b. 13, 19). In other traditions the term al-ṣūma as applied to the palāt al-ḥṣīfī is ascribed to the Beduins and prohibited (Muslim, Muwāṣṣīt, trad. 228, 229; Abū Dāwūd, Muwāṣṣīt, bābi, b. 78; Abūmad al-Ḥanbal, Muwāṣṣīt, ii. 10 etc.); cf. on the other hand Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, bābi, b. 20; Muslim, Muwāṣṣīt, trad. 129 etc., where the term 'ṣūma is used without censure.

From some traditions so much may be gathered, that the — or at least some of the — Ummiyyah showed a predilection for postponing the times of the palāt (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 7; Muslim, Muwāṣṣīt, trad. 166, 167; al-Naṣr, ʿImām, b. 18; Zaid b. Abī Majādī, Al-ṣī⩽, N. 113).

In opposition to this a palāt in due time is declared the best of works (Bukhārī, Zāhīr, b. 1; Muwāṣṣīt, b. 5; Muslim, ʿImām, trad. 138, 139; Tirmidhi, ʿṢalāh, b. 133; Barm, b. 2). In other traditions this is said of a palāt at its earliest time (Tirmidhi, ʿṢalāh, b. 13).

This early state of things is reflected in several respects in a tradition according to which 'Umar b. Abī al-ʿĀṣim once postponed one of the palats and was rebuked for this by Urra b. al-Sūaybī, who related to him that al-Mughirah b. Shu'ba had once been rebuked for the same reason by Abī Māʾūn al-Anṣārī, on account of the fact that Gabriel himself had descended five times in order to perform the five palats at their exact times in the presence of Muḥammad. Thereupon ʿUmar admonished 'Urra to be careful in his statements (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 1; Muslim, Muwāṣṣīt, trad. 166, 167; al-Naṣr, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 10).

Some early groups of traditions affect to reproduce reminiscences of the practice in Madina in Muhammad's time.

a. The palāt al-ḥadrī was performed at noon, when the sun was beginning to decline (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 51).

b. the palāt al-maḡribī when the sun was setting, into ʿAbū's room, no shadows being yet cast there (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 13; Muslim, Muwāṣṣīt, trad. 168). After this palāt people had still time to visit the remotest parts of the town, while the sun was still "alive" or "pure" (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 1, 13, 14, 18, 21).

c. the palāt al-maḡribī was finished at a time when people could still perceive the places where their arrows fell down (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 21).

d. the palāt al-ḥṣīfī was sometimes postponed till a late hour, sometimes till the first third of the night had passed (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 40, 21, 24).

e. the palāt al-ḥṣīfī was performed by Muḥammad at a time when a man could discern his neighbour (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 13); but the women on their way home could not yet be recognised (Bukhārī, Muwāṣṣīt, b. 27).

In a second layer of traditions these general indications are specified by the mention of the first and the last limits allowed for the different
prayers (cf. e.g. Muslim, Manāfidi, trad. 176, 177). On one day Muhammad performed:

a. the ṣalāt al-ṣuhr when the sun began to decline;

b. the ṣalāt al-‘asr when the sun was still high, white and pure;

c. the ṣalāt al-maghrib immediately after sunset;

d. the ṣalāt al-‘īsha when the twilight had disappeared.

b. the ṣuhr: at daybreak.

c. the day following the first day of the month.

d. the ʿasr: later than the day before.

e. the asr: later than the day before, the sun being still high up;

f. the maghrib: before the twilight had disappeared;

g. the ʿīsha: when the first third of the night had passed;

h. the ʿufār: when sunrise was near (asfara bih).

In a tradition communicated by al-Shāfiʿī (Kitāb al-Umm, l. 62) the fixing of the mawāzik just mentioned is ascribed to the example of Gabriel (cf. Zaid b. 'Ali, Maqāmāt al-Fihā, N. 109). These mawāzik have for the most part passed into the books of ḥāl. We cannot reproduce all details here. The following scheme may suffice:

a. ṣuhr: from the time when the sun begins to decline till the time when shadows and objects of equal length with the objects by which they are cast, apart from their shadows at noon. The Hanafites alone deviate in one or their branches in so far as they regard this as the ultimate term by the time when the shadows are twice as large as their objects. In times of great heat it is recommended to postpone the ṣuhr as late as possible;

b. ʿasr: from the last time allowed for ṣuhr till before sunset. According to Mālik the first term begins somewhat later;

c. maghrib: from the time after sunset till the time when the twilight has disappeared. Small deviations only, in connection with a prediction for the first term;

d. ʿīsha: from the last time mentioned for the ṣuhr till when a third, or half of the night has passed, or: till daybreak;

e. ʿufār: from daybreak till before sunrise.

b. This side by side with these mawāzik we find in the books of Tradition and of Law the times on which it is not allowed to perform prayers, viz. sunrise, noon, and sunset (Bukhārī, Muwaffiq, b. 30–32; Muslim, Sahīh al-Maṣāḥih, trad. 285–294; cf. al-Nawawī's commentary on this point, and further Wānīk, Al-Handebak al-Muṣāhib al-Muṣāhib, Paris 1921). According to 'Abū Īshā it is only forbidden to wait until sunrise and sunset for prayer (Muslim, Manāfidi, trad. 296). In Makkah prayer is allowed at all times (Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, b. 73; Tirūrī, Ḥadīth, b. 43).

Bibliography: Apart from the works cited:


(A. J. Wesseling.)

MIKHĀL ṢABBAGH, an Arabic author born of Catholic parents in Akko in 1784, was educated in Damascus and then came to Egypt. Here he joined the French army of Napoleon's expedition, had to leave the country with them and came to Paris. The State printing works employed him as a proof-reader and the Bibliothèque Nationale as a copyist of Oriental manuscripts; his irregular habits prevented him leading a comfortable or settled existence, although de Sacy and his pupils appreciated his thorough knowledge of his mother tongue. He himself only used it to compose ḥālās in the old style in praise of great men of the period and to make some money thereby. For example in 1805 he addressed a poem to the Grand Vizier when he visited the printing works, in 1805 Pope Pius VII, in 1810 to Napoleon on his marriage, in 1811 to the King of Rome, in 1814 to Louis XVIII. These poems were printed at the government press, that in Pius VII with a Latin translation by de Sacy, that to Louis XVIII with a French one by Granget de Lagrange. He also published a work on carrier pigeons entitled Kitāb Muḥābāt al-Barīr wa l-Œumām fi Ṣalāt al-Ḥamīl, La colonie messager, plus rapide que l'éclair, plus prompte que la vue, par M. S. traduit de l'Arabe en Français par Silv. de Sacy, Paris 1805; based on the preceding: Die Blitzgeschwindeste Brieffahrt, oder einweltliche Kunst des Umschutz, Tüchen und Briefen der Briefe abzuschweifen, nach dem Arab. von M. S. Herborn 1806; Brieftausch der Kunst der Barrikaden, welche seit der Zeit der Erfindung gebräuchlich wird, aus dem Arab. von Th. J. K. Arnold, Frankfurt 1817; La unione messaggera risa l'una delle due, trad. di M. S. Cataneo, Mailand 1822; Die Briefe eines Schmerz al der Brief, aus dem Arab. von C. Lüger, Straßburg 1879. — He left in manuscript a history of the Arab desert tribes of Syria, a history of Syria and Egypt and important for its lexicographical information: al-Rahīm al-Sibli Ṣallām al-Qāsim, il-Maḥīth al-Kūn l-Dīn, M. S.'s Grammatic der ab. Umgangs sprache in Syrien und Ägypten, nach der Münchner Ms. herausg. von H. Thorbecke, Straßburg 1886.


MIKHĀL-ŌGNU, an old Ottoman noble family. This family, traces its descent to the feudal lord Kose Mîkhâl ʿAbd Allâh, originally a Greek (cf. F. A. Geurin in Ch. Schefter, Petit traité de l'origine des Turcs par Th. Spaudowuy, Constantino, Paris 1856, p. 267: L'ang dialecte du nom semble Mâkhlûl ... Pahdit Mîkhâl sans descendre les Mîkhalogî). The name appears in the reign of 'Ohmân I. as lord of Chirimenka (Khirmeñjal) at the foot of Olympus near Edras, and later as an ally of the first Ottoman ruler earned great merit for his share in aiding the latter's expansion (cf. J. V. Hammer, in G.O.R., I. 43, 57; following IIridi Billias and Nefti). Converted to Islam, Köse Mîkhâl appears again in the reign of 'Odana's son Urkhan. The rank of commander of the army [v.] became hereditary in the family of Köse Mîkhâl.
which is even said to have been related to the royal house of Savoy and of France (cf. Paolo Giovio: "Mikhelel di zangus Turchetta e per via di donna al fa-parente del Duce di Savoia e del Re di Francia; in this case Mikhał [Mogola] alias Köse Mihăil must have been descended from the Palaeologus; cf. J. v. Hammer, "G.O.R., i. 382", and along with the Malko-oghlu (properly Malković e. Marković), the Ewrenos-oghlu, Cemal-oghlu, Timurtas-oghlu, Tatar-han-oghlu, and Turksche-oghlu, were among the most celebrated of the noble families of the early Ottoman empire. Köse Mihăil, called ʻAbd Allâh, died in Adrianople and was buried there.

The following genealogical table shows the order of succession of the Mihăil-oghuls:

"ʻAbd Allâh, called Köse Mihăil, son of ʻAsrâ, d. at Adrianople, buried in his own mosque there."

---

As Adrianople was certainly not conquered till 1361 (see F. Bachinger, in M.O.G., ii. 311) he must therefore have lived into the reign of Murad I. What J. H. Mordtmann has said in the article "Ewrenos" would therefore be true about his remarkably long life. Köse Mihăil had two sons, namely Mehmed Beg and Yahya Beg (Bakšhî); of whom only the former acquired some renown. He was vizier under Murad Celebi and a close friend of Sheikh Badi al-Din of Simâw (q.v.). Under Murad he was Beglerbeg of Rumel, and died in 825 (1422) at Iskander, the head of the judge Tât al-Din-oghlu, and is said to have been buried at Plevna in Bulgaria (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Siyâset-

---

According to the genealogy published by Isma'îl Hakki, "Köbologer" (Stambul 1345 = 1927), p. 35 which is based on a "Sevilismâne" in the Ewliya

office, "Yahyâ Defteri", No. 247, in Siwâs, the genealogy of the Mihăil-oghuls is as follows:

---

If we compare the article "Yâkıbek Paşa" in Mehmed. Surayîs, "Sevilismâne" (Istanbul, iv. 652), where the descendants of this general are given, we get a different picture of the genealogy.

1) According to Mehmed Thaârî, "Sevilismâne", iv. 101, Iskander-Beg had four sons, ʻAli, Mehemmed, Köbîr and Selîmûn. This must be wrong and the genealogy is as above.

MIKHÂL. [See Merkez.]

MIKHÂL, any simple instrument for measuring, e.g. the pointer on a sundial; in Egypt the name of the Nilometer, i.e. the gauge on which the regular rise and fall of the river can be read. To get an undisturbed surface, the water was led into a basin; in the centre of this stood the water gauge, a column on which cifs and fengers were carefully measured off. The level of the water was ascertained by an official daily and proclaimed by cries.

Originally the rising of the Nile was measured by the gauge (al-ṣūbârāh). According to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakîm, al-Kudî, and others, Joseph, the son of Jacob, built the first Nilometer at Memphis; at a later date, the "aged Dalîkâ" built Nilometers in Aḥmîn and Anjûnîn (Antinoë). These were the Nilometers in use throughout the Greek period till the conquest of Egypt by 'Amr b. al-Ĥâ, the latter erected a Nilometer at Assuan and a second at Dendera. Others were built in the reign of Ma'âwiyah and 'Abd al-Ĥâ. Finally the Caliph al-Mutawakkil had a large Nilometer built in the palace of Khalifâ and, instead of the Christian officials appointed Abu 'Ibâd to look after it, and the office remained hereditary in his family down to the time of al-Mârî (d. 1443).

The ancient Egyptians are said to have drowned a virgin in the Nile at the beginning of its rise as a sacrifice. 'Amr compelled the Nile to rise and fall at God's command by means of a writing which he threw into the water.


AMIL (A.). According to some Arabic lexicographers the meaning of this term is time of birth in contra-distinction to mansūb which may denote also "place of birth." The latter is the usual term for birthday, especially in connection with the birthday of Muhammad and Muslims with the birthday of the Prophet and the months (cf. the art. MAWIL). milûd denotes also Christmas. For other special meanings cf. Duvey, "Supplement aux dictionnaires arabes," i.e.

Bibliography: the Arabic lexicon, i.e.

AMILAS, the ancient Mylasa was the capital of Caria and famous in antiquity for its sanctuaries of the Carian Zeus (in mineral and modern western sources: Milasi, Milas, Melas, Meliso), a town on S.W. Anatolia, 45 miles from its seaport, Kuilkû (on the Gulf of Melitene). It is the capital of the kaza of the same name in the milîyet of Mugla (formerly the sandjak of Men-
MILAS

teshe) and has 7,346 inhabitants (census of 1928) compared with 7,101 (of whom 3,200 were Greeks) who were removed by the exchange of 1922, 739 Jews, who still flourish, and 74 foreigners in 1908 (Sallabanne Alda, of 1326 A.D.).

Milies lies on a low eastern spur of the Soda Dagh (Gr. St. Elias) in the centre of a very fertile plain surrounded on all sides by hills, and watered by the Sarı Cay which flows round the Soda Dagh on north and west. The road to the sea however does not follow this marshy water-course but crosses the hills south of the Soda Dagh, here commanded by the once powerful medieval fortress of Patlin (three miles S. of Milies). The bay itself was in the middle ages defended by the island citadel of Ano Kalesi (t. Iacoh, Atien, Mitten, xv. 139) and later by a castle at the harbour built by Mehmed I (Piri Ke're, Bâbîrîyê, ed. P. Kahle, chap. 21). At Milies met the old, and although difficult, only roads to the west to the important medieval port of Balît (Miletus), to the north into the fertile plain of Karposlu Osyav and Cino and into the Manassar valley, and eastward to Mugla, the other important town of this district. This and its protected situation near the sea within a broad fertile plain destined the town to be once more a capital when the region again attained political independence under the Turkish dynasty of the Menteşe [q. v.].

The region first passed temporarily under Turkish rule when, after the victory of the Seldjûqs at Manzikert in 1071 the western Anatolian coast with Nicæa, Smyrna and Ephesus and even islands like Samos and Rhodes were occupied by the Turks. Although we have no definite information about Milies itself we know that the monks of the neighbouring Latinos had to leave their monasteries on account of the Turks (in 1079; cf. Th. Wiegand, Milet, i. 185). But Byzantine rule was soon restored. It was only when the centre of the imperial government was withdrawn to Constantinople after the victory over the Latins in 1261 that this region finally passed into Turkish hands. When and how the final conquest took place we do not exactly know. Melanudion, which with Milies formed a theme from the period of the Comnenoi (W. Tomasehle, Z. hist. Topographie Kleinasiens im M.1. Vienna 1891, Abb. d. Ak. d. W., p. 38), and is therefore to be located in the neighbourhood of Milas and was by a Byzantine till 1373 at least, was again taken for a time from the Turks of Menteşe in 1376, so that it must have been occupied by them a few years before (Wiegand, op. cit.). That Menteşe is called Śwadzko (=Skił Łągi, Emir al-Sawadkhî) in Pachymerias (i. 472; ii. 211, Bonn ed.), in Sanolo (Hopf, Chron. greco-romanica, p. 145) Turquemodarum (read: Turquemodarum = "Turkoman of the sea") suggests a conquest from the sea. There is no longer any record at this period of the bishopric of Milas, which as a church of the eparchy of Caria (see G. Parthy, Hierocellis Symmecmenon et molestae graecae epicopatrum, p. 33, 112 etc.) was under the metropolis of Stavropolis which still existed in the 6th century (A. Wächter, Der Verfall der Griechen in Kleinasiens im XIV. Thek. A., p. 54 seq.) (Stavropolis, the ancient Aphrodia, at the village of Gere, twenty miles west of Denizli).

Milas appears as the capital of the principality of Menteşe about 1339 in al-Ūmar (ed. Taeschner, nev, p. 21); while Fokha = Phocasia which appears as a capital in the Genoese report, ibid., p. 47 is probably an error of the writer and is not to be corrected to Mugla and in Ibn Baṭṭuta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii. 278 seq.) also, who here enjoyed the hospitality of the Akgî gild (on a Parturjumâne written in Milas at the end of the 14th century see Tuschner, in Islamica, iv. 40) and admires the wealth of the town in gardens and orchards and gives the name of the lord of the country as Shaddâ al-Dîn Utâkan b. Menteşe, whom he visited in his capital Pećin, not far away. The Menteşe held very little in Milas as they were engaged in embellishing their residence. It is noteworthy that the two mosques of this period lie outside the old town, still largely enclosed in its old walls; one to the south, in the Hacı İlyas quarter, the little Şâlî al-Dîn Dîjânî's with outer court and stepped minaret, built under Utâkan Bey in 1422; the other just outside the walls to the east, the mosque of Aghamed Gîâzî built in 1378, which with its entrance in the narrow side (without an outer court) and the stepped minaret built above it (Ismâ'îl Hağı, Kitâbâler, Istanbul 1939, fig. 47) looks as if it had once been a church (cf. Wulsinger, Die Piran-Monche zu Milas, in Festschr. d. Tuch, Hochschule in Karlsruhe, 1925, p. 10 of the reprint). The minbar of this mosque also dated 1780 (1378) is now in the Çinili Kiosk in Constantinople. From the position of these mosques, it may be deduced that the old town remained in the occupation of the Christians, who still held most of it in quite recent times. The only mosque in the old town, just in its centre, and in the highest part of it, the Bilidân Dîjânî, seems also to have been a church and was probably used by the garrison, if it is old. The medrese of Kıpçâk Bedir al-Dîn, which dates from the period of the Menteşe, unfortunately cannot be exactly dated (Rev. Hist. v. 38).

Milas received its first important building from the first Ottoman governor Fîrûz, whom Bâyaştî appointed over Menteşe-ili (Dâvûdar-ı Emâri, ed. Mârûmîn Hîtal, Istanbul 1928, p. 88) after the conquest. (792 = 1390) (the date given by most Turkish sources is supported by Bâyaştî's confirmation of the Venetian privileges for Balât of May 21, 1390, Diplomatario Veneto-levanti, Venice 1899, ii., No. 134). The Menteşe who fled to Egypt (Dâvûdarî, c. c.) was probably the prince of the house ruling in Balât, while the senior Aghamed Gîâzî may have held out in Milas and Pećin till July 1391 (according to his tombstone he died in Pećin in Şahrûn 793 as Şâhî). In 1394 Fîrûz built to the north of the old town and outside of it a splendid mosque in the style of the brass private mosques (of Wulsinger's monograph); Ottoman rule was interrupted by Tûsmâ who passed through Milas on his return from Smyrna in the winter after the battle of Angora (1402) (Ducas, p. 76, Bonn ed.), for about twenty years by the restoration of the former dynasty. This last period of the Menteşe-oghlus has left no memorials in Milas or Pećin. The Ottoman commanders thus made their headquarters in Pećin, after which this last of the Menteşe sandık was long called (Aḫû Bahr-i Bahram in Hâdîlî Kaîtî, Zâwîyâ-un-nâî, p. 638, i.e. the second half of the xvii century) and only moved
to Milas at a later date, when a magnificent official residence was erected, with defensive towers, and is still partly inhabited.

From the second half of the xviii century we have Ewly’s description of the town (in the unprinted vol. ix. of his *Streit-nähe*, MS. Rehler Agha, No. 452, fol. 57) He says the town had 4, 5 madjels and two large khanas. At this time the garrison was still in Petin. He praises the gardens of the town but rightly describes the climate as unhealthy. Among the products he mentions tobacco, with which Milas supplied the whole of Anatolia. Among the nine places mentioned by him, we may notice that of Shakh Shushier because it probably refers to the Baba al-Shushier now here by Ibn Battuta. Ewly’s description of the old ruins is much exaggerated, although he saw a good deal more than now exists. Pococke (Travel., ii., ch. 6) at the end of the eighteenth century was still able to sketch a temple of Augustus and Roma here. All that now survives in addition to the town walls is the Baita Kapu (a Corwinian gateway with the Carian double-axe) and a mausoleum called Gümüşkhisen (tile-greaser-worker) (Chios-Goidler, *Voyage dans l’Empire Ottoman*, ii., 1791, p. 85—92). In the adjacent village of Sultan Köy is the tomb of Sultan Bedir al-Din, Shaikh Kasim, who died at Iznik in 854 (1451) and is buried here, a *khólica* of Sündu Muhammad al-Bukhari (see Rev. Hist., v. 31—44), on the site of a church of St. Xenia, who died here (Bull. de Cerr. Hell., iv. 61—67).

The capital of the Menteşe already mentioned several times by Petin (Gr. Petras) consists of an imposing gate built over ancient foundations and Byzantine masonry and an extensive town lying south of it. The citadel with its walls and towers crowns a steep rock that rises out of the southern end of the plain of Milas (Inma‘il Haşki, fig. 40) and is accessible only at the south side by a great door flanked by a tower adorned with lions carved upon it. Inside the fortresses, where now is a miserable little village, the only architectural remains are the foundations of a church. Opposite to the entrance to the citadel, on a platé surrounded by walls, some of which still stand, lie the palace and its annexes, now mostly in ruins. All that survives is a charming medrese, built of stone, of Ahmed Pasha of 777 = 1375 (Inma‘il Haşki, fig. 51—54). In the medrese, which is flanked in the yandaş by reliques of lions holding flags, the founder is buried (see above); opposite the medrese stands a mosque built by Ewly’s Bey in 733 (1333), in ruins except for the gateway of Byzantine doorbeams and fragments of minbar (the inscription is given in Ewly’s), probably the one that Ibn Battuta saw being built on his visit to Petin (Barghin). There is also a mosque and medrese, a bath and a palatial serai, all in ruins. Exceptionally finely carved tombstones give the names of important persons who lived here down to the xvth century. Ewly’s, who still found about one hundred houses here, thought there must once have been a great town here. Petin is mentioned by Kalkanbendi, *Nefi‘ al-Afdal*, v. 18, as the possession of a certain


(P. VATTER).

Milk (m.), possession, property. The word is not found in the Kur‘án, but is in regular use in legal terminology. The double meaning of the word shows that the usual distinction in its legal language between the conceptions of possession and property is not found in the Arabic. There is, it is true, a special term for the actual power over a thing, what we call possession, in the narrower sense, namely yad, “in hand”, but the distinction between a judicial ownership and the actual control is not found in Muslim jurisprudence and there is not a word for property which takes into account the actual ownership, from the positive or the negative point of view. As a result we find, for example, that the ownership of a thing passes directly by an agreement if this was intended, even if the thing in question is not at once handed over. On the other hand, not only things but also rights can be owned.

The following are excluded from the possibility of being property and subject to legal regulations:

1. useless things (e.g. wild animals); 2. things the use of which is prohibited by religion (e.g. wine-grapes); 3. things which are usually implanted or have become polluted to such an extent that they cannot be purified (e.g. swine, dung etc.)

If such things, however, are acquired, one talks not of milk but of ḥabq, a special claim upon them; legal transactions relating to such things have a special vocabulary of their own.

*Komāl al-milk* is a necessary preliminary for the property of an owner being liable to ḥabq [q.v.].


**Milla** (m.), religion, rite. However obvious it may be to connect this word with the Hebrew and Jewish and Christian-Armenian milla, *multa*, *attaration*, word, it has not been satisfactorily proved and where it received the meaning which is taken for granted in the Kur‘án, religion or rite. Nor is it known whether it is a purely Arabic word or a loanword adopted by Syriac or other languages. When Mohammed and others before him (Noldeke, Z. v. d. *K*., iv. 413) seems to hold that it is Arabic for the 4th form mulla or *ma‘n* to dictate") in the Kur‘án it always means (even in
the somewhat obscure passage, Sūra xxxviii. 6) "religion" and it is used of the heathen religions (vii. 86 sq.; xiv. 16; xvii. 19) as well as of those of the Jews and Christians (ii. 114), and of the true religion of the fathers (xii. 38). The word acquired a special significance in the Medina sections where the Prophet in his polemic against the Jews speaks of "Abraham's milla", by which he means the original revelation in its purity, which it was his duty to restore (ii. 124; iii. 89; xvi. 124; xxi. 77 sq.; cf. iv. 124; vi. 162; xii. 37). Muslim literature follows this Kirānic usage but the word is not in frequent use. With the article, al-milla means the true religion revealed by Muhammad and is occasionally used elliptically for al-hadi' al-milla, the followers of the Muhammadan religion (Tabari, ill. 813, 5658); just as its opposite al-dhimma is an abbreviation for asl al-dhimma, the non-Muhammadans who are under the protection of Islam; e.g., Ibn Sa`d, ill. 238; 51; cf. also the derivative milli` opposed to dhimma, client (Balbaki, ed. Schwally, p. 121 infra).

Bibliography: Noldeke, Orientalische Schriften, p. 40; Z. D. M. G., vii. 413; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, Glosari, s. v.; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Meheemansche Feest, p. 3095p. (F. Buhl)

MIM, 24th letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of foury. On different forms of the letter cf. ARABA, plate 1. In some dialects of Southern Arabia and of tribes coming from that region, mim was and is used as the article of determination, side by side with it. A well-known tradition is put into the mouth of a man from Southern Arabia in the following form: Zile `arabri an malla fī mu`arrab. Cf. Ibn Yā'ish, ed. Jahn, ii. 1337; Landberg, Études sur les dialectes de l'Araîche méridionale, i/ii. 281—290.

(A. J. WENSINSKY)

MINA, later often pronounced Mena, a place in the hills east of Mecca on the road from it to 'Arāfa [q. v.]. The distance between the two is given by Mu`addib as one parasang, while Wavell calls it five miles and says the continuation to 'Arāfa is nine miles. Mina lies in a narrow valley running from west to east, 1,500 paces long, according to Burchardt, surrounded by steep barren granite cliffs. On the north side rises a hill called Thalh. Travellers from Mecca come down into the valley by a hill path with steps in it; this is the Tāmān (q. v.), which became famous in connection with Muhammad's negotiations with the M walmart. The town consists of stone houses of fair size which form two long streets. Close beside the Tāmān is a rudely hewn short pillar leaning against a wall: this is the "great djamra" or the "Aṣāfa djamra", at which the pilgrims cast stones [cf. DJAMMA]. A little to the east in the middle of the street is the "middle djamra also marked by a pillar and lastly at a similar distance the third (the so-called "first djamra"). As one approaches the east end of the valley, there is on the right of the road a square mosque surrounded by a wall, the Masjid al-Kabīr, which was rebuilt by `Abd al-Rahman in 874 (1467) reconstructed by the Mamlūk Sultan Zāk`ar. Along the west side of the surrounding wall is a colonnade with three rows of pillars; but there is none on the east. So these three djamra [cf. D.JAMMA] Ibn Rusta (c. 500 A. H.) tells us that the mosque had 168 pillars of which only seventy-eight supported the west wing. The north side of the wall is pierced by several doors. In the centre of the court of the mosque is a little domed building with a minaret built over a fountain. There is another dome over the colonnade on the west side (see the illustrations, ii. 256).

The most striking feature of Mina is the very great difference, noted already, by Mu`addib, between the quiet and empty streets of the greater part of the year and the tremendous throng and bustle of the pilgrimage month when, as Wavell says, half a million people with heavily laden hearts of burden hope to cover nine miles in the period between sunrise and 10 a. m. Every body in the valley is then covered with them in which the pilgrims spend the night. Mu`addib tells of five houses built of teak and stone (among them was a frequently mentioned Dār al-humra) and large stone buildings are still to be found in Mina; but these are usually empty and are only let at the pilgrimage to the more wealthy pilgrims and even among those many prefer to live in tents. This depopulation of the city has been a subject for discussion among the geologists, for some held that this circumstance enables Mina and Mecca to be regarded as one city (mi`raj), a view which others reject. But another circumstance must have contributed to prevent a permanent settlement of the town, which is also true of other places on the pilgrim's route, namely the incredible filth and dreadful stench which is caused by such masses of humanity at the Ḥajjd. Complaints are made even of the uncleanness of the Masjid al-Kabīr and at Mina there are further the decomposing remains of the countless animals sacrificed.

The Ḥajjd ceremonies in Mina date back to the old pagan period [cf. ḤADJ], for Muhammad, as usual in taking over old customs, contented himself with cutting out the too obviously pagan elements, the result being that we can no longer reconstruct the old forms with certainty. The old posts make only passing references to them [cf. DJAMMA]: that they were similar to the Muslim practices is evident, for example, from an interesting passage in the Medina poet Kāzī b. Khattīm (ed. Kowalski, No. 4, p. 1798), where there is a reference to the "three days in Mina" and where we further learn that the festival held there offered an occasion for entering into and carrying on love-affairs. The stone throwing is certainly very ancient; its significance is quite un-Hiylī in Islam, although it is doubtless if there were already three heaps of stones in the pre-Islamic period [cf. DJAMMA]. It is also clear that the ceremonies in Mina formed the conclusion of the Ḥajjd even in ancient times. Muhammad however made some serious alterations here, for he inserted a visit to Mecca before the stay in Mina, whereby the ceremony first received its legitimate Muhammadan character; but the old elements remained the important factors, for the Ḥajjd ends not in Mecca but, as before, in Mina, to which the pilgrims return after the degeneration to Mecca. A survival of the pagan period probably exists in the slaughtering place preferred by the majority on the southern slopes of Tāhira "the place of sacrifice with the rain" [cf. Sūra xxvii. 192], as its association with the city of Abraham itself indicates. It was a sacred spot to be adopted into Islam. From Burton's description it is a square rocky platform, reached by a few steps. Muhammad himself did not directly forbid the use
of the pagan place of slaughter, but deprived it of its importance by saying that all Minā is a place of sacrifice; a clever procedure which he also followed at 'Arafat and Manzilah.

According to the law of Islam, the pilgrims who arrive in Mecca on the 8th Dhu 'l-Hijjah should leave this town in time to be able to perform the midday salát in Minā and remain there till sunrise on the 9th and only then go on to 'Arafat. The majority however do not do this but go on the 8th straight on to 'Arafat where they arrive in the evening. After performing the ceremonies of the pilgrimage in 'Arafat and Manzilah [q.v.], they go before sunrise on the 10th to Minā to celebrate the day of the great sacrifice (yuwm al-'aţâ or yuwm al-ţarî). (In contrast to the pre-Islamic practice, which was to start only after sunrise). Here the concluding titles are gone through, the slaughtering, the clipping of the hair and the lapping. There is not complete agreement on the order of these ceremonies, which one tradition (Wajkid, transl. Wellhausen, p. 429) makes Muhammad declare to be quite irrelevant. The relevance of the stone throwing is noteworthy, for on the day of sacrifice it is only done at the 'Aka'aba heap, while on the three following days each pilgrim daily throws seven little stones on all three heaps (cf. the illustrations above, ii. 256 and Burton, ii. 205). The conclusion of the whole pilgrimage is the three Minā of 'aţâ days, the 11th, 12th and 13th Dhu 'l-Hijjah (cf. above, ii. 195 and the article Tariq). They are days of rejoicing which are celebrated with great jubilation, illumination and the firing of shots. All the pilgrims however do not wait for these three days but set off on their return journey before then.

The typical form of the minar as a pulpit, which is placed to the right of the mihrab and of the spectator, is an erection on steps with a portal with or without a door at the entrance to the steps and a conico-pyramidal canopy to the platform. This form is peculiar to the minar of wood, which is the most usual. The variants in stone and brick are more simple and frequently are only a bare platform reached by three to five steps. The fine series of minars of wood begins with that most famous of all in the history of art, the minar in the great mosque in Kairwan. On the occasion of the extension of the mosque by Ibrahim II Ibn Aqblab (261 – 289 = 874 – 902) it is said to have been brought with the lustre tiles of the mihrab wall from Baghdad and set up. It is made of plane-tree wood and is in the canonical minar shape with a staircase here of 17 steps – to the present platform. The pulpit, however, has not yet the stylized structure of the later wooden minar. It has not the portal nor the canopy at the top. Its composition of about 200 carved panels and narrow strips of unequal size, is simply a primitive agglomeration of profuse ornamentation, still very ornate: in feeling, such as would hardly ever have been found in Baghdad, and even in Kairwan can scarcely be regarded as original. Saladin has pointed out that the pulpit must have been restored after Kairwan had been sacked by the troops of the Fâtimi Mustânî Ablb 'Abd al-Rahmân in 441 (1049). In any case it has several times suffered damage and undergone restoration so that its present general appearance cannot be dealt with critically until we have a thorough monograph based on exact investigation on the spot. The ornamentation must, as Kahle observes, be regarded as Omayyad (Springer's Kunstgeschichte, vi. 385).

The vine branches of the frame-strips and the panels filled with floral patterns and leaves resemble the decoration at Māhsūs [q.v.] and some of the geometrical patterns, which are of all imaginable combinations, are already found on the shafts of
pre-Islamic columns in Diyar Bakr (cf. von Berchem-Strzygowski, Amida). The archaic combination of designs on the minbar has no connection with the decoration which since Sasanid we call 'Abbasid. We have here a phenomenon comparable to Muhitt in since here also ornamentations from different sources are combined to form a general scheme whose common denominator is formed by the formal quality of the chiselluro comune to them all. We do not even know how long the nucleus of the carved strips and latticed panels may have previously existed in Bagdad and they may have there belonged to an Abbasid minbar before the pieces were brought to Kalawati and supplemented by copies and additions of local workmanship.

The few pulpits that have survived from the Fatimid period follow the Syro-Egyptian style of woodwork of the period, with their system of frames filled with foliage. The tendrils were prevented from over-running the whole surface by being placed within small polygonal areas which were grouped together in cassettes (Kühnel, Spriger's Kunstgeschichte, vi. 406). The wooden mihrab of the eighth century from Cairo illustrated in the article minbar illustrates this style, which is also represented by the minbar made in 1091 A.D. for the mosque of Aslan to now in Hebron, and by the pulpit of 1155 A.D. in the mosque of Ams in Kins on the upper Nile.

During the Fatimid period the pulpit developed its canonical form as represented in the minbar of the Masjid al-Aqsa in Jerusalem, which was gifted in 1168 A.D. by Nur al-Din to Aleppo and later taken by Saladin to Jerusalem (Saladin, Manuscript, fig. 28). It becomposes appears with the doorway and the domed canopy. The main decorative motives are 8-pointed stars and the polygonal and star-shaped subsidiary panels showing carving in relief inlaid with ivory and mother-of-pearl. Of the minbar of Sultan Lodji in the mosque of Imam San in the year 1269 A.D. little more is left than the framework, while the panels are preserved in the Arab Museum in Cairo and in the South Kensington Museum (cf. Descriptive Catalogue of the Arab Museum, Cairo). That wooden minbars were sometimes copied in stone is shown by the stone pulpit in the mosque-madrasa of Sultan Hasn in 757 and 765. The mihrabs on the door case and soon after found on the dome also, here as in the mihrab goes back to Turkish influence transmitted through Syria. Like the mihrab, the minbar also attained its finest workmanship in Cairo under the second Mamluk dynasty in the ninth century and later. No essential alteration was later made in its canonical form and its embellishment remained standardised and varied only in details. A fine example of this fully developed Cairo type is in the South Kensington Museum. According to the inscription, it was presented by Kâl Bey (1468-1495) and has finely carved ivory panels and traces of painting on the wooden parts. The central star pattern is replaced by a smooth surface. The gilt undulated dome with its filigree and crescent on the stalactite cornice are, as Briggs observes, characteristic of the period (Briggs, Mab\textit{aw, Architektur in Egypt und Palästina}, p. 217).

After the Turkish conquest, the general deterioration in craftsmanship in Cairo affected the minbar also, but exceptions, like the finely-worked pulpit of the mosque of al-Baândar, however show that the good old tradition still survived. Hakim II's minbar in Cordoba has not survived but from the descriptions of the Arab writers it must have been a peculiarly valuable piece of work, for according to al-Makki it cost 35,705 dinars. It could be moved on wheels and contained the caliph 'Osama's Qur\text{\textsuperscript{a}}n. In the mosque of 'Ali as-Din in Konya is a minbar of hazelwood; according to an inscription on the posts supporting the upper part, the work of an artist of Aklia's from the year 550 (1155). Two inscriptions on the door of the pulpit mention Sultan Mas\text{\textsuperscript{a}}id I (510-551 = 1116-1156) and Kilij Arslan II (551-584 = 1156-1188) (cf. J. H. Loytved, Konica and F. Surre, Schicksalskunde, Kleinkunst, p. 27, pl. vi.-viii.). Inscriptions from the Khur\text{\textsuperscript{a}}n decorate the frames of the balustrades of the steps. The pulpit is of the traditional Syro-Egyptian form, but is, however, distinguished from them by its vigorous structure. Polygons and star-shaped panels fill the side frames, together with the same tendril patterns symmetrically interwoven, as we find naturalised in all the eastern lands of Islam from the beginning of the eleventh century (detailed illustration in Surre, op. cit., fig. 24).

In Persia and Afghanistan all the old minbars seem to have been destroyed during the Mongol invasion. On the other hand, the minbar illustrated here in the mosque of Lâwhar Shah Agha in the sanctuary of the Imam Re\text{\textsuperscript{a}} in Meshed which was built about 840-850 (1436-1446) is original in ornamentation and an example of the Timurid minbar. The structural motive is thrust into the background by the profuse covering of small pentagonal and star-shaped wooden panels with tendrils carved in relief after the style of the contemporary silvers; the effect is that of a carpet. Nothing is known of old minbars in Turkish. In India, pulpits were built almost exclusively of stone. Many, some of them richly carved, still exist in the Muslim provinces and towns of India. The pavilion on four pillars, common and popular in India, which gives a charm to buildings for Muslim worship as a decorative finish to the roof, was also used here for the stone minbar. Indeed one might even wonder whether this originally Indian structure was carried by the Eastern Turks to Central Asian lands and adopted by them for the minbar. Minbars with such canopies are frequently found in the mosques of the province of Gu\text{\textsuperscript{a}}jar and in Ahmad\text{\textsuperscript{a}}bād (cf. these volumes in the Arch. Survey of India, Western India). The mosque of Hüs\text{\textsuperscript{a}}l Khan Kâ\text{\textsuperscript{a}} in Dühluh, for example, has a stone minbar with seven steps and a canopy on pillars on the roof, but no entrance gate. The triangular side walls are divided into square areas which are carved in relief (Arch. Survey of India, Western India, vol. vii., Gu\text{\textsuperscript{a}}jarat, pl. xxvii., xxx.). In Haidar\text{\textsuperscript{a}}bād, the Muslim state of the south, on the other hand, the minbars are more simple and heavier, and have no canopy (cf. illustration from Oman\text{\textsuperscript{a}}bād).

Fig. 1. Minbar in the Sultán Óthma Mosque in Kairuân.

Fig. 3. Minbar in the Sultán Hasan Mosque in Cairo.
MINATA or MINATAR ALL-BURJ is also the most commonly used term in scientific literature, the phrase "the twelve signs of the zodiac" in ancient Persian and Greek texts, then the same of the ecliptic formed of the twelve signs each covering 30 degrees. The SMART software contains references to MINATA in three different passages. In the SMART xxv, 61 they placed two heavens or "Jaburij" in the heavens and adorned them for the spectators. In SMART xxx, 61 they placed two heavens or "Jaburij" in the heavens and who placed a lamp in them and a light-giving moon.

MINATA is entitled "Jaburij" and verse 1: "By the heavens with their lights (Jaburij)". Babylonian may with great probability be assumed to be the original home of the zodiacal circle. The period of its origin cannot be fixed with certainty; the first attempt at a dating of the constellations is the path of the sun and the planets, however, date from before the period of Hammurabi and is in no case in the third millennium B.C. Almost all the names familiar to us are already found in Sumerian inscriptions. The Boghaz-Kil list of about 3500 B.C. gives all the signs of the zodiac, with the exception of Leo and Libra.

The only pictorial representation of the starry heavens of the early Muslim period, the fresco on the dome of Kasr Amra shows the ecliptic as a broad band which are arranged to the twelve Burj. It also shows the pole of the ecliptic and the 12 (elliptical) degrees of longitude, as well as the equator and a series of parallel circles. The peculiarity of the arrangement of the heavens in the church of Kasr Amra is, especially the mina, is broadly speaking the same as that on the Atlas Farrokh. Thus, it should be noted that the fresco of Kasr Amra represents the heavens reflected as in a mirror.

The twelve Burj: Preliminary Notes

The names of the Burj are given in Arabic literature with many variations; those quoted below are the most usual. With the fixed stars a distinction is made between those which form the outline of a constellation (Zuwilah min al-burj), i.e., the essential stars and such as "go beyond the constellation" (Jabbah al-burj) and are regarded as only being loosely connected with it, i.e., the unessential stars.

The account here given is based in its main features on the statements in the first part of Al-Kaswin's Cosmography.

1. al-Abra or al-Abbas, the Ram (Aries). It consists of 13 essential stars, 3 unessential stars in its immediate vicinity; its forepart is turned to the west and its hindpart to the east. It has a face on its back. The two bright stars of the head (β and γ) are called al-Sharik and al-Abard ("the latter"); they form the same time the first of the 23 stations (mansion) of the moon (manadi). According to another reading the name al-Abra is given to the unessential star β Aries which is situated above the figure of the Ram. The three stars, 2 and 3 Aries form the second station of the moon and are called al-Atab ("little panther").

2. al-Thaur, the Bull (Taurus). 32 essential and 14 unessential stars; its forepart faces the east. The bright star at the point of the northern horn (presumably β Tauri) is also included in the Wagoner (Boötes) as well as in the bull. α is called al-Daharun, "Alm al-Thaur, Taur, Al Nujum, Hadil, Al Nujum and Al-Daharun" (large cow); γ is called al-Ka'aba (the Hyades which surround it). The Pleiades are called al-Thaur, γ and α together as Al-Khulasa ("the two dogs") of al-Daharun. The Pleiades form the third, al-Daharun and the Hyades together the station of the moon.

3. al-Tauwamun or al-Dzawa, the Twins (Gemini). 14 essential and 7 unessential stars. The Twins are in the form of two men whose heads are turned in the northeast and feet to the southwest. Castor and Pollux (α and β) are called al-Dhahra al-mukhtariyy; they form the second station of the moon. 7 and 8 are called al-Ha'ar; together with three other stars of the Twins they form the third station of the moon. The name of 7 and 8 Geminiorum is al-Daharun. 4. al-Saraj, the Chef (Cancer). 9 essential and 4 unessential stars. α Cancer and al-Saraj form the eighth station of the moon and have the peculiarly Arabic name of al-Nabaka ("the cartilage of the nose") or in with keeping with the Almagest, al-Madhâb ("mountain"). The star δ on the south foot is called al-Yasir ("the extremity"); δ Cancri and A Leonis form the ninth station of the moon, al-Tarq ("the glance").

5. al-Asad, the Lion (Leo). 27 essential and 8 unessential stars; he is conceived of as looking to the west. α (Regulus), γ, 7, 8, and δ are called al-Mahu ("Forehead of the Lion") and form the tenth station of the moon; δ and ε are the seventeenth station of the moon. α Leo, 7 and 8 are called al-Ghurab ("blackhair") or "man of the land") or al-Mu'ad al-Asad, δ Leonis is called Ḥaab al-Asad or al-Ghurab station of the moon; al-Ghurab. According to another reading, the name Ḥaab al-Asad is given to small stars in the vicinity of al-Mahu.

6. al-Abra (only in the catalogue of fixed stars taken from the Almagest), the Virgin (Virgo) or al-Sabawi, the ear of corn. 26 essential and 6 unessential stars; the head of the Virgin lies south of 4 Leo, her feet west of α and β Librae. The five stars in the shoulders β, γ, δ and ε Virgo, form the thirteenth station of the moon, al-Amsa; a Virgin forms the fourteenth station of the moon, al-Smâhî al-Abud or al-Sabawieh (cf. Smâhâ) which name is applied to the whole constellation of the Virgin. (N.B. The name Smâhâ stands for Smakh or 4. When Virginia is not quoted in the name of the fourteenth station of the moon. The fifteenth station of the moon consists of the stars 4, 5, 6 and 7 on the left foot; it is called al-Ashâr.

7. al-Mahse, the Scales (Libra). 8 essential and 9 unessential stars. α and β Librae and the pan of the balance form the sixteenth station of the moon which is called al-Zakab or Za-kâbîy al-Sabah ("wine-cup of the Scorpion") (cf. Sumerian ZAB.A.N.A, Akkadian Zabantu, as the name of the constellation Libra).

8. al-Abra, the Scorpion. 21 essential and 3 unessential stars; it has its head to the west and its tail to the east. 3, 4, 5 and 6 Scorpi are marked by the fourteenth station of the moon al-
...the eighteenth station of the moon Ṛkut al-ʾAffāh, and the nineteenth station of the moon al-Sawadāʾ ("Sight of the Scorpion"). The stars γ and τ to the right and left of Ṛkut al-ʾAffāh, are called al-Nāyād, q. al-Kāmil, the Archer (Sagittarius) or al-Xaww, the Bow or al-Sākhn, the Arrow. 31 essential and no unessential stars; the face with bow and arrow is turned to the west, the hind-part of the horse's body to the east. (The fresco on the dome at Kuşçur 'Amra on the other hand shows the upper part of the body of the archer turned towards the hind-part of the horse's body, and aiming with the bow over this to the west. The stars γ (on the point of the arrow), δ (on the bow-grip) ε (at the south end of the bow), ω (on the right foot) are called Ṛkut al-ʾAffāh, ρ (on the left shoulder), ο (on the notch of the arrow), τ (on the shoulder blade) and ζ (under the shoulder) al-Nāyād al-Mā'ā. Both constellations together form the twenty-second station of the moon, al-Nāyād, γ and δ on the tail are called al-ʾAlīṣbinī. 11. Sāhī al-Ma'ā or al-Sāhī, the water-carrier (Aquarius) or al-Dalwī, the pail. 42 essential and 3 unessential stars; the head of Aquarius points to the N.W., the feet S.E. and γ on the right shoulder are called Sād al-Malik or Sād al-Makkī. The two (or three) stars on the left hand (α, β, γ, δ) form the twenty-second station of the moon, Sād al-Malik, β and δ on the left shoulder together with ε and ω Capricorni form the twenty-fourth station of the moon Sād al-Malik. The four stars γ, δ, ε and ω on the right fore-arm and the right hand are called Sād al-ʾAlīṣbinī and form the twenty-fifth station of the moon. 12. al-Samahātim, the two Fishes (Pisces) or al-ʾAbbāt, the Fish. 34 essential and 4 unessential stars; the figure is conceived as two fishes, the western in the south of the back of Pegasus, the eastern in the south of Andromeda. The two fishes are connected by a band of stars, al-Kawwātī does not mention any outstanding stars. It is evident, then, that by far the greater part of the 28 mansūl fall into the area of the 12 hurūf and 20 of them. Only the following four do not belong to them: No. 5 al-Hākem (α, β, γ, η Orionis), No. 26 al-Farq al-anwar (α, ω Pegasi), No. 27 al-Farq al-fātir (γ Pegasi, α Andromedae), No. 38 Bata al-ʾAbbāt or al-Riḍā (a large number of stars forming a fish in the neighbourhood of β Andromedae). The zodiacal figures No. 1, al-ʾAqul, No. 4, al-Sarafāt, No. 7, al-Māzda and No. 10, al-Dīgādī are known together as Būrūjī min lišākat, Greek Διῶνυσον σύμβολα: No. 2, al-Tawārīkh, No. 5, al-ʾAdīl, No. 8, al-ʾĀfāq and No. 11, al-Dalwī under Būrūjī min lišākat, Greek Διῶνυσον σύμβολα: No. 3, al-Qāsim, No. 6, al-ʾAdīl, No. 9, al-ʾAlīṣbinī and No. 12, al-Samahātim under Būrūjī min lišākat, Greek Διῶνυσον σύμβολα: i.e. "Double figures": Twix, Virgin and Ear of corn, Archer with Horse's body and the two Fishes. al-Kawwātī gives from Ptolemy the extent of the Minyatā as 486.259.721½ Mil, the length of each Būrūjī as 39.588.510½ Mil, and the breadth as 3.322.943½ Mil.

Mintāṭa in Astrology.

Muthallathūtī. By al-muthallathūtī (qg. al-muthallathātā) are meant in Arab astrology the Greek ἤλεων, Lat. hermes, or triqueira, which in the middle ages were usually translated by tripēstos. The twelve signs of the zodiac are here arranged in threes at the angles of four intersecting equilateral triangles of which one is allotted to each of the four elements. Each triangle is given two of the seven planets as its rulers (ῥηθ, pl. ῥηθ, Greek ἐνευρήματα or ἡγομονεῖσθαι, one for the day and another for the night; a third is associated with the two others as "companions". The arrangement is as follows:


The distribution of the Muthallathūtī has been settled since the time of Ptolemy (εἰσαγωγή). Wawīdī or Shumar. By dividing each hurūf into three we get 30 decans each of 10°, which in Arabic are called wawīdī (sing. wawīdī), wawīdī (sing. ʾawār) or darūfūn (from the Indian ḍarabhā, a loanword from the Greek) or ḍarabhī (Pers.), in Greek διάκλητον or ἐνευρήματα, in mediæval Latin facti, more rarely decani. The astrological significance is the same as with the Greeks, who in turn go back to Egyptian models. The decans are not mentioned in Ptolemy, al-Shumar means properly the paranautelomata of the Babylonian Tenkāra, the constellations which rise at the same time as the separate decans according to his list, Abū Maḥār and other Arab authors took over the list of the paranautelomata from Tenkāra.
MINTAQA

The Mintaka is, as in the Greek system, the fundamental basis for all calculations. It is divided into 360° degrees (γεζα, pl. γεζαδς or γεζαδα, coll. γεζαδι, pl. γεζαδις), each degree into 60 minutes (δεκατις, pl. δεκατα, δεκαταν), each minute into 60 seconds (δεκατις, pl. δεκατα, δεκαταν), each second into 60 thirds (δεκατης, pl. δεκατα, δεκατητα), and so on.

The points of intersection of the ecliptic with the equator (δαρα or fašok ma-waddal al-nabah) define the two equinoxes (al-balidin), the points of the greatest northerly and southerly declination of the two solstices (al-banat). The position of a fixed star or planet with respect to the Mintaka is defined by giving its longitude (nabul, pl. nabulat or in al-Battani al-ματαλλις al-himawan) and latitude (arg, pl. wawat). The longitudes are numbered from the vernal point (al-muḥāṣṣat al-waṣṣaṣ). The axis erected perpendicular to the plane of the ecliptic meets the sphere of the fixed stars in the two poles of the ecliptic (bāhš al-buṣṣaṣ al-hurūf).

On Arab star-maps and globes, we frequently find a mixed ecliptical and equatorial system of coordinates used (cf. the remarks above on the fresco on the dome at Kasr ‘Amra), which consists of ecliptical circles of longitude through the poles of the ecliptic and equatorial parallel circles.

Precession (in al-Battani al-biṣāṣ bi-waṣṣaṣ al-μātaṣṣ) in later authors more precisely bi-waṣṣaṣ muḥāṣṣat al-baṣṣaṣ). Among the Arab astronomers supporters were found for the theory of Ptolemy, who explained the precession as a continual revolution of the whole heavens around the pole of the ecliptic with a period of 36,000 years, as well as for that handed down by Theon of Alexandria (Thawr al-Ishārāt) from older sources, according to which the process of the precession consisted of an oscillation to and fro around the “nodes of the path of the sun”. The greatest amount of the precession according to this theory is 8° west or east of the nodes; the retrogression amounts to 1° in 80 years so that the whole phenomenon repeats itself after 2,160 years. The latter theory found particular approval in India and was further developed there. Thābit b. Khira gave an explanation for it which at the same time took into account the (more suspected than observed) diminution in the obliquity of the ecliptic and calculated the length of the period at 477 years. Thābit attacked and refuted the oscillation hypothesis of Thaum and of the Aṣbāk al-μaṣūdī (al-Baydāwī), on a basis of new and comparative observations he found that the precession amounted to 1° in 66 years, which corresponds to a period of 25,760 years, which is roughly 10%/too small. The very accurate estimate of 1° in 70 years is also occasionally, if rarely, given in Arabic literature, according to E. Zinner, Geschichte der Sterne und der Kugeln, p. 289.

Obliquity (Majl faṣah al-hurūf), very frequently al-muṣṭalad bi-waṣṣaṣ or al-buṣṣaṣ in contrast to al-muṣtaṣṣ al-μātaṣṣ, “declination of the separate points in the Mintaka”, cf. al-Aghawī, p. 21). The pro-

The word "Mintaka" also refers to a constellation in Arabic astronomy, which is part of the zodiacal circle. It is considered to be the most important and prominent star in the constellation of Taurus. The constellation Mintaka is the third brightest star in the sky after the Sun and Venus. It is also known as "Aldebaran" in the Western astronomical system.

The Mintaka constellation is divided into two main parts: the "Trapezium" and the "Eye". The "Trapezium" consists of four bright stars: Aldebaran, Beta, Rho, and Sigma. The "Eye" is a bright star, Beta. The constellation is located in the eastern part of the sky and is visible from most parts of the world.

In addition to its astronomical significance, the Mintaka constellation is also important in astrology and Astrology. It is considered to be a significant point in the zodiacal circle and is associated with various aspects of human life, including love, wealth, and success.

The Mintaka constellation is also significant in the study of mythology and astronomy. It is associated with various myths and stories from different cultures, including the ancient Greeks and Romans. In Greek mythology, Mintaka is associated with the goddess Aphrodite, who is considered to be the goddess of love, beauty, and fertility.
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problem of estimating the obliquity of the ecliptic was during the classical period a centre of interest for the Muslim astronomers. As a first attempt at an exact estimate in the Muslim period, Ibn Yunus (ch. i., p. 222 of the Leyden Codex of the Paris Codex, No. 4275) mentions an observation of the period between 778 and 786 which gave the value \( \varepsilon = 23^\circ 31' \). We have an unusually large number of observations of later dates. (For details see Nallino’s notes on al-Batâni’s *Opera Astronomicum*, i. 157 192.)

- **MINIOCOY**, a coral island in the Arabian Sea midway between the Laccadive and the Maldives; it belongs like the former to the Ah Râja of Cannanore but ethnographically and geographically has more claim to be attached to the Maldives group. It is six miles long but very narrow, being only 1/4 square miles in area. The population is about 3,000. The people, who are probably of Siaghalese origin, have been Muhammadans since the sixth century. The language is Malh but the Arabic character is used. They are strictly monogamous. A girl’s consent is required for her marriage and she brings no dowry, but receives presents from the bridegroom. The women go unveiled. There are three castes in the island. The inhabitants all live in one village which is divided into ten quarters in each of which the men and women are separately organised with their own headmen and headwomen. All work on land is done by women. The men are sailors and fishermen. Most of the island’s food supply has to be imported. The chief exports are cocoanut, coir, cowries and dried fish. The important position held by women in Minioyo has suggested its identification with Marco Polo’s “Femal Island” (ed. Vule, ii. 404).

**Comparative table of the Arab values for the Obliquity of the Ecliptic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Obliquity observed</th>
<th>Average obliquity</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>(220 B.C.)</td>
<td>23° 51' 20&quot;</td>
<td>23° 43' 45&quot;</td>
<td>+ 7° 35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipparckhus</td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>(130 B.C.)</td>
<td>33°</td>
<td>33°</td>
<td>33°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>(140 A.D.)</td>
<td>35° 10'</td>
<td>35° 41'</td>
<td>- 2° 41'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabulae Protaiae</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>S29</td>
<td>33° 45&quot;</td>
<td>35° 41&quot;</td>
<td>+ 7° 35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(al-Fid al-Asma’it)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other observers under al-Mamûn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banû Mûsâ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Batâni</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>(860)</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>35° 40&quot;</td>
<td>- 1° 48'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Amjadîr</td>
<td>al-Râjkâa</td>
<td>(918)</td>
<td>35° 30'</td>
<td>35° 26'</td>
<td>- 1° 34'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Abd al-Rajmân al-Ṣîîfî)</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>(963)</td>
<td>33° 45&quot;</td>
<td>34° 35&quot;</td>
<td>- 1° 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu ‘l-Wafî</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>35° 0'</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiljîn b. Rûstam al-Kûhî</td>
<td>Bagdad</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>34° 17&quot;</td>
<td>34° 40&quot;</td>
<td>- 1° 23'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Yûnûs</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>(1001)</td>
<td>34° 52&quot;</td>
<td>34° 19&quot;</td>
<td>+ 0° 33'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Birûni</td>
<td>Ghomî</td>
<td>(1019)</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>34° 10'</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphemonian Tables</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>(1230)</td>
<td>32° 29'</td>
<td>32° 19'</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Shāfiî</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>(1353)</td>
<td>31° 25'</td>
<td>31° 25'</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Beg.</td>
<td>Samarkand</td>
<td>(1437)</td>
<td>30° 17&quot;</td>
<td>30° 49&quot;</td>
<td>- 2° 32'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUCHIRI, Abu'l-NADIR AHMAD b. VAQAR, Persian poet, nicknamed Shahbadda "six serpents", because of the wealth he accumulated in horses and cattle; but some say the name should be read Shabadda or Shah-badda i.e. "serpent-thunder". He was a native of Isfahan, calling himself "Dastmashar" in his verse; although Dawlatshah says he came from Balkh. He was a younger contemporary and imitator of Umar (n. v.), but he is considered to have excelled his model in poetic power. After completing his studies under Abu'l-Faraj of Susa (d. circa 392 = 1002) he enrolled himself in the service of the Amir Minuchir b. Khubsh b. Washqur, ruler of Djurjan and vassal of Mamduh b. Ghafran, and from the name of this first patron he took his taqibally. Presumably through the influence of Umar he later became attached to Mamduh's entourage of literary men at Ghafran, and wrote firdaws in praise of his new patron and of his sons Mamduh (who reigned for less than a year) and Mas'ud who succeeded to the Ghafranid throne. The latter was assassinated in 438 (1641), and Minuchir did not long survive him (Rashid ul Khân, Majmu' al-Farâbî, i. 545), says he died in the same year and quotes Abayi as having called him "short-lived". In his work Minuchir shows himself to be a gifted versifier, displaying a clever facility in rhyme and very often a reiteration of simplicity and straightforwardness of language. Also he did not hesitate to use new forms for his verse, and he is the earliest Persian writer we know of who used the stylized form of the mu'ammad, which, as used by him, consists of a series of mu'âra's or stichoi, in groups of six. All six may rhyme together, or only five; in the latter case the last line rhymes with the last lines of the other strophes. In spite of his qualities as a versifier, Minuchir cannot be regarded as a great poet; even for his day. His themes, - wise, love, springtime and the virtu of patrons - are those of the stock pattern, and his firdaws are deliberately moulded on the Arabic form, with all its artificialities. In flattery of his patrons he is as servile as any in the whole range of Persian panegyrists and his conceit of himself as it appears in his work is sometimes ludicrous in its effect. (Cf. No. 48 in Biberstein-Karavansky's edition, Paris 1886).

Bibliography: works quoted above and Ekhâr in G, Mrnawak d. Iran. Philologie. A Thiran ed. of the Dîwân was published in 1297 a.h. (R. LEVY)

MIR, a Persian title abbreviated from the Arabic amir and approximating in meaning both to it and to the title mirâd [q.v.]. (For the dropping of the initial m. cf. Br. Shah for Abi Shah.)

Like amir, the title is applied to princes (Minuchir, ed. Biberstein-Karavansky, 1886-96, speaks of Mas'ud, Sultan of Ghafran, as *Mir*), but it is also borne by poets and other men of letters (e.g. Mir 'Ali Shurî, Mir Khâyîî, Mir Mu'âsin; cf. the following art.). In India, Sâlinda sometimes call themselves by the title. As a common noun it is used as an equivalent of *sâ'î*, e.g. *mir* famiy, *mir* döyûr. In Turkish there was derived from it the colloquial adjective mirî (*belonging to the government*), which gave rise to *adamî* (*the government*) in the colloquial Arabic of Iraq.

MIR, the poetical designation of Mir Muhammad Taqî b. Mir 'Abî Allâh, was a native of Aramshah. After the death of his father he went to Dhihli during the reign of Shah 'Alam (1713-1722 = 1750-1806) and became a pupil of Sirâdî al-Dîn 'Ali Khân Arsl. In 1722 he went to Dhihli for Lucknow, where he spent the remaining portion of his life. He is recognized to be the most eminent poet of the Urdu language. He died at Lucknow in 1725 (1810) when he was nearly 100 years old. He is the author of six *dorâs* which have been repeatedly printed in India, and a biography of Urdu poets, entitled *Nukat al-Samarah*.

Bibliography: Shittas, Ghalchîn Bikhârî, fol. 167-176; Asad, Abu 'l-Hayâl, Lahore 1913, p. 203-241; Katun al-Dîn, Tarikh Shârîf, 1 Urdu, Dhihli 1848, p. 115-120 (M. Husayn Horâm)

MIR AMMANN. [See AMMANN.]

MIR DJUMLA. [See MUHAMMAD SÂDI.]

MÎRÂDî (-î), originally ladder, later "ascend," especially Muhammad's ascension to heaven. In the Karân, Sîra xxi. 10-25 and ill. 1-12, a vision is described in which a heavenly messenger appears to Muhammad and Sîra liii. 12-18 deals with a second message of a similar kind. In both cases the Prophet sees a heavenly figure approach him from the distance but there is no suggestion that he himself was carried off. It is otherwise with the experience alluded to in Sîra xvii. 1: "Praise him, who travelled in one night with his servant from the Masîjîl al-Harâm to the Masîjîl al-Akâsh, whom surrounding we blessed, in order to show him our signs." That Muhammad is meant by the "servant" is generally assumed and there is no reason to doubt it (Schirke, Islam, vi. 13, no. 56, 25-40, Z. A. T. F., xviii. 53, 54), that the Masîjîl al-Harâm is the Meccan sanctuary is certain from Karâmî usage (Horovitz, Kuran, Ustâr, p. 149); but what is the Masîjîl al-Akâsh? According to the traditional explanation, but not the only one recognised in Hadith (see Schirke, op. cit., p. 12, 14 and above, s. v. MBb) it would mean Jerusalem, but how could Muhammad, who in Sîra xxx. 1 speaks of Palestine as *dîwân 'Arâd, call a sanctuary situated in Jerusalem al-masîjîl al-oqbî? The age of this explanation is not quite certain; perhaps it was already known to Umar b. Abî Rahîm (ed. Schwart, s. v.) and Abû Sâkh (Lilin of the Hudâbilin, ed. Wellenhaus, cef. 24), but even these belonged only to the Umayyad period (contrary to Lammens, Sacramouts, p. 72, this is true also of Abû Sâkh, who according to Aghânî, xxi. 94 was a partisan of the Bani Marwân and panegyrist of Abî al-Malik). Muhammad probably meant by al-Masîjîl al-Akâsh a place in heaven, such as the place in the highest of the seven heavens, in which the angels sing praises of Allâh and we would then have in Sîra xiv. 1, evidence from the Prophet himself about his nocturnal ascension into the heavenly sphere (Schirke, op. cit., p. 11, 13, 14, Horovitz, flâr. ii, i. 164, 165), testimony which is however content with the mention of the experience itself and says nothing about its course. The question
of the possibility of an ascent to heaven is several times touched on in the Qur'an. In Sura xi. 38 Fir'awn gives Hâshîa orders to build a palace so that he can reach the cords of heaven and clumb up to the god of Mudh (cf, also Sûra xxviii. 3). In Sûra li. 38, the calumniators are asked whether they had permission to build a ladder (jinnat) so that they could hear the heavenly voice and in Sûra vi. 35 the consequences are considered which the signs brought by the Prophet with the help of a ladder to heaven might have on his hearers. The old poets also talk of ascending to heaven by a ladder, as a means of escaping something one wants to avoid (Zuhair, Makallaha, p. 54; Aṣghâ, xv. 34).

Hadîth gives further details of the Prophet's ascension. Here the ascension is usually associated with the nocturnal journey to Jerusalem, so that the ascent to heaven takes place from this sanctuary. We also have accounts preserved which make the ascension start from Mecca and make no mention of this journey to Jerusalem. In one of these the ascension takes place immediately after the "purification of the heart" (see Bûkhât, Sahâb, bab 1; Hadîqâ, bab 76; Mawrid, bab 42; Abûmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, lv. 207; v. 143; Tahât, ed. De Goeje, i. 3157 sqq.). In the last mentioned passage we read: "When the Prophet had received his revelation and was sleeping at the Ka'ba, as the Qur'ân used to do, the angels Gabriel and Michael came to him and said: With regard to whom have we received the order? Whereupon they themselves answered: With regard to their lord. Thenceon they went away but came back the next night, three of them. When they found him sleeping they laid him on his back, opened his body, brought water from the Zamzam well and washed away all that they found within his body of doubt, idolatry, paganism and error. They then brought a golden vessel which was filled with wisdom and belief and then his body was filled with wisdom and belief. Thereupon he was taken up to the lowest heaven. The other versions of this story show many additions and variants; according to one, for example, Gabriel came to Muhammad through the roof of his house which opened to receive him; according to another, it was Gabriel alone who appeared to him and there are many similar variants. All these versions however put Muhammad's ascension at an early period and make it a kind of dedication of him as a Prophet, for which the purification of the heart had paved the way. Ethnographical parallels (Schieke, op. cit., p. 2-4) show other instances of a purification being preliminary to an ascension. Similar stories are found in pagan Arabia (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 171 sqq.) and also in Christian legends (op. cit., p. 170 sqq.). Another story (Ibn Sa'd, vi. 143) says that the ascension took place from Mecca although it does not associate it with "the purification of the heart" which it puts back to the childhood of the Prophet (cf. Hatâma).

How did it come about however that this, obviously the earlier, tradition of Mecca as the starting point of the ascension was ousted by the other which made it take place from Jerusalem? The localisation of the Qur'ânic Masâ'ûd al-Alâ'î in Jerusalem is by some connected with the efforts of 'Abd al-Malik to raise Jerusalem to a place of special esteem in the eyes of believers (Schieke, op. cit., p. 13; Horovitz, op. cit., p. 165 sqq.; do., in Islamic Culture, li. 33 sqq.) and in any case it cannot be proved that this identification is older than that of 'Abd al-Malik. It might all the easier obtain currency as Jerusalem to the Christians was the starting point of Christ's ascension and from the fourth century Jesus's footprint had been shown to pilgrims in the Basilica of the Ascension; as now, perhaps as early as the time of 'Abd al-Malik, that of their Prophet was shown to Muslim pilgrims (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 167 sqq.). The idea of the "heavenly Jerusalem" may have had some influence on the development of the "heaven" legends; when Muhammad meets Ibrahim, Musâ and Isha in Jerusalem, the presence of these prophets in the earthly Jerusalem is not at once intelligible, but it loses any remarkable features if Bait al-Mahd is (Ibn Hishâm, p. 267) from the first meant the "Heavenly Jerusalem" (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 168, another explanation cf. ii. 604). Perhaps also the phrase allaâhâ bârâhâ bârâhâ bârâhâ was taken to support the reference to Jerusalem; when these words occur elsewhere in the Qur'ân they refer to sites in the holy land (Lammeens, op. cit., p. 72, note). While the stories quoted above only say that Gabriel took the Prophet up to the heights of heaven, but are silent as to how, others add that a ladder (mawrid) was used for the ascent (see Ibn Hishâm, p. 268; Tahât, Taflur, xv. 10; Ibn Sûd, v. 143); this ladder was of splendid appearance; it is the one to which the dying turn their eyes and with the help of which the souls of men ascend to heaven. The ladder is probably identical with Jacob's ladder in Genesis, xxviii. 12; the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees, xxvii. 21 calls this mawrid and Sûra xxi. 3, 4 calls Allâh, Ibn Sa'd, Musnad, i. 355; to whom the ange and the spirit ascend (Horovitz). According to Sûra xxxii. 4, the soul rises to Allâh; according to Sûra liv. 4 and xcviii. 2, Allâh knows what descends from heaven and what ascends to it; and in Sûra xlii. 32 there is a reference to steps (mawrid) in the houses of men. Muhammad therefore already knew the word, which is presumably taken from Ethiopic (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 174 sqq.). Among the Mandaeans also the ladder (sumbôta) is the means of ascending to heaven (Gins, transl., Lidzbarski, p. 49, 208, 490) and there are parallels to the ladder of the dead in the mysteries of Mithras (see Andrac, De Person Mûnamêni, p. 45; Wetter, Pâsa, p. 114, note 2); the Manichaean amûlil al-sabha (Fûhi, p. 355, xx) by means of which the dead man is taken to the sphere of the moon is a more distant parallel (Bewun, op. cit., p. 59).

Just as the mawrid is associated with the ascension, so Bûrâk is originally connected with the night journey to Jerusalem; it found its way however at an early date into the legend of the ascension (see Bûkhât, Musnad, bab 1; Abûmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, lv. 207; v. 387; Tahât, Taflur, xv. 12). The prophets earlier than Muhammad had used Bûrâk as their steed (Ibn Hishâm, p. 267; Dîyârîkhti, Taflur al-Khamrât, i. 349), in particular Isha'âm ("Adîdja'd, ed. Ahlward, xvi. 48-82; Tahât, Taflur, xv. 5; Thâm'ât, "Athâ'î, xvi. 6, p. 63; Hâshîa, l. 369). This idea of one animal used by the different prophets is borrowed; according to the Misrafi statement, late it is true that Bûrâk on Zariah, ix. 19, 855; Fûhi de K. Ehrhart, xii.), the ass which Abraham rode (Genesis xvii. 3.) is the same as that used by Zipporah and her sons (Exodus, iv. 20) and is that on which
the Messiah will make his entrance (cf. also Ibn Sa'd, t. jîl. 176). The recollection that this deed was an act survives in Muslim tradition so that Burāq is described as "smaller than a mule and larger than an ass" (Bukhārī, Manāšir, bûl. 43; similarly Ibn Hīghām, p. 264; Ibn Sa'd, t. jîl. 143). Ibn Sa'd already describes Burāq as a female beast and, as early as a story attributed by Ibn Iṣâq to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Burāq is given wings (Ibn Hīghām, bûl. cit.). That "The Jāhāf seems to be the first who speaks of Burāq's human face (Ibn Hīghām, l. c., p. 370); in the miniatures dealt with fully by Arnold, "Painting in Islam," p. 178 sqq., al-Burāq usually has a woman's head. At the gate of each of the seven heavens through which he wanders with the Prophet, Gabriel is asked for his own name and that of his companion (Bukhārī, Sa'd, bûl. 1, Tabārī, Tafsîr, xv. 4; Anwarī, ed. de Goeje, l. i. 157). After he gives these he is next asked if Muhammad has already been sent as a prophet (awwâl ba'thul ilâha, correction for the original awwâl ba'shitha found in Tabārī, Anwarī, l. i. 158; see Snouck Hurgronje, "Ibl," vi. 5, note 4); this also indicates that the ascension originally belonged to the period immediately after his call (Schirke, q.v. cit., p. 6). In each heaven they meet one of the earlier messengers, usually Adam in the first, Yahyā and Īsā in the second, Yūsuf in the third, Idrīs in the fourth, Hārūn in the fifth, Muḥammad in the sixth and Isḥāq in the seventh heaven; there are also variations and Adam appears as judge over the spirits of the dead (Andrae, p. 44 sqq.; Schirke, p. 17; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Manṣūrī, v. 145; cf. Apoc. Mosis, p. 37). Of the other messengers of God we are only told—in addition to being given a description of their personal appearance—that they greeted Muḥammad; Muḥammad is an expression by which says that Muḥammad is higher in the esteem of Allâh than himself and that the number of his followers surpasses his own (Tabārī, Tafsîr, xv. 11). On another occasion, Muhammad engages in a conversation with Muḥammad after Allâh had imposed upon him 50 jâhâls a day as obligatory prayers for the faithful. On Muḥammad's advice, Muhammad asks several times for an alleviation and each time Allâh grants it; but when Muḥammad says 5 jâhâls are still too many, the Prophet refuses to ask for less (on Genesis, xviii. 23 sqq. as the prototype of this episode; cf. Goldschîher, Studien, l. c.; Schirke, p. 19; Andrae, p. 52). According to some versions, Muḥammad dwells in the seventh heaven and the conversation seems to be more natural there. To the ascension belong the visits to paradise and to hell. Paradise according to many Muslims is the seventh heaven, according to others in the first; in some it is not mentioned at all. The statements about its rivers are contradictory (Schirke, p. 19; cf. above KAWTHAR), the Sâdīr al-Mustâdhab is usually placed in the seventh heaven (Bevan, p. 59; Schirke, p. 18). In one description hell is put below the first heaven (Ibn Hīghām, p. 269; Tabārī, Tafsîr, l. c. 19). According to another, the place of punishment of the damned is on the way between heaven and earth; Muhammad sees it on his journey to the Bait al-Maṣūm (Tabārī, xv. 101, also Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Manṣūrī, l. c. 257; l. c. 353; l. c. 125, 182, 224, 231, 239). On the punishment in hell cf. Schirke, p. 17; Andrae, p. 44; Horovitz, p. 172; Reumann, Das mamlûkische Buch der Geister, p. 81 sqq.; Lâbzârî, Johannitbuch, p. 98 sqq.; Gossen, p. 183.

That Muḥammad appeared before Allâh's throne in the seventh heaven and that the conversation about the obligatory prayers took place there, is already recorded in the oldest stories (see above) but only rarely do they extend the conversation between Allâh and the Prophet to other subjects (Tabārī, xxvii. 261; Manṣūrī, iv. 66 as a dream; Andrae, p. 70). But objection was raised to the assertion that Muḥammad on this occasion saw Allâh face to face (Andrae, p. 71 sqq.), and the question was also raised at an early date whether the ascension was a dream or a reality, whether only the soul of the Prophet was carried up or also his body (Castañi, Anuario, Introd. § 320; Andrae, p. 72; Bevan, p. 60; Schirke, p. 15, note 1).

The Hadîth contains, besides these, other details which Aṣīr (Ediœtologia, Madrid 1919, p. 7-54; Do., Danse y ci Islam, Madrid 1927, p. 55-71) has discussed. In developing the story of the Prophet's ascension Muhammadan writers have used models afforded them by the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. A few features may also come from the Parvesh from the Aisa Virat; cf. the works already mentioned by Andrae, Bevan, Schirke, Horovitz and W. Boussens, in A.R.W., iv. 136-169.

Later accounts (Chauvin, Bibliographie, xi. 207 sqq.; Aṣīr, Ediœtologia, p. 53 sqq.; Do., Danse y ci Islam, p. 72 sqq.; Nallino, in A.R.O., viii. 803) collect and systematize the material scattered in the older sources; they only increase the matter without however increasing the depth of its thought. Among the Mu'tah-books which have become popular in modern times that of al-Qâhîrî may be mentioned (this is the correct form, see Nallino, q.v. cit., p. 813) on which Darîd (d. 1201) wrote a hâjiya; also that of Barzanî (d. 1179). In the non-Arab lands of Iblâs, Persia, Turkey, Hindustânî and Malay versions of the legend have contributed to its dispersion (see Chauvin, loc. cit.).

The ascension of the Prophet later served as a model for the description of the journey of the soul of the deceased to the throne of the divine judge (Aṣīr, Ediœtologia, p. 59 sqq.; for the Sûfis however, it is a symbol of the rise of the soul from the bonds of sensuality to the heights of mystic knowledge. Ibn al-ʿArâf thus expounds it in his work Kiftî al-ʿirâf ila Mašîm al-Burâq (Aṣīr, p. 61 sqq.; Andrae, p. 31 sqq.), and in his Fustâlî, ii. 356-375 he makes a believer and a philosopher make the journey together; but the philosopher only reaches the seventh heaven, while no secret remains hidden from the pious Muslim (Aṣīr, p. 62 sqq.). Abu l-ʿArâf al-Maṣūrî's Risâlât al-Qiftî is a parody on the traditional accounts of the Mu'tah (Aṣīr, p. 71 sqq.). Aṣīr in his Mu'tah-books quoted has dealt with the knowledge of Muslim legends of the ascension possessed by the Christian middle ages and their influence on Dante, in a separate work (La ediectologia musulmana en la divina comedia, Madrid 1924) he has collected and discussed the literature produced by these authors down to 1923.

According to Ibn Sa'd, t. jîl. 147 the ʿirâf took place on the 17th Râšt of the 17th Râmahân. For centuries however, the night before the 27th Râdîb—a date also significant in the history of Mecca (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 71)—has been regarded by the pious as the Lailat al-Mu'âfî, and the eve is like the Mawlid al-Nâṣir devoted to reading the legend of the feast
MIRĀDĪ — MIRĀTH

(one al-Abdān, Madāḥī, i. 143 sqq.; Herklotz, Quom ↓ i Jumān, i. 165; Lane, Manners and Customs, London 1856, p. 474 sqq.; Snouck Hurgronje, The Achenese, i. 219; Aïn, Enoto-
logie, p. 97).

Bibliography: is given in the article; cf. also R. Hartmann, in Bibliothek-Warbung, Ver-

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MIRĀN MUḤAMMAD SHĀH I, of the Fārābī dynasty. He belonged to the younger branch of that line, which had taken refuge in Gujrat, and his ancestors had lived in that kingdom and had married princesses of the Maqṣarī family until Maḥmūd I of Gujrat had, on the extinction of the elder branch of the Fārābīs, placed ‘Aḍī Khān III, Muhammad’s father, on the throne of Khandeh. Muhammad, who was, through his mother, the great-grandson of Maḥmūd, and the grandson of his son, Maqṣarī II, succeeded his father in Khandeh in 1252 and in 1257 tacitly intervened in the cause of ‘Aḍī al-Dīn Imād Shāh of Barār by aiding him against his enemies, Bābur Anṣār Shāh I of Ahmadnagar. He was defeated and driven back into Khandeh, but succeeded in persuading his uncle, Bahādur of Gujrat, to intervene, and with him invaded the kingdom of Ahmadnagar. The campaign was only partially successful, but Muḥ-
hammad was indemnified by Bābur I for his losses. He accompanied his uncle in the campaign which ended, in 1331, in the capture of Mānadd and the annexation of Malwa to Gujrat, and on Bahādur’s death in 1357, was summoned, in his mother’s right, to the throne of Gujrat, but died on his way to Ahmadsābād.

Bibliography: Muhammad Khāsm Fīrūzā, Gujrat-i Fāhranī, Bombay 1852; An Arabic History of Gujrat, ed. E. Denison Ross (Indian Texts Series); T. W. Haig, The Fārābī Dy-
nasty of Khandeh (The Indian Antiquary, 1918).

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MIRĀTH (A.), inheritance (pl. manārāth), vāriṣht leg, vāriṣht heir.

1. The law of inheritance (‘ilm al-farāšāh, “the science of ‘dispositions”, i.e. of the quotas laid down in accordance with Sūra iv. 18, which is called after its most important and most difficult part) is one of the branches of Muhammadan law in which Muhammad made more deeply modified earlier practice by legislation. Although the Kur’ānic reg-
ulations are fairly detailed, the task of deducing all necessary conclusions from them, to which lawyers turned with particular enthusiasm, gave rise to a great mass of traditions and considerable diver-

gences of opinion on questions not expressly decided in the Kur’ān. In the law of inheritance we can also still trace fundamental old Arabian pre-Islamic features.

In the period before the rise of Islam, in keeping with the patriarchal system prevailing among the Arabs, the estate of a deceased tribesman went, if he died intestate, to the nearest male relative(s); the order of succession in which these relatives, the so-called ʿaṣba (corresponding to agnates), were called upon to inherit survives me-

natised in its order in the Muslim law of inheritance (cf. below). Minors were, as incapable of bearing arms, excluded from the succession as were female relatives: widows also were not entitled to inherit, and originally no doubt themselves formed part of the estate, a view which survived in the levirate marriage usual among the Arabs, to which Sūra iv. 23 (cf. below) refers in forbidding it. There is no evidence of any preferential treatment of the first-born, which we find elsewhere in Semitic law. This, the original legal position, had by Mu-
hammad’s time most certainly altered somewhat in favour of women; in cases where the deceased had no male relatives his daughters seem frequently to have obtained the estate; but women had by no means equal treatment with men, as is clear from Muhammad’s regulations. In addition to these principal heirs the pre-Islamic Arabs had also secondary heirs who correspond to the later so-called quota-heirs (dhawi t-farāšah) and who, in a sort of part of the estate, the bulk of which went to the ʿaṣba. From Kūrān ii. 176 and iv. 37 which conform this arrangement, we can see that these included the parents, the “relatives” — apparently so far as they were not ʿaṣba — and the so-called confederates (jā’il, plur. ǧā’ilāt); the settlement of the 

portions falling to them was done in accordance with Sūra ii. 176 — at least in part — according to the law of the testament.

3. Muhammad modified this system considerably in details, the main point being the improvement in the treatment of women as in his innovations with regard to the laws of family life generally (cf. Ṭal‘ī). At the same time there is a clear endeavour to fix in legal form the practice which had varied considerably in heathen times. The main line of the system in the general conceptions as above briefly outlined were retained by the Prophets. One provision which had been made under special circumstances he was not able later to keep in force; immediately after the Ḥijrat he had ordered that those who migrated with him (the madīṣīn) and the believers in Mecca (the amīrāt) should regard themselves as brethren and therefore able to inherit from one another, while all bonds of relationship between the madīṣīn and their relatives left in Mecca, even if they were believers, were to be regarded as broken (Sūra viii. 73, with the limita-
tion imposed in vii. 16); but this was expressly revoked by Sūra xxix. 6. Tradition regards this fraternisation as a special case of confederacy (jā’il/dam, cf. above, section 2). For the rest, Muhammad in his first Mēlā period confirmed the system of secondary heirs and made the general practice in regard to inheritance (cf. ʿilm al-

farāšah) (Sūra iii. 176) is probably to be dated in the Rāmādān of the year 2, and iv. 37, of which the first view in
al-Bai'dawi is undoubtedly the right one, cannot be much later); that in ii. 176 he expressly makes the fair treatment of the secondary heirs a duty, already reveals the direction which later ordinances were to take. Connected with this is the probably contemporary ii. 241 sq., which secures the wife, if she survives her husband, a legacy of maintenance for a year. Not much later, about the year 3, is Sura iv. 23: "Ye, who are believers, are not permitted to inherit women against their will"; this is a prohibition against the 'apala forcing the widow of the deceased into a levirate marriage and generally assuming the position of ward over her, which belongs only to her male relatives; this is not meant as a regular legal ordinance, which is part of Muhammad's endeavour to improve the position of women [cf. Ta'liq]. Very soon after the battle of Uqud, when numerous Muslims had fallen, we have — as a result of it — the final 'Urfi\nordinance of Sura iv. 3:18: 'To the men belongs a share of what their parents and relatives leave, and to the women belongs a share of what their parents and relatives leave — whether it be much or little — as a definite share, 9. If the relatives (not entitled to inherit), the orphans and the poor are present at the division, give them some of it and speak kindly to them (verses 10 to 14) go on to deal with the treatment of orphans.' 12. Allah commands you, as regards your children, as follows: to the boy belongs as much as the share of two girls; if however there are (only) girls (and more than two, two-thirds of the estate belongs to them) and if there is one (girl) to her belongs the half. And the parents shall each have a sixth if the (legator) had children, and if he had no children and (only) his parents inherit from him, his mother shall have a third. If however he has brothers, his mother shall have a sixth. (All this) after deducting any bequests he may have made or a debt. Ye know not whether your parents or your children be of greater use to you. (This is) an ordinance of Allah and Allah is all-knowing and wise. 13. To you belongs the half of the estate of your wives, if they have no children; but if they have children you shall receive a fourth of their estate — after deducting any bequest that they may have made or any debt. 14. To them belongs a fourth of your estate, if you have no children; but if you have children an eighth of your estate belongs to them — after deducting any bequest that you may have made or any debt. 15. If distant relatives inherit from a legator, male or female, and he has a brother or a sister, each shall have a sixth; but if there are more, they shall have a third among them after deducting any bequest that he may have made or debt, 16. Without prejudice (this is) an ordinance of Allah. Allah is all-knowing and gracious." (Verse 17 sq. contain promises and threats.) As the settlement of the successor in indirect lines left undecided, Sura iv. 175 supplemented the above: 'They ask thee for a decision. Say: Allah gives you the following decision for remote kindred: if a man die childless and have a sister, half of what he has is here and she dies childless, he: is her heir; if there be two sisters, two-thirds of the estate belongs to them; but if there be both brothers and sisters, the brother shall have as much as two sisters.'... The object of these regulations is simply to supplement the law regarding the rights of the 'apala; they are not a reorganisation of the whole law. Each of the persons named is therefore only allotted a definite portion. The remainder, and this is as a rule the major portion, of the estate falls as before to the 'apala. There is a distinct tendency to give female relatives half the share of male relatives of the same degree; even in the case when there are daughters but no sons (and correspondingly sisters but no brothers), they do not receive all that would belong to the sons or brothers; but we regard a few smaller portions the two sexes rank equally. The quotas here given abolished the testamentary settlement of the portions usual in the hebron period, which was still approved by Sura ii. 176; this is the historical starting point for the tradition — early interpreted in another sense — that a legacy in favour of the heirs is not valid. Sura ii. 244 sq. (cf. above) is probably rightly regarded as alienated by the settling of the widow's portion in tradition. There is a slight difficulty in interpreting only in iv. 15; but there can be no doubt that this verse refers to half-sisters on the mother's side, as indeed it has always been interpreted; the text of Uba\n even inserts an addition to this effect (cf. Nikolaus-Bergstrasser, Geschichte des Koran, ii. 82, 83, note 5). The verse iv. 175 on the other hand refers to full sisters, how the 'Urfi wished half-sisters on the father's side to be dealt with, is difficult to say. In iv. 12 "more than two" (girls) is to be interpreted, as the verse requires, as "two and more"; similarly, in the case in which the mother is allotted a third of the estate, it is presumed that the father gets the other two-thirds.

4. The full details which tradition is able to give regarding the causes of the revelation of the regulation of the law of inheritance are not historical; on internal grounds all we can say is that it took place soon after the battle of Uqud (cf. above, section 3). The numerous hadiths which simply repeat the 'Urfi\n\nregulations may be neglected here. Tradition can only record very few actual divergences from the prescriptions of the 'Urfi; one of these is that a woman received back as her inheritance a share of what she had presented to her mother and who represented the latter's whole estate (in parallel case it is a man who has given his mother a garden; by this alteration the divergence is disposed of). According to another story, the Prophet is said to have laid it down that the wives of the mukhabbar should inherit the houses of their husbands; according to the wording, it cannot have been a temporary arrangement which was abolished by the final settlement. While nothing can be quoted in favour of the first hadith, the second, which does not seem to be intended as a foundation for any legal clause, may have a grain of historical truth in it.

5. The prescriptions of the 'Urfi\nare supplemented and developed in countless traditions among which a comparatively large number relate not decisions of the Prophet himself, but of his Companions (we may cite Ibn Hanbal, iv. 279 sq. as a typical mixed form); in reality they must not for a moment be regarded as fact, but only as anonymous evidence of the first developments of the 'Urfi\n\nlaw of inheritance. At this stage of development it is already firmly established that an unbeliever cannot inherit from a Muslim; the right of a Muslim to inherit from an unbeliever is finally also denied, although there is some opposition to this view; on the question
of inheritance of a mu'zazzad, unity was not attained. Excluded from the right of inheritance is also one who has killed the legatee; according to one view, always, according to another only if the slaying was deliberate (with 'anā'ā; cf. article 457). That a slave has no right of inheritance is taken for granted. Legal relationship is necessary for the right of inheritance; thus illegitimate children of those whose paternity has been disputed by al-nisā' [q.v.] have no legal claim on the estates of both father and his relations. The patron ( manslaughter, q.v.) is included among the 'aqqaba, who are placed in the order which had been handed down from the pre-Islamic period and continued to hold good: the patron and the masu'm slave inherit from one another and according to one view, the same right is granted to the masu'm, meaning the man before whom the persons concerned has adopted Islam. After the masu'm come — although some oppose this — the 'awāiṣ, i.e., persons related to the legatee in the female line, whose representative is usually the 'āqūl, and maternal uncle, In cases all these heirs should not exist, the fellowtribesmen are named. The law in Sūra iv. 14 is also extended to the widow whose husband dies before the consummation of the marriage; on the question what should be the share of two daughters, we have the answer two-thirds, doubleless in keeping with the sense of Sūra iv. 13, but also that based on the literal interpretation (the half); finally half brothers on the father's side, about whom the Kūr'ān lays down nothing definitely, are excluded from inheriting by full brothers. With certain modifications which occur again in the latter teaching, a son's daughters are treated like daughters and grandparents like parents, but this regulation only won recognition after opposition and varying practice in details. Here arises the problem of the different shares of the grandparent along with the brothers when he appears with them as 'aqqāb, which goes back to his varying position in the series (cf. below sect 58); along with other views we find quoted also the one that later prevailed but it does not seem to be the earliest. The Kūr'ān lays it down that before dividing the estate the amount of any legacies and debts should be deducted; and in early times — probably in literal interpretation of the Kūr'ānic passages — the legacies often were given preference to debts; after some opposition the opposite teaching prevailed. The 'āyās [q.v.] to be paid for a slave was in itself subject to the usual laws as part of his estate; but in early times the wife was not allowed a share in the 'āyās of her slave husband, which goes back to old Arab conceptions of the family; the other view ultimately prevailed. In addition there are numerous, often contradictory, views on separate points which show the greater interest taken in the matter. The interest taken in early Islam in the law of inheritance is reflected in Ḥādith; there are traditions in which the Prophet orders the law of inheritance to be taught and learned — calling it "the half of knowledge" — on account of its difficulty and expressing the fear that this subject, so difficult to remember, might in time disappear from the memory of his community.

6. The law of inheritance attained its full development in the system of ḥādith; the following are its principles according to the Shāfi'i teaching (for the most important divergences in the other schools cf. below sect. 7).

a. The law of intestacy in general.

According to Muslim law, there is no fusion between the property of the legatee and that of the heir. The creditors of the estate can therefore only assert their claims against the estate; on the other hand, the heirs have no claim on the estate until all debts are paid. The ḥādith has therefore no special teaching on the rejection of legacies, the different ways of succeeding to an inheritance, etc. In addition to pledges entered into by the deceased, the debts of the estate include the funeral expenses and the religious duties omitted by the deceased so far as they consist of concrete things (e.g. unpaid neṣīḥa) or can be annulled for by payment (e.g. neglected fasts [ṣawād]) or can be carried through at the expense of the estate by a deputy (e.g. the waqf omitted without good reason); in the opinion of a minority of the Shāfiʿi legists, omitted gifts may also be included in these. After the debts the legacies have to be paid (cf. waqīya); the remainder passes to the heirs. A necessary condition for inheriting is that the heir has survived the testator; in doubtful cases, when persons who would inherit from one another have died without its being certain which died first, as a rule no inheritance passes between them (this decision is already found in Tradition; there was a very old, difference of opinion on the point). The heir must also have existed when the testator died; only in the case where a man leaves a pregnant widow or 'aqqāb al-must, is a child's share reserved for the unborn child (Tradition is not agreed on this point). If a man is missing long enough to be considered dead, the qādī can declare him "presumably dead" at the request of the heirs after investigating the circumstances; the heirs thus receive the right to take possession of the estate for the time. Excluded from succession are the following: one who has caused the death of the deceased, the one who is an unbeliever from the succession to a Muslim and vice versa, the 'abr (the unbelieving member of a state with which the Muslim stands in no treaty relation) and the slave. As in old Arab law the succession of the 'aqqāb is the basis of the law of inheritance in the case of an intestate; the 'aqqāb are the usual heirs, inheritance by others is only an exception from the general rule; on the order of succession among the 'aqqāb cf. under 3. The 'aqqāb receive the whole estate after the deduction of the portions set aside for the quota-heirs by the Kūr'ān (cf. under 2). If there are no 'aqqāb, that portion of the estate which remains after the deduction of the portions of the quota-heirs goes to the state treasury (bāt al-māl), a notable change from the view found in traditions — cf. section 5 — even 'Omār II is said to have decided otherwise, cf. al-Dhahabī, Barā'ī, bāb 58); it being presumed that this is administered according to the law for the benefit of the Muslims; otherwise the Kūr'ānic quota-heirs receive the remainder of the estate in proportion to their quota by the so-called law of reversion, with the exception of the widower or widow if they are not also at the same time blood-relations of the deceased (here also as in the case of the exclusion of the widow from sharing in the 'āyās of her slain husband, the basis is the old Arab family law). Only if there are neither 'aqqāb nor quota-heirs and the state treasury is not being administered in accordance with the law are the qāhām 'awās — i.e. persons related to the deceased in the female line as well as those
female relatives who cannot be quota-heirs—called upon to inherit (there are two theories regarding their order of succession). If there are none of these relatives, any Muslim may take possession of the estate, if he be capable and ready to administer it for the general good of Muslims.

A. Rights of the 'apāha. The 'apāha are called upon to inherit in the following order which in essentials already existed in the pre-Mahomedan period: 1. The male descendants (the legatees) in the male line, a nearer excluding the more distant relatives from succession; 2. The nearest male relative in the ascending male line with the provision that the father, but not the grandfather (and remoter ancestor), of the deceased inherits before his brothers; the grandfather shares with the brothers (cf. below). 3. The nearest male relative in the male line in the descendants of the father: first the full brother, then the half-brother on the father’s side, then the descendants of the full brother, then those of the half-brother on the father’s side. 4. The nearest male relative in the male line among the descendants of the grandfather (as under 3) etc.; 5. Lastly the mawālid, i.e. the patron (or patrilineal), if the deceased was a freed man, and then his 'apāha. —The brothers of the deceased inherit only with the grandfather as 'apāha in equal shares with him, but if there are more than two of them, the grandfather receives one-third of what is to be divided between him and the brothers. If there are also quota-heirs, the grandfather is allowed in addition at least a sixth of the estate (when he would inherit as a quota-heir; cf. below). He can then choose the most favourable of the three arrangements. This rule seems to be a compromise between the two earlier contradictory views that the grandfather excluded the brothers or mawṣura was excluded by them (cf. above section 5). — Female 'apāha. If the deceased left sons as well as daughters, they inherit jointly, the share of a son being twice as large as that of a daughter (according to Šura iv. 12) while the quota allotted to the daughters (ibid.) is dropped, as is intended by the spirit of the Kurānic law. The daughter who inherits along with a son is therefore also called ‘apāha and in order to distinguish her from the male ‘apāha, the ‘apāha bi-nafa‘i (‘apāha by themselves’), she is called ‘apāha bi-l-ghairi (‘become ‘apāha through another’). The daughter of a son of the legator is similarly treated, inheriting along with a son of a son; and the full sister who inherits alone with a full brother (by Šura iv. 175); finally it applies also to the half-sister on the father’s side who inherits with a half-brother on the father’s side (the grandfather makes the full sister as well as the half-sister on the mother’s side ‘apāha bi-l-ghairi). — If the full sister and the half-sister on the father’s side inherit alone with a daughter of the deceased or of a son, they do not receive their Kurānic quota (Šura iv. 175) which in this case goes to the daughter or son’s daughter (according to Šura iv. 123), being the remainder of the estate after deduction of all quotas that have to be paid; they are in this case therefore called ‘apāha ma‘á l-ghairi (‘inheriting with one another as ‘apāha’).

b. Rights of the quota-heirs (Qanām fáṣiratāt; cf. the article Farád). The regulations in this connection are in general based on literal interpretation of the Kurānic regulations. It is true that here only the daughters, parents, husband and wife, and brothers and sisters are allotted a quota but (with some limitations) the rules holding for the daughters have been extended to the daughters of the son and those for the parents to the grandparents; in addition, a distinction has been made among the sisters between the full sister, the half-sister on the father’s side and the half-sister on the mother’s side. The total number of quota-heirs has thus been raised to twelve: 1. The daughter is entitled to half the estate, two or more daughters get two-thirds, but if daughters inherit along with sons, their claim to the quota drops and sons and daughters receive the whole after deduction of the quotas to be paid; in this case the daughter’s share is half a son’s. 2. The daughter of a son is subject to the same rules as a daughter; inheriting along with the son of a son she receives half as much as he as ‘apāha bi-l-ghairi. As the son’s daughter is related to the son through him, she is excluded from participation when a son of the legator inherits. A daughter on the other hand does not exclude a son’s daughter from the succession; as however daughters and son’s daughters together have only two-thirds of the estate as their quota, a son’s daughter has only a sixth if there is one daughter, and nothing if there are two or more, unless she inherits in these cases along with a son’s son as ‘apāha bi-l-ghairi. 3. The father’s quota is always a sixth of the estate; in addition he appears as ‘apāha and receives as his quota also any residuum of the estate after deducting all quotas, unless male descendants of the legator inherit jointly with him. 4. The paternal grandfather (in default of him, the remotest ancestor) also receives one sixth of the estate as his quota but is excluded by the father; he also appears as ‘apāha (like the father) if there are no male descendants nor father of the deceased. But if in addition to him there are also brothers of the legator, he appears with them as ‘apāha (on the share which falls to the grandfather in this case and in the case where there are also quota-heirs, cf. above 3). 5. The mother by Šura iv. 12, receives one-sixth of the estate if there are children, son’s children or two or more brothers or sisters of the legator; otherwise a third (on the meaning of the Kurānic rule cf. above; in practice the father in this case as a rule receives two-thirds, i.e. according to the scheme, one sixth as quota-heir and the rest as ‘apāha; on the exceptions cf. below under 2). 6. The quota of the grandmother is always a sixth; from this the mother’s share is excluded by the mother, and the father’s mother by the father and mother; all other female ascendants of the legator rank equally with the grandmothers on both sides if there is no father or mother, so far as they are not related to the deceased by a male descendant not entitled to inherit (therefore for example the mother of the maternal grandfather inherits nothing). 7. A full sister receives half, two or more such sisters receive together two-thirds of the estate (Šura iv. 175). Along with a full brother or grandfather she becomes ‘apāha bi-l-ghairi and receives the half of the brother’s share (Šura iv. 175). Along with the daughter or son’s daughter she becomes ‘apāha ma‘á l-ghairi (cf. above 2); sons, sons’ sons and the father exclude her from succession. She has a claim to the quota only when the legator has died without leaving de-
ascendants or male ascendants. § The treatment of the half-sister on the father's side in general corresponds to that of the full sister; along with a half-brother on the father's side or the grandson, she becomes ḥābla in ḥāblah, with the daughter or son's daughter ḥābla in ḥāblah (cf. above) and sons, sons' sons, father and full brothers exclude her from the succession. Full sisters exclude her only in so far as two or more full sisters receive together two-thirds of the estate, so that nothing is left for the half-sisters; if however the half-sister inherits along with one full sister they receive together two-thirds, the full sister getting a half and the half-sister a sixth; unless she in these cases inherits along with a half-brother on the father's side as ḥābla in ḥāblah (i.e. the same rule as with daughters and sons' daughters; cf. above), 9 and 10. The rights of the half-brother on the mother's side and of the half-sister on the mother's side are enunciated on Sūra iv. 15: each of them receives a sixth, two or more together share a third among them, they are excluded from the succession by descendants and male ascendants. 11. By Sūra iv. 13 the widow receives half of the estate, but only a quarter if there is a son or son's child; it is indifferent whether these are his wife's or his own descendants. 12. The widow, by Sūra iv. 14, receives the half of what a widow would receive under the same circumstances; if the deceased leaves more than one widow, they share equally the quota allotted to the widow. During the ʿiddat (period of waiting; q.v.) after a revocable ʿaḏhāb a man and woman are still regarded as man and wife for purposes of inheritance.

4. Exceptions from the general rules. Although the quota-heirs can never all inherit together and in particular the collateral relatives are excluded from their quotas by those in the direct line, the number of qualified quota-heirs may sometimes be so large that the sum of their shares is larger than the whole estate; in such cases their shares are proportionately reduced (cf. above). Otherwise, the occurrence of a number of heirs makes no change from the main rules necessary, except in a few particular cases which have special names; these cases are in which, if the main rules were strictly carried through, the inheritances would be in a proportion to one another which would be contrary to the law; e.g. in the case of the so-called ʿaḏḥāhāta: if some one dies leaving a husband or wife and both parents, the mother would receive in this case a third, the father's share however, which is usually two-thirds (cf. above c 53) would be here reduced by the quota either of the widow i.e. a quarter or of the widower, i.e. the half and thus reduced to five-tenths or to a sixth; according to tradition, it was ʿOmar who decided in this case that father and mother should share, in the proportion of two to one, what remains after deducting the portion of the widow or widower, an arrangement which is doubtless in the spirit of the Qur'anic rule. Another case, the so-called ṣawāqis, is that in which a wife leaves her husband, her mother, two or more half-brothers on the mother's side and also one or more full brothers; as the quotas in this case make up the whole estate, nothing would be left for the full brothers as ḥābla, and they are more closely related to the legator than the half-brothers; in this case, which is also said to have been decided by ʿOmar, the law lays down that the full brothers have the same rights as the half-brothers so that all inherit in equal shares the third originally set aside for the half-brothers. On a third case of this kind cf. Ḥanāyta.

The most important points of difference among the maḏhdhib, including the early legists, are the following. It is unanimously agreed that an unbeliever cannot inherit from a Muslim nor a Muslim from an unbeliever, but ʿAbd al-Muṣayyib and Ibn ʿAbī al-Naḵḫaṭi recognize the right to inherit in the latter case. Unbelievers who belong to different religions cannot inherit from one another according to Mālik and Ibn Ḥanbal, but they can according to Abū Ḥanifa and al-Shāfiʿi. There are three views regarding ability to inherit from the muṭawwīd according to Mālik, al-Shāfiʿi and Ibn Ḥanbal, his whole estate goes to the state treasury; according to Abū ʿAbd al-Muṣayyib and al-Shāfiʿi it goes to his Muslim heirs; according to Abū Ḥanifa what he has made while a Muslim goes to his Muslim heirs, but what he made after his apostasy goes to the treasury. If a legator has been deliberately (with ʿamal) and illegally slain, his slayer, it is unanimously agreed, is excluded from inheriting. Abū Ḥanifa, al-Shāfiʿi and Ibn Ḥanbal, but not Mālik, also exclude one who has killed him without design (with ḥaṣaṣ; q. v.). One who is a slave to some degree can, according to Abū Ḥanifa, Mālik and al-Shāfiʿi, neither inherit nor bequest; according to ʿAbd b. al-Muṣayyib the maternal uncle inherits along with the daughters. The relationship of ʿaḏḥāb, which is produced by some one attaching himself to the tribe (usually on the adoption of Islam by a non-Arab; cf. above, sect. 5), and which results in the patron becoming surety for the ḍīya (q.v.) of the client, does not, according to the usual view, give any right to inherit. Abū Ḥanifa al-Naḵkhah, and Abū Ḥanifa take the opposite view but hold but it may be dissolved at any time by either side so long as the patron has not paid a ḍīya for his client. The paternal grandmother is not excluded from the succession by the father, according to Ibn Ḥanbal only; in his view, in this case she inherits a sixth either alone or shared equally, with the mother. Among female ascendants, according to Mālik, only the mothers of the two grandmothers inherit, likewise their mothers and so on, but according to Abū Ḥanifa also the mothers of all male ascendants and their mothers again, and so on; both views are quoted by al-Shāfiʿi, but the latter is best known and has established itself in the maḏhdhib. According to Mālik and al-Shāfiʿi, the female ascendants on the father's and mother's side share in equal portions the sixth allotted to the grandmother, who is nearer of the two to the legator. According to Abū Ḥanifa, however, the nearer female ascendant on the father's side excludes the remoter on the
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and the remainder as quasi-dower, according to the more usual view; according to the other, the remainder goes to the issue. There are no legal relationships between an illegitimate child and his ascendants (including his mother and her relatives), only between him and his descendants; if there are none, the estate goes to the issue. In the special case of the so-called  

chherhat (cf. above 6 d), there is no divergence from the general principles. — On the whole the 2nd law of inheritance represents an independent systematisation of the common principles found in the Koran and Tradition but diverging further from the old Arab pre-Islamic principles; whether and how far it the Sunni system already presupposes (as has been proved by the Zaidis; cf. Bergsträsser, O. J. Z., vol. xxxv, p. 124) has not yet been investigated.

6. On the law of the 2nd Zaidis of Streitmann, ibid., vol. xii, p. 52.

5. The most important peculiarity of the law of inheritance among the Kharijij Islaami is the following: the paternal grandfather inherits a quota-hair a sixth of the estate if there are descendants of the legatee; otherwise he inherits as apate, thus excluding the brothers, just as he himself is excluded by the father. The grandmother is exclusively excluded by the mother. Female descendants, like husband or wife, have no right to the residuum. Maumummin is content with rights of inheritance; freedmen, negroes, Abyssinians or Nubians cannot inherit from another if there are no other heirs (cf. above, sect. 5). If there are no heirs at all, the estate is given away in charity. The special case of the so-called  

chhekhra is settled as among the Shi'ites (cf. above 6 d). — The independence of this system on the Sunni is apparent.

9. The law of inheritance, as a branch of family law and possessing a peculiarly religious character, is a very full-rigour in the Koran, has always been one of the chapters of Muslim law, most carefully observed in practice (cf. ibid., and MABL.) At the long run it must lead inevitably to the splitting up of even the largest estates, various endeavours have been made to avoid this injustice, but which was considered unavoidable. A plan, frequently adopted, was to constitute a considerable portion of the estate religious endowments (cf. above, sect. 9). As the number of the tribe of Taimum which supplied all agents to the Kharijij movement. His father was called  

Abu Talib. His brothers  

Uwais b. Umayya had been one of the instigators of the Kharijij movement of secession at the battle of Siffin: he himself had taken part in the movement and had fought against the Caliph Á'li at the Nahawand (58 a.) after this defeat he gave up all political activity although, like his brother, he remained faithful to his old opinion; but he declared himself against armed insurrection, political assassination (karbala) and the participation of women in the Kharijij movement. These moderate views, which Mirdas retained till the end of the caliphate of Mawya and which caused the restorers to class him among the  

fashoda (quainters) of the Kharijij, made him the most remarkable when he came out openly and actively against the excesses of the governor  

Abu Yusuf, ibn Mubarak, ibn Ziyad, in his repression of the Kharijij. A woman named  

Abdulladh or  

Aluladh (the latter form, given by Ibn al-Madhir from al-Baladhuri, seems to be wrong) had been cruelly martyred by the governor. Mirdas's indignation was so aroused that he left Basra with 20 of his followers and went to al-Awja on the Fars frontier, where he held out for a long time without committing any of those acts of fanaticism usual among the Kharijij and confined himself to imposing a levy equal in value to the position.
"(laya) which was legally due to him and his companions (to A.-R.). 'Umarid-dah b. Zayd sent against Mirdas the Khilafah chief Abu-l 'Abbas b. Zura (this is the best authenticated form; al-Ya'fur in the first of the two versions which he quotes has Ibn 'Abbas al-Thumawi: Abu 'Abbas b. Zura in the head of the text of 3,000 men. They met near a village called Aikan (or Midya, according to a verse quoted by Yakhz, 4, 712-713) but the Khilafah, in spite of their great inferior number, defeated him. In the following year, a second expedition of 4,000 men under the Tanami 'Ababa b. Abda was organized by Ibn Zayd but he found the Khilafah encamped near the town of Dhabba. It was a Friday and the two parties agreed to finish their prayers before fighting. But the government troops, breaking the oath that they had sworn, fell upon the Khilafah while they were still praying and massacred them. Mirdas's head was cut off and taken to Ibn Zayd.

This episode, significant in itself, provoked a tremendous reaction throughout the realm in view of the same which the piety and moderation of Mirdas had brought him. His death was promptly avenged by 'Abda b. Ikhlaq, who was later to become one of the leaders of the 'Abdah rising, and it was in the same year of Mirdas that the Khilafah rebelled again on the death of the Caliph Yazid. The baniwa and death of Mirdas were sung by several poets, notably the famous imam b. Hisham (q.v.) whose memory is cherished to this day.

The bibliography given in the article, however, is not completely accurate. It wrongly attributes it to the Anakhs (Mic) and does not even mention Mirdas. — Cf. also Wellhausen, Die Koranredaktion (1880: G., G., Gh., philhist. KL, N. J. V. 2, 1901), p. 25-27. (G. Levi-Dezza VI).

MIRADSIDS, an Arab dynasty in Syria. The Miradsids took their name from the leader of the Banu al-Asad tribe of the Khilafah, Sulaym b. Mirdas. We know nothing of Mirdas himself. On Sulaym cf. the article and on his successor Sulaym al-Daws, the art; for the other members of the dynasty of YAM.

In the beginning of the fifth (eleventh) century the Khilafah migrated from the Irak to the region of Aleppo. In 414 (1023) their leader Sulaym took the town. The dynasty, at first so strong and ancient, became to feel that its last representative Sulaym exchanged the town in 476 (1083) in spite of his brothers' protest for a few smaller towns with the then powerful Banu Chinah in the Euphrates valley.

The importance of the Miradsids, the second last Arab ruling family of Syria, lies in the fact that they successfully defended the northern province of Aleppo, by arms and policy against the Byzantines and Turks. Lanz-Hofer gives the genealogy in his Muhammedan Dynasties (London, 1894: Sulaym al-Daws Nisal 3 (2) Shaib 4) also son of Sulaym and Resha Saddam al-Daws, Muhammad (4) also had some Shaib and Wathilib.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(M. Sobirin)
minutes each day. It is said to be one and half times the size of the earth.

Astrologers call Mars al-Naṣṣ al-ʿAlāʾi, the minor misfortune. It is the planet, which next to Saturn is credited with the most ominous omens and effects, war, revolutions, death, configuration etc. The character of those born under Mars is in keeping with this.


MIRZA or MIRZÉ, a Persian title, from Mard-nāma or Andar-nāda, and originally meaning "born of prince" (cf. Mard-nāma and Farsag-nāda, which occur in Sa'dī etc.). The title, in addition to bearing its original significance, was also given to noblemen and others of good birth, thus corresponding to the Turkish Ağā. Since the time of Nādir Shāh's conquest of India it has been further applied to educated men outside of the class of mulla or "alim." In modern times the title is placed after the name of a prince, and before the name of other persons bearing it: e.g. Hūsain Mirzā Princive Hūsain," whereas Mīrza Hūsain is practically equivalent to "Mr. Hūsain" (R. L Levy).

MIRZAPUR, a district (and town) in India in the Benares division of the Central Provinces: area 3,240 square miles. The population is nearly 1,160,000 of whom barely 7% are Muslims. The latter show a tendency to increase in proportion to the Hindus, owing to their greater vitality, containing as they do a smaller proportion of the very poor. The district is, however, a stronghold of Hindism, and Islam makes little progress by conversion. Nothing is known of the early history of the district. It was occupied by Rājdūt in the eleventh century A.D. and in the next century passed into the power of the Muslim rulers of Rājdūt. Down to the Moghul conquest, the district played an important part in the military history of India, as it contained the great stronghold of Čūnār which guarded the gateway of the east.

At Rājdūt near Allahābād is the tomb of a Muslim martyr, called Sayyid Ashāfī Ābd o, which is a place of pilgrimage. Near the gateway of the fort of Fīrāūgāh is shown the tomb of Sayyid Zein Ābd o, the saint who miraculously took the stronghold for Sher Shāh. The town of Čūnār contains two mosques at one of which are preserved garments said to have belonged to Hasān and Husain. The tomb of the Afghan saint Shāh Khāzīn, Sulaymān (1545-1606) with those of his family forms a group of buildings of architectural interest. His festival is celebrated on the 17th-21st Djamād I.

Mirzā Pūr city is the capital of the district of the same name. It has a population of 50,000 of whom six are Muslims. It is a Moghul foundation dating from late in the xviii cent.; in the xviii and early xix centuries it attained great prosperity as a trading centre, being at the junction of important roads and at the highest point on the Ganges reached by the larger ships. In 1854, the opening of the East India Railway left the town isolated; since then it has declined, as the railway now carries the trade with which it used to deal.

Among the mosques is one founded in the middle of the xixth century by a Muslim lady named Gāṅgā Bihā, who also left funds to build a sarai. The town contains the celebrated Hindū shrine of Vindhyavāsa, much visited by pilgrims and formerly held in special veneration by Thāgā.


(M. J. ALLAN)

MIRZĀ TAḴĪ KHĀN, Amir-i Nāḵīum or Amir-i Kuhīr, was born at Farāhān of humble parents, his father having been first the cook and then the steward of the Kāriḍ Khān, who ended his life as the first minister of Muhammad Shāh Kājūr (1834-1848). In 1829, as a young memial, Taḵī Khān accompanied the Persian Commander-in-Chief on the Mission which was sent to St. Petersburg after the murder at ʿĪrān of the Russian ambassador Grebiskof. On his return to Persia after this visit to Europe, he was promoted to be a māzīr or writer, and subsequently was advanced to the rank of Khān. By the time his master and patron died the young official had achieved distinction enough to be made wāris responsible for the army in ʿAḏharbājān. Still further honours came, when, during the negotiations at Erzerum for the settling of outstanding disputes between Persia and Turkey, he was sent to represent his own country in place of the Murād al-Dawla, who had fallen ill after his appointment as plenipotentiary. On the conclusion of the Treaty of Erzerum, Mirzā Taḵī returned to ʿĪrān and was then commissioned to accompany the young Wāḥid ʿAbī, Nādir-i-Fārābī, Minister to Tabrīz, to which the latter was sent as governor of ʿAḏharbājān. In 1848, Taḵī Khān's master became Shāh, and on the way back to ʿĪrān he appointed him his lieutenant to the post of Prime Minister. It is said that either modesty or prudence caused him to refuse the title of Āḏar Shāh which is bestowed on the holders of the office, but, in any event, he continued himself with the less imposing one of Amir-i Nāḵīum, which he had held in ʿAḏharbājān as Commander-in-Chief. As a mark of the royal favour he was given the sister of the Shāh in marriage, and found in her a wife who displayed the utmost devotion to him for the short remainder of his life.

In office he had the rare distinction in Persia of being amenable to bribery, and he had a regard for his country which led him to resent interference from foreign powers in its affairs. Moreover, recognizing the reactionary influence of the "māzīr," he attempted in such ways as were open to him to check their activities. He reorganised the army in spite of attempts by his enemies to rouse certain sections of the troops into revolt against him, he made efforts to improve the fiscal system of the country and he had some success in making the provincial treasuries self-supporting. Trade, both internal and external, was encouraged by him, and it was he that equipped ʿĪrān with the fine bazaars which it now has. As has been indicated, his period of office was not a peaceful one. In 1850 occurred the execution of the "Bābī" (q.v.) at Tabrīz, the revolt of the Hábitā at Yazd and Zīljān and the rebellion of the "Seven (Bābī) Martyrs" at ʿĪrān. The rising were put down with great cruelty, and in consequence an attempt was made by the Hábitā on the life of the Amir-i Nāḵīum, whom they regarded as responsible. Almost from the begin-
ning of his period of office he had aroused by his influence over the Shâh the jealousy of the latter’s mother and of possible rivals, and their secret attacks were helped by his overbearing character. In November 1851 his enemies succeeded in securing his discardment, after which the ill-judged attempt of the Russian ambassador to give the fallen minister his protection roused the anger of the Shâh who ordered him to retire in disgrace to Karshin. There, on January 9, 1852, he met his death at the hands of the sovereign’s farrakhlâgh.


MISÂHA (science of measurement, plane and solid geometry) is the name given by the Arabs to the science of comparing magnitudes and its methods. In the wider sense it covers the measurement of all things which can or need be measured, mainly lengths, areas, volumes, weights and numbers; in particular however, the ilm abînâ aims at geometry, with definitions of solids and geometrical figures as well as the laying down of rules for the calculation of lengths, areas and volumes of the different figures in elementary plane and solid geometry. The conception misâha therefore includes only a portion of what we call measurement in the wider sense, or practical or technical geometry (i.e. the measurement of things as their length, breadth and volume) in particular it excludes measurement in the narrow sense, geometry. The Arabs possessed special treatises dealing with the problems of geometry. They therefore make the same distinction between theoretical and applied measurement, which had developed among the Greeks from the time of Aristotle and is most clearly expressed by Hero in his Metrica and Dioptra.

The definitions given by the Arabs themselves of the conception misâha are very varied. Some authors give a very wide one (e.g. al-Umaw): *Measurement consists in ascertaining an unknown quantity by means of a known number, which gives the amount of the unknown quantity in units of the quantity used for measuring*; most of them mean by it the measurement of length, area and volume. Al-Shâhwan makes a clear distinction between direct measurement, *the test of coincidence* (qadsi), and indirect measurement by calculating from certain formulas.

We find treatises on geometry throughout the whole period in which the Arabs acted as the transmitters of the ancient culture with which they had become acquainted, from the earliest beginnings of their literary activity at the beginning of the ninth century A.D. to the decline of Arab mathematics about 1600. The purpose of such works was to give the future surveyor, architect or builder the necessary equipment, the theoretical foundation for his profession. Three groups of these treatises can be distinguished according to their method of treatment:

a. those which contain examples, completely worked out, illustrating the process of calculation (e.g. that of al-Baghdâdî);

b. those which only contain a series of fully worked out problems, and are a kind of exercise book (e.g. that of Abû Bakr).

On the method of exposition in these works it should be noted that we cannot of course speak of mathematical formulae in the sense of the word among the Arabs. They, especially the eastern Arabs, had no language of mathematical formulae; it was only later among the western Arabs and probably only in the field of algebra that a technical language was developed. The rules for measuring were always written out fully in words, sometimes even the figures occurring in the text.

The matter of the works on misâha, especially the larger ones, as a rule comprises introductory remarks, rules for calculating areas and volumes and the most important lengths found on them, and occasionally also practical exercises.

A. Introductory remarks. These are as a rule

1. Definition of the term misâha.

2. Explanation, description and systematic classification of the geometrical figures to be discussed.

3. Definition and list of the most common units of measurement.

B. Rules for calculation.

1. Plane surfaces (and the lengths occurring on them).

1. Quadrilaterals (square, rectangle, rhombus, trapezium, trapezoid, quadrilateral with salient angles).

2. Triangles (equilateral, isosceles, scalene, right angled, acute-angled and obtuse-angled).

3. Polygons (regular, irregular, *drumshaped figure* (nushtâib), *hollow figure* (madâ战绩ef) *stapleshaped figure* (nasudrâfaj).

*Drumshaped* and *hollow* figures are formed by the combination of two congruent trapeziums in such a way that in the former the shorter, in the latter the longer parallel sides coincide; a number of varieties are distinguished. The stapleshaped figure is formed by placing together a number of rectangles of the same length but different breadths, in which the proportions of the breadths form an arithmetical progression.

4. Circle, segments of a circle (semi-circle, segment, sector, circumference) and related areas (crescent or crescent *lîdâla*), egg-shape, bean-or lentil-shaped, or oval figures.

The crescent is formed by the subtraction of two segments of circles of different radius with a common chord, egg-shape and bean-shape by the addition of two congruous segments which in the egg-shape are less, in the bean-shape greater than the semi-circle. The area of the oval (ellipses) is given by Savasorda as $\frac{1}{4}(a + b)^{2} \pi$.

II. Solids (and the areas, especially superfi cies, and lengths that occur on them).

1. Prism (ordinary straight and oblique prism, square column, rectangular column, dice, triangular prism, obliquely cut prism, *corpus simile domini* in Abî Bakr as translated by Gerard of Cremona).

2. Cylinder.
3. Pyramids (straight and oblique pyramids, sections of pyramids).
4. Cones (straight and oblique cone, section of cone).
5. Sphere and section of a sphere, hemisphere, segment, sector and zone.
6. Regular and semi-regular bodies (the five Platonic and two Archimedean are treated at any length only in al-Kashi).
7. Other bodies (cylindrical vault, and pendants; the only difference between them is the length) hollow dome, roof-shape, round vessel (kufūr), wreaths and discs (hollow cylinder), terrace-shaped figures.

C. Practical exercises.

These are generally speaking rare in works on Misâha. We frequently find exercises in dividing fields modelled on Hero and Euclid. Savasorda has a number of exercises on fields on slopes, in hollows and on summits and on the calculation of the heights of hills; al-Hanbali has some on the measurement of inaccessible pieces of ground, the depth of wells and breadth of rivers. Of other problems some may be mentioned; for example, the calculation of the number of pieces of stone or bricks required to build a house or a roof, the ascertainment of the height of a wall.

It must not however be supposed that the subject matter as above described is fully contained in any work on Misâha. The individual works differ in subject matter according to the inclinations and abilities of their authors, just as our text-books of geometry do at the present day. We find works planned on a very comprehensive scale (by al-Hanbali and al-Kashi), alongside of very brief ones, often dealing only with portions of the subject (e.g. the anonymous Berlin MS. No. 5954 which contains only formulae for calculating plane surfaces), or even only a single problem (like the treatise by al-Shihabawi). We therefore often find exercises which are only put into works on geometry in order to show the author’s special knowledge or results of his research in a particular field.

Among remarkable examples of this kind are the insertion by Djamah al-Kashi in a work on Misâha of a treatise of regular and some semi-regular bodies (the calculation worked out by him in sexagesimal fractions to the fifth is so accurate that it only begins to differ from the correct figure in the tenth decimal place); the formulae for the area of a surface given by al-Imawī F = V \times \pi \times r^2 for trapezoids with a right angle and his improvement of Hero’s formulae for the segments of a circle; the formula for an arc given by al-Kashi; the formula \( s^2 = \frac{a}{2} \sqrt{b(a - b)} \tau \), where \( \tau \) is the diameter of the circle around a regular polygon of \( n \) sides of length \( a \) given by the same author and al-Baghâdî (the same formula is found in the works of the Hindus and attributed to the latter to the Hindus; it is however, so far as we know, not found in any Hindu mathematical work yet published); also the application of algebra in geometry by Abû Bakr and Ibn al-Rammâh. The former uses the algebraical solution for problems of areas in order to show the application of equations of the first and second degree to the six cases distinguished by al-Khwarizmi; the latter uses combinatorial analysis to investigate the different possibilities of stating the problem.

The methods of calculating the volume are the same as we find among the Greeks and Egyptians. When it is not a question of a matter that has been taken over from them, in which case the formulae are directly adopted, the obtaining of results is purely inductive and empirical. Al-Karkhî for example for the volume of a sphere gives, in addition to the formula \( \frac{4}{3} \pi r^3 \), the method of obtaining which he says nothing, also \( \frac{2}{3} \frac{\pi r^3}{3} \), which he gets by comparing the weight of a cube of wax with the weight of a sphere, which is made out of the cube of wax and whose diameter is equal to the edge of the cube. Al-Baghâdî deals with a method of ascertaining the volume from the weight and specific gravity. Al-Kashi knows the method of immersion of Archimedes mentioned by Hero. The direct method of measuring the length of areas by laying a thread along them is still recommended as the most reliable by al-Karkhî and Bahâ’ al-Dîn. It is evident that such methods must lead to approximative results and formulae be approximations, the typical feature of practical geometry, continue to be used by the Arabs in measuring long after they obviously knew of their inaccuracy. Ibn Mannûthi criticizes the usual formulae for the area of a triangle \( \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} (a + b + c) \frac{c}{2} \) and \( \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} (a + b + c) \frac{c}{2} \); al-Baghâdî the formula for a quadrilateral \( \frac{1}{2} (a + c + d) \frac{1}{2} (b + d) \), which comes from the Egyptians.

The reasons for the long survival of such rules are partly that the formulae gave in practice quite useful results and partly that the practical men who were concerned with measurement in the exercise of their trade wanted easier to calculate rather than great mathematical accuracy and took no note of slight errors, especially if they thereby avoided calculations with roots. For similar reasons and in keeping with the traditional practice, almost all works of Misâha give no scientific geometrical proofs of the accuracy of the formulae they quote. Only the book of the Jew Al-‘Azmah, who may be reckoned among the western Arabs, gives logically worked-out proofs in any number; we occasionally find references to early mathematicians (especially Euclid) in Ibn al-Bannâ and Ibn al-Hanbali. Probably inspection was quite sufficient (Abd al-‘Aziz for example draws plane figures in a network of squares each of one unit and counts the squares and their parts within the area) or a simple demonstration in some form or a calculation to prove the correctness of the procedure, which was frequently illustrated also by examples completely worked out.

A further peculiarity of Arabic authors was to give formulae which agree completely in substance in different algebraical forms. The Berlin MS. No. 5954 gives for example for the calculation of the sections of the hypotenuse in the right-angled triangle the following formulae: \( s = \sqrt{a^2 + (c^2 - b^2)} \), \( s = \sqrt{a^2 + (b^2 + c^2)} \), \( s = \sqrt{a^2 + (c^2 + b^2)} \), \( s = \sqrt{a^2 + (b^2 + c^2)} \), \( s = \sqrt{a^2 + (c^2 + b^2)} \). This differentiation was probably only intended to give as many forms as possible of the relations between the known and unknown magnitudes so as to afford the practical man a choice of different correct formulae of which one might suit the special case better than another.

The sources of Arab geometry are to be sought among the Greeks and Hindus. The form and
substance of the rules are almost entirely Greek, especially in the older authors. Hero’s “elaborations” in particular, which in turn go back to Egypt, seem to have been the model for Arab works on geometry. To Egypt may be traced the preceding of a metrological section (found in many books on **misāḥa**), the problems on dividing fields, the formula for the treasiphi, the special name for the upper side of a quadrilateral (rūda’t al-wari‘a). Hindus are the values for \( \sqrt{4 \cdot \text{cd}} \), for the quadrilateral inscribed in a circle, the terms are, perpendicular from the summit of an arc and chord, the marking of lengths in Hindu figures, the use of algebra to solve geometrical problems (equations, method of double error, combinatorial analysis). The chief teachers were however the Greeks, whose achievements the Arabs generally speaking never surpassed, the requirements of practical measurement gave them to new problems and practical geometry remained down to quite modern times in commentary, the majority of the problems of which had been finally settled long ago by the Greeks.

The services of the Arabs to geometry lie less in the extension of the field by ascertaining new, hitherto unknown facts, although in the **misāḥa** works we do find a series of new and novel rules, than in their enrichment of this science by new methods of calculation and teaching and especially in their preserving the inheritance of the ancients and handing it down to the western world. Although Hero’s geometry first became known in northwestern Europe through Roman surveys, it was mainly the Arab sources which gave new life to this subject which had become stagnant in its old form. Arabic original works were made accessible to the west in Latin translations. Leonardo of Pisa in his *Pratica geometrica*, which remained a standard work for three centuries, depended closely on Sasanid works, who most probably owed a great deal to ‘Abū Bakr as there are striking similarities between the **liber embūdarum** and the **liber mensuratoriun**; down to late in the xvth century we continually come across writings on practical geometry, which in form and content show to what originals they go back.

**Bibliography**: a. Manuscripts: Arabic authors translated into Latin:
2. **Libror. Sasanidi abūsahnī** (author presumably Zaid Abū ‘Uthmān; \( \dagger 1052 \)); Suter, **Arabica**, 3, 6, fol. 776–777.
3. **Libror. abūsahnī** (author presumably Qasim Abū ‘Uthmān; \( \dagger 1057 \)); Suter, **Arabica**, 34, fol. 777–777.


**Gods 1728**, 1 and 1729.


**MIS‘AR b. MUHĀRILH** ABū DULAF AL-KHĀBAJĪ AL-YARARE, in Arabic poet who lived at the court of the Shāhīd Nūr II b. h. in Baghdad (301–331 = 913–944) and in 331–344 was sent by him to conduct a Chinese embassy back to their land and on his return visited India. He later gained the favour of the Khwarazmian vizier al-Salḥī al-Talākī (so al-Samī‘ al-Ashrāf, fol. 1679) Isābīl b. ‘Abd al-Dīn (c. 385–995). To him he devoted a long poem on the thieves’ dialect of the Banū Sāhin, which his patron so much admired that he himself wrote a commentary upon it (extracts in Thābitī, *Natūna*, ill. 176–194). The dates of his birth and death are nowhere exactly given. To his long journeys he alludes in verse quoted by Thābitī, *op. cit.,* ill. 174. The only authentic information has been preserved by the author of the *Filōr*: on p. 346 sqq., where al-‘ānār al- javāhirī is of course not to be translated as Elbegi (note 151) *there was a ramant current* but (she was a great traveller). He is given the account of a temple in Mukān said to be of gold, and on p. 350, sqq., a description of the capital of China. A comparison of these with the corresponding account of his journey attributed to Abū Dulaf in *Yāqūt, Muḥqim*, ill. 457 sqq., shows that the latter is a late falsification (cf. Marquart in the *Forschungen* for Sasan, p. 252). This is confirmed by an internal criticism of his statements. The first country to be entered after leaving Muslim territory is, he
MISSBAH. [See SURBA.]

MISKIN, poor, a loanword which has shown remarkable vitality. It is a name for a class between those enjoying full citizenship and slaves; according to L. W. King; freemen who do not belong to the ruling race. In the meaning "poor" it has passed into Aramaic (messha{n}), Hebrew (mishken), North Arabic (miskin or, against analogy, mizkin), into Southern Arabic and Ethiopic (miskih). It has passed from Arabic into Italian as messchina and into French as messin. In Arabic, on the analogy of the form miska, it is usually of common gender but the feminine form miskzin is also found with plural miskinot. Muhammad often uses the word in the Koran, the list of persons whom it was a duty for believers to support. As in Sura ix. 60 it is found alongside of "fakara", commentators and jurists have felt that some distinction must be made between the two. They usually explain mishkin as needy, but not absolutely without possessions like the fakara, and refer to Sura xviii. 78, where there is a reference to poor people who possess a ship among them. How uncertain this is, is however evident from the fact that the Miskins in opposition to the Sindhis take the other view and regard the miskhin as the most needy; cf also the various definitions collected by Lane. Zohr Masaheb in Sura xc. 16 does not help us. From the meaning "poor" gradually developed that of "base, miserable", also in the moral sense, e.g. Ibn Sa'd, iii. 6 ult., where Abu Sufyan's Hind is called al-Miskin. On the other hand, the word can mean "humble" as in the words attributed to Muhammad: *Let me live as a mishtin and die as a mishtin and include me among the mishteena*.


(Fe. Buhl)

MISR, a proper name denoting the eponym of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the Copts. In accordance with the Biblical genealogy (Genesis x. 14 sq.), Misr is called the son of Ham, the son of Nuh. The Biblical origin of the pedigree appears clearly in the form Misra'm or Misram (cf. Hebrew Mista'am) which is found side by side with Misr. In some genealogies between Ham and Misr there is inserted Balsar, a name of which the origin is unknown to me. There exists, however, also quite a different genealogy, according to which Misyam is a son of Tabpid, one of the early heroes (djahhira), who ruled Egypt after the Deluge.


i, a proper name denoting Egypt as a country. It may be supposed that Misr was already the name of Egypt among the Arabs in pre-Islamic times as it is used in the Koran (e.g. sura x. 87; xii. 21, 100; xiii. 30), whereas the Biblical form Misiuin does not occur. It has remained the Arabic name of Egypt (q.v.) up to the present day.

ii, a proper name denoting the capital of Egypt, i.e. at present and since its foundation Cairo, which with its full name is called Misr al-Khires (cf. Cairo). Misr occurs, however, already as the name of the city or the cities situated south-west of later Cairo; when the name had been transferred to this city, the name Misr al-Khurram (Old Misr) clung to the old settlement, situated between the mosque of 'Amr and the right bank of the Nile (cf. Bâitar, Babylion, p. 16).

In the period between the Arab conquest and the foundation of Cairo the name Misr is regularly applied to the settlement just mentioned (Ibn Khurdadhbih, B.G.A., vi. 247, 251; Ibn Rostom, B.G.A., vi. 115 sq.; al-Hakim, Fawâ'id al-Khams, bab 13; Abu Daud, al-Mas'udi, bab 74). We are, however, not able to decide whether this is the part (Babylon, Fustat or the Tulin citadel) is especially denoted by it. It may be supposed that the combination of Fustat Misr "Fustat in Egypt" (cf. e.g. Mas'udi, Tabari, B.G.A., viii. 335; Makrizi, Kha'if, i. 285) opposes Fustat Misr to and Misr forms the link between the application of the name Misr to the country and to the capital. After the conquest of Egypt by the Musulins there were two settlements only on the right bank of the Nile where it divides, viz. Babylon and Fustat; the papyri never mention Misr as the name of either of these settlements. Yet in the latter part of the seventh century a.d. the application of the name Misr to one or to the other or to both
must have begun, as is attested by John of Nikiu who at least once uses Misis as the name of a city, where he speaks of "the gates of Misis" (p. 25). To one passage Misis appears as the name of the country (p. 201, 209).

The statement that the name Misis as the name of a town arose after the Muslim conquest only, is in opposition to Butler, who maintains that at least since the age of Diocletian three existed on the right bank of the Nile, to the South of the later Babylon, a city called Misis (cf. Butler, Babylon of Egypt, p. 151). I do not believe that the tradition concerning the Arab conquest of Egypt do not give the slightest credit to the existence of a city bearing the name of Misis, Butler’s reference to the Synaxarion proves nothing, as this work was composed many centuries after the conquest. — The Coptic name of Babylon was Kerma.


d. a common noun, denoting a town: it is used especially in connection with the capitals of the provinces in the times of the conquers, e.g. in the tradition: "The amurār will be accused at your hands" (Abû Dawîl, Dhatîl Íjâbah, b. 28). Baser and Kûs are among the "two misīs" (ibid, Bâbûlî, Dbâhî, b. 13; Yâ'ârî, Mušqâ‘ân, iv. 454). Further, any town may be called misīs (e.g. Bâhûlî, Dhadî, b. 2; Ašârâ‘, b. 15; Yâ‘azî, b. 25; Tîrmîdî, Nîshâb, b. 32 etc.). This misīs is a genuine Semitic word, cf. Līlîa di‘-Arab, s. v. and the Jewish-Aramitic misîr, mesâ‘anâ, which have the same meaning, viz. that of a house or a field as an exactly delineated and demarcated territory (cf. J. Levy, Chaldeisches Wörterbuch, b. n. Neubrandenburgsches Wörterbuch).

It may be supposed that the geographical name Misis (cf. above, a.–c.) comes from the same root and has originally a meaning akin to that of the common noun.

(A. J. Wernstedt)

MISRA‘, a term in Arabic, properly applied to a hemistich or half line (but) the first hemistich is called ma‘nâ and the second sa‘ir. Each has two, three, or four feet, sa‘ir or ma‘nâ.

The last foot of the first hemistich is called ‘asra‘ and that of the second sa‘ir. As a general rule, and in the first verse of a poem, the foot should have the same measure (ma‘nâ) and rhyme (sa‘ir) as the last foot.

(Mer. Men Chresten)

MISRIS, [See Mısır,] arab. Al-Maṣṣīṣ, a town in Cilicia on the Euphrates.

In antiquity it was called Misis a name, which (like that of Mešk in the Lycician passes) is derived from the cult of the legendary seer Mopsos (cf. Meyer, Griech. d. Altert., ii. 2, § 483). In ancient times, the town was chiefly famous for its bishop Theodorus (d. 423), the teacher of Nestorius and friend of the suffering bishop and inventor of the Armenian alphabet.


The emperor Heraclius is said to have removed the inhabitants and laid waste the district between Antioc and Mopsuestia on the advance of the Arabs, in order to create a desert zone between them (al-Tabarî, i. 2366; al-Baladhîrî, ed. de Goeje, p. 163), between the Arab-Balkh (ed. of Misis). Under the same name all the towns taken by the Arabs from the Maṣṣīṣ to the fourth Armenia (Malatya) are said to have been left unfortified and uninhabited as a result of the invades of the Mardaites (Theoph., ed. de Boor, i. 363, 37). According to Ibn al-Khaṭṭâb al-Azdî (in al-Baladhîrî, p. 164), the Arabs conquered al-Maṣṣīṣ and Tarzûs under Abu ‘Ubaydah, according to others under Mâsarî b. Mârîk, who was sent by Abu and who thereafter advanced as far as Samtî (in 16 = 637; Castani, Annali dell’ Islam, iii. 805, 311). Al-Maṣṣīṣ was no longer in the possession of the Byzantine forces up to Ajikulayî in 31 (651–652) on his return from Darawiyata (Daghistan in Farsîya) (al-Baladhîrî, p. 164 sq.). After the Syrian rebellion against ‘Abd al-Malik, the Vizier Constantine IV Pogonatis in 65 (684–685) advanced against the town and regained it (al-Ya‘rusî, ed. Hontama, ii. 321). Yâ‘ârî b. al-Khakâm in 77 marched against Mardî al-Shām between Malatya and Al-Maṣṣīṣ (al-Ya‘rusî, ii. 337). It was only in 81 (703) that ‘Abd al-Malik’s son ‘Abd al-Azîz retook the town and had the citadel rebuilt on its old foundations (Baladharî, p. 165; Ya‘rusî, ii. 466; Wâdî al-Tubzî, ii. 521).
1127: Ibn al-Abbás, ed. W. C. K. Dietrich, pp. 272, 273; On the site of a heathen temple he built a large mosque which far surpassed the mosque of Umar in size. When 'Abd Allah b. His was governor of Maghrib (i.e. 211 = 826), it was enlarged by al-Mamūn. Al-Mansūr increased the garrison to 1,000 men and settled in the town the inhabitants of al-Khuṣās, Persians, Slavs and Christians. Arabs (Nabataeans), whom Marsûn had transplanted thither (see above), and gave them allotments of land. It is probably that to the same event the story refers that allāh b. ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbd al-Malik died in 1017 (612/613). His successor was 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama, who died in 1021 (615). al-Mansūr died in 1036 (631).

On 22 February 975 E. A. D. attacked the town of al-Mansūr led by itself by al-Mansūr. The garrison was increased to 1,000 men and settled in the town the inhabitants of al-Khuṣās, Persians, Slavs and Christians. Arabs (Nabataeans), whom Marsûn had transplanted thither (see above), and gave them allotments of land. It is probably that to the same event the story refers that allāh b. ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbd al-Malik died in 1017 (612/613). His successor was 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama, who died in 1021 (615). al-Mansūr died in 1036 (631).

On 22 February 975 E. A. D. attacked the town of al-Mansūr led by itself by al-Mansūr. The garrison was increased to 1,000 men and settled in the town the inhabitants of al-Khuṣās, Persians, Slavs and Christians. Arabs (Nabataeans), whom Marsûn had transplanted thither (see above), and gave them allotments of land. It is probably that to the same event the story refers that allāh b. ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAbd al-Malik died in 1017 (612/613). His successor was 'Abd al-Malik b. Maslama, who died in 1021 (615). al-Mansūr died in 1036 (631).
Bonn., p. 503; Vasilev, Vostatyia, 10 Anfri, in Poleh izv. Bel. fac. imp. S.-Pth. Univ., east 1900, p. 88 sq., note 4), al-Mu'tasim bin 'Abd in the following year attacked Ammâria; his general Bâghr commanded a part of the army which included the Ma'ṣûqa contingents (Mich. Syr., iii. 96). In 1245 (859) the town was again visited by an earthquake which destroyed many places in Syria, Mesopotamia and Cilicia (al-Yâhûdi, iii. 1449). The Caliph al-Mu'tasim after restoring order in the Thughlîr al-Shamîya (251 = 900) returned from al-Maṣûqa via Fândûk al-Mansûr, the Eski-kanda and Baghna to Antâkiya, Hulab and al-Raâka (al-Tâbarî, iii. 3158-2200; al-Fândûk, a place near the Antâkiya near al-Mas'ûqa; Yahkîl, iii. 918; Saâf al-Dîn, Marâqîjî, ii. 365).

When in 1292 (904-905) the Byzantines and the people of Marînî and Tarusât held the town for the Ayyubids they were defeated and driven out by the突如其来 bin 'Abî Shâhîb al-Abî an-Nu'âwarî (al-Tâbarî, iii. 3231; ibn-al-Athâr, vii. 37); Saâf al-Dîn, Zaf. inn. 8, fac. imp. S.-Pth. Univ., east 1902, p. 154, note 2).

In 1344 (955-956) the Hamdânid Saif al-Dawla was visited by horsemen from the frontier towns of Tarusât, Adana and al-Maṣûqa and with them an envoy from the Greek king who concluded a truce with him (al-Nu'âwarî and al-Ma'mûn al-Dîn in Freytag, E.D.M.G., i., p. 192; ibn al-Mu'âsir, Alâî, Dodâl al-Dawla al-Maṣûqa, transl. Vasilev, op. cit., Pruschen, p. 56). Defeated by Leo Phocas in 349 (960) in the pass of Kûbûl, Saif al-Dawla spent the night in al-Hâfûz and returned to Halâb via al-Ma'lûka (al-Abî an-Nu'âwarî in Freytag, op. cit., p. 196; Yahkîl bin Sa'd, Tu'rîkî, ed. Kračkovskij-Vasilev, in Patrolog. Orient., iii. 1924, p. 275).

In 352 the emperor Nicephorus took Adana, the inhabitants of which fled to al-Maṣûqa, and annexed the Domestica John Trifimice (Vânis bi. al-Shiminâshî, al-Dumâtî) against this town. They fought for several days, but had to withdraw as his supplies were running short, and after laying waste the country round burned the adjoining al-Ma'lûka (Ma'ṣûqa) at the mouth of the Djâlân (Yahkîl bin Sa'd, op. cit., p. 703 sq.). The emperor himself came again in DJi T-1/2ka 333 (Nov. 964) to the marches (al-Thughlîr) and besieged al-Maṣûqa for over 50 days but had again to abandon the siege owing to shortage of supplies and returned to winter in Karmania. Finally the town was stormed by John Tâmasçâ (Arm. Knîf Žann) on Thursday the 11th Râjah 354 (July 13, 965). The inhabitants set it on fire and fled to Kafarsâ:b. After a desperate struggle on the bridge between the two towns the Greeks took this suburb also and carried off all the inhabitants and captives (Yahkîl bin Sa'd, op. cit., p. 793; ibn al-Mu'âsir, vi. 408-411; Abu 'l-Fâdil, Arm. Mard., ed. Reliable, ii. 482 sq.; Mich. Syr., iii. 128; Elias Nisâbîn, ed. Brooks, p. 218; transl. p. 106; Georg. Cedren., ed. Bonn, ii. 362; Leen Diakon, ed. Bonn, p. 39 sq.; Matti'êl Uluhayce, ed. Dâlâerîraz in Rev. hist. evr., Doum. Arm., i. 3; Stepân Aoûtik of Taron, Armen. Gëzic, transl. H. Gulbert and A. Burchardt, Leipzig 1917, p. 134, 3). They were, to the number of 200,000 or 300,000, it is said, led past the gates of Tarusât, which at that time was besieged by the emperor's brother Leo, to terrify the people of the town (ibn Shîhâ, Râmûl al-Maṣûqa, in Freytag, Z.D.M.G., Elias Nisâbîn, op. cit.). The gates of Tarusât and of al-Maṣûqa were gilded and taken as trophies to Constantiâpolis, where one set was put in the citadel and the others on the wall of the Golden Gate (Georg. Cedren., op. cit., 163).

The town remained for over a century in the hands of the Byzantines till 1292 when the Emperor Bâghr formed an alliance with the Sultan of the Andronicus, the people of Marînî and Tarusât held the town for the Ayyubids (Mich. Syr., iii. 96) at least Kupolopatidis (Mich. Attal., Bonn ed., p. 301) and whose ephemeral kingdom comprised the land from Tarusât to Malayyûn, Adana and Antâkiya, held al-Maṣûqa (Mich. Syr., loc. cit.); Laurent, Byzance et Antioche sous la couronne Phocaïque, Rev. des H. Arm., i., 1839, p. 1-72). Shortly before the arrival of the Crusaders, the Seljûk Turks took Tarusât, al-Maṣûqa, Ayîn Zarba and the other towns of Cilicia (Mich. Syr., iii. 179). About the end of Syr. 1097 the Franks under Tancred, who had been invited thither from Lombardy by Othon III, took the town which was stormed after a day's siege; the inhabitants were slain and rich booty fell into the hands of the victor (Albert. Avenius, in 15 sq., in Migne, Patrof. Lat., cxxv, col. 1456 sq.; Ralph. Cadom., Gesa Tanceredi, c. 39 sq.). William of Tyre describes al-Maṣûqa on this occasion (ii. 31, in Migne, Patrof. Lat., ccl. 2065; En passant Mammatur una de nobilitaturn sibiurum provinciarum civitatum, muro at multorum insulae igni, rei aequo et globa atque atque etiam prorsus commodis?; Count Baldwin, who had quarrelled with Tancred, followed him along with the admiral Winius of Boulogne and encamped in a wood near the Djâlân bridge; Winius left him there and went with his fleet to al-Ladikîya, while the two rivals had a desperate fight, after which Baldwin withdrew to the east (Albert. Avenius, iii. 15. 59, in Migne, op. cit., col. 1445, 472). Tancred followed him, after he had imposed on the city *plus patrosum quam principis legem* (Ralf. Cadom., c. 44). The Byzantine general Tâkitios, who had joined the Crusaders to take over their conquests in name of the emperor, left them in the lurch in the beginning of Feb. 1098 at the siege of Antâkiya and ceased to demand the town of Tarusât (Turan), Mammatur Adedàs (Adana) (Raymond of Aguilers, in Bargus, Gesa del per Francos, Hanover 1611, p. 146 sq.). Bohemond only took possession of the towns of Tarusât, Ain Zarba and al-Maṣûqa in August (Will. of Tyre, ii. 2). After the town had again fallen to the Greeks for a period, Tancred again took it in 1101 (Rud. Cad., c. 145), but had to hand it over to Tarusât, Adana and Ain Zarba to Bohemond on condition that they return to captivity in 1103 (Will. of Tyre, ii. 2, in Migne, op. cit., col. 379). In the following year however, Longinius, Tarusât, Adana and Mâzûrwa were regained for Byzantium by the campaign of the general Monastrus (Anna Comna, Avestâs, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 149, 3; who apparently did not recognize the identity of Mâzûrwa with Mâsoo
in which she mentions several times). In the treaty between Bohemund and the emperor Alexios of Sept. 1108 the town was promised to the former (Anna Comnena, op. cit., p. 218). Tancred having taken it in the preceding year with 10,000 men from the Byzantine general, the Armenian Aspicles (Anna Comnena, ii. 147). At this time, of the citizens of the town, one (probably Kafarbayla) was in ruins (Anna Comnena, op. cit.). Baldwin of Burg and Joscelin of Courtenay, who allied themselves against Tancred with Kogh Vassil of Kasitum, were supported by the latter with a detachment of 800 men and a body of Febekeks, who were stationed in al-Maṣṣaṣ as Greek mercenaries (Mattheos Urbyacott, transl. Dulaunay, p. 266 sq. = Rec. Hist. Creut., Doc. Arm., i. 865). The great earthquake of 1114 destroyed the town like many others in Cicilia and Syria (Smbat, in Docum. Arm., i. 614).

Under the Frankish patriarchate of Antioch, Mopsuestia-Mamistra was separated from the ecclesiastical province of Antioch and made an autocephalic metropolis (Michael Syrus, ill. 191); reconstructions of the Nativitas Antiochana of the Crusading period, MS. of Chalki (now in Leningrad, Russ. Publ. Libr., MS. Gr. 716, cf. Benekevich, Byz. Neupgreich. Jahrb., v., 1927, p. 33), note, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, in Εαυτοκρ. Φιλολ. Εκδ. Ιλισσου, Constantinople, 1884, p. 65; "Μοσούστιασ ανακαινισάς τον Σωτήρα Ανακαινισάς σαι ενα γανθανόντας; cf. cod. Paris. suppl. gr. 1226, ed. Nau, R. O. C., 1909, p. 215; Vatic. gr. 1455, ed. Gelzer, Byz. Zeitschr., i, p. 250, No. 165 and pass.). The Bula Merguersian stretched (according to a work on the boundaries of the Antiophene diocese, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, op. cit., p. 67) from Seleucia in Syria and Adana to the Mount Ararat (now Özrev or Kafarba), and to the Mount Ararat of the latter, which is unnotably identical with "Adana, the Saliyan; for the name Djakhian (probably first found in the Umayyad court proc. of Abd al-Rahman II) 710 A.D.; Naldcke, Z.D.M.G., since 1890, p. 699 sq.) and Saliyan for Pyramus and Smyrna are no doubt derived from the Biblical rivers Gihon and Pishon (Gen. ii. 11) (wrongly explained from the Persians Djakhin in Com. d'Asie Min. Nancy 1904, p. 278). In 1133/34 the Cephalis town of Levon I, son of Constantin, took the town (Arm. Mais, Mises, Mamestia, or Mamasstia of the Greeks (Cinnamos, L. 77, ill. 145; Smutek Zarapet, Chronic, in Docum. Arm., i. 615). The brother of the emperor: John II Comnenus went to him and Levon gave his sons his daughters as slaves to the town of al-Maṣṣaṣ and Adana as dowries. But when they quarreled he took back from the Greeks all he had given them, and Isaac had to flee with his sons to Sultan Basil (Michel Syrus, ii. 250). Levon, falling through treachery into the hands of Raymond of Poitiers, had to settle (1136–1137) al-Maṣṣaṣ, Adana and Sarvankar (now Sawaran Ka‘fet), but regained his liberty in a couple of months; he very soon took back these towns (Docum. Arm., i. 152 sq. = Chron. d'Alexandre de Dulaunay, transl. Dulaunay, p. 157; Smbat, op. cit., p. 610). The emperor John in 1137 (1144 Sel.) had his revenge on Levon. He invades Cicilia, took Taras, Adana and al-Maṣṣaṣ, and Levon himself with his wife and children and took them to Constantinople, where Levon subsequently died (Der al-Allık, xi. 25; Michael Syrus, iii. 245; Gregor. presb. Fort. d. Chron. der Meth. Kopt., transl. Dulaunay, p. 225; cf. Docum. arm., i. p. xxii, 1 and 153; Will. of Tyr., xiv. 24; Rührich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Terumal, p. 241). John installed Coloman (Colomannus), son of Boris and grandson of king Coloman of Hungary, as governor of Cicilia (Will. of Tyr., xiv. 24, xvi. 9, in Migne, Patr. Lat., cxxi, col. 603, 756; "Das Cileaen" mentioned in Regim et principum christiatis, No. 24, in Bongars, Gesch. der Deut. Frur., i. 182, l. 46 and passim). When the emperors, John died as Murad al-Din on April 8, 1143 (Will. of Tyr., xvi. 24 sq.); Rührich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Terumal, p. 228, & his successor Manuel Comnenus had his body brought by boat from Mopsuestia down the Pyramus to the sea and taken to the capital (Niketas Choniats, Mau. Komn., i, Bonn ed., p. 67).

Thoros II, the son of Levon who had escaped home from his confinement in Constantinople, was again able to cast off the Byzantine yoke. When in 1151 he took Mais and Til (Tall Hamid) from the Byzantines (Smbat, in Docum. Arm., i. 619) and made their general Thomas prisoner, the emperor Manuel in the following year sent against him with 12,000 cavalry Andronicus Comnenus, whom he had appointed governor of Taras and al-Maṣṣaṣ (Gregor. presb., in Docum. Arm., i. 167 = Mani. Edess., transl. Dulaunay, p. 334; Smbat, Chron. in Docum. Arm., i. 619). Andronicus, who did not recognize Thoros as ruler of Asia Minor, advanced against al-Maṣṣaṣ but was surprised by the Armenians and put to an ignominious flight with his 12,000 men. Thus not only the town, which was very well supplied with provisions and military material of all kinds, fell into his hands, but also a great part of Cicilia (Gregor. presb., transl. Dulaunay, p. 334–336 = Doc. Arm., i. 167 sq.; Smbat, op. cit.). The emperor, himself too weak to avenge the insult, twice induced by gifts the Sultan Kılı-capital Anak (Gregor. wrongly: Mustih) of Kinnie to attack Thoros. The Sultan, who on the first occasion (1153 A.D.) was content with the defeat of the Armenian and the return of the lands taken from the Greeks, again attacked al-Maṣṣaṣ, Ain Zathu and Tall Hamid (Arm. Tilu Hamann) in 1156 but could do nothing against them and had finally to retire after heavy losses (Gregor., op. cit., p. 338 = Doc. Arm., i. 171).

The emperor Manuel himself passed through Cicilia in 1159 with a large army to the assistance of the Crusaders. Thoros had already retired to Vakka (in the desolate mountains (Arm. Rhymnia, Chron. in Doc. Arm., i. 505) when the emperor entered al-Maṣṣaṣ at the beginning of November, but he did no injury to any one there (Gregor., transl. Dulaunay, p. 335 sq. = Doc. Arm., i. 187).

The Frankish kings led by Baldwin came to pay homage to him in the town or on the adjoining pratrum palmarum (as Will. of Tyr., iii. 27 translates Murad al-Din) where his court was held in camp for 7 months (Gregor., transl. Dulaunay, p. 358; Rührich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Terumal, p. 298). Thoros was also able with great skill to become reconciled with him, and on acknowledging Byzantine sovereignty and ceding several towns in Cicilia, was recognised as "Sebastos" of Mais, Anazarbos and Vakka (Doc. Arm., i. 186; Smbat, ibid., p. 622). His brother Mihel, who attempted his life while out hunting between al-Maṣṣaṣ and
Adana, was banished by Thores and given by Nur al-Din the town of Kitzura (Kyrkhis; Sumbat, loc. cit.). After the death of Thores of Masi (1168-1169; Sumbat, p. 623), Mieh (Arab. Matthe b. Liwun al-Amsa) succeeded him and at first ruled only over the district of the passes (Bitrid al-Durub). In 1171 he surprised Count Stephen of Hiles at Mamluka and plundered him (Will, of Tyre, xx. 25-27). In 1168 (1172-1173), supported by troops of his ally Nur al-Din, he took from the Greeks Adana, al-Maṣṣaṣa and Tarus (Ibn al-Abbās, xi. 255. Kannal al-Din, transl. in Köhler, s. v. Besorge, in Gesch. d. Krummhafe, i, Berlin, 1874, p. 336).

When Mieh's successor Rupin III fell through treachery into the hands of Bohemund of Antioch, his brother Levon II obtained his release in 1184 by ceding the Maṣṣaṣa, Adana and Tall Handam (Tils) and paying 3,000 dinars; immediately afterwards, Rupin retook these strongholds from the Franks (Miche, S. i, 397. Dec. arm. i, 394).

Hērum, the nephew of the Catholicos Grigor IV and son of Kontvans of Tarun, who came to Cilicia in 1189 with his brother Shahinsah, received from Levon II (1185-1215) his niece Alice, daughter of Rupin III, in marriage and the town of Masi, but died in the same year (Sumbat, in Dec. arm., i, 629; Marquet, Šahānmand, 1295. Thirstraubn, Vienna, 1930, p. 481 sq.); the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa in 1186 (1190) was about to go to Syria via Tarun and al-Maṣṣaṣa when he met his tragic end in the Kalkastra (alleged) [7] letter of the Armenian Catholicos in Ibn Shaddad, in Rec. Hist. Orient. des Comtes, ii. 162; a portion of the story therupon went to Antioch via Tarun, al-Maṣṣaṣa and Thagia (Hhen al-Muḥākāh b. al-Shirshāb b. al-ʿAwīṣa Katb, Portolla, the Syrian passes, with which Köhler, Gesch. d. Krs. Jorns, p. 530, 41 identifies it).

Willbrand of Oldenburg who visited the East in the train of Duke Leopold VII of Austria and Steiermark and the Teutonic Grandmaster Hult von Sulis, came in the beginning of 1212 to Mamisere which he describes as follows: (Willi, w. 18, ed. Laurent, Forgeronati, Lez., sig. 1864, p. 175). "Hic est civitas prud. opus ortum, quæ communiter diu sim, nata amico, loci autem, loco ad orbem turritam, sed antiquitate servavit, pannos in gradu somnis omitit habitab, ubi capitnos, qui terrae suscitant, imperatori domino." In the vicinity lay "puellam etiam cum ejus ortum di patriamos horti Panthe. . . . ad muri temporis posterioritatem Graci." In hac civitate (Mamisiere) habitant sepulchra hos Fabrici. Ipse vero ducit a Gamaelii. (cf. Tomaseck, S. B. Ak. Wien, 1801, app. viii., p. 71) magnam dictam levon II granted the republics of Genoa and Venice the privilege of having their own trading centres in al-Maṣṣaṣa, which could be reached by ship from the sea before the mouth of the Dijana became silted up (Allajin, Slavono en l'Arménie-Cilicie, p. 287).

The attempt of Raymond Rupin of Antioch to seize the throne of Armenia after Levon's death in 1219 failed; he was, it is true, able to take Tarun and attack al-Maṣṣaṣa but he was taken prisoner by Constantine of Barerbod and died in prison in 1222 (Dec. arm., i, 514; Köhler, Gesch. d. Krs. Jorns, p. 741 sq.).

For twenty years the Rupins ruled almost undisturbed in the town. Their glory reached its height under the splendid-loving Hērum I (1219-1270). Here were held the annual festivals of the Church at which numerous princes and nobles used to gather down to the last and difficult years of the king. Here was held the brilliant ceremony at which his 30-year-old son Levon was dubbed knight. Fears that the king brought the seat of government further from the destruction of Sin (Allahan, Siennan, p. 287 sq.).


Three years later (1269), the district of al-Maṣṣaṣa was visited by an earthquake (al-Siyūṣī, in Dec. arm., ii, 1906, p. 772, note 1). Baibars (Arm. Patrāb gīn = Arab. Baibars al-Dīn) himself, in 673 (spring of 1279) took the field against Levon III, son of Hērum, bid waste the whole of Cilicia as far as Korhīn and stormed al-Maṣṣaṣa and Sin, the former on 26th March. The inhabitants were massacred, almost all the houses burned and the great bridge destroyed (Arnou, Kandarayn Maysay, s. v. Kantvah al-Maṣṣaṣa; cf. al-Maķriti, ii, 125 sq. with note 154; Muḥammad b. Ali Tūfādhi, Geč. d. Mamīkā, Kūtesjan, ed. Bičak, in Patr. Orient., cix. 389; Barhebzena, Chron. syr., ed. Bedja, p. 531; Sumbat, Chronik, in Dec. arm., i, 653; Köhler, Gesch. d. Krs. Jornsal, p. 697; van Berchem, C. T. A., i, 688, note 2), When in 697 (1297-1298) an army under the eniers Salf al-Din Kīpēš, the Nīṣma Ṭūṣ, the Mākaṣar al-Dīn Labkī, the Nīṣma al-Shāh, the Mākaṣar al-Dīn Bilnūr al-Maṣṣaṣ, and Salf al-Dīn al-Aṣāl invaded the lands of Sin, al-Maṣṣaṣa is not specially mentioned among the unimportant places taken like Tall Handam, Hamūn (Hamanj), Kāfurr Nadīm, al-Maṣṣaṣa, Sirfandik, Hadjar Shaghūū, al-Nakār and Zandīna (al-Maķriti, ii, 60-65; Muḥammad, op. cit., p. 603; al-Nuwarī, in Bičak, in Patr. Orient., cix. 382). In 1262, the Egyptians crossed the Dijana by a bridge of boats, got behind the Armenians who had retired to Masi and inflicted a severe defeat upon them; among those who fell are mentioned the barons Hērum of Dijana, his brother Constantine, Wahramlot, Oghin, the son of the marshal, along with 23 knights and many men (Sumbat's Continuator, in Dec. arm., i, 698). This authority also mentions a raid by an Egyptian force against al-Maṣṣaṣa (Mamestia), Adana, al-Małik (Mīn) and Tarus in 1334-1335 (Dec. arm., i, 671; Tomaseck, S. B. Ak. Wien, 1801, app. viii., p. 68). The last Egyptian invasion took place in 833 (1333-1374). Among the towns destroyed were Sin, Adana, al-Maṣṣaṣa and 'Ain Zarqa, and Levon IV had to surrender in 1375 after a siege of nine months in Qtabān (Dec. arm., i, 686, note 3). The town thus passed nominally into the Fāṭīḥī al-Djūkchāniya of the Mamlık empire; it had, it is true, by now sunk into insignificance and it is not mentioned, for example, among the towns taken by Shahsawar in 1467 (Allahan, Siennan, p. 287 sq.).

Armenian sources mention 8 archbishops of the town from 1175 to 1370 (1175-1306 David, 1215 Johnnun, 1266 Simon, 1306 Constantine 1310 John, 1332 Stephen, 1342 Basil, 1362-1370 unnamed; cf. Allahan, op. cit., p. 290). Michael Syunni knew only four of about 100 admitted (Cārēv, transl.
Chabot, iii. 23 sq., 451, No. 27) and the Frankish writers from 1124 onwards Bartholomaeus, before 1234 Ruparius and in the years from 1162–1238 three or four more unnamed bishops (Albert Aquensis, in. 16; Will. of Tyre, xiv. 107; Lu Quiro, Olivii Christianorum, iii. 1198–1200; Burckhardt, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jemuid., p. 42, 202). On account of the many Egyptian invasions the Latin archbishopric was removed to Aya by Pope John XXII in 1320 (Allianin, Sitizian., p. 290).

After the fall of the kingdom of Little Armenia, the power of the Rasađan-Oghlu and Džm "Kadik-Oghlu gradually spread in Cilicia. Selim I on his campaign against Egypt in 922 (1516) and on his return also preferred to keep to the east of the stream (Taschenier, Anatol. Wegenbuch, iii. 32). Mişeti has been Ottoman since that year, in which the decisive battle was fought on Mardij al-Dīsilī Ā. In Kasafriya a khān was built for caravans passing through in 1522 and restored in 1850 by Hasan Pasha. The Džalān bridge became useless in 1730 when the central arch collapsed; in 1766 this was repaired, but it was blown up in 1782 on the retreat of the Turkish troops from the fighting at Balīnī in order to hold up the advance of Irbīm Pascha’s pursuing army. As late as the middle of the sixteenth century it could only be crossed by an improvised wooden footbridge.

In modern times Mişeti is mentioned only by eastern pilgrims and travellers as a place only spent a short time there. Thus it was visited in 1452 by the Burgundian Bertrand de la Brocquière ("Missae-sur-Johan"), in the sixteenth century by P. Reen, 1682 the Meccan pilgrim Mehmud Edīb, 1695 the Armenian Patriarch of Antiochia Makarios, 1794 Paul Lucas, 1736 (Chevalier Oger, 1760 on the Dan Carsten Niebuhr, 1813 Macd. Kinnier, 1834 Ancher Eloy, 1836 Colonel Chesney, 1840 Almawrth, 1853 Victor Langlois, whose report was somewhat exaggerated by Cari Ritter (Irkendane, six. 66–115). The "Margen Gallo" visited by Ludwig von Rauter on July 8, 1568, is not (as in Röhrich-Meissner, Deutsche Pilgerreisen nach der L. Land., 1880, p. 434, note 43) al-Masqīt, but Merkez Kaleesi or Mandus Jekandar (Kan. Syn. pers.). Somewhat fuller descriptions of the modern Mişeti and its ancient and medieval ruins were given in the sixteenth century by Langlois, Allianin and at the beginning of the 18th by Cousin (see Bibliography).

The stretch of the Baghārd railway from Derāk south of the Taurus via Adjana and Mişeti to Manārīs at the foot of the Amanus was opened on April 27, 1912. As a station on the railway (the station is actually 1½ miles N.W. of the place) the town gained a certain strategic importance in the Cilician campaign of the French in 1919–1920 (1919) settlement of about 1,200–1,500 Armenians; May 27–28, 1920: full-scale Turkish blockade of the garrison there, about a company strong; end of July: withdrawal of the troops to Adana; cf. E. Bremond, La Cilicie en 1919–

According to the Arab geographers, al-Masqīt lay on the Džalān (Divānā, sometimes confused by the Byzantine authors with the Sāqā, Arab. Salān, with which it seems to have had at one time a common mouth: George Ceder, ii. 362; Anna Comn., ii. 147), 1–2 days’ journey from Bāyās and one from "Ain Zarba and Adham, 12 mils from the Mediterranean coast. The sea could be seen from the Friday mosque in the town; in front of the town lay a beautiful fertile plain (the ancient "Ašān al-Baḥr"). Al-Masqīt lying on the right bank of the Džalān was connected with Kafarbijya by an ancient stone bridge built by Constantine and restored by Justinian. The country round was rich in gardens and vineyards, watered by the Džalān. According to Yauppet, the town originally had a wall with 3 gates and Kafarbijya, same with 4 gates. A speciality of the town were the valuable fur-clacks exported all over the world. Ten miles from al-Masqīt, which is somewhat inaccurately placed by Ibn Khurdābdīhī, Yauppet and others on the Džalān al-Lukkām (Ammou), was the plain of Mardij al-Dīsilī Ā, which is often mentioned in the records of the fighting between the Maṇīlak and Little Armenia (probably the "agor Margueri" on which Cicero encamped: ad fam., iii. 8). In it, N.E. of the town on the road to Siu, was the fort of al-Amūdān (al-Maṣrīzī, ed. Quatremètre, ii. 61; cf. Kāf al Amūdān in Abu l-Fida’s, Ann. Musul., vii. 93; Reske, v. 18; located by Allianin, Sitizian., p. 275 sq., 100 far east in "Hēmēlīn, Kalkašī"). A field of Mardij al-Dīsilī Ā is also mentioned near al-Masqīt (Yauppet, iv. 487; Saif al-Dīn, Maṣrīzī, iii. 74). Tall Hūmā, a strong fortress of the Thughūr al-Masqīt, corresponds to the modern Hānīyeh, now called Biṭbiṣ (Z. D. M. G., xi. 191, 200; Yauppet, ii. 868; Saif al-Dīn, Maṣrīzī, iii. 211; Ibn al-Sinān, Bahrī, ed. p. 339). There also was Tall Hūmā (Yauppet, ii. 867; Maṣrīzī, i. 211; Ibn al-Shībūnī, ibid.; exact site unknown). Al-Ain at the foot of the Džalān al-Lukkām, over which went the Darb al-Ain pass, was also one of the forts of al-Masqīt (Yauppet, iv. 756; Maṣrīzī, ii. 293) on the frontier against Halab bay Biṭbiṣ (q. v.; cf. van Berchem, Voyage en Syrie, p. 237 sq.), Hīnī Siinān (al-Balādhūrī, p. 165; Yauppet, ii. 155) is probably also to be sought near al-Masqīt. A pass called Thūnīyat al-Ukhāb, "to be distinguished from that of the same name near Damascus, was in the region of al-Masqīt (Yauppet, ii. 938; Maṣrīzī, i. 230). Even the remote fortress of Sunalī (on its site cf. Tomasek, Zeitschrift f. J. Kirj., p. 144) was sometimes reckoned in the Syrian Thughūr and located near al-Masqīt and al-Tarsī (Balādhūrī, p. 170; Dijammīl, Yauppet, iii. 416; Maṣrīzī, ii. 167; Byzantion vu sàqās, Sév., 131; al-Saṣīfī on the present Sūqūgūd (Z. D. M. G., ii. 150; Reiske on Abu l-Fīdī, Annal., ii. 649, note 76 according to Ǧudīlī Khulīsa: "Ḫiṣār Saṣīfī, that is Sūgūd") is also reckoned by Yauppet (iii. 401) to the marches of al-Masqīt. Not far from the town was a Syrian monastery, Gawtakht (mentioned about 1200 a.D. by Barhebr. Chron. cel. ed. Abbebroe-Lamy, i. 624; in Allianin, Sitizian., p. 295), Qobūth, probably identical with Jōchakht. The neighbouring fortress of Adham (now Taunkal) and Camubetofen ("in interl. Millīzī, i.e. of Mīm, Arabic: al-Mallūn") were accorded to Wilfrard of Oldenburg (op. cit.) about 1212 in the possession of the Teutonic Order (Allianin).

The Venetians had a church in al-Masqīt (Geste des Chrétiens, in Doc. arm., ii. 831). Armenian authors mention there the churches of St. Sarkis, Thomas and Stephan (Allianin, p. 288 sq.).

The present Miṣeti (frequently also written Misītā,
as appears e.g. from the tradition in which it is related that Muhammad one day received a visitor and

Concerning Zaid b. Khalid it is related that he used to sit in the mosque keeping the tooth-pick behind his ear, "just as a writer keeps her pen" (Abu Daud, Ta kuła, báb 25; al-Tirmidhi, Ta kuła, báb 18). When Muhammad was in his last hours, there entered a man with a piece of wood fit for a si saw; 'Ali b. abu Talib and Chis it, so as to make it smooth (Bukhari, Muqaddimah, báb 83).

In general Hadith emphasises the value attached to oral tradition of Muhammad to the si saw. When he entered his house, his first movement was towards it. Muslim, Ta kuła, (báb 13; Abu Daud, Ta kuła, báb 27). His servant 'Abd Allâh b. Mas'ud received the so-called "as-si saw" [the tooth-pick] which he used to take care of Muhammad's si saw (Bukhari, Fadhl Al-As-si saw, báb 20). When Muhammad awoke at night, he cleaned his mouth by means of the si saw before he washed himself and performed night-prayer (Bukhari, Adhûn, báb 8; Muslim, báb 73; Tirmidhi, Adhûn, báb 35; Muslim, Ta kuła, báb 16). In one tradition it is said, as a matter of fact, that the miswak use of the si saw before every si saw was introduced by Muhammad as a compensation for the abolition of the si saw used before every si saw (Abu Daud, Ta kuła, báb 25). In another tradition (Nasâ'i, Rawa' i, báb 66) the use of the si saw is called obligatory before the Friday-service.

The appreciation of the miswak which appears from all these traditions culminates in the fact that it belongs to the customs of the "natural religion" (Jâfri: Abu Daud, Ta kuła, báb 29) or to the ordinances of the Apostle (Tirmidhi, Nisâb, báb 1).

Nevertheless Fîlûk does not declare the use of the miswak obligatory in any case. There is general agreement on this point. According to some traditions, however, the Khazârîs did declare the use of the miswak obligatory before the si saw, but these traditions are not generally accepted. According to Fîlûk the use of the miswak is recommended at all times, especially in 5 cases: in connection with the si saw, under all circumstances, in connection with the ka'bah; with the recitation of the Kurân; after sleep; and as often as the mouth has lost its freshness, e.g. after long silence.

According to the school of Shafi'i the use of the miswak is blamable (makhrûb) between noon and sunset at the time of fasting; for the smelly breath (khashîf) of the faster's breath is beloved by Allâh (cf. Nasâ'i, Ta kuła, báb 6).

It is recommended to use a miswak of orchard-wood of medium hardness, neither too dry nor too moist; to cleanse the palate as well as all sides of the teeth, beginning from the right side of the mouth, moving the miswak upwards and downwards in order not to hurt the alveoles.


MITHKAL (mûsaf), the weight of a thing, this is the meaning of the word in the Kurân; a particular weight for weighing precious metals, jewels, drugs, etc., probably the oldest unit in the Arab-Troy system. The mithkâl corresponds to the Roman solidus of the Constantinian system which the Arabs adopted. In Syria, 'Abd al-Malik took it over for his unit of gold when he reformed the currency in 195 (696). Its dinar weighed a mithkâl of 65.5 grains (425 grammes), hence mithkâl is used as a synonym for dinar. The silver dirham weighed 7/9 of a mithkâl and the mithkâl contains 24 dirhams. Slight variations in weight are found in the different parts of the Mud. world.

Bibliography: See the bibliographies to the articles Dinar and Dirham. (J. A.)

MIWADH. (See Hamid)

MI ZA F. MI ZAF. (K. m. el. Mezaf). Among the various classes of musical instruments dealt with by Arabic, Persian and Turkish writers on music is one which embraces those with "open strings" (mu'tar mushuk) such as the lyre or cithara, harp, psaltery and dulcimer. Among them are instruments grouped as mezaf. Nowadays, this term refers to all stringed and wind instruments (M. F. O. B., v. 28) but in the Middle Ages it had a more restricted meaning and stood for "instruments of open strings". Al-Jawhârî (d. ca. 1003) and al-Saghârî (d. 1241) define them as "musical instruments which you beat upon as in the 'ud (lute), tanbur (pandore) and the like", meaning by this that mezaf were played with the fingers or plectrum in the same way as the 'ud and tanbur were. The Târîkh al-Arâb includes the tambourine among the mezaf, but it is an erroneous deduction from the saying of 'Umar, marra 'l-mu'tar da'mah (he paid by the sounding of the stuff), which has misled many writers (cf. Sachs, Reallexikon der Musikinstrumente, s. v.). The author of Muqaddimah (17th cent.) states that the mezâf was "a stringed instrument belonging to the people of al-'Irâq" (p. 277), whilst al-Mutâarrî (13th cent.) says that the mezâf was "made by the people of al-Yaman", a provenance which ibn Khuradhdhî (d. 912) also gives the instrument (al-Ma'sûl, vii. 93). A more precise classification is allowed by al-Shalâbi, who includes the mezâf among barbitons (horâfîb) and lyres (târîqân), which agrees with our oldest authority, ibn-Lathîb b. al-Muqaffar (11th cent.), who says that mezâf and mezâf were terms given to "an instrument of many strings", whilst al-Fârîbî (d. 950) specifically denominates mezâf as instruments of "open strings" (Kosegarten, Lit. cata. p. 77, 110). In the Târîkh al-Asbâbî the mezâf is nowhere placed in the hands of the minstrels, probably because it was of insatiable merit. One performer on the instrument, Muhammad b. al-Harîrî b. Hâshîrî (14th cent.), was asked sarcastically if it were a rat-trap (Aqâ'ûb, 4, 153).

Tradition says that mezâf were "invented" by 'Abd b. Dhalîl, the daughter of Lammak, who was of the
seventh generation from Adam (al-Mas'ūdī, viii. 89). Since there was a hadith condemning miṣrūf as signs of the end of the world (al-Tirmidhī, ii. 33) it is quite likely that the fiṣṭūṭh thought it consistent with policy to make ṭilāl or ḍašāl ("error, destruction") the originator of these muṣālik or "forbidden pleasures". On the other hand, we read that "David the Prophet had a muṣāfa on which he used to play when he recited the psalms" ('Ilāh al-Fārikh, iii. 189), which was an echo of the Jewish tradition that he was an devotee of the king (I. Samuel, xvi. 16, 23). The name may be a survival from the days of belief in sympathetic magic. The voice of the dijinn was termed the 'ṣaf, and the spiritual world could be conjured by the sounds of the muṣāfa. In Islamic times musicians claimed that their music was inspired by the dijinn. The Greek σίθων was an instrument of the same class as the muṣāfa. It was of Lydian origin and the name is suspiciously like the Semitic one.

Lyre and cithara. Although we see these instruments in the hands of the ancient Semites on the monuments they do not appear to have had acceptance among the musicians of Islamic times except with the fallāšūn, unless the seven-stringed muṣāla (= maṣ北方) of Khurāsān was such an instrument (al-Mas'ūdī, viili. 99). Both words are of Greek origin and they appear in Arabic as fiṣṭūr and fiṣṭūra generally. In Palestine and Egypt to-day, a primitive type of lyre is known under the name of ṭabūra barbariya or ṭabūra (barsura or barsura). Villoteau (Descr. de l'Égypthe, tète mon. ii, 1910, and Saint-Saëns (Lavignac, Encyc. de la musique, iv. 1858) have shown that much of the ancient Greek method of lyre-playing still obtains in the modern Egyptian fiṣṭūra-playing. It is worthy of notice that the Arabic word for striking the fiṣṭūra strings is ṣarraba, and this is practically identical with the Greek σαρραβά.

Harp. Whilst we possess an actual example of a Sumerian harp with the sound-chest below the strings, this type does not seem to have had any vogue with the Arabs or Persians in artistic music, and is only found among the peasantry. In Palestine and Upper Egypt to-day it is called the muṣūr or ṣawā and ṣawā. The harp with the sound-chest above the strings has been a far more important instrument and is to be found in the Assyrian sculptures (cf. the Assy. word āmēk and the Ethiopian ṣaŋa). That extremely chatty Turkish writer Ewylyī' Celebi says that this instrument, which the Persians called the long, was "invented" by Pythagoras. Soore Solomon (Traveili, i. 227), and even al-Shālāsī says that it was of Byzantine (Kūn) origin (fol. 15). Yet Ibn Khurdāchib and al-Dżamā'ī, who were those most particular to the Persians and, indeed, the type may be found on the Šēstānian sculptures (Ker Porter, Travels, ii. 175). The Arabs call it the dāk and ṣawā and ṣawā (cf. al-Luqawī, ed. Sachau, p. 97). It may be that the dāk and ṣawā were different types of harp, the Persian and Arabic. There were certainly two types, the straight sound-chest and the crooked. In the Muṣūrāt al-Kumān ṭabūr (tabūr) and fiṣṭūr (fiṣṭūr) are likened to the dāk and ṣawā respectively. Among the Arabs the ṭabūr is mentioned as early as al-Asā'ī Mālūf (d. ca. 629). Al-Fārikh devotes a section in his Xīsād al-Mas'ūdi to muṣāfa, ḍiṣṭūra and fiṣṭūra, and other instruments "in which there is made to every note, according to its state, a solitary string", and he shows them strung with both fifteen (diatonic) and twenty-five (chromatic) strings (Rosengarten, e. c.). Both Ibn Sinā (d. 1037) and Ibn Badr (d. 1048) deal with the ṭabūr, whilst in the Xīnāt al-Tahāf (xiv. century) and the works of Ibn Ḥašibi (d. 1455) the ṭabūr is fully described. The oblique sound-chest was 150 cm. long, and the handle (ṭārīk) 81 cm. long. The strings are fixed to the horizontal bar below twenty-four or twenty-five strings of goat's hair were stretched, being fastened to metal pegs (ṣawā). Some players even used thirty-five strings so as to embrace the scale of the Systematics. The face of the sound-chest was of skin, but the remainder of the framework was of vine or paul tree wood. The handle was placed under the left arm (cf. the pictures in MSS.) and the fingers of both hands were used in performance, plucking (ṣawāt) being fastened to the finger tips. Nowadays the ṭabūr has fallen into complete desuetude among the Arabs and Turks. Even among the Persians it has become rare, and in its modern form it was little different from the occidental instrument (Advielle, La musique chez les Persans, p. 13), whilst the instrument shown by Kampeuer (xvi. century) under this name was a zither. In 1636 Ewylyī' Celebi found only twelve players of the ṭabūr in Constantinople because, he said, it was a difficult instrument to play (Travels, i. 234). At this time the Turkish ṭabūr had forty strings and a very large instrument of the xvi. (not xvii.) century is given by Engel (Mus. instr. in the South Kensington Museum, p. 59).

Although the "humped back" of the ṭabūr or ḍiṣṭūr became a favourite theme for poets, and it was certainly the best known type, yet an instrument with a "straight back" was also to be found. A more pronounced "hump" existed in a type mentioned by Ibn Ḥašibi and called, probably on account of this feature, the ṣawā. It was strong similarly to the ṭabūr, but had a wooden instead of a skin face on the sound-chest, and its tuning pegs were also of wood.

A Byzantine harp called the salāb (erroneously written salāb, salāyak [cf. the art. šalak], which clashes with the opinion of the present writer, Red.), or salāb in most dictionaries and MSS.) was also known to the Arabs. It was actually a survival of the old Greek σαλαβία, and is described in the Muṣūrāt al-Kumān as an instrument of the Čečs (Yunahābiyān) and Byzantines (Kum) resembling the ḍiṣṭūr (p. 136). According to Ibn Khurdāchib it had twenty-four strings (al-Mas'ūdī, viii. 91; cf. Farmer, Byzantine musical instruments in the ninth century, p. 4 n.). Ibn Sinā classes it with the ṭabūr among the instruments with "open strings" stretched across a space.

Psaltery. In describing those instruments with "open strings" stretched across a surface, both Ibn Sinā and Ibn Badr mention a particular type named the anāf. Whilst the name suggests a "long necked" instrument, the details given of strings of different lengths but identically situated bridges (ḥamālāt), compel one to recognize in it a trapezoidal psaltery, one species of which was known later as the Xīnāt. The word anāf also stood for "phoenix", and we know that the Greeks of old had an instrument called the φοίνιξ. This
but not by Kaeuper, whilst Advielle in the sixth century gives both a design and a description. In Turkey, whilst the word is registered in the sixteenth century by Meninski, it is not mentioned by Hafiz of Khaflan nor described by Elyi's Celebi, in their lists of Turkish musical instruments. In the next century however, it is recognised by Todesini, and to-day the sanfur is one of the most esteemed instruments in the country, where it may be seen in two forms: the sanfur turki and the sanfur francese. The former, exclusively used by the Jews, has 160 strings, grouped in fives, giving thirty-two notes, a two octave chromatic scale. The latter, which is confined to the Turks, was introduced from the West about the middle of the last century by a certain Hilmi Bey. It is mounted with 105 strings, also grouped in fives, which are placed on the sound-chest in the Occidental way.


al-MIZAN, the balance, is the common instrument from musama "to weigh", which means to weigh in the ordinary sense and also to test the level of, like the Latin library. Here we shall discuss:

1. The various instruments used for weighing in the ordinary sense; brief notes are added on the ascertainment of specific gravities. 2. Levelling instruments.

I. BALANCES.

The steelyard (al-harîfûn, q.v.) has already been dealt with; the general principles of the balance are also discussed in that article. — The usual balance with two arms of equal length had the same shape among the Muslims as in ancient times and at all periods in the west; this we know from extant specimens and illustrations in accurate works, notably in al-Khâzînî, in a manuscript of al-Karwâni with reference to the constellation Libra (fig. 1), in a manuscript of Hâfîzî, in the Ḳasîm, al-Abbâr of Abu 'l-Fâlî (fig. 2). In the beautiful manuscript from which Ch. Schefher published the Sîyâr Namaî of Naṣīr-î Khosraw,
on p. 88 in the illustration of the Mašdûl al-Akṣâr there is a balance labelled tareeq (Sifer Nameh, Relation du voyage de Nazari Khoran, ed. Ch.)

Fig. 1.

Schefer, Publications de l'ecole des langues orientales occidentes, ii. ser., i., Paris 1881. The common balance is called misân but in the Kur'an we also find ṣiṣār, which, according to al-Thâlibi, is a loanword. Other names are ṣiḥâm, which does not only mean the beam and tongue of the balance and is contrasted by the ḥanân al-ṣufâ to the ṣiḥâm (steelyard), also parts from the Persian harātân, thus mīrzâd for scales for gold and ṣâkhâ for beam and tongue. Minâjam means the tongs and also the beam. According to J. Ruska, ṣâkhâ: seems to be used for scales (for gold). On the expressions connected with harâzân, see that article. Al-Maṣfurî mentions Harrân as a place where balances were made, in his work Aṣâṣl al-Tâhîštî fi Mu'rad al-Alââm, p. 141; in this town many very skilful mechanics were engaged in making astronomical instruments. The accuracy of the balances made in Harrân was proverbial. The Arabs devoted special attention to the construction of balances used to identify metals and jewels from their specific gravity, to distinguish false from genuine and pure and to ascertain the composition of alloys of two metals by the use of the principle of Archimedes. They called these balances misân al-mâši, "water" (hydrostatic) balances. Of makers of these, al-Khârîjî (c. 1100, q. v.) mentions: Sanad (Sinâd): b. All (c. 350 = 864), Muṣlammad b. Zakariyâ al-Mazî († 320 = 932—933), Ibn al-Aṭâāl († 359 = 966—970), Vâlamî b. Yûsuf (perhaps al-Kasâ', d. c. 370 = 980—981), Ibn Sinâ († 423 = 1037); Aḥmad al-Fâdi al-Maṣâfî (the "measurer", also mentioned by al-Birûnî without the "Maṣâfî"), Aḥmad Haṣîm al-Khârîjî (as the celebrated mathematician is never called Aḥmad Haṣîm, it is doubtful whether he is the individual mentioned by al-Khârîjî). The scales were made by these men are still fairly simple as only two, or at most three, scales were used in them. A contemporary of al-Khârîjî, namely Aḥmad Ḥâkim al-Muṣâfar Ibn Isâl al-Aṣfârî (d. before 515 = 1121) added two more scales; these and other improvements made the scales much more convenient to use. Of him al-Balâhâzî says (E. Wiedemann, Beitr, xx., Einige Biographien nach al-Balâhâzî, in S.B.P.M.S. Erl., xliii., 1910, p. 17): "He constructed the balance of Archimedes with which one ascertains forgeries. The treasurer of the great sultân feared that his frauds would thus be discovered. He therefore broke the balance and destroyed its parts. Al-Muṣâfar then took up al-Muṣâfar's work and made the balance a
most accurate means of measuring; he called it the universal balance, *al-mizân al-jâmi*'. But, no doubt in memory of his predecessor, he called his book *Kitâb Mizân al-Dira.*

**Fig. 4:**

For special purposes such as the examination of gold and silver and their alloys, many contrivances were made with balances and the movable scales and running weights on the beams, for example in the physical (tâbî‘) balance of Muḥammad b. Zakariyya al-Rāzī (fig. 3); it goes back to Greek models, e. g. of Archimedes (fig. 4; cf. al-Khâsînī, *op. cit.*).

**Fig. 5:**

Here we shall describe somewhat more fully the "balance of wisdom"1) of al-Khâsînī.

Al-Khâsînî gives the beam ạ of the balance (fig. 5) a thickness of six cm. and a length of

---

1) H. Bauer (Zur Geschichte des spez. Gewichts im Altertum und Mittelalter, Dissertation, Erlangen 1913) has reconstructed the "balance of wisdom", as nearly as possible following the data of the original. Reproductions are in Erlangen and the German Museum in Munich. The illustration is taken from a photograph. In the original right and left are reversed.
two m. In the centre it is strengthened by an additional piece C, obviously intended to avoid any bending at this point. A cross-piece D (tirida) is let in here. Corresponding to it is a similar cross-piece F on the lower part of the tongue, in which moves the tongue D, itself about 50 cm. long. The upper cross-piece E is hung by rings to a rod which is fastened somewhere. Pegs or small holes are placed at exactly opposite places of the cross-pieces B and F to which threads are tied or drawn through. The friction at an axis is thus avoided, which, in view of the great weight of the beam, is quite considerable. The knob visible below the beam under its centre is used to secure the tongue to the beam, or to take it out in order to adjust it evenly. The tongue has for this purpose a peg at the foot which goes through a hole in the beam. Al-Khâzîn also observes that one could also take shorter beams but then all the other dimensions must be proportionately smaller.

The beam is divided not on one side only, as in the illustration, but on both. The scales are hung on very delicate rings of steel (qaṣāna ṭalâwi) on the points which fit into little niches on the upper surface of the beam. Five scales are used for ascertaining specific gravities, i.e. in investigating alloys and examining precious stones. Of these the scale H (fig. 53) is called the cone-shaped or al-kâsin, the judge, as it is used to distinguish false from true. It goes into the water and in order to meet with less resistance in sinking is cone-shaped and pointed below. The scale J is called the winged (muqânnaḥ, fig. 5b and 5c, side and top view). It has indented sides so that it can be brought very close to the adjoining scales. It is also called the movable (muqâshūb). There is also a movable running weight K (al-rumûmā al-mawṣūra) which serves, if necessary, to adjust the weight of the lighter beam; it is therefore also called the rumûmā of the adjustment (al-dîdî). The other scales are used to hold weights. Al-Khâzîn attained an extraordinary degree of accuracy with his balance. This was the result of the length of the beam, the peculiar method of suspension, the fact that the centre of gravity and axis of oscillation were very close to each other, and of the obviously very accurate construction of the whole.

Al-Khâzîn himself says that when the instrument was weighing 1,000 mithkâl, it could show a difference of 1 ḥabâr = 1/20 mithkâl, i.e. about 25 centigrammes in 4.5 kilograms. We thus have accuracy to 1/60 of a mithkâl. Al-Khâzîn used his scales for the most varied purposes. Firstly, for ordinary weighing, then for all purposes connected with the taking of specific gravities, distinguishing of genuine (passa) and false metals, examining the composition of alchemy, changing of dirhams to dinars and countless other business transactions. In all these processes the beams are moved about until equilibrium is obtained and the desired magnitudes in many cases can at once be read on the dividers on the beam.

**False Balances.** That as early as the time of Muhammad balances showing false weights were used for fraudulent purposes is shown by various passages in the Kitāb (Sūra xxvi. 182; vii. 13; xvii. 37). We read for example: "Weigh with the just (or upright, mustaṭfa) balance". Al-Djawart (middle of the 12th century; cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, iv. Über Wagen bei den Arabern, in S.B.P.M.S. Erg., vol. xxxvii., 1905, p. 358) describes two such arrangements. In the one the beam of the balance consisted of a hollow reed closed at the ends in which there was some quicksilver; by a slight inclination of the beam this could be made to flow as desired to the side of the weights or of the articles and thus make the one or other appear heavier. A balance like this was used in Cairo in the time of E. W. Lane by a dishonest police inspector (mustaṭfa). In the second pair of scales the tongue was of iron and the merchant had a ring with a magnetic stone. By bringing the ring close to it the balance went down to right or left.

The balance or the principles applying to it were used for many purposes besides weighing. Contrivances turning on an axis in which sometimes one and sometimes the other side becomes lighter or heavier, especially by the admission or release of water, were used to produce automatic movements; they are often called mustaw (cf. e.g. the writings of the Banū Mūsa and of al-Djasar; e.g. in F. Hanauer, Über das Kitâb al-Hiyal, Das Werk über die innere Anordnung der Banû Mûṣa, Abh. 2. Göttinger, der Naturwissenschaften und Medizin, Heft II, 1922; E. Wiedemann and F. Hanauer, Über die Uhr im Bereich der islamischen Kultur, in Nova Acta der Kais. Leop.-Carol. Akademie, vol. c., 1915, N. 5 and other passages). In the hour balance used to measure time, a container filled with sand or water is hung at one end of a lever poised with arms equal and has a hole in the bottom. The equilibrium disturbed by the gradual loss of sand or water is compensated for by weights which move along the other arm. From their weight and position one can calculate the time that has passed (E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xxxvii.: Über die Stundenwage, in S.B.P.M.S. Erg., 1914, p. 27; a full description is given by Prof. F. Hanauer in E. von Besser's manual, Die Geschichte der Zeitmessung und der Uhren, 1918).

Most artists who describe as *scales* al-misār, i.e. rulers, al-burēnes, the compasses, al-fāriyāt, set square and level, as they serve to show lapses from the straight etc. — Mihkâl, al-kâsin, ḥabâl are *scales* with which one measures whether things are correct or over measure in business transactions (Rasûl ibn Khâdîm al-Safâ', Bombay 1305, 1/2, 128).

For a few further meanings of al-misâr see Dory, Supplément, s. v. wanâna. — In mathematics the balance is used to elucidate certain mathematical processes. The steelyard is used to illustrate the inverse relation: the weights are in inverse proportion to the length of the arms (cf. e.g. Th. Ibel, Die Wogen im Altertum und Mittelalter, in Programm Forchheim, 1905—1906, p. 93; Rasûl'
with the water displaced weighed \( P' \), so that from \( P'' - P' \) we get the volume of water corresponding to the mass \( P'' \), which is then calculated by al-Biruni for a weight of 100 mithqāls. As almost always,

\[
\text{Fig. 6:}
\]

in ascertaining the specific gravity the Arabs rely on the ancients, particularly on the work of Menelaus on the artifices by which one ascertains the quantity of each of a number of mixed bodies" (Fi Hilāl allatt al-arafa al-hā Mīhrū bītal wāhid min Tāba'īn mithqālītātā (from the Escorial MSS) and Ma'rifat Īsānīyūn al-Afdālin al-mithqālītā (according to Ibn al-Kifā), p. 527: Professor Dr. Wurmschat is giving an edition of this work in *Philologus*). In al-Biruni's work, Archimedes himself is mentioned and a certain Manṣūrīya (according to Noldeke, probably Mansūrī). The Muslims however did not slavishly take over the statements of the ancients. Al-Biruni, for example, emphases that one can ascertain the composition of an alloy of two components but not of three, as Menelaus says. Among the Muslims it was certainly al-Biruni who did most in this field, in his work "on the relations which exist between metals and jewels in volume" (Moṣāfā 'I'Nāb allatt bān al-Fi'dītāt wa l-Jawshārī l-l-Hufayri, cf. also al-Biruni, Chronology, text, p. xxxiv), which still remains, and also in another work, which only survives in fragments quoted by al-Khazini. Al-Biruni was induced to compose the first named by the difficulties encountered in the quantities of metals necessary to copy a given article. As predecessors be mentioned Saʿūd b. 'All, Yalām b. Yūnus, Ahmad al-Faqīl al-Būghrī. So far as we know he was followed and his results were used by: Abū Ḥaṣan Omar al-Khawāżī (see above), al-Sīrāfī (see above), al-Khāzīn (see above), Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Omar al-Rāzī († 1210, Suter, No. 328), and Abu ʿIṣāf Allāh, ʿAbū ʿAbd Allāh al-Maḥsūṣ, a work ascribed to Plato which was composed in the time of Bāyazīd by a slave of a son of Šāhān, a Turkish work by al-Qāṣfī, and a Persian by Muḥammad b. Marqān (on these works, as on mineralogical literature in general, see E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xxx.: Zur Mineralogie des Islam, in S.P.M.S. Est., xlii., 1912, p. 203). We must also mention the study by Abū Ḥaṣan al-Nāṣrī who is not to be confused with the commentator on Euclid, and the work on the measurement of bodies which are compounded of

1) It is to be noted that expressions like specific gravity and specific volume, which refer to the unit of weight and the unit of volume are not found among the Arabs. Al-Bīrūnī, for example, gives the amount of water displaced by 100 mithqāls of various substances corresponding to their volume and the weights of the metals which have the same volume as 100 mithqāls of gold and in the case of other substances the same volume as 100 mithqāls of blue yāḥūr.

The statements on specific gravities refer to: A. Metals: gold, mercury, bronze (ḫaller), copper, brass (ḫihāb), iron, lapis lazuli, pearl, coral, corseilin,onyx and rock crystal. B. Other substances: Pharaonic glass, clay from Siānīyān, pure salt, salt earth (ṣalāḥ), sandarach, enamel (mīnā), amber, pitch, wax, ivory, bakkan wood, willow wood.

The weights of equal volumes of liquids and the volumes of equal weights of liquid are sometimes found directly, sometimes ascertained with the aërometer of Pappus. The former magnitude plays an important part in the liquids used in every day life like oil and wine. The second was of more scientific interest. It is especially interesting that the Arabs found that hot water and hot urine had a larger volume than equal weights cold. They also knew that ice had a larger volume than the same weight of water.

The facts ascertained with the aërometer of Pappus for fluids refer to cold fresh water, hot water, ice (does not properly belong to this connection), sea water, vine-gar, wine, sesame oil, olive oil, cow's milk, hen's egg blood of a healthy man, warm and cold urine. Fig. 7 shows the aërometer reconstructed by H. Bauerreiss (from al-Khāzin). N is a massive cone used to make the instrument heavy. There are inscriptions corresponding to the Roman numerals. For details the reader may be referred to H. Bauerreiss’s article.

The principle that floating bodies of the same weight sink in water to the same depth finds application in a juristic trick cited in the Kitāb al-Hijāl fi ’l-Fikāh of Abū l-Ḥāsim al-Kaṣwī. The weight of a camel is ascertained by putting it in a boat and noting how deep the boat sinks. The camel is then replaced by iron weights until the boat sinks to the same level (cf. J. Schacht in G. Bergerotto, Beltr. zur sotetischen Philologie und Linguistik).

In medical works and treatises on weights and measures, figurines are given for the weights of equal volumes of oil and honey (cf. Bauerreiss, op. cit.).

So far as it is a question of particular bodies, the values as ascertained by the Arabs agree very well with those obtained by modern science and even surpass in accuracy those obtained by it up till the beginning of the last century.

Bibliography: This is given in the article Al-Šarāṭ."
An exactly straight ruler is laid on the plate and one looks over this.

Ibn Sinā (Cod. Ledenaei, No. 1061) in order to test whether the upper surface of the base of a theodolite is horizontal, makes a cavity in it with exactly perpendicular walls, pours water in and proceeds as in the case of the plate. To test whether a large ring is absolutely smooth, al-ʿUrdī used a process which he called al-ʿafādām. This is not a ready-made instrument but an apparatus to be put together from case to case. The ring to be tested is first of all placed exactly horizontal with the ground by means of the level (Fig. 9). Inside the ring on its concave side a circular gutter of potter's clay is built. Its outer edge comes up to the level of the surface of the ring while its inner edge is a little higher. The gutter is filled with water and some light ash are scattered on it. If the water flows over the ring the depressions in the ring are filled with it, while the ashes remain on the raised parts of it. The inequalities in the surface of the ring are thus brought out (Fig. 10). Al-ʿUrdī emphasises that the test must be made in absolute calm.

Al-ʿUrdī also used the same method in order to see that the outlets for water in a distribution system at Damascus were all of the same level. In the centre of the reservoir he put a gutter like this and deepened or raised the bottoms of the channels running out of it until the water from the gutter spread equally over the channels which revealed any inequalities (Fig. 11). Cf. H. J. Seemann, in S. B. P. M. S. Erg., ix., 1928, p. 49 and J. Frank, in Zeitschr. f. Instrumentenkunde, xviii., 1929.

4. A plumb-line (ṭīḥal, ʿabq, bāḥt [from ʿabq], ṣaḥāḥa) is dropped from the apex (Fig. 12) of an isosceles triangle, made for example of wood, with its perpendicular marked; a piece is sometimes left open in the centre of the under side for the weight of the plumb-line. If the plumb-line coincides with the perpendicular, the surface is horizontal (the figures go back to al-Ṣāḥibī and al-Khalīfī). Such drawings have led to the erroneous idea that Muslim students were already acquainted with the pendulum (cf. E. Wiedeman, in Verkl. d. d. phys. Ges., 1919, p. 663; the apparatus is called al-fāsādī [e.g. in al-Ṣāḥibī, al-ʿUrdī, see below]. Day, op. cit., also al-fāsādī).
In the architect's balance (fig. 13), according to Ibn Luyūn or al-Tūnirān (see below), a rectangular piece of wood is placed on the beam a a to be examined; in the middle of it, a perpendicular line b e is drawn before which a plumb-line is hung; according to the original figure, it seems to be two parallel lines between which the plumb-line hangs. 

Al-Marrākushī (see below) has described a more perfect form (fig. 14). In the figure a b, a c and d e are rods, and a b = a c and a d e is an isosceles triangle; d e is pierced in the centre. A plumb-line is hung from a through the hole. If the surface on which b and c are put is horizontal, the thread of the plumb-line goes through the centre of the hole.

Whether the levels and other similar instruments are themselves correct, whether for example the plumb-line from the apex to the base is perpendicular, is tested in this way: After the plumb-line comes to rest in one position of the level, the latter is put in various positions on some horizontal surface, particularly in one perpendicular to the first, and in one in which left and right have places exchanged. If the plumb-line always comes to rest the level is correct but if it only does so in the former case the error can be corrected by adjusting the position of the surface and that of the level.

The level here described is usually called ṣabūn (σωματίδιον); the word, however, is also used for the wooden set square, as used by carpenters (s. Masāfīkh al-Kūlān, ed. v. Vloten, p. 255) and land surveyors like Abu l-Wafā' (s. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und Medizin, Heft iv., 1922, p. 98). A synonym is according to al-'Abīyān (Abū l-Farāhīt al-Abūsī, Med. b. chap. 13): ša'abūn. From the same root we have in Ibn Wāshīya (Cod. Leidensis, No. 1279, p. 537) ša'abūn, in Deyo (Supplement, ii., p. 246) ša'abūn and ša'abūn. Connected with this is ša'abūn, dust of ša'abūn.

Sometimes one finds it stated that levelling is done with the ša'abīn; e.g. in al-Battānī (ed. Nallino, text, 1903, p. 137); muwāzīn bi ʿlāyān, and an exactly similar statement is made by Ibn Sinā (Cod. Leidensis, No. 1061). A set square is either brought up to the plumb-line and a perpendicular dropped on the surface from it, or the ša'abīn is used for the level, the essential part of which is the plummet.

On larger surfaces, such as roofs, etc., a long rod (ša'abīn = cubitale) is first of all laid down and on it the apparatus for testing the level is placed; this is called suqūn al-šarīr (or al-sarrāfīn of the architects; cf. Ibn Luyūn, see below).

5. At the apex of a threensided pyramid built on a surface by 3 rods of equal length, a plumb-line with sharp point in the plummet is hung. This ought to hang over the centre of the surface (al-ṣūfīni, see below).

6. On the apexes A and B (fig. 15) of two sharp-pointed tetrahedrons of equal height A L H K, and E L M N, a rod of some length A B is laid on which is fixed a triangle with a plumb-line hanging from it or an arrangement such as is already described for the scale-beam. If the plumb-line or the tongue comes to rest, the rod and therefore the surface is horizontal (al-Marrākushī, see below).

The necessity of making surfaces exactly level continually crops up in building, and also in putting up astronomical instruments, and in constructing the Indian circle with which the meridian and then the direction of the ṣidrā is ascertained. In this case the level surface is usually not prepared on the ground but on a firm foundation, perhaps of stone. The construction for the Indian circle is already described in the Hydrometia of Proclus (loc. cit.) in the same way as by the Arabs.

We now deal with the tests used to see if a thing is perpendicular:

1. The simplest method is to hang a plumb-line beside it. In the case of level perpendicular surfaces, this must touch it all the way down if its point of suspension is on it. This method is always recommended in working with the quadrant (s. also below).

2. If the point of suspension is a little in front of the surface the thread must be equidistant from it all the way down.

3. In the side of the gnomon, a perpendicular rod, often with a cone-shaped top, Ibn Yūnus (see below) cut out a groove which ended in a hemispherical cavity. In the groove a thread is hung from the top of the gnomon with a ball shaped weight. If this comes to rest in the hollow, the gnomon is perpendicular.
4. The gnomon is moved backwards and forwards (turned about on its foot: *mawṣûf* or *mu-nilâr*); its shadow must only move so far on the level surface, on which it stands, as is in keeping with the movement of the sun during the turning (Ibn Yūnus, see below).

5. A circle is described at the foot of the rod and a pair of compasses used to test whether the distance of the top of the gnomon is the same from all points of the circle.

8. Ibn Sinâ drills a small hole through the gnomon parallel to its base, puts it in a vessel with a horizontal bottom which is filled with muddy water and examines whether the surface exactly coincides with the level of the hole.

7. In order to examine whether a level surface is standing exactly perpendicular, two exactly equal parallelepipedal blocks of wood (fig. 16) are placed on it, $L_1$ and $L_2$, one above the other. From the upper edge of $L_1$ a plumb-line is hung; one watches whether its thread exactly touches $L_2$; the best plan is to place a very thin ruler between $L_2$ and the plummet and test the position of the thread with respect to $L_2$ (al-Marrākush, see below).

11. In order to ascertain the difference in height between two points $x$ and $y$, which are at a distance $s$ from one another, as is necessary in making a canal for example, one looks horizontally from $x$ with an apparatus which is at a height $a$ from the ground; to a vertical rod at $y$, and ascertain the height $b$ at which the point observed is above the ground. A mark can be made in it (in modern mensuration, the rod at $y$ has divisions marked on it). The difference in height is $a-b$. According to fig. 19, the Arabs, like Hero, seem to have used something similar. Ibn al-Awâsim (see below) uses a square board on which are marked a number of circles touching one another, which are distinguished by different colours or have different centres. In order to place the rods absolutely perpendicular, plumb-lines are hung beside them (fig. 17).

The horizontal line of vision is obtained in various ways:  

1. A rod (e.g. an ell long) with square sides is put up in such a way that the upper surface appears horizontal to the eye and one looks along this surface.

2. The rod (struck) is put on the above mentioned dish or plate (fig. 8) and one looks along it.

3. At the end of the rod nails are fastened at the same height and their heads are pierced and one looks through the holes.

4. For a rough examination, one can put, at the two places, two tube-shaped bricks which for convenience may be made each out of two half-pipes (Ibn al-Awâsim, see below).

5. An astrolabe is put in a horizontal place such as the edge of a well or on its cover and one looks through the eyepiece.

Other methods of ascertaining differences of level are as follows:

1. An assistant is sent from the higher position to the lower holding a rod of a known length, vertically until one sees just the end of it; if $A$ is the length of the rod, $L$ the difference in height. If the distance is too great for the top of the rod to be distinguished, a light is put on it, for example a lighted candle and the observation is made by night.

2. If it is a question of ascertaining whether a place outside a well is lower than the level of water in the well, the distance of the latter from the surface of the ground or from the edge is ascertained by letting a rod and thread down with a shining heavy object at the end and used in calculation.

Two apparatuses, closely connected with each other, are the following:

3. To a rod (fig. 17) the triangle with the plumb-line is attached. To its two ends two threads with weights at the ends are attached, $a$ and $b$.

Fig. 17.

Two posts $a$ and $b$ are erected at the points, the difference in level of which is to be ascertained.

The one thread is fastened to the end of the lower post $a$, and the other hung along and over the post $b$ until its weight comes to rest. The amount of shifting of the thread measures the difference in height (al-Khûzîn, see below).

4. The *mawṣûf* (the bat, fig. 18) consists of an equilateral triangle with a plumb-line which hangs from the middle of one side. The triangle is suspended by this side. Two rods, an ell in length, are erected to eells apart; a rope is passed from the top of one to the top of the other and by two threads $a$ and $b$ the *mawṣûf* is suspended in its centre. If the plumb-line goes through the apex of the triangle, both places are on the same level, if not, one is raised by putting stones below it for example; but the end of the rope can, as in 3, be moved along (Ibn Lârûn, see below).

5. In the Paris manuscript N°. 2488, an unknown author describes 3 apparatuses for levelling (fig. 19—3). In the first (al-mârâkûs, the known) a rod of wood an ell in length is bored through its entire length and tongs with a tongue suspended from its centre (fig. 19a). Through the hole a rope some 15 eells long is drawn which is fastened to the two vertical rods already mentioned. The second apparatus (fig. 19b; al-takhshûs, the similar) corresponds to the *mawṣûf*; only the two threads $a$ and
are replaced by rings which are put over the long rope: a, a. The third arrangement (fig. 19c: abu-le, the pipe) is also mentioned by al-Khalili and Hāfiz al-Dīn but not described; it probably corresponds to our canal-level, a communicating pipe filled with water, such as is very fully described by Hero (Dioptias, p. 197 and loc. cit.); but he gives it no particular name, probably because it is associated with a dioptra. On the plain-line of the figure is written 

\[
\text{From the Paris MS. Nr. 1437, a. in the bow, b. in the similar c. the pipe, d. the weight.}
\]

Tighnārī mentions another instrument called mizān al-haf, Ibn Wāḥishī (see below) of one or brass called ṣafār or ṣāfr. Neither are described however. Arab authors who give full descriptions of Arab instruments are the following:

1. Ibn Wāḥishī (or Abū Thālib al-Zāliyāt, + 870) in Kitāb al-Fāṭhāh al-Nabawiyya, in "the Book of Nabatean Agriculture" (cf. H. Schmelzer, in Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaft und Medizin, Erlangen 1922, Heft VI, p. 36). His data are supplemented by those of numerous commentators.


3. Ibn Abū Ṭalāb (c. 1100) in Kitāb al-Fāṭhāh al-Dawḥa, deals with levelling ground etc., and gives notes on al-Tīgħnārī and others (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, x., see below).

4. Abū Īshāq b. Layūn (c. 1348) in Kitāb al-Fāṭhāh al-Dawḥa, deals with levelling ground etc., and gives notes on al-Tīgħnārī and others (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, x., see below).


Full details of levelling are given in the astronomical books in discussing the ascertainment of the meridian, e.g. in Khūṭ al-Dīn al-Shāhī (d. 1311; e.g. E. Wiedemann, in Zeitschr. für Physik, vol. x. 1922, p. 267); al-Khalīlī al-Nāṣīrī etc. Many books on the astrological give information on the subject in discussing surveying problems, e.g. al-Bīrūnī (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xvii., 59 sqq.).

I give once again the names of the levelling instruments:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mizān} & \quad \text{mizān al-bawātīn} & \quad \text{mizān al-haf} & \quad \text{mizān al-tuṣār, bārā'ī, ṣāfrā, šāfā, bāsīn, ṣafār, ṣafārī, sīdeq}.
\end{align*}
\]

In know of no comprehensive treatise on levelling in connection with canal building etc. in the early Muslim period. For the literature see my Beiträge, iii., 229; xviii., 26 and H. Schmelzer, loc. cit., p. 41. For knowledge of these matters in ancient times see C. Mörkel, Die Ingenieurs-technik im Altertum und H. Diels, Antike Technik, Leipzig 1920.

**Bibliography:**
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**MIZMĀR** means literally "an instrument of piping". In the generic sense it refers to any instrument of the "wood-wood" family, i.e. a reed-pipe or a flute. In the specific sense it refers to a reed-pipe (i.e. a pipe played with a reed) as distinct from a flute, as we know from Ibn Sinā (d. 1037) who describes the mizmār — a reed-pipe — as an instrument "which you blow into from its end which you swallow", as distinct from an instrument like the yārū' — a flute — "which you blow into from a hole". Ibn Zayla (d. 1048) writes similarly but substitutes the Persian word mizmār for the Arabic word mizmār. In Ibn Sinā's Arabic treatise al-Najūṭī we read of the mizmār as distinct from the other instruments in his Persian Dāngān-māna the word is mizmār. Further, the Maṭfī al-Ṭūlān says, "the mizmār is in the mizmār" (p. 236). For the present purpose, "wood-wood" instruments (mizmārāt) may be divided into:

1. Reed-blown types.
2. Reed-pipe-blown types.

Among the former we have single reed-pipes of the clarinet, oboe, and saxophone types, as well as double reed-pipes, the bagpipe, and the chiww. Among the latter we have the flute and recorder, as well as the pampipes.

**Reed-blown types.** Single reed-pipes occur in ancient Semitic art and literary remains (Livvango, i. 35 sqq.). Hoary gossip attributes the "invention" to the Persians (al-Masūdī, Maraghi, viii. 90), whilst Djamshīd himself claims to have been the actual "inventor" (Ewilīy al-Ṭebēbi, i. 641). With Islamic peoples, reed-pipes are found with a conical or cylindrical tube (mudālī) pierced with finger-holes (mudāsīn), and played with a single or double beating reed (ṣafla, ṣafrā). Among the Arabs of the 18th century, the mizmār finds a place at convivial
parties (Me'aṣeqa'tiyā, xvi.), and in the 18th century, it is one of the martial instruments of the Jewish tribes of Al-Hijār (Aẓḥār, ii. 172). When 'Isām came, an anathema was placed on reed-pipes mainly, it would seem, on account of the female reed-pipe player (sāmūmāt) who, as was common in the East, was looked upon as a courtesan, and, indeed, the term sāmūmāt and sāmūyāt became almost synonymous. It is improbable that the Prophet Muḥammad could have referred to a reed-pipe (mizmūr) in the well-known ḥadīth in praise of the chanting (bādī'a) of Al-Hārūn al-Ṣāḥī. The reference was rather to 'a mizmūr (Hebr. mīṣmerh 'psalm') from the masbūhāt of the House of David' (cf. my Hist. of Arabian music, p. 33). In early days, what the Arabs called the mizmūr, the Persians called the sāmūyāt, and the latter distinguished the flute by the name sāmūyāt (soft sāmūyāt). Later they called the reed-pipe the sāmūyāt (black sāmūyāt) and the flute the sāmūyāt (white sāmūyāt) because of the colour of the instrument. About the beginning of the 16th century, a musician at the 'Abbasid court named 'Azāzī invented a reed-pipe which was named after him the sāmūyāt or mizmūr (Ṭūfṣī al-'Arabī). What the invention was we can only conjecture. It may have been the cylinder used for altering the pitch of the instrument, or perhaps it was the introduction of a conical tube (see my Studies, p. 79, 82). At this period we have no information whether the various reed-pipes had cylindrical or conical tubes or whether they were played with single or double beating reeds. The word mizmūr was accorded little recognition in the East; whatever favour the invention itself found. In the West, where the name eventually became vulgarized into sāmūyāt, it became the most important reed-pipe not only in Spain as we know from al-Shakundī (d. 1321; al-Maḥkārī, Mbk. Dīnī, i. 59), but also in the Maghārib (Ibn Khaldaṭ, ii. 353). It became the sāmūyāt of the Spaniards (see also Schiaparelli, s. v.).

The mizmūr (= mīṣmerh al-wāz) is described and delineated by al-Fārābī (d. 950). It had eight holes for fingerling, giving a complete octave. He also describes a smaller reed-pipe called the surūnāt (Koengarten, p. 95; Lamm, p. 122; D.Erlanger, p. 264). One special feature of this instrument was called the sāmīr. In the Maṭfīṣ al-Ulām (p. 237) we read: 'The sāmīr of the mizmūr is its head, and it is by itself that it is made narrow and wide [in compass].' It was actually the cylinder inserted into the head of the instrument which lowered the pitch when required (see my Studies, p. 82), a device called later the rankh (Kanz al-Tawṣīf) or fajīl (Villoteaux). It was called the sāmīr because of the sound of the button at the top of the cylinder - which was turned round. The word surūnāt came to be modified into surūnāt and then sāmīr. Popular etymology opined that the word was derived from sāmīr 'reed' and sāmīr 'reed.' This form only appears in the lexicon (Hārūn-i Fāṣī). Some modern even write sūrūnāt. The sūrūnāt found its way into martial music as early as the beginning of the 16th century (Aẓḥār, xvi. 159: the text has sūrūnāt).

In the 16th century, Ibn Zāla shows how, by deviation in the fingerling and embouchure, other notes were obtained on the reed-pipe (Fwā'n, sāmīr). In the Persian Kanz al-Tawṣīf (xvith cent.) the mīṣmerh, also called the sāmīr sāmīr, is both described and delineated. More valuable is the explanation of the actual making of the beating reed with which the instrument was played, from which we learn that it was a double reed. In the next century a Turkish author Ahmad Uğlī Shukurullī copied extensively from this work (Lavignac, l. 3014). Ibn Ghāzī (d. 1435) says that all the notes could be obtained on the sāmīr sāmīr (= sāmīr sāmīr) by accommodating the fingerling and the embouchure. The smaller instrument, the mizmūr, was defective in the upper octave he says. A similar type of reed-pipe to the latter called the kalābīn is also mentioned by him. Ewliya Čelebi says that it came from Śīrāz. In the Muḥammād b. Muršid Tustarī (xvith cent.) we learn that the nūy sāmīr (se mīṣmerh al-wāz) was 27 cm. long.

With the Turks, the Persian word sūrūnāt had been altered to sūrūnāt and the term had become common to both the sāmīr (= mīṣmerh) and sūrūnāt in the East. Ewliya Čelebi (xvith cent.) mentions among the Turkish reed-pipes of his day the ḍabāj Üzmi sūrūnāt, the sūrūnāt sūrūnāt, the waṭfī sūrūnāt, and the ṣāmīr sūrūnāt (a Moroccan reed-pipe). He also speaks of a sūrūnāt sūrūnāt, which, he says, was an English invention (l. 642). This is the same as the sūrūnāt, which, he says, is the clarionet, an instrument which Denner is said to have 'invented' about 1690, which is after its mention by Ewliya Čelebi. The Persians still continued to call their reed-pipe the sūrūnāt, and a xvith-century design of the instrument is given by Kaempfer. Both Russell in Syria (l. 155) and Villoteaux in Egypt (l. 356 sq.) refer to several kinds of reed-pipes in use in the xvith century. The latter delineates these and describes them fully. They are: the ḍabāj Üzmi sūrūnāt, the sāmīr sūrūnāt, the sūrūnāt sāmīr, and the waṭfī sūrūnāt. The sūrūnāt sūrūnāt, the sūrūnāt sāmīr, and the waṭfī sūrūnāt are various kinds, the first being 58.5 cm. and the last 31.2 cm. in length. The modern instrument is also delineated by Lavignac, p. 2793; Sachse, p. 428. For specimens see Brussels, Nr. 122, 355, 357; New York, N.Y. 1331.

In the West as well we find a new name, or instrument, the ḍabāj or ḍabāj Üzmi [q.v.]. It is said to have been introduced by the Turks (Delphin and Guin, p. 48) but the name is mentioned by Ibn Battīţa (d. 1377) who likens the Mesopotamian sūrūnāt to the Maghribī ḍabāj (l. 120). There are, however, two kinds of ḍabāj, one - a cylindrical tube blown with a single reed, and another - a conical tube blown with a double reed. This may explain why ḍabāj does not always equate with sūrūnāt and sūrūnāt in the West (Ṭaḥhīṣī al-Niyārī, p. 93; Muḥammad al-Ṣaghīrī, p. 34). The cylindrical tube instrument is known in Egypt as the ḍabāj. For details see Bīl 'Allī, p. 105; Delphin and Guin, p. 47. For specimens and designs see Hist. p. 201, tab. xxxi.; Brussels, N. 354; New York, Nrs. 402, 2824; Lavignac, E. 3971. A reed-pipe that became quite famous in Western Europe was the ṣūrūnāt played with areed. The original ṣūrūnāt (= sūrūnāt) was a horn or clarion, and was made of horn or metal. Pierced with holes for fingerling, and played with a reed, a new type of instrument, somewhat similar to the modern saxophone, was evolved. In the xiiith century, this ṣūrūnāt was 'improved' by the Andalusian Caliph al-Hakam II (Bibl. de autores Españ., l. 440). Ibn Khaldaṭ, who describes it, says that it was the best instrument of the same family (l. 353). Ibn Ghāzī,
in his holograph MS. in the Bodleian Library, writes ḥiḥ, but adds, "also called ḥiḥ", but the latter remark has been deleted, it appears to be delineated in the Cancrins de Santa Maria (Riaño, fig. 41, b).

Another interesting instrument is the ʿifrāṣya or ʿifrāṣya, which may have been the forerunner of the European rusticus. It has a cylindrical pipe, and is played with a double reed. It is probably the descendent of the ʿāṭa al-ṭārīqī that al-Ghazzal (d. 1151 A.D.) speaks of. It is delineated and fully described by Villoteau (i, p. 8.7). Examples are given at Brussels, No. 124; New York, No. 2864. Both the reed-pipes and Reed-pipes belong to outdoor music. Just as we see them in the ʿAff Lālā of al-Lālā as being essential to folk, ceremonial, procession, and martial music, so they are today, and probably have always been.

Double reed-pipes. Ibn Khurdadhbih says that the Persians "invented" the double reed-pipe called the diyaṣṣa (al-Maṣrat, Murūḍ, vii, 90), in the viiith century. Frescoes at Qūṣir ʿAmrī (Mussul, pl. xxiv). It has been suggested that the word should be ḥiḥ, but diyaṣṣa is also given by al-Farāhi (see my Studier, p. 57), who describes and delineates the instrument which he says, was also called the minār al-maṭṣārā or maṭṣārā. The two pipes were of equal length and each was pierced by five finger-holes, which gave an octave between them. Probably the instrument known in the Middle Ages as the simānā (vulg. zamānā) was actually the old diyaṣṣa, although it merely played in ʿaṭāshī from the first sixteenth century to the eighteenth century. As early as the xith century we read of the zamānī in Egypt (al-Maṣrat, i, 136). The name itself means "joined" (see my Studier, p. 78), and it was doubtless a double reed-pipe. Since the xith century at least, zamānī has been the name for this instrument in the East (cf. Niebuhr, i, 145), and Lane (p. 367) describes and delineates it. It has cylindrical tubes and is played with single beating reeds. It is to be found with a varying number of finger-holes and is named accordingly (Sachs, p. 433). In the Maghrib it is called the mubānī and mubānī (Lavignac, p. 2793. R.A., 1866), whilst in Syria it is given a vulgarized or metathetical form of the old mānī (cf. Sachs, p. 257; Dallaman, Pal. Draw.). For specimens and descriptions see Brussels, Nos. 115-118; New York, Nos. 2167, 2632; and Z.D.P.V., 1927, p. 19. Specimens in my collection range from 10 to 43 cm. in length. The smallest type of double reed-pipe has only one pipe pierced with finger-holes, whilst the other serves as a drone. This also carries the name of zamānī when the two pipes are of the same length (cf. Niebuhr, i, 145). When the drone pipe is longer than the chanter pipe it is known as the ʿarqīḥ (ʿarqīḥ, Manṣūra, i, 291; ʿarqīḥ, Lavignac, p. 2812) in modern times (cf. Freyag, Christ, Arab., 1884, p. 34) in Egypt and Syria. Villoteau (i, 962) gives a detailed description with scales and designs of three sizes, 97, 82.6 and 88.6 cm. in length. In South Kensington Museum there is one 144 cm. long. Like the preceding instrument it is played with single beating reeds. The drone pipe is furnished with additional tubes (bīyāḥī) which are affixed to lower the pitch.

In Syria the smaller type of ʿarqīḥ is named the maṣṭānī, a most significant name, in spite of its being ignored in the lexicons. Lane (p. 267) figures six finger-holed instruments, which he says, were used at ʿūṣbī, and by Nile boatmen. For specimens see Brussels, Nos. 342-346; Z.D.P.V., 1927, p. 2.

Bagpipe. An ancient instrument in the Orient, just prior to Islam we have it figured on Sasanian sculptures (Ker Porter, Travels, ii, p. 64). We do not know its ancient Semitic name, but Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Sallūm mention it as the maṣāfīr al-ṣūltānī, describing it as being played by "an artificial contrivance." Although Niebuhr (i, 140) calls it the zamārāt al-ṣūktā, and Lane, p. 386 names it the zamārāt biṣṭānī, the more general term used in Arabic speaking countries is ʿabāra, although we found it mentioned in Tunisia (Von Humboldt, p. 4). The word ʿabāra is given variations by some European writers as in the ʿabāra of Villoteau (i, 970) and the ʿabāra of Roumanet (Lavignac, p. 2812). In Persia, the bagpipes have long been known as the nūṣ al-amīr, the maṣṭānī, or maṣṭānī (Lavignac, p. 2793) from whence the Hindustani name maṣṭānī or maṣṭānī (Trogore, p. 84; Day, p. 151). In Turkey, the older word was ʿabār, with a stem in ʿabār (Meninck, Sachs; cf. EwIyūs Čelebi, i, 642: ʿabārī ʿabārī, but Čelebi would appear to be equally popular, and this name is to be found throughout the Balkan countries (cf. Arab. ʿabārī; Span. paño; Engl. Bagpipe).

The bagpipe used by Islamic peoples is generally equipped with a chanter pipe (five or six finger-holes) and mouthpiece, but rarely with a drone pipe. The chanter, terminating in a horn (Schallsttick), is often double, a feature which was probably the original reason for the term maṣṭānī being used with the bagpipe. The woodwork is sometimes inlaid with metal, whilst another feature is the adornment of the instrument with tassels, beads, shells, and other trinkets. Designs may be found in Niebuhr (tab. xxi) and Sachs (p. 454), and actual specimens in Brussels, No. 372.

Instruments of reeds. The Chinese chēn is such an instrument. Probably it was not invented by Islamic peoples although known to them. The chēn is described in the Maṣāfīr al-ʿūlām as follows: "The maṣṭānī is a musical instrument of the Chinese. It is made of compounded tubes (nāḥīḥ), and its name in Persian is ʿabārī manṣūra." (p. 277). We get a little more information from Ibn Ghālibī who informs us that the ṣīlaḥ or maṣṭānī-khāṣā, was made of tubes of reed joined together. It was blown through a tube and the notes were written down in finger-chords. For names, types and designs see Van Andel, Chinese Music, p. 80.

A. Pipe-blown types.

1. The flutes of the Arabs, Persians and Turks, unlike those of the Western Europe, are played vertically, a current of air being blown across the orifice (manṣūra) at its head. EwIyūs Čelebi (i, 623, 638, 642 read ʿabārī not ʿabārī) is not sure whether it was Pythagoras or Menon who "invented" the first instrument of this type, the shepherd's flute, called the kanālī (cf. ʿabārī). Ibn Khurdadhbih says that it originated with the Kurds (al-Maṣrat, viii, 90), and Ibn Ghālibī (Shārī ʿal-ʿawālī) says that this instrument was the nūṣ ʿabārī (white nūṣ). We know from Ibn al-Aʿrāfī (d. 840) that the Arabs called
this flute or reed-pipe the ḫanūṭ. A characteristic
of the Arab flute was its length, hence the ancient
Greek proverb which likened the talkative person
to an Arabian flute (Menaḥerī Pargoth).
In the early days of Islam, the Arabs called
their flute the ḫaṭḥa (later modified into ḡaṭṭa),
and this is the name used by the poets al-Aṣbāḥ
(d. 629) and Ruḥā b. al-ʿAdlīkī (eighth century).
These terms fell into disuse in the East when
Persian musical influences were at their height.
The Persians called their flute the nay sūrūn
(sweet nay) so as to distinguish it from the nay
proper and the warān, which were reed-pipes,
and so the Arabs of the East called their flute
the nay, although in the West the old word ḫaṭḥa
or ḡaṭṭa was retained. Another term for the
flute in early days, perhaps a different kind, was
yaḥū (Mafṣūṭ al-ʿUlām, p. 336), and in the
fourteenth century Glossarium Latinum-Arabicum it
equates with caleumula. In the sixteenth century it
was still a common name with Šafiʿ al-Dimʿ Abī al-Muʿāmin
(p. 9) in the East, and with al-Shaḥṣudī in the
West (al-Maṣkūtī, i. 59, reada nādūr "not narrow").
In the contemporary Vocabulaire en Arabe it
(yaḥū) agrees with ṣītula. The words ḥarrī's and
ḥarrī's (al-Djwāshari, al-Fīrṣāshāhī) would appear
to be vulgar forms of yaḥū.

Whilst the diminutive ḥaṭḥa (ḵaṭṭa) sometimes
occurs in reference to a small flute, ḍabāḥa and
ṣakhk (Y ḥaṭṭa "to grow up") were the more
general terms used in ʿIrāq (Iṣḥāq al-Safārī, i. 97),
Egypt (al-Maṣkūtī, i. 136), Spain (al-Ṣafārī, Fī
Du Arab), and the Maghrib (Ibn Khaldūn, ii. 358).
It became the ṣīwālka of Western Europe. Another
name for a small flute was ḡawma, and this word
also found a place with the Latins as the joch
(Du Cange). In Persia, the small flute was called
the ṣiḥa (Kana al-Tuṣṭīf), hence the Balkan pi- nion and pisik.

We read of the nay in the Ābādī (i. 71) but
we cannot be sure whether it was a flute or a
reed-pipe. Rāzī (Kosgarten, p. 45) ignores
the flute (nay) and says that it was inferior (māghir)
to the mizmár (reed-pipe), but so late gained
wide recognition in chamber music that it can probably
be reason of jūsī appraisement and the style of the
darwāsh. Šafiʿ al-Dimʿ Abī al-Muʿāmin (d. 1394)
describes the nay with eight holes for fingers
and the thumb-hole at the back being called the ṣ ajud ("verhament"), its name revealing its function.
In the Persian Kana al-Tuṣṭīf (eighth cent.) we find two
very small flutes mentioned, but in the Ṣaḥīḥ at-
Adwār (sixth cent.) we find that the nay ahūd
was normally 63 cm. long. Five larger sizes are
given, the longest being 99 cm., with two smaller
sizes, the limit being 31.5 cm. Ibn Ḥašī perpetrator
also registers several varieties including the nay bānūn
of 67.5 cm. approximating in pitch to the harmen
string of the flute, and the nay dir of 33.75 cm.
approximating the air string. Ewīliya Čelebi (eighth cent.)
gives the names of a number of Turkish flutes (i. 633) including the ḥuṣūh muṣṭafrī, the ḱālmudī, and the ḱa-Ikām, unknown flutes (i. 954)
describes and delineates the Egyptian instruments
of the last sixteenth century. The largest, 77 cm.
long, was the nay ḥaṭṭ (= ḫar), and the smallest,
48.8 cm. long, was the nay ṣīruf, the harfeh of modern Syria (Mushārqa, p. 20). Other
flutes named by him are the nay ṣabūr, the nay
ṣuwarq (ṣuwarq), the ṣuwarq, and the nay
ṣuwarq. In Turkey the ṣuwarq is the smallest
flute used in chamber music (Lavignac, p. 3019).
Turkish and Egyptian flutes are usually well made,
with a head to support the lips. In Palestine and
the Maghrib they still retain, more or less, a
primitive appearance, and although the seven holed
flute is common (Christianowitz, pl. 2), the five
and six holed instrument has acceptance (Delphin
et Guin, p. 45: Z. D. P. F., 1947, pl. 1). In the
Maghrib, these flutes in the orchestra still retain
the name of ḩaṭḥa (vulg. ḡaṭṭa), and they are
usually about 40 cm. long, whilst the ḡaṭṭa or
ṣabūr is smaller. In the interior, longer flutes like the ġaṭṭa and ṣuwarq may be found. Delphin and Guin give an account of these.

The recorder, or flute à bec, also found
favour in the East. This is the Arabic nābūs (mouth nay), the Persian nāb, the Turkish ḏāūkh, and the Hindustāni ʿalāmā. As early as the ḫawās
al-Safārī and the Mafṣūṭ al-ʿUlām (sixth cent.) we
read of the ṣīwālka, which was doubtless a flute à bec (see my Städter, p. 83). Villeteau (i. 951)
says that it was an instrument of this type in his
day in Egypt. The ḏāūkh or ḏāūkh is mentioned
by Ewīliya Čelebi in nine different species (i. 642),
and is also mentioned by Ḥaḍḍī Kāhlīfa (i. 400).
The ṣīwālka would appear to have been a small
three-holed recorder such as was common with
pipe and tabor players in Medieval Western Europe.
It was played with the fingers of one hand, the
other hand being used for beating the ṣāṭī or drum,
and hence the phrase in al-Ghāsāni: the ṣīwālka of the drummers (ṣāṭī).

Pan pipes are also common to the folk. Both
Pythagoras and Mosques are credited by Ewīliya Čelebi
(i. 624, 636) with the "invention" of the
mūsīlar or panpipes. Although the word stands
for "a composer of melodies" in the Mafṣūṭ al-
ʿUlām (see also Meninski), it is referred to a musical
instrument in the sixteenth century (N. E., xiv. 312).
A contemporary writer, Ibn Ḥašī, says that the mūsīlar
is one of the [wind instruments] with free
pipes. Its notes are determined by size [of pipes].
The lowest have the least notes, and the shortest
the highest notes. We find the instrument called
mūsīlar (Pasang-i Sīwāl) whilst Ḥaḍḍī Kāhlīfa
(i. 400) has ṣawīlar, and Toderini (i. 237) musul,
which probably gave birth to the Romanian
musical. The term mūsīlar survived up to modern
times (Villeteau, i. 963), but the more general
word used today (Mushārqa, p. 20) is ṣīwālka.
(Pedro de Alcala [1505] mentions a harp by this
name, but perhaps he confused the name with ajmān).
Russell (The Natural History of Allige, i. 156)
writing in Syria in the sixteenth century says
that panpipes were to be found with from three
to twenty-three pipes. Kaemmerer, p. 743, delineates
a xvith century Persian instrument.

The names of instruments in the mūsīlar group
in Arabic are legion. Many of those not mentioned
in this article are regional and are of folk origin,
their source being often discernable, such as in
the namūsārā and namūsīlar, to name only two.
More interesting however, are the older words
like ḫawās, ṣūrūn, and ṣabūr. The first two occur
al-Fīrṣāshāhī (d. 1414), and ṣabūr, which equates
with mūsīlar, reminds us of the much debated
passage in Eschil, xxviii. 15. Zanbāk occurs in
in al-Azharī (d. 981) and even earlier (cf. Lane).
The Greek ἱππαλή and the Latin saxula were
strung instruments, and Iadore of Seville's sax-'
ologia as a "wood-wind" instrument has long been
suspect, but since mankāb is to be found in Arabic equating with ammūnā and māmūr there would appear to be good reason for accepting Iskole of Seville.


Specimens of instruments: Brussels, Catalogue des... du Musée Instrumental du Conservatoire royal de Musique; New York, Catalogue of the Croisière collection of oriental instruments (1st ed.).

(H. G. FARMER)

MIZWĀR, arbilised form of the Berber awmar, who precedes, he who is placed at the head, equivalent to the Arabic awmar ad-dam and like this frequently has in North Africa the meaning of chief of a religious brotherhood (q.v.), the superintendent of a mosque (q.v.), or the chief of a body of shorā (q.v.), dialect form from the class plur. sharaf. In those districts of the Maghrib, where the old Berber organisation has survived, mainly in the Great Atlas and Central Atlas, awmar is sometimes equivalent of amīr, the political adviser to a body; cf. R. Muntagné, Les Berbères et le Maghreb du sud-est (Paris 1930, p. 222).

The term māmūr (or māmūr) is early found in the histories of the Maghrib in connection with Almohad institutions. There it means the head of a faction and the corresponding office seems at this time to be often confused with those of ḥāfiz and makāb (q.v.). In the time of the Marinid Caliph Abū Yūnās Yaḥyā (q.v.) al-Maṣūr, chief of the twenty-one Almohad tribes had two māmūr: one for the first rank of the hierarchy, i.e. the earliest recruits of the Almohads, and another for those who had joined them later (q.v.). (Kisāb al-ʿAṣīr, in E. Levi-Provençal, Documents inédits d'histoire almohade, Paris 1928, p. 70; also p. 65 and p. 64 and M. Gandolfi-Demourey, Introduction au翻译 of the Maṣūr al-ʿAṣīr of Ibn Faḍil Allāh al-ʿUmar, Paris 1927, p. xxvi.).

At the present day, māmūr is in constant use in Fāṣ for the  ḥāfiz (q.v.) of the principal Shāfit groups who live in this capital.

(E. Levi-Provençal)

MOBEDH, a Persian word which passed into Arabic the form  محمد or  محمد, we also find in Arabic the Persian plural, moubēd, but usually combined with mābēd in the expression mābēd mābēd, which means "chief of the mābēd", "grand mīrābēd". It is also found alone (mābēd) standing for mābēd mābēd. The Arabic plural is mābēd. The word is derived from the Pehlevi mābēd, which means "chief of the magis" and therefore indicates a priestly office; according to al-Maṣāḥīrī, Kūstān-Tanbīh wa l-tahrīf, B. G. A., vi. 103, the word would mean खाḍā dā din and be derived from ma = "religion" and ḥāfiz = "protector", and according to al-Yaḥṣīrī (Tarīkh, i. 207) ḥabān al-ʿawād. In Armenian texts the word is rendered by magis, in the Greek acts of martyrs by muārōt; muārōt muārōt; muārōt muārōt; in Syriac and especially in the acts of the Persian martyrs not only by ܡ 가운, but also by ܡܓܕıyla; in one passage (Hofmann, Assyri, p. 88, cf. below), the word muārōt is used immediately before ܡܓܕiqueta. The Syriac has also ܡܓܕܝ因地制 or ܡܓܕܝ因地制 corresponding to the Greek ἔφορος, έφορος, יִשְׂרָאֵל, we have no satisfactory information regarding the functions of the mābēd; we know more about those of the chief of the mābēd or mābēd mābēd. The information given below relates to the Šāfit period, a period in which the clergy were reorganised and which is reflected in the Arabic and Persian Muslim sources.

In the later Anvātā, we find references to the sacredotal organisation but the names do not agree with those of the Šāfit period; for example the principal office, that given in the Šāfit period to the mābēd mābēd, is called Zarokhīsho, and had judicial functions like the chief of the mābēd. The term magis is only found in the Pehlevi commentaries on the Anvātā. The sources from which we can extract information about the mābēd, and the mābēd mābēd or chief of the mābēd, are of course Pehlevi or go back to Pehlevi texts. Among the former which have come down to us is the Bundahish which among other things contains a list of ašbāb mābēd: the Anvātā, Wāfīg Nūṣak; the Kūstān-Tanbīh al-dār USB, (transl. by Nöelke in the Börsen-Postchrift: Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, iv., 1875, and by Pagliaro in L'Época e il Romanzo nel Medio Evo perurnico, Florence 1927, a part of the text 1-3 is reprinted in the Hijjafūkh für das Pehlevi by Nyberg); the Mobiles aus der...
stian, a legal work studied by Bartholomew in the
Samishian Scriptures, A. H., 1920, is valuable for our
knowledge of the judicial functions of the mohbedh and
mohbedh mohbedh; a few short moral treatises
preserving traces of laws (cf. Pagliai in R. S. O.,
x., 1925, p. 468—577 etc. The numerous references
to the mohbedh and the mohbedh mohbedh which we
find in Persian and Arabic sources come from lost
Pehlevi sources or Arabic and Persian versions of
them. Thus the Book of Kings especially in the latter
part contains some information about the mohbedh but
not anything full or precise about their functions;
the matter of the Shahrulm is taken, as we know,
from a Persian prose version of the Khwadhamagh.

The version which we have of the letter of Tammur
(published and traln. by Darmesteter in J.A., 1904, 1.)
gives very interesting information about the Shan-
nian hierarchy and also about the mohbedh; it
comes from a Pehlevi document which, according to
Christensen, goes back not to the time of Ardashtr
but rather to that of Khusraw the Great (cf. Empire
des Sassanides, 111—112, and more recently Aver-
com et Tammur, in Acta Orientalia, x. 43 1937).

The numerous writers in Arabic and Persian
whose works give as notes to the mohbedh derive
their matter, as regards Persia, from information
supplied directly by contemporary mohbedh or
grand mohbedh, from Pehlevi works translated into
Arabic (especially the translations of Ilan al-Muqaffa')
which no longer exist, such as the Khwadhamagh
and the A'Am-nama or "book of offices" (Kidsh.
al-Rusun; cf. below). Of great importance is the
Kidd al-Tadj or Achkad al-Mu'indi by al-Lijibhi
(cf. F. Gabrielli, in R.S. O., x. [1928], p. 252—308)
and others written by al-Lijibhi himself and the
Kidsh al-Mu'indi wa 'Ashish which is attributed
to him; very important also are the works of the
historians, chroniclers, geographers and polygraphers
or men of letters like al-Ya'qib, Ibn Kuttaha, al-
Dinawari, al-Talhuri, al-Mas'udi, Hamza al-Ishbunah,
al-Thaliibiti, al-Nawairi, al-Shahrastani, etc.

Of course all these sources bear different relations
to the Pehlevi originals or to one another and they
diffuse the same material, but from the fact that
they frequently combine legendary matter with accurate
statements, e. g. some concerning certain
of the functions of the mohbedh.

Information of value can also be extracted from
Syriac, Greek (especially Acts of Martyrs) and
Armenian (historians etc.) sources.

Even by combining all these sources it is not
possible to give a precise account of the office of
mohbedh in the Sassanian ecclesiastical hierarchy as
laid down in the organisation of the kingdom
attributed to Ardashtr (cf. Kitho al-Tadj, p. 23—30)
and to follow its developments (cf. the letter from
Tannur, al-Mas'udi, Tabbth, p. 105—104 and Maru'dhi,
II. 156; al-Ya'qib, Historia, i. 202: al-Shahr-
astani, ed. Cureton, p. 193; transl. Hausrucker,
I. 292). Nothing definite can be deduced from the
Parsi hierarchy of the present day as the ecclesiastical
organisation has profoundly changed. But we may
assume that high priests regularly called mohbedh
were given the task of supervising in the different
divisions of the empire (one might say dioceses)
the very varied work of the hereditary clergy, the
mohb, who had so great an influence over the lives of
the Persians that is to say not only the very
ceremonial occasions of worship, the sacrifices,
the care of the pyres, but also the care of souls
and the education of the people. These mohbedh
and their chief (cf. below) were like all priests the
ministers of learning, princes of learning (cf. Tabbth,
p. 97, where there is an allusion to the unbounded
knowledge of the mohbedh and
hordis) and the Arab writers must also have
obtained information from mohbedh (cf. Inostranee,
Etiopia sassanide, p. 10). The mohbedh had also
judicial functions (cf. below); in the Acts of the
martyrs they appear vested with executive power;
but since courts of inquiry were composed of lay
officers and priests, it is probable that this power
was exercised by the whole college or by delegation.
It is also certain that the title of mohbedh is not
applied exclusively to these heads of administrative
divisions or dioceses (of whom it is nevertheless
characteristic) because at the court of the king,
according to the sources, especially the Shahrastani,
there were many high priests called mohbedh or
hordis who formed a kind of council around
the grand mohbedh (cf. below) or who had other
special offices. Gradually the name mohbedh must
have come to mean, as at the present day, a
priest fully qualified to do everything in connection
with worship. The other terms for Persian priests
seem to refer rather, either to their dignity (e. g.
dastur) or to functions occasionally performed by
them (cf. zoroastrianism). Rent and mortgage are
sometimes put on the same level. The relation of
the mohbedh to the other degrees of the hierarchy
like the hordis, another office (perhaps teacher)
having supervision over the diocese of priests is not
clear. Al-Mas'udi says in the Tabbth, p. 103, that
hordis were lower in rank than mohbedh.

At the head of the hierarchy of priests were
no doubt the hordi hordis or chief of the
hordi and the mohbedh mohbedh or chief of the
mohbedh. Tannur, the writer of the famous letter,
is called by the Denkari: hordis hordis hordis, according
to Darmesteter "chief of the religion", while al-
Mas'udi (Tabbth, p. 99) calls him better the
mohbedh of Ardashtr. Indeed it is quite certain
from our sources that the supreme head of the
ecclesiastical hierarchy was the chief of the mohbedh
mohbedh or chief of the hordi (hordis) who was also the first dignitary
of the court; all the religious clergy which constituted a state within the state
was concentrated in this postifl. Al-Mas'udi in
the Tabbth, p. 103, says of his rank that it was
almost equal to that of a prophet.

In accounts of the ceremonial of the Shahrastani,
he is always given first place and he frequently
appears surrounded by a council of high priests,
hordi or mohbedh. Besides all the functions
which he exercised as chief of the clergy, i.e. the
supervision of the whole religious life of the
country, the settlement of theological questions,
of problems of ecclesiastical policy, the appointment
and dismissal of ecclesiastical officials, he had
others which we must outline. Christensen thinks
he can deduce from several sources (letter of
Tannur, al-Mas'udi, Tabbth, p. 103—104: Ya'qib,
Historia, i. 4—102) that out of five such officials
formed with the king a kind of ministry, the
composition and number of members of which
perhaps changed from time to time but which
always included the mohbedh mohbedh (cf. e. g.
the Shahrastani, ed. Mohl, vi. 223 where the mohbedh
is called the king's visitor). But he was also
supreme judge as head of the mohbedhs of the
administrative divisions, as the latter were the
judges of higher degree in their respective areas. It is derived from the studies of Bartholomae on
universally legal texts (and especially on the *kufr-i-
huduzi Dictation*, cf. Zum Saunadiischen Recht, p. 34, etc.) that in the different districts there
were judges of first instance and of two degrees (has lower, mas higher), above whom was the
muhadhih of the district. The supreme judge was ultimately the mubahih or mubtahih whose final sentence
could not be disputed. For the judicial functions of the mubtahih it is interesting to consult the acts
of the Persian martyrs in Syracc and Greek (cf. Hofmann, Auszüge aus syrischem Akten Jurisprudenz,
Leipzig 1880; the texts of Bedian, etc., in Patrologia Oriental., etc.). The Arab writers also
give us a pretty clear idea, especially as regards the mubtahih mubhah; for example in Tabari, i.
559; Noldeke, Gesch. al-Fursan unter der trater, p. 230, the mubhahih mubtahih in advising the king in
the matter of the son of Dhi Yasaan, lays particular stress on the young man's right to have his
prayer granted; al-Mas'udi, Muruq (ii. 156) and
Tamukht, p. 105, calls him Sadiq ul-luluf; in the
mubahih also (ii. 211) we are told in connection with the abuses of Hurnus son of Khurraw that,
having abolished the jurisdiction of the mubhahih, the good old tradition and the ancient laws fell
down to desuetude. In al-Tha'alibi, Hist. Pers., p. 506-7, we find two answers which are interesting in this
connection; they were given by the mubhahih mubtahih to the king, who had consulted him with
respect to the sentence of death to be pronounced against his chief wife and her son; in the Kirids
al-Tufy, p. 78 it is related that King Kawkadh full of admiration for a subtle answer given by the
mubtahih exclaimed: "It is with justice that kings have given you the first place and that
they have entrusted you with the control of jurisdiction!"

Some Arabic sources also allude to the court of justice which was held on the occasion of the
great festivities of the *Nuruz* and the *Mubhahih* (e.g. Kitab al-Tufy, p. 159-63; al-Majdab wa-
I-Ahlsad, p. 539-95; al-Kirdmi, al-Aqhdar al-Tabyha, ed. Schauz, p. 215-319, 222-223; Silust-nama, ed. Schueter, p. 38-40, etc.). According to these stories, the people on those days had the right
to bring any complaint against the king before a commission of which the grand mubtahih was the
most important member; the first complaint was judged by the grand mubtahih who thus had the
right to condemn the king, the latter having pronounced a formula of submission, kneeling
before him. The complaints that followed were judged by the king. According to al-Nuwairi, the
mubtahih also offered to judge on those ceremonial occasions a basket of fruits over which he had
uttered a prayer. Tansur's letter (J. A., 1904, p. 344-345) informs us that in the procedure laid
down by Ardashir for designating the heir to the throne the grand mubhahih played the most important
part, that is to say he proclaimed the new heir chosen by divine inspiration should it happen that
the other dignitaries summoned to deliberate with him were not in agreement. The position of the
grand mubhahih as intimate counsellor and minister
of the king who placed complete confidence in him
(is he often called *counsellor of the king*)
is very clear in the Sujudnama as well as in the
Arabic and Persian sources (cf. al-Tha'alibi
p. 504-505; al-Mas'udi, Muruq, ii. 171; where Bahramson of Bahram, son of Hurnus, addresses

the grand mubhahih: "Thou, supporter of religion,
counsellor of the king and the man who directs
his attention to affairs of state neglected by him").

According to al-Mas'udi, Tamukht, p. 104, only the
mubhahih and a few other high officials of state
possessed a copy of the *Sujudnma* or register of offices, a very large book, forming part of the
*Mubhahih* (in *Naufurlis* was translated by Ibn
al-Makaffi with the title *Kitab al-Kutub*).

Among the details which are preserved in the sources about the grand mubhahih, we are told that
he was one of the three who shared the king's table in time of war when the royal meals were
very frugal; and that when a victory was won, he
along with other dignitaries pronounced a discourse
(Kitab al-Tufy, p. 172) in which he was the main
feature in the sources is the wisdom of the grand
mubtahih and indeed of all the mubhahih (cf. below).
In the *Sujudnma* (we pick out only a few of the
more interesting episodes) the Byzantine ambassador
who was, the grand mubhahih tells Khurraw, of the
school of Plato, puts seven questions to the mubhahih
which he answers (Mohl, vi. 399 sqq.) and thus excites
the admiration of the king. In this story, as
usual, the grand mubhahih appears surrounded by
other priests called mubhahih on mubtahih as the
case may be, and he is also given the title *dawir*.

Cf. also the questions put by the grand mubhahih
to Khurraw Anbarka in (Mohl, vi. 394 sqq.) and
the assembly of the mubtahih under the presidency
of the grand mubhahih to put questions to Hurnusson of Anbarka (ibid., p. 424-430). Another
passage (Mohl, vi. 442 sqq.) describes the heroic
piety of the grand mubhahih who consoles a high
official, a victim of King Hurnus, and is poisoned
by the latter. The grand mubtahih is also represented
as interpreting the language of birds (cf. also
al-Mas'udi, Muruq, ii. 169-170; the dialogue of
the owls denouncing the cruelty of King
Bahram son of Bahram son of Hurnus (276-
293 A. D.), and in al-Tabari (i. 965; Noldeke, p. 250) he explains the invasion of jackals in the
reign of Khurraw as a punishment for the impunity
of the land.

The story is very well known among the Arabs
of the dream of the grand mubhahih in the night of the
birth of the Prophet and his interpretation of other
miraculous happenings of the same night (al-Tabatt,
982 sqq.; Noldeke, p. 253; Amiral dell' Islam, i. 150); Hamza al-Irshahid (ed. Gottwald, p. 37)
quotes a list of *Sujudnama* kings drawn up by the
mubhahih Bahram son of Mardanish (Noldeke, p. 401).

In religious discussions the steps to be taken
against heretics, in the persecutions and inquisitions
against the Christians, the mubbih and the grand
mubtahih are always most prominent (Hofmann,
Auszüge, texts of Bedian, Patrologia Oriental., etc.).

Cf. also the articles MAsk, Zinat.

A list of grand mubhahih of the Sassanian period
and of mubhahih contemporary with the last editions
of the book is found in the *Bundakhsha*, ch. 33
(Christensen, Empires des Sassanides, p. 35).
The first grand mubhahih appointed by Ardashir
was, according to Tabari (Noldeke, p. 9), a man named
Pehr (?). The mubhahih mubhahih Aturpitt-Zartuskh
lived, according to the Pahlavi sources, 150 years
and was grand mubtahih for 90. Ellsche (Langlois, ii. 230) mentions a grand mubtahih, who had the
honourable title of Hamakdun (*he who knows all
religion*) on account of his vast theological learning;
this title seems to have been often given to the
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MÖBEDH — MODON

A number of names of grand mōbedh are given in various sources, among them the Acts of the Martyrs in Syria, Greek and Armenian; some are also preserved on the seals published by Herfeld in his work on the monuments of Faikuli. Māzak was according to some texts mōbedh or even grand mōbedh. In Ibn al-Fiṣṭiḥ, p. 216, we have a description in verse of pictures representing with other dignitaries "their mōbedh and their kārābāḥ" who judges ignorantly and iniquitously.

On the somassāk cf. the article Zoroastrianism and Goldzuber, Muhammedanische Studien, 1. 170 and Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bayān, ed. Sandbühl, Cairo 1927, III, 7, on the Ġānibīya. It is known that the Zoroastrian clergy played an important part in the Ġānibīya movement (Inschriften, Études somassianes, St. Petersburg 1909, p. 10–15).

After the Muslim conquest the importance of the grand mōbedh and of the mōbedh diminishes in proportion as Islam spreads; our sources of course continue to mention them and Arab writers give information obtained directly from mōbedh (al-Taftahi, t. 2874, year 31 a.H., mentions the mōbedh who advised the governor Mūhawalā to kill king Yaqūt; al-Musṭaḏhī, Khiṣāṭ al-Tūbākh, p. 104 gives the name of the mōbedh of all Persia in 342 a.H. etc.).

The organisation of the Fārsī at the present day is different, mōbedh means a priest qualified to perform all the duties of worship. This, however, is beyond the scope of this article.


(Michelangelo Guidi)

MODON, a town in the Morea on the south-west point of Messenia, about 20 miles N.W. of Cape Arkitas, opposite the island of Sapienza at the foot of Mount Tenea. Modern is frequently mentioned in ancient times under the names Mōsōnos and Mosoun; from the latter comes the Italian name of the town, modern, under which it has been known since the middle ages in Europe. In the middle ages it was of much greater importance than in antiquity. The good harbour of the town, sheltered by cliffs of varying height, has long been a haven of refuge and of supply for ships going from the west to the Levant. Hence pilgrims frequently mention the town and their accounts of their travels even contain maps.

The Arab Idris, in his geographical work finished in 1548 (1153) for Roger II of Sicily, enumerates many seaports and towns on the mainland of Greece. Among these is MODON of which he records that it is a fortified town and has a citadel which commands the sea (Geographie d’Edris, ed. A. Jaubert, Paris 1846, p. 305). By the treaty of 1109 with the Byzantine emperor Alexius III, Venice was allowed to trade freely in Modon. The town had suffered severely at the hands of the Venetians in 1125, and again of the Normans in 1146 but was recovering again slowly. After the taking of Constantiople by the Crusaders (1204) and the division of the lands which had previously formed the Byzantine empire, Modon fell to the Venetians, under whose rule it remained for nearly three centuries. It is this period that marks the golden age of the town, which, carefully administered by her merchant princes, developed a new prosperity and became an important and secure centre for trading with Egypt and Syria, while previously it had often been a nest of pirates. In the 13th century the population of Modon was a mixed one of Greeks, Jews, Albanians, Turks, Gipsies and Western Europeans. The Turks of the neighbourhood raised swine which they sold to the townspeople. According to some sources, at the end of the 13th century five thousand swine were exported annually from Modon to Venice. About the same time a settlement of gipsies in Modon is mentioned, who came from Egypt, a district about forty miles from Modon, from which they said they had fled — for the sake of the Christian faith — and were seeking refuge in all lands with a letter of recommendation from the Pope (cf. Die Pilgerfahrt des Ritter Arnold von Harf, ed. E. v. Groschwitz, Cologne 1860, p. xxvii, 67 f.; Z.D.P.V., xvii, 1894, p. 144). The fact is, however, that the gipsies of Modon after 1500 went over en masse to Islam, about the end of the 14th century were again mainly Christians, outwardly at least, after 1715 again became Muslims and finally after 1821 became Christians again.

During the second half of the 14th century the population of Modon increased considerably for many Christians and Jews of the Peloponnese, seeking to escape the Turkish yoke, took refuge here. While the town itself was immune, the country round, which was flat, suffered a great deal from the Turks. Thus for example about 1480, the Turks raided this plain and destroyed the fig trees there. In the last decades of the 14th century, the Venetian republic had much anxiety about Modon and her other possessions in the East, which the Turks had long coveted. In 1499 the Admiral Antonio Grimani was ordered by his government to see to the defence of Modon against the Turks. In July of this year, the Turkish fleet came to the vicinity of Modon and soon afterwards several naval encounters with the Venetian fleet took place. In a naval battle fought on Aug. 8, 1499, outside Modon, the heroic Venetian Andrea Lovestano, governor of Corfu, was taken by the Turks and put to death. Another Venetian admiral, Melchior Trevisano, was now entrusted by the Venetian republic with the defence of Modon and her other possessions in the East. At the same time the republic despaired of making peace with Turkey, but the negotiations broke down in face of the impossible conditions laid down by Bayezid II. Among other things he insisted on the surrender of Modon. In the meanwhile on March 23, 1500, the Turks had occupied Merona, a little town near Modon. Marcus Gabriel, the commander of Modon, had previously, on February 18, 1500, reported to the Venetian government the great straits of the town. According to his report, the garrison was not sufficient to defend the town against the Turks, and for a successful defence he would require four thousand trained men, in addition to artillery, arms, munitions and gunpowder, which the town lacked. In spite of his difficult financial
situation, Venice managed to provide the town with money, troops and artillery. But the Turkish fleet again appeared before Modon while Bayazid II advanced on the town by land at the head of an equipped army. An attempt by the Venetian fleet under Admiral Hieronymus Contarini to raise the blockade on July 24, 1500 failed with heavy losses. The Turkish fleet, according to the Venetian admiral, had very good artillery. In the meantime famine had broken out in the garrison so that they could hold out no longer. Four Venetian galleys were able to steal through the Turkish fleet into the harbour and bring the garrison food, munitions and men, but this could not avert the fate of the town. After a siege of twenty-eight days during which the town was bombarded by heavy artillery, the Turks stormed it. On Sunday, August 9, 1500, the Venetian garrison had to yield to this onslaught.

The lot of the surviving garrison and other inhabitants of the town was a hard one. They were either massacred in most inhuman fashion or sent into slavery. Very few of them succeeded in escaping. But the number of people captured did not come up to the expectation of the Turks, because the Venetian authorities had earlier sent thousands of old men, women and children from Modon to Crete and Zante. Among those who fell at the capture of the town was the Roman Catholic bishop of Modon, Andreas Falcius, a number of prominent Venetians and high officials of other origin. When the news of the capture of Modon by the Turks reached Venice, it was plunged into deep mourning. This is reflected in a letter which the Doge Augustino Barbarigo sent on September 7 to the Pope and several European rulers with reference to the catastrophe. The sole consolation of the Venetians was the devout hope that their fleet might succeed in retaking Modon. The Venetian Senate at once saw to the settlement of a number of the refugees from Modon in Cephalonia. Sultan Bayazid II regarded the conquest of Modon, at the fortifications of which he was rightly amazed, as a gift from God. When he entered the town as a victorious conqueror, it had already been partly consumed by fire which had been begun by the defenders themselves. The fugitives from Modon, who had taken refuge in Zante, watched the flames that were destroying their homes burn for several days. Sultan Bayazid II promoted the first janissaries to leap over the walls of Modon to the rank of Sarach-bey. He had two towers built of the skulls of the fallen and massacred Christians and turned the cathedral of the town, the venerable church of St. John, into a mosque. On August 14, 1500, he went to the new mosque to return his thanks to God in prayer. He then saw to the resettlement of Modon, the walls of which were rebuilt. By imperial decree, each Peloponnesian village had to send five families to become permanent settlers in Modon, the revenue of which were allotted to Mecca. After a brief stay, Sultan Bayazid left his new conquest. He took with him as a prisoner the last Venetian defender of the town, Marcus Gabriel, whose life he had spared with the intention of using him for his own purposes later. The historian Saffet, a native of Sinope, wrote some time before 1523 an account of the taking of Lepanto (Napactos) and Modon (Pethioudo'si Amfákhíi ve-Muion). The brief description of the capture of Modon written by Münzeli Sîyâsî Mehemet also gives details of the sultan's treatment of the town (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., Leipzig 1909, p. 49).

In 1531 the Knights of St. John endeavoured to take Modon from the Turks and to establish themselves there. To do this they equipped a small fleet under the command of the Abbate Fra Bernardo Salibia, a nephew of Pope Clement VII. Two Greeks employed in the harbour of Modon and Johnas Skandalis, a Greek from Zante, whose father was a customs officer in Modon, were to assist the enterprise. The fleet, led by Salibia, with two merchant ships, which also concealed soldiers, sailed for Synéfira. The warships were hidden in the vicinity of this island, while the two merchant ships under the guidance of Johnas Skandalis, made for the harbour of Modon. Permission to land was given without trouble to the crews of these two ships, who gave themselves out to be some merchants and some janissaries, and they were allowed to spend the night in the tower at the harbour. Johnas Skandalis and his little band of followers then succeeded in overpowering the Turkish guard at the tower and taking nearly the whole town. The rest of the Turkish garrison shut themselves in the palace which had once housed the Venetian governors of the town, and offered a stubborn resistance. In order to overcome the Turkish garrison the warships hidden at Synéfira were necessary. These now came up, although very late, and bombarded the town with their guns. Scarcely had they begun when a strong Turkish fleet appeared. The Knights and Johnas Skandalis therefore abandoned Modon, but not without carrying off some sixteen hundred prisoners.

The years 1532—1534, during which a Spanish force in the service of Charles V occupied the adjoining Coroni, were a critical period for the Turks in Modon. But after this, it was left in peace for a considerable period. The Travels of Evliya Celebi who visited the Morea in 1667 to 1668 contain valuable notes on Modon and its vicinity, while Hikâîî Khalifa (d. 1658) contains nothing essential.

During the war which broke out in 1684 between Turks and Venetians in which Germans, Poles and Russians also shared as allies, Modon with the whole of the Morea was restored to the Venetians. General Francesco Morosini in 1686 broke the resistance of the Turkish garrison with the help of Greek and German troops and secured it for the Adriatic republic. The chief mosque of the city, i.e. the old cathedral, was once more dedicated to Christian worship. Only in 1699 after the peace of Carlowitz did the Turks recognize the Venetian claim to Modon. Venice now did her utmost to restore the city which, with its commerce, had much declined during the Turkish occupation. Of the seven administrative divisions (cameru) into which the Venetians had divided the Morea, the third was that of Modon. This district was again divided into four areas (Fanari, Arcadia, Navarino and Modon). From a Venetian record of September 29, 1699, giving the results of a census by the Venetian officials, we see that the district of Modon had been depopulated to an incredible degree. The 218 villages detailed in this list were inhabited by only 11,702 souls. Modon itself, including the citadel, had only 236 inhabitants of whom some must have been Muslims. A large number of villages which at the turn of the xviiith—xxviiith centuries belonged to the district of Modon, have
Turkish names, some of which survive to this day. These villages were originally left to Turks whose names in time passed to the village (cf. S. P. Lambros, in Delton, publication of the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece, vol. II, 1885. p. 686-710, pl. VII, thereon Τουρκική Μελετήματα, Athens 1884, p. 114 sqq.; Fieschi Antonio Paschico, Brève discussion corrigé du Peloponnesio e Morea, Venice 1704, p. 125 sqq.).

After the conquest by Morosini whose services to Modon are commemorated in inscriptions still in existence, the town remained for some nineteen years under Venetian rule. In 1715 the grand vizier 'Ali Kamurtri with the help of a number of Greeks took not only Modon but almost the whole of the Morea from the Venetians in a very short time. The Venetian garrisons of Navarino and Coroni as well as the inhabitants abandoned them when the Turkish army approached in the summer of 1715, in order to take refuge in Modon, which was much more strongly fortified. Soon afterwards the Turkish fleet and army began the siege of the town. After a brief resistance Modon surrendered voluntarily. After the capture of the town the grand vizier ordered a general slaughter of the Christians. Many in the district thereupon adopted Islam in order to save life and property in this way. The Turks who had formerly owned property in Modon or the neighbourhood were allowed by imperial edict to resume possession of it. The peace of Passawitz (1718) finally ceded Modon to Turkey. The town recovered from the catastrophe of 1715. From 1725 onwards a busy trade developed between Modon and the lands of North Africa, especially Algeria and Tunis; this trade had existed previously but not to the same extent. Modon played a certain part during the war between Turkey and Russia in 1768-1774. The Russian vice-general Georg Vladimir Dolgovski in 1769 with 500 Russians, 150 Montenegrians and 100 Greeks (mainly Maimotes) besieged Modon. The Turkish garrison of Modon consisted of 800 janissaries and a large number of Turks of the town and vicinity able to bear arms. The walls of the citadel were in good condition, and the supply of food and munitions ample. The siege lasted a long time; the fighting was conducted mainly by the artillery on both sides. The Russians had also two warships co-operating on the sea. At the end of May 1769, Turks and Albanians from the interior of the Morea came to the help of the besieged who undertook a valiant sortie, when they learned of the approach of help. In the battle that now developed the Russians suffered heavily. They were forced to abandon most of their artillery and to escape to Navarino, from which they sailed with the rest of the Russian army and a few Greek notables. A few years later, the Turks in Modon were still displaying the guns which they had taken from the Russians in 1769. According to reliable sources, the Turkish population of Modon about 1820 was four to five hundred fighting men. About the same time 'Ali Agha was prominent among the Turks of the town for his wealth and in other respects also. The vicinity of Modon was almost exclusively inhabited by Greeks who cultivated the land, which mainly belonged to the Turks, and were despised by them as contemptible menials. During the Greek War of Independence of 1821-1827, all the attempts of the Greeks to take the town failed. At the end of March 1821, a Peloponnesian force led by the orthodox patriarch of Methone, named Gregory, and other notables, besieged Modon and the adjoining towns of Koroni and Neaokastro. The besiegers were joined in the spring by Greeks from the Ionian islands and later by Philhellenes from Europe. On May 18, 1821, Greek ships, under the captains of the Speziators, Nikolaos Moutsas and Anastasios Koladuratsos blockaded Modon. But neither the Turkish garrison nor the armed Turkish civilians in the town were the least dismayed. On the contrary, they undertook raids in all directions and did their best to impede the progress of Greek emancipation. Many fierce encounters took place between the Turks of Modon and their besiegers. In July 1821, Turkish ships re-provisioned Modon but they were not successful in their attempt to re-provision Neaokastro, the garrison of which was in dire straits from want of food and even water. On August 8, 1821, the Turks of Modon decided to attempt the relief of their compatriots in Neaokastro, who had in the meanwhile been forced to capitulate to their Greek besiegers. On the road between Modon and Neaokastro a battle was fought on August 8, 1821, in which the valiant chief Constantine Pierrakos Mavroschialos, a member of the illustrious Mavroschialos family, fell. On the same day, the Greeks took Neaokastro; but they gradually abandoned the siege of Modon. The town was able to continue to hold out, only, however, with the frequent help of the Turkish fleet.

When Ibrahim Pasha, the adopted son of Mehmed 'Ali, undertook to suppress the Greek rising and to pacify the Morea, Modon and its neighbourhood formed his main base. There he landed troops on February 24, 1825, and dug entrenchments. Modon became an important base for Ibrahim Pasha's operations. On October 8, 1826 the town was taken from him by the French General Maison. Not before 1827 the French left and Modon has since then belonged to the Greeks. Bibliography: (as far as not given above): Ant. G. Monfrederatos, Μανόν και Κρινόν ιπτ 'Εστεφάνας γι' αυτοκοινονία, πολιτισμού και δημοσιογραφία του, Athens 1914; K. Hopf, Geschichte Griechenlands im Mittelalter, Leipzig 1867-1868, i. and ii., pasiwm; W. Miller, The Latin in the Levant, London 1908 (cf. the Greek translation with additional notes and connections by S. P. Lambros, Athens 1909-10, pasiwm; R. Röhrich-H. Miesner, Deutsche Pilgerreisen nach dem heiligen Lande, Berlin 1880, p. 689; Eydel, Histoire du commerce du Levant, Leipzig 1885, i. and ii., pasiwm; S. P. Lambros, Νεα Ελληνιστική Εκδοσις (periodical), index vol., Athens 1930, p. 420; C. N. Sathas, Monumenta Helenica historica, I.--ii., Paris 1880-1890 (exp. and vii.); C. L. F. Tafel-R. Predelli, Diplomatiauer Veneto-Levantinum (1300--1454), I. and ii., Venice 1880, 1899; E. Gerland, Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Erzbistums Patras, Leipzig 1903 (these three books contain many documents relating to Modon); Sanudo, Diarii, iii., pasiwm, esp. p. 688-694; P. Bembo, Rerum Venetarum historia, Basel 1556, fol. 110-114; F. Sansovino, Historia universale dell'origine et imperio de' Turci, Venice 1573, fol. 207; Historia politica, Bonn ed., p. 56-58; Echtes Chronico, ed. S. P. Lambros, London
MODON — MOGADOR  


MOGADOR, a town in Morocco on the Atlantic coast. The Bay of Mogador, protected against the north winds by the rocky promontory on which the town is built, against those from the west by an island about 1,000 yards in length, forms a natural harbour which, although not large and inaccessible for ships of large tonnage, has however the merit of being accessible at all seasons, an advantage which secures it a favourable place among the anchorages of the Atlantic coast of Morocco which is, generally speaking, inhospitable. This favoured situation was taken advantage of at a very early period. In spite of the lack of precision in the sources, it is probable that we should seek at Mogador the site of one of the five Phoenician colonies founded by Hannibal (3rd century). The island seems to have been known as the island of Hera or of Juno. Filioy records that at the end of the first century B.C. the king Juba II fortified purple-dyeworks on the "Purpuraria insulae," islands in the ocean opposite the Autoleus", a Getulic people who lived in the north of the High Atlas. Getulic purple, which was celebrated at Rome, was supplied by the neutralus abundant on this coast. It is only at Mogador that we find an island and islets which can be identified as the "Purpuraria insulae," but no archaeological discovery has yet been made to confirm the deductions made from the ancient geographers.

In the 8th century of the Christian era, according to al-Bakri (who finished his book in 1068), Amogdal, a very safe anchorage, was the port for all the province of Sis. We see in the name of both local sultans, Sidi Mogdii, still venerated at the present day, whose tomb is on the bank near the mouth of the Wãdi 'El-Kob. It is however possible that the saint, of whom we know nothing, gets his name from an old Berber place-name. Mogdii, and Mogdar, is only a Spanish or Portuguese transcription of Mogdull, through the forms Mogodal, Mogdor, which we sometimes find in the texts. The harbour and the island bear the name Mogdor or Mongdor on a series of portolan of the 14th and 15th century (publ. by Ch. de la Roncière, La Découverte de l'Afrique au Moyen-âge, 1925) but there was not a town here, when in Sept. 1506, the king of Portugal Dom Manuel I commanded a gentleman of his court, Diogo d'Azambuja, to build a fortress here which was called Castel Real of Mogador. Built with great difficulty in face of the hostility of the natives, the Portuguese stronghold did not long resist them. While at Safi and Santa Cruz of Cape Goeur (Agadir), the state of anarchy in which the tribes lived favoured the rapid progress of the Portuguese, it seems that at Mogador they came up against resistance probably organised by the old Berber marabouts body of the Râgrâs. The garrison had to remain blockaded in Castel Real, revictualled with difficulty from the old Berber marabouts of the Râgrâs. In the autumn or November 1510, the tribes were strong enough to seize the fortress in circumstances which we do not know.

A sketch of the 16th century and plans of the xviiiith leave no doubt as to the site of Castel Real. It was situated, not at the mouth of the Wãdi 'El-Kob, where it is now shown an alleged Portuguese fort which however only dates from the end of the xviii century, but on the shore of the northern passage opposite the island, on the rocky point which supports the mole west of the present harbour. Sometimes abandoned, sometimes more or less restored by the rulers of Morocco, who from time to time kept a small garrison there, the old Portuguese castle survived till 1765 or 1765 and was only destroyed when the town was built.

In spite of the lack of success of the Portuguese attempt, this privileged situation continued to attract the envy of European nations. At the beginning of the xviiith century, Spain, fearing that Moroccan, Algerian or even European corsairs would establish themselves at Mogador, thought of seizing it herself to protect the route to the Indies. At the same time, English agents were thinking of making Mogador a base against Spain. The Saltñas Mawlij Zaâïn in 1611—1612 and his son 'Abd al-Majà in 1628 drew up a scheme to fortify the place to prevent foreigners from establishing themselves there. This was the time when in France Richelieu and Père Joseph were drawing up schemes for a colonial policy. The Chevalier de Ravilly in 1626 suggested to them the occupation of Mogador and the organisation of a factory and fisheries there. He had it reconnoitred in 1629 but found it impossible to take it by surprise.

In spite of so many projects and attempts against it, the island and the shores remained practically deserted. Ships however frequented the roadstead. It was through Mogador that in the first quarter of the xviith century, the greater part of the trade between Marrakesh and Holland took place. Later, in the time of Mawlij Isâm-id'l, the harbour was mainly used as a refuge for corsairs who came there to rest and repair their vessels.

In 1731, Sidi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allîth, then khâlifa of his father for the district of Marrakesh, desiring to develop commercial relations between his subjects and Europe, ceded the island of Mogador to a Dutch company, which however preferred to establish a centre at Agadir and was not successful there. A few years later on becoming sulîm and having made Marrakesh his capital, Sidi Muhammad decided himself to found a town at Mogador and to conduct all the commerce of
the south of his kingdom through it, to the greater benefit of the royal treasury, which would obtain not only the customs from this increased trade but also profit by the rents of the buildings, most of which had been built by the sovereign and were his private property. The harbour also served as a base for the corsairs who, through the menace they offered to the islets of Europe, forced the Christian nations to conclude treaties with the sultan by which he received valuable presents and even sums of money. In order to populate the town and start business in it, he demanded that European consuls and merchants should settle there and have homes built at their own expense.

By 1760 he had begun work but it is from the autumn of 1764 that the foundation of the town really dates; it was given the name al-Suwaïra (Souira), the little fortress, by which it is known to the natives; the name Mogador is only used by Europeans. We also find a Berberised form (Taouzir). The sultan went in person to choose and distribute the sites for the buildings. He had asked the English to send him an architect. They sent him a French "engineer", a native of Avignon, called Nicolas Courtu, who had made the plans for the fortifications of some places in Romillan. He was an adventurer who, after working in France and contracting, entered the English service during the Seven Years' War. He was living at Gibraltar where he entered Sidi Muhammad's service. The sultan did not gain much by his services and sent him back to France at the beginning of 1767. None of the present buildings in Mogador can be attributed with certainty to Courtu, for after him a number of European architects and masons worked for the sultan, notably a Genoese architect who built the battery called the źidla situated on the western rampart facing the sea. Mogador owed to its builders the narrow streets, massive gateways and bastions of European type, the like of which cannot be found in other Moroccon towns and which give it a quite a special character. Sidi Muhammad also built outside the town a country palace which still stands half buried in sand opposite the little village of Diyabat.

The dreams of the sultan were only imperfectly realised. The merchants, attracted to Mogador by the promise of a reduction in the export duties on goods, were soon undeceived when they saw that the sovereign did not keep his promises but constantly imposed new burdens on trade. The prosperity of Mogador remained insignificant under Sidi Muhammad and declined under his successors. The situation of the town, a long way from great cities and main roads, made it frequently used in the sixteenth century as a political prison and compulsory place of residence for high officials in disgrace. Mogador remained however the starting-place for the caravans to Sfax, Mauritania, and the Sidi in and has retained from this position a certain commercial importance, to which the opening of the port of Agadir to commerce will now do considerable harm.

On August 15, 1844, after the battle of Isly, a French squadron commanded by the Prince de Joinville, who had just bombarded Tangiers, came and bombarded Mogador. It was intended to make an impression on Sultan Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahmán by striking at a town which belonged to him personally and from which he drew considerable revenues. A three hours' bombardment silenced the batteries; the French army then disembarked on the island, the garrison of which, entrenched in the mosque, made a vigorous defence until the next morning. On August 16, a detachment of 600 men went to spike the guns, throw the gunpowder into the sea and destroy the last defences of Mogador. The town, which had suffered very little from the French shot, but had been evacuated by the inhabitants, was burned and plundered by the tribes of the country round (Shiyādān and Ḥaṣān).

Mogador is now the headquarters of a corrupt civil. It had 18,401 inhabitants at the census of 1867. The Jewish element is particularly large, numbering 7,770.

The extremely temperate climate is remarkably equable; but it is spoilt by the wind which blows almost incessantly, laden with sand from the neighbouring dunes.


MOGHUL. [See MUGHAL.]

MOHUR, an Indian gold coin. The name is the Persian mohur, which is a loanword from the Sanskrit mudrā, seal or die. The earliest occurrence of the word on coins is on the forced currency of Muhammad b. Tughlāq where it has the literal meaning of "sealed" or "stamped". By the sixteenth century it had come to be used as a popular rather than precise name for gold coins in general. Very little gold had been issued in India for two centuries before the reign of Akbar. One of his reforms was the issue of an extensive coinage in gold. In addition to many pieces which had only a brief circulation, he revived the old gold tanka (q.v.) of the Sullātus of Delhi on a standard of 170 grains (11.02 grammes) to which he gave the name mohur. That the name at first could be applied to any gold coin is shown by Dībānīgar's reference in his Mīmāṃsā: (_transl. A. Rogers, O.T.F., vol. ix., p. 10) to mohurs of 100, 50, 20, 10, and 5 tula. After the numismatic experiments of Akbar and Dībānīgar, only one gold piece was struck, occasionally with subdivisions so that the general name acquired a particular meaning, especially among the English merchants in India. Mohurs continued to be struck to the end of the Mughul Empire and by the states into which it broke up in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Akbar and Dībānīgar issued
MOKHÀ, a small seaport on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea in 13°10' 50" N. Lat. and 43°12'10" East Long. (Greenwich).

The once imposing town lies on a small bay between two promontories with forts on each about one and a half miles apart. The wall which surrounds the town is a semicircle with four gates. In the north of the Bâb al-Hamidâtlya leads to the citadel of the town and to a tongue of land which runs out into the sea; in the east roughly in the centre of the wall is the Bâb el-Shâbûli through which the for of the al-Bâdî is reached and to the east the road to al-Tâiss from it, while the road to al-Holeida runs north via Bâb el-Bâr-lt. In the north the Bâb al-Salam admits to the fort of al-Bârûli and the road to 'Aden; in the west through the Bâb el-Bahr the harbour is reached; its stone breakwater is now much decayed. This also holds of the wall which connects the city-gates. Seen from the sea the town which covers an area of about half a square mile, still looks very fine; the white mass of houses stands brightly out from the dark blue waters of the Red Sea. But as one approaches, the damage which wars, dilapidation and turbulent times have done to the once sore tried town, is apparent; the houses are for the most part deserted, while the inhabitants, consisting of Arabs, Soudais, Danûkîli, Jews and a few Parsees, have settled in huts outside the town. East of the Bâb al-Shâbûli, for example, there is a large group of huts, inhabited by Arabs, while further south and on the other side of the Wâlî el-Kheer is the Jewish quarter (êl-Sâ'îl al-Yahûdî). In the north lies the ancient cemetery and a whitewashed mosque which contains the tombs of the patric sain of the town, Sheikh 'Ali b. 'Umar al-Shâbûli; in the east of the town is a second important mosque with a minaret 118 feet high, which forms a landmark visible from a considerable distance, along with several smaller ones. The country round is barren. Drinking water is brought by a conduit from the Mawrst twenty-four miles to the north. The population has varied considerably in the last hundred years. In 1824 it was 20,000; in 1878-1879 5,000, in 1882 it was put at 1,500 inside the town and in 1901 it had sunk to about 400.

al-Mokhà is briefly mentioned by al-Adamî in connection with al-Mandib as lying in the land of the Bânî Maqîdî; al-Ma'sûdî also refers to it briefly in his geographical work. The Portuguese gave the town the name by which it has become known in Europe: Moca. P. Manoel d'Almeida calls it Mocou in his Historia geral de Espanha a alma por B. Ihesua Telles (Columba 1666).

About 350 years ago Mokhà was an insignificant village, but rapidly grew in importance when Shaikh Shâhûli discovered the peculiar qualities of the coffee bean and introduced the habit of drinking coffee. In 1513 Alfonso Alberequerque found Mokhà still a modest place but by 1610 it had become the most important port for trade with Abyssinia, and England was endeavouring to trade with it while the Dutch had a factory here. Coffee was the chief article of export along with other specialities of the Yemen, and received its name from the town. As late as 1763 Nieuhof found the town very prosperous; but the capture of 'Aden by the English put an end to its prosperity. 'Aden and al-Holeida attracted all the trade of Southern Yemen. Under Turkish rule Mokhà was a kâdî in the sandjak of Ta'izz but its trade was insignificant. In 1916 for example, only about £10,000 worth of coffee was sent to 'Aden. There is a minimum of industrial activity and that only to supply local needs. Indigo dyeing and the manufacture of spirits may be mentioned: the latter is in the hand of Jews. Mokhà is connected by telegraph with Şanî (via Ta'izz), al-Holeida (via Zahût), Shaikh Sa'dî and Portu. Mokhà has acquired a new importance by the creation of the intendant of the Yemen and is now beginning to share the trade with al-Holeida.


MOLLÀ. [See MawÌlà.]

MOLLÀ KHUSRAW. [See Muhammad b. Farâmàk.]

MOMBASA (Munis, anciently Mvita), an island and town on the east coast of Africa, in Lat. 4° S., Long. 39° E. The island, about 3 miles in length from north to south and nearly the same distance from east to west, is remarkably compact in shape and is so placed in the deep inlet formed by the converging of several creeks as to be almost entirely surrounded by the mainland, only presenting its south-eastern angle
to the Indian Ocean. This peculiarity of its situation suggested to the late W. E. Taylor the derivation of the name Mvita (the "Curtailed Headland") from kita, "point". The more usual derivation from vita, "war" seems inadmissible on phonetic grounds; another explanation connects it with ska, "hidden", either from its hidden position, or from the inhabitants, as it is said, having hidden themselves in the bush during a raid from Pate.

The town of Mombasa is situated at the eastern end of the island and, being the terminus of the Uganda railway and the only port of the colony, is of considerable commercial importance. The population, according to the latest information available, is something over 44,000, of whom 26,906 are classed as "Africans" (i.e. the permanent residents, mostly Swahili, and a floating contingent of labourers belonging to other tribes). The remainder includes 7,525 Arabs, 7,556 Indians, 1,000 Europeans, and a proportion of "other races". The Arabs, Swahili and many of the Indians are Moslems; the two former chiefly Sunnis of the Shafi'i sect, though a few of the older men belong to the Itzhita. There are several mosques, very plain buildings, as a rule, and devoid of minarets; the muhaddithin stands on the flat roof to give the call to prayer. The largest and most imposing of these structures is that belonging to the Khodja.

The origin of Mombasa is involved in some obscurity. It is certain that Arab trading stations existed on the East African coast at the beginning of the Christian era, and we learn from the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea that the traders frequently married native women. This indicates a fairly early origin for the Swahili race. The first permanent settlements, however, seem to have been post-Islamic: 69 (659) is given as the date for the settlement of Pate; and, as Lamu is said by native tradition to have been founded by colonists sent out by 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân (A.D. 678-705), these two towns were no doubt contemporary. There is no mention of Mombasa in the traditions of Lamu or Pate. At this period, except for a statement made to the late Captain Sigand (Land of Zanj, p. 29), that 'Abd al-Malik sent out Syrians, who "built the cities of Pate, Malindi, Lamu, Kilwa, Mombasa, Lamu and Kilwa". Other authorities place the founding of Kilwa much later, viz. 365 (767). The Chronicle of Kilwa states that "Ali b. Hasan of Shiraz, the founder and first Sultan," installed one of his sons as ruler of Mombasa, no doubt the first of the "Shirazi Sultans," the last of whom was deposed by the Portuguese. It would appear that Mombasa was for some time under the sovereignty of Kilwa; but how far the "King of the Zanj" described by Idrisi and, later, by Ibn Sa'd, as residing at Mombasa, was independent, is not clear. The names of the twelve tribes (called indifferently kabita or frâha) said by native authorities to make up the Swahili population indicate a composite origin and possibly a late one, as the bulk of the people came from settlements already founded. It is possible that the Wamvita (who either take their name from the city or gave their name to it) go back to the alleged foundation under 'Abd al-Malik; but against this is the assertion, repeatedly made, that the Wachangamwe, Wakkilindini and Watangana are the saifa safa, "the three" — i.e. the three aboriginal "tribes". Some native authorities give these three as "Kilindini", separate from Mombasa. Changamwe is a village on the mainland, a mile or two from the crossing at Makupa; Kilindini (now important as the principal harbour for steamers from Europe) is at the western end of the island. Tradition says that Kilindini was a city before Mombasa existed, and, in fact, the jungle near the present port contains numerous ruins of uncertain date, which, so far as I know, have not yet been completely examined. Tanga is on the island of Mombasa, now included in the town. The remaining tribes are those of Kilindini I (a town to the north of Mombasa; its inhabitants are said to have come from Shirazi), either Shirazi in Persia or a town of the same name in Tanganyika Territory, a colony from the original Shirazi), Pate, Panza (or Faza, in the island of Pate), Shaka (a Persian settlement near the mouth of the Tana), Mtwapa (between Mombasa and Takaungu), Jomvu (on the creek known as Port Tudor), the Wagnyua (the people on the mainland north of the Lamu archipelago) and the Waktuwa (the Somalis). Another account omits this last name and substitutes that of the Wamalindi. Krupf (Dictionary, p. 249) mentions a tradition that the town was built (not on the present site, but at the place known as Kwa Masheke, a little to the north) by the Mvita, whose tomb was pointed out to him; but it seems probable that this eponymus was invented to account for the name. When that of Mombasa was introduced we have no information, but it was used by the Arab geographers as far back as the 13th century. It is mentioned, as already stated, by Idrisi. Ibn Sa'id speaks of "a great estuary" to the west of the town, by which must be meant the creek now known as "Port Tudor", and says it is distant about one degree from Malindi. Ibn Battuta, who spent one night there, on his way to Kilwa, describes it as "a large island, two days' journey by sea, on the coast of the Sawahi country. It possesses no territory on the mainland. They have fruit-trees on the island, but no cereals, which have to be brought to them from the Sawahi. Their food consists chiefly of bananas and fish. The inhabitants are pious, honourable and upright, and they have well-built wooden mosques". This would imply that the coast opposite Mombasa was not reckoned as part of the Sawahi. Present-day Swahili restrict the term "Swahili" to the strip of coast between Malindi and Lamu, which they look upon as the cradle of their race and this might be taken as intended by Ibn Battuta, but for his reference to cereals being brought from "Sawahil", which would place it in the south, since the dhows laden with millet come up from that quarter with the S.W. monsoon (cf. Taylor, Africisms, § 128).

The first European to reach Mombasa was Vasco da Gama, who touched there, April 7, 1498, but did not land, owing to the real or suspected treachery of the Arab or Swahili pilot sent by the Shah of Persepome. He went on to the rival state of Malindi and established friendly relations with its ruler, who hoped to find in him an ally against Mombasa. Mombasa — after the city had been repeatedly destroyed, in whole or in part, by Almeida in 1505, by Nuno da Caixa in 1538 and by Continho in 1589 — was rendered tributary to the Portuguese in or about 1590, after the adventurer Mr. Ali Bey had induced the Shah to tender his allegiance to the Turkish Sultan and had been
driven off by Continho’s fleet. At the same time
occurred the invasion of the Zimbias, an unidentified
tribe who had spread desolation on their march
north-eastward, “probably from some locality on
or near the West coast” (cf. Thel, l. 352). From
Mombasa they passed on to Malindi, where the
Portuguese garrison, with the help of native allies,
effectually resisted them, and, if not exterminated,
they ceased to exist as a tribe. The fort, still in
existence, was erected between 1593 and 1595,
and Mombasa was held by the Portuguese for
some sixty years. The last Shtráz Shalikh, Shaho
Mahamab b. Hishaam, was deposed and the Shalikh
of Malindi, Almâr, installed in his stead with
the title of Sultân. Immigration from Portugal was
encouraged, but in 1615 the settlers, apart from the
garrison, only numbered 50 (cf. Stranb, p. 173).
In 1605, a convent of Augustinian monks was
founded, which, with other ecclesiastical establish-
ments, was under the jurisdiction of the Arch-
bishop of Goa till 1612. In that year a separate
diocese of Mozambique was created. Shalîk Almâr
died in 1609 and was succeeded by his son Hsân,
whose treatment by the Portuguese authorities ranks
among the scandals of Colonial history. He was
finally murdered, at the instigation of the governor
De Mello Pereira (1615). His son, Yüsuf, aged
seven, was sent to Goa to be educated and there
baptised by the name of Geronimo Chingulita.
After an inquiry held at Lisbon in 1618, the
highest ecclesiastical tribunal in Portugal pro-
nounced Hsân innocent and decreed that Yüsuf
should be restored to his inheritance. In 1630 he
was sent home and installed as Sultân, continued
for a time to profess Christianity, but, being accused
of apostasy because he had been seen praying at
his father’s tomb and apprehensive of being sent
to Goa (the seat of the Inquisition), revolted,
openly declared himself a Moslem and massacred
all the Portuguese in Mombasa (cf. Faria y Sousa,
vol. iii., iv., I., p. 391). His example was followed
by Tangâ, Miangitâ and some other towns (1631).
Mombasa was besieged for three months by F. de
Mowra, with a fleet from Goa, but without success.
Yüsuf, however, probably seeing that he would
be unable to hold out permanently, returned to
Arabia after dismantling the fort and destroying the
town. The new governor, Seixas de Cabreira,
subdued the revolted towns and repaired the fort,
as recorded in the inscription still legible above the
gateway. The Portuguese rule becoming more
and more oppressive, the Coast Arabs appealed
in or about 1660 to Sultân b. Seif al-Yaribl, Imam of
Oman, who had already expelled the Portuguese
from Maskat. He took Mombasa after
a long siege and various operations; and though
it was retaken shortly afterwards, the power of
Portugal was already on the wane, and Seif b. Sultân
again captured Mombasa in 1698 and installed
Nâgr b. Abîd Allah al-Masri as governor. Internal
squabbles and a revolt against this governor led
the town open to a last Portuguese attack, in
1748, when Luis de Mello Sampaio sailed to it
with the help of Bwana Tann Mkun (Abî Bakr
b. Mahammed), Sultân of Pate. This occupation
lasted but a short time and was terminated by
another massacre, probably that commemorated in
the tradition recorded by Taylor (Aphorismus, § 401).
A period of anarchy ensued, which became so
intolerable that not only the “Twelve Tribes” of
Mombasa but the chiefs of the pagan Wanyika on
the mainland, appealed to Seif b. Sultân for help.
He sent three ships and appointed a governor.
In 1739 this office was held by Mîhammed b.
Ishâm al-Masri, the first of a line who became
practically independent rulers of Mombasa. When
the Ya’arabi Imam were ousted by the Al Bit Siadi,
the Masri refused to recognise the new power.
They were left undisturbed for a considerable time,
but the more energetic policy pursued by Sa’îd
b. Sultân (1804—1856) induced them to seek
British protection in 1832. This was provisionally
granted by Captain Owen, but withdrawn three
years later, as the Home government refused to
sanction it. Sa’îd finally gained possession of
Mombasa in 1837, when the leading Masri were
captured by treachery and deported to Bandar
Abâs. From that time till the establishment of
the British protectorate in 1896, Mombasa remained
subject to the Salîyid (now called Sultân) of Zannibar,
who indeed retains a certain jurisdiction over the
ten-mile strip of coast leased from him by the
British East Africa Company in 1887. The principal
event in its history since that date is the invasion
of the Masri in 1895, coincident with, but not
caused by the proclamation of the British pro-
tectorate over the mainland territory, which
was taken over from the Company by the Imperial
Government. Since then the completion of the
Uganda Railway and the harbour works al-Killindini
have noticeably changed the character of Mombasa,
which is now a flourishing seaport, much frequented
by European shipping.

The dialect of Swahili spoken at Mombasa was
considered by the late W. E. Taylor “the truly
central” language, “the best fitted for accurate
statement and grave discussion”; though that of
Zanzibar has now attained a wider currency. The
art of poetry was, till recently, much cultivated
there; the best known of the native poets are
Muyaka b. Mwiinyi Hai, Mwaliima Sikuju (died
1891), and Hemedi b. Mîhammed b. Abîd
al-Masri, who was still living during the last
decade of the sixteenth century (since deceased),
Mîhammed b. Abîd, 4Abîd Allah Borashidi, Mwiinyi
Mugwama.
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MONASTIR (pronounced Moustař, Moustra; ethnic Moustiri), a town in the Stél, the eastern coast of Tunisia, on the site of the ancient Ruspin at the end of a cape which runs out to the south-east of Sısa. The Arabic name raises a problem which is not yet solved. The name clearly conceals the Greek word παρθένιον which suggests that there was an important Christian monastery here at one time. This is however a pure hypothesis, supported by no text, although Tissot (Géographie historique de l'Afrique, ii. 165—166) seems to take it for granted. If on the other hand we remember that the Arab Monastir from the end of the eighth century was a great Muslim monastery and probably the first to be founded in the west, it is tempting to accept the explanation suggested by St Haan 'Abd al-Wahhāb that the name was given to the Muslim foundation by the Greeks of the country or Berbers speaking Greek, still Christians or recently converted to Islam.

It was in 180 (796) that Haršama b. 'Ālyan, who ruled the province of Idrīya, in the name of the 'Abbasid caliph al-Raḥim, founded the rihāz of Monastir. This fortified monastery retained considerable importance in Western Islam. A century after its foundation, it was quoted which proclaimed its great importance and promised the highest rewards to those who came there to fight the infidel or to prepare themselves for the holy war. The Prophet foreseeing the foundation of al-Monastir is said to have said: “On the coast of Idrīya, there is one of the gates of Paradise which is called al-Monastir; one enters it by the grace of God’s mercy and leaves it by the effect of his pardon”; or again: “He who keeps watch in the frontier town of Monastir for three days has the right to Paradise” (cf. Abu l-‘Arab, Classes des savants de l’Idrīya, transl. Ben Cherief, 5, 7, 9, 14, 15; Ibn ‘Idhārī, Bayţan, transl. Fagman, i. 1). In the 9th century al-Bakri gives a description of Monastir the substance of which is taken from al-Warrāt (d. 753) and which is not quite clear to us. It is a large town (bāṣṭa), he says, which contains a quarter (rayḥah) of considerable size. In the middle of this quarter stands a citadel (ʿāṣlim) which contains suites of rooms, oratories and castles (ṣayfāt) of several stories. To the south of this citadel is a great court (ṣubay) with ṣubhās, called ṣubhā ḍawrū, around which women who wish to devote themselves to religion come to live. It seems that the “fortress” was the town itself with its ramparts, still known by the name, common in Tunisia, of ṣubā. Outside the ṣubāt is the quarter also encircled by ramparts and turrets in which we have the rihāz. This occupies the north-east angle of this “fortress”; its walls and high tower (mizba) dominate the plain and the country round. To the south is a courtyard with tombs; here no doubt we have to locate the abodes of the pious women mentioned by al-Warrāt. The interior of the rihāz shows traces of frequent attention and repairs which makes its plan singularly complicated. We can however perhaps recognise the general arrangements of which the rihāz of Sīsa, founded twenty-five years later, gives us a clearer scheme on a smaller scale; a central rectangular court; surrounded by two storeys of cells. On the first floor on the south side, the cells are replaced by a hall for prayer of no great height, very simple with crude vaulting. It is probably the same as is mentioned by al-Bakri: “On the first storey is a mosque where there is always a ṣubhā of great splendour and merit, which has the direction of the community”. The signal tower, circular in plan, occupies almost the same position as that which dominates the rihāz of Sīsa. In addition to the dwellings of the marabouts there are reservoirs, baths and *Persian mills* in the monastery. Every year a great fair was held at Monastir on the ʿAshūrā day when the pious began their temporary withdrawals from the world. Some, however, shut themselves up for life and devoted themselves entirely to prayer and the defence of the lands of Islam. The people of al-Mizār supplied them with provisions, in itself a religious mark.

The ninth century was undoubtedly the golden age of the rihāz of Monastir. Its importance however must have diminished somewhat as a result of the foundation in 821 of the rihāz of Sīsa, which was the starting point for the expedition to Sicily. Al-Bakri would regard the rihāz of Monastir as a dependency on that of Sīsa. It was nevertheless, as well as the land around it, an auspicious place. We can date to about 1000 A.D. the building of the Great Mosque, close to the rihāz, and that of the little mosque of the Sayjada, both of which have preserved wikābas of a very curious transitional style. It is probable that the Lady whose tomb has given its name to the cemetery of the Sāfījida rulers. According to al-Idrīsī (13th century), the dead were brought there by boat (the roads were by no means safe at this time) from the town of Mahdia. The tombs of this period are numerous in the cemetery in which the patron saint of Monastir, Sīlā al-Mezari, is buried.

Although Monastir did not play a great part in history after this period, the town and the rihāz continued to be an object of care to various Tunisian dynasties. From the Hafṣid al-Mustanṣir (1260) date the two gates of the ṣubā of Bab al-Darb and Bab al-Shir. As to the rihāz, one of the gates as rebuilt by the Hafṣid Ali b. Fāris in 828 (1424); another dates from 1058 (1648) and is the work of the Turks.

Monastir is at the present day a town of some 7,000 inhabitants. Three little islands, one of which contains a number of puzzling artificial caves, shelter the roadstead outside, which is frequented by a considerable number of ships at the sunny and sardine fishing season.

**Bibliography:** Abu l-‘Arab, Classes des savants de l’Idrīya, text and transl. by Mohammed Ben Cherief, Algiers 1920, passim; Vayre, Massignon, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 661; Ibn ‘Idhārī, Bayţan al-Mizār, ed. Dossy, 1, 1, 80; transl,
of Montenegro and the latter in the Mediterranean area around Lake Skutari down to the coast. After the destruction in 168 N.C. of the Illyrian kingdom of the Ardiae whose last capital was Skutari, to which they, along with the Herzegovinas, Southern Dalmatia and Northern Albania, had belonged, they came under the rule of the Romans and later formed part of the province of Dalmatia. In the first century A.D. we find the two tribal areas replaced each by a town organised on Roman lines with the old tribal territories attached to them, but Ill-defined: Doclea, at the corner formed by the junction of the Moraca and Zeta, and Scodra, now Skutari, which later, in the division of Dalmatia under Diocletian, became the capital of the province of Preradovita or Praeradis and has maintained a dominating position almost down to the present time [cf. Skutari]. Doclea, on the other hand, is representative for Montenegro of the economic and cultural decline of south-west Europe since ancient times. In spite of the step-motherly nature of the country, we know from the ruins of public and private buildings gleaming in the miserable desert of the Karst and from epigraphic evidence that it was once a prosperous city with considerable trade with the interior across Lake Skutari and on the Boyana which flows out of it (Patsch, in Pauly-Wissowa, Reclamsynopädie der alt. Altertumswissenschaft, 1. 1251 sqq.). It suffered severely in 395 when the Balkans suffered so much at the hand of the Teutons at the time of the migration of the Visigoths, but in spite of the plundering of the Adriatic territory which followed at other hands also, it was still the scene of a bishop in 602, in the period when the towns of the peninsula were finally destroyed as a result of the raids of the Avars and Slavs and the permanent settlement of the later, who having no understanding of town life, retained in their new homes their traditional poor and primitive mode of life, for the most part in family groups settled on the land and mainly engaged in cattle-raising.

II. Its situation and tradition, from traces in place-names, remnants of the old population and the city walls, show much decayed, preserved for the most part in the ruined town of Doclea which hitherto had held the position later occupied by Montenegro, its old ecclesiastical position — there is a record of a bishop of Doclea subordinate to the Greek metropolitan of Durazzo — and seemed also to have given it a military and political preponderance, since the little Slav state which later grew up here bore after it the name of Doliaca, Slav Duklikiya down to the 16th century. This originally comprised only southern Montenegro and the stretch of territory called Kravina along its west bank of the Lake Skutari. The littoral itself (with Cattaro, Budua, Antivari and Dulcigno) and Northern Albania, with many Roman towns like Skutari and Drvasto, remained Byzantine on the contrary, as part of the theme (province) of Dyrrachion down to the 16th century, while eastern and northern Montenegro belonged to Serbia and the north-west to the principality of Travunia (capital Trebinje).

Of the early obscure pre-history of Doliaca all that we have is a Byzantine seal of a ruler of probably the tenth century: Πρωτομακάριος Δουλικιάς; the country was then not only ecclesiastically and culturally but also politically under Greek influence like the larger Slav Adriatic states. From 1000 A.D. our information is fuller, if not absolutely reliable.
Prince John Vladimir, a figure much obscured by legend, is inextricably associated with the last efforts of the Western Bulgar state. First a prisoner, then the son-in-law of the Czar Samuel (d. 1014), he was murdered (drowned in Lake Prespa) by the last Czar John Vladimir (1015–1018) in the Bulgar capital. Remembered in Montenegro as a saint by Christians and Muslims alike, he now rests in the monastery of Shen Jon near Elbasan in Central Albania.

In the years that followed, Byzantium, after the Bulgars, its opponents for centuries, had been finally disposed of by the Emperor Basil II (Berislav) in 1018, beginning the so-called Slavization of the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula, enforced its suzerainty to the northwest also. Dioclesia under three able rulers not only survived this danger but attained an importance never reached by Montenegro itself in its best days. Prince Stephan Voyislav — it is not known in what relationship he stood to John Vladimir — in spite of great opposition from the Byzantines (1036—1042) obtained Travunia (see above), Zachlumia adjoining it (on the central and lower Narenta), almost the whole Adriatic coast between the Narenta and Boyana along with Cattaro and Antivari as well as Northern Albania with Skutari and established the still existing Latin bishopric in Antivari, out of political hostility to Byzantium. His son Michael was the first to take the title of king; the choice of his son Constantine Bodin as Bulgar Czar by rebels in Macedonia (1075) ended however in a — temporary — humiliation of Dioclesia. Michael and Bodin, who preceded his father presumably in 1082, made an alliance with the Normans in Italy and supported Robert Guiscard in his fighting in the west of the Balkan peninsula (1081—1085) with Alexius I Comnenus. Bodin succeeded at the same time in extending his rule over Bosnia also (then practically only the territory on the lower course of the Buna, the Vrba and the Narenta) and Serbia or Rascia (in the modern north and eastern Montenegro, the sandjak of Novi Pazar, T. W. Serbia and S. E. Bosnia). The kingdom of Dioclesia attained its greatest extent with the conquests of Stephan Voyislav — but only for a brief period. Bodin's good fortune faded away. After the restoration of Byzantine rule on the Adriatic, reprisals were begun (1085—1094) under the personal direction of the emperor Alexius. The king was defeated; the links that bound the various parts of his kingdom together were loosened and quarrels broke out within the royal family itself. In 1096 Bodin could still receive Crusaders in his capital Skutari: Provencals under Raymond of Toulouse, who had marched through Dalmatia and probably through the Zeta valley (cf. above) and were making for Durazzo in order to reach Constantinople from there by the old Via Egnatia. After this we have no certain information about him and his successors. All that is certain is that Dioclesia was driven from the coast and out of Northern Albania by the Byzantines and became tributary to them, while Serbia, which had hitherto been politically insignificant in comparison, began to expand at the expense of Dioclesia under the Grand Zupan Vukan, Bodin's governor, and his successors, especially after the Byzantine empire fell steadily into decline from 1180 onwards. The Grand Zupan Stephan Nemanja, a native of Dioclesia, depri vied it of the former possessions of Dioclesia in Northern Albania and on the coast from the eastern shore of Lake Skutari to Cattaro, disposed of the last Dioclian prince Michael in 1189, and united his territory with Serbia. From the 12th century the old name of the country was replaced by that of the river Zeta (Latin: Zenta, Genta).

III. Under Nemanja's dynasty Zeta (with Northern Albania and the coast) remained for 470 years under Serbia and was frequently governed by princes, repeatedly by heirs to the throne. Widows of kings also had estates on this sunny strip of coast. A benefactor of the land as a builder was Helena (d. 1314), the French wife of Stephan Uroš I (1243–1276). She had the towns on Lake Skutari restored, which had suffered severely from the Mongol storm which in 1242 had swept southwards along the Adriatic, and built and repaired numerous churches and monasteries in the predominantly Roman Catholic territory around the Lake and on the coast which was under the bishops of Anti var and numerous suffragan bishops, including also the great Benedictine Abbey of St. Sergius and Bacchus on the Boyana (now the ruins of Kisha e Shirijit), at which there was an important trading centre with much visited animal markets. St. Sava (d. 1236) created an Eastern Greek bishopric for the Zeta on the island of Prievlaka on the Gulf of Cattaro; the land also had many well-endowed monasteries of this creed on the islands in the Lake Skutari (like Vranjina), and what fertile soil existed elsewhere belonged for the most part to monasteries in Serbia, on Athos and in Jerusalem, granted by the, in this respect, extravagant Serbian rulers. The population received a considerable admixture, now completely absorbed, by the immigration of Wallachians and Albanians.

A grave danger to Serbia was the power of the nobles, which had increased out of all proportion as a result of the constant feuds in the royal family. When after the death of the Czar Stephan Dušan (d. 1355) a general collapse of the great but only loosely knit state began, the centrifugal forces led in Zeta also (1360) to the formation once more of an independent principality by the brothers Stracimir, George and Balsa, sons of Balsa, a nobleman of Wallachian origin, to whom the government of the country was entrusted.

IV. The break-up of Serbia took place just at the time when the Ottomans were vigorously extending their power in the Balkan peninsula. Their victories at Cirmen on the Marica (1371) and at Kosovo ("field of the blackbird", 1389) destroyed the independence of the petty Serbian states in Macedonia and reduced Serbia itself to the district of the Morava, where it however not only maintained itself till 1459 but, as a result of the Turkish defeat at the hands of the Mongols at Angora (1402), was able for a time to rise to considerable power again. In spite of the danger which threatened Zeta also, George and Balsa exhausted their strength in continual foods with their neighbours over pieces of land, and in the reign of George II the turbulent nobles, among whom the most prominent were the Crnojević or Gjurojević from Budna, Cattaro and the lower Morafa, broke the kingdom up into little fiefdoms. The result was that when the Ottomans under Khaïr al-Din entered Albania from Macedonia, Balsa in 1385 lost a battle and his life north of Valona, and George II after fighting with varying
fortune, realising his own weakness, handed over his Albanian possessions in the south and east of Lake Skutari as far as Tuzi (S. E. of Podgorica) for an annual pension of 1,000 ducats (1396) to Venice, who thus became till 1479 the southern defender of Zeta against the Ottomans. George retained Duligno, Antivari and Butina for himself as well as the lands west and north of Lake Skutari.
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But even this reduced territory found no peace. Under Balša II, the last of his warlike but unimportant house, two long and trying wars with Venice were fought; during the second, the prince died (1421) and left his lands to the despot (Duke) of Serbia, Stephan Lazarević, who lost Duligno to the republic. V. The second period of Serbian rule very soon alienated the sympathy with which it was at first received and had to fight increasing difficulties caused by the influence of Crnojević (see above). In addition there was an irrode by the Turks in 1430 and the demands of Venice. The latter took Antivari and Budan and appointed the unwieldy Stephan Crnojević its salaried governor in the little mountain country now quite cut off from the coast; he (1455) induced the people to take the oath of fealty to the republic in the island monastery of Vranjina (cf. above). The end of Serbia (1459) seemed to secure Venice complete possession of the lands round Lake Skutari, but soon afterwards the Ottomans surrounded this land on all sides, for the conquest of Bosnia (1463) was followed (1466) by the annexation of the Herregovina and of the present Northern Montenegro as far as Nikšić, which then belonged to it.

Like Stephan Crnojević (d. 1465) his son Ivan (1465–1490) who called himself Gospodar Zetki (lord of Zeta), was also a vassal of Venice, who gave him little support in the wars with Muhammad II over Upper Albania than after the evacuation of Skutari (1479), be had to fly to Italy, and Zeta was occupied by the Turks, which was the beginning of their long rule here. The contest for the throne after the Sultán's death (1481) induced Ivan to return and renew the struggle, which however ended in 1482 with the recognition of Turkish suzerainty. His youngest son Stanisla, a hostage in Constantinople, adopted Islam in 1485, and took the name Skender Beg. Ivan, also called Ivan Beg — his country was also known as Ivanbegovina — resided in Cetinje where he built a small monastery in 1484—1485, to which the Eastern Greek bishop of Zeta (see above) moved. The state suffered from the great independence of the tribes, who had strong separatist tendencies, like the Nyegiuti, Biyelici, Orixinti, and Čeklici; each formed a political entity with a well-defined territory, its own chief chosen for life, courts, tribal and family feuds, blood-vengeance, etc., — institutions which survived in Montenegro down to the sixteenth century and existed in the north Albanian highlands until quite recently.

Not even the greatest submissiveness earned for Ivan's elder sons, at constant enmity with one another, the goodwill of the Turks. George (1490–1496), who introduced the printing-press into Cetinje and in 1495–95 printed beautiful Cyrillic ecclesiastical works, died in Asia Minor in exile. Stephan (1496–1499) was interned in Skutari, where he is said to have ended his days as a monk. On the other hand in 1514, a separate sandžak with capital Zablak (to the north of Lake Skutari) was created for the Muslim Sultaš Skender Beg Crnojević out of Zeta, which had been incorporated in the sandžak of Skutari. The latter did not deny his descent; he was also tolerant in matters of religion, used his Slav mother-tongue in his correspondence and was in regular communication with Venice, although their relations were occasionally overloaded; in Venice Bòtida Vuković of Podgorica (d. 1540) and others from 1519 printed Cyrillic ecclesiastical works. Skender Beg's title Sandžak Crnogorski naturalised the name Crna Gora for the country, which we find as early as 1435 and as Montenegro in 1496 for the highlands above Cattaro. In 1528 all notices of this remarkable Montenegro-Turkish ruler cease. Crna Gora again becomes a šadžak under the sandžak of Skutari.

Montenegro under Turkey, under the unassuming ecclesiastical suzerainty of the bishop or Vladika of Cetinje chosen by the tribal chiefs, formed five mahlia or districts in the shape of a small triangle between Cattaro, Podgorica and the N.W. end of Lake Skutari, which in 1614 contained 90 villages with 3,534 houses and 8,027 men capable of bearing arms, of whom however only 1,000 had guns. The poll-tax was readily paid and they shared in the wars of the Porte against Venice and in suppressing rebellions in the adjoining lands, such as the closely related Brda, which had much more desire for independence. This long stereotyped monotonity did not change till 1688 when the Montenegrins with the Vladika Vizirion placed themselves under the protection of Venice, whose lands were under those of the Turks, and who since the failure of the siege of Venice had been fighting with the Turks from 1684 to the Peace of Carlowitz (1699). After the failure of his first attacks Sulaiman Paša, Sandžak of Skutari, as a punishment destroyed Cetinje in 1692 with the support of a number of Montenegro tribes.

VI. The process of liberation thus begun found vigorous support in the warlike Vladika Danilo Petrović Nyeguš (1697–1735) after whom the dignity of bishop became hereditary in the family, and its holder gradually increased his importance at the expense of the tribal chiefs. In 1711 an embassy from Peter the Great introduced relations with Russia, which however were only occasionally of benefit to the land. Even in the joint war on the Porte which immediately followed, Montenegro was left in the lurch at the peace of the Pruth (1711). The protection which fugitive Montenegro found in Dalmatia was used in 1714 as a pretext by Turkey for declaring war on Venice. In the same year Našim Paša Kopruli laid waste Montenegro entirely, Cetinje which had been rebuilt in 1704 being once more destroyed. As a result of the peace of Passarowitz (1718) more peaceful conditions

1) The story that all Muhammadans in Montenegro who would not be baptised or leave the country were put to death as partisans of Turkey on Christmas Eve 1707 is however a patriotic fable.
began to prevail except for the almost daily guerrilla fighting on the frontiers. Danilo took advantage of the peace to build up the country again after the overthrow of the Turkish administration, with the help of Venetian subsidies, so far as the poverty and the intractable nature of the people permitted. In 1724 Cetinje was rebuilt.

Under his impeccable successor Sava Petrović Njegoš (1735–1783), there was a complete relapse into the previous barbarism: no authority, civil and blood feuds, murders. No one dared to leave his house unarmed. The whole people lived by murder and robbery. In addition there were secret conspiracies with the Turks against their own countrymen, abject appeals to Venice and journeys of appeal to St. Petersburg, notably that of the able but powerless ecclesiastical condottiero Vasilije (d. 1766).

In the general distress the Vladika only thought of enriching himself. Some relief was afforded Montenegro in 1767 by the south Slav Štefan Mali (Little Stephen), the Lažn (false) Czar, who was accepted as the Czar Peter III murdered in 1762, and received such general recognition, out of respect for Russia, that in spite of his unmasking by the minister of foreign affairs Yuryi Volodymirıć Dolgoruki (1769), he was tolerated by Russia also until he was murdered by a servant in 1773. Able, unselfish, strict and just, he restored for a time unwanted order and security.

There was no considerable war with Turkey for a long period. All the more serious then were the relations with the suzerain in the reign of Peter I the Saint (1782–1830). The hereditary warir of Skutari, Kara Mehmed Paša Buhalili, taking advantage of tribal feuds, laid waste the whole country in 1785, forced it to pay the poll-tax again and burned down Cetinje. During the Austro-Russian-Turkish war of 1787–1792, there were only trifling encounters, for which in 1793 Kara Mehmed Paša again threatened serious reprisals. Kara Mehmed Paša being involved in 1796 at Slainia and later killed in the great battle of Kruše; his head was long preserved as a trophy in Cetinje, in keeping with the Montenegrin head-hunting custom which had become a regular practice in war. The consequence was that the tribes of Biyelopavlići and Piberi, in the Brda east of the Zeta valley, joined Montenegro.

A welcome and more profitable change were the wars of 1806–1808 and 1813–1814 in alliance first with the inhabitants of the Bocchi di Cattaro and the Russians, later with the English against the French, who had occupied Dalmatia under General Marmont after the peace of Pressburg (1805). Numerous ruins stretching as far as Ragusa still testify to the thrist of the Montenegrins for destruction and plunder even on Christian soil.

Peter I, a cultured ecclesiastic educated in Russia, full of good intentions, endeavoured throughout his life by legislative (1798 and 1803) and personal effort to unite his people, raise their moral tone and avert distress by introducing the potato, but in spite of great patience he met with bitter hostility, contributed to also by Russia which, only after being appealed to for a long time, in 1799 granted 1,000 ducats a year for public purposes but did not pay it regularly.

The first ruler over the Montenegrins, Gospodar Čemorgosdž i Biskvi, was Peter II (1830–51), a highly gifted man of the world, bishop only in name, one of the greatest of Serbian poets and also of unending vigour which did not hesitate at severe punishments and death sentences. The Radonic family which claimed secular (governorship) power for itself had to leave the country. Supported by Russia from 1837 by a grant of 9,000 ducats yearly and occasional gifts of grain, and on this account more highly esteemed by his covetous countrymen, he concentrated the government in his own hands. The powers of the tribal chiefs were restricted. A senate of 12 regularly paid members under the presidency of the Vladika henceforth formed the supreme governing body and court of justice: its authority was enforced by well-paid troops stationed throughout the country, the Gvaršija, in addition to whom the head of the state had a bodyguard, Prosjanici. The building of the first public school and a small state printing-press in the capital, the purchase of two cannons and the building of a powder mill, show the small scale of the state but mark the desire for progress. The innovations, and still more poverty and a great increase of population, as in earlier times led to the emigration of numerous families to Serbia and Russia.

Foreign politics were mainly characterised by troubles over the Montenegrin continual fighting celebrated in song, with the neighbouring Muşammadans, especially in the Herzegovina, which was then ruled by 'Alt Paša Rizanbegović (d. 1851) as a practically independent sovereign, under whom Smail Aga Čengić (d. 1840) distinguished himself in the fighting.

VII. Centralisation and reforms generally formed the programme of the next two reigns, which was firmly and successfully carried through in spite of much opposition. Under Danilo II (1852–60) the clan system was dealt a shattering blow, when the chiefs were replaced by captains of princely birth and legislation regulated by the code of 1855. His accession however marks the close of a period which was mustered as a hereditary secular power now replaced a theocracy. Danilo renounced his hereditary rank and with the approval of Russia and Austria had himself proclaimed Knyaz i Gospodar Crne Gore i Brda. The attempt of the Parte to obtain by force under Serdar Ekrem 'Omar Paša in 1852–1853 recognition of his suzerainty thus threatened was vigorously opposed by Austria after giving ample assistance in 1853 through Feldmarschallleutnant Count Leiningen's mission to Constantinople. During the Crimean War (1853–1856) Danilo remained neutral to the discontent of his people. On the other hand, he became involved in a war in 1858 because he supported the rebels in the Herzegovina; this ended in the defeat of the Turks in the valley of Grabovo (north of Risano) and in an enlargement of Montenegrin territory in 1859. In 1860 the ruler, who had previously had to put down conspiracies, some led by relatives, was murdered in Cattaro by a Montenegrin emigrant.

His able nephew Nikola I (1860–1918, d. March 1, 1921) who had been educated in Trieste and in France, son of the doughty Wojвод Mirko (d. 1867), completed the building of the state. By long steady work, first as an absolute and from 1905 as a constitutional ruler, and by very skilfully managing foreign relations, he created out of the ill-famed, unfertile, rocky little country a kingdom which was enlarged by the addition
of fertile valleys with its own sea coast, good communications and post routes, a busy economic life, modest prosperity increased by emigration to America, more law-abiding and secure since the institution of the civil code of 1888, with a good system of education and a well organised soldiery with modern equipment to be reckoned with in Balkan questions. Relationship by marriage, notably with the courts of Russia and Italy, reflected glory to the pretty little capital of Cetinje which had also become a centre of culture; 1910 crowned the work by raising Montenegro to be a kingdom. While interested great powers, notably Russia, gave grants of money, arms, munitions, etc., which were readily accepted and also requested, this development was conducted mainly at the expense of Turkey, with whom three wars were waged at longer intervals in addition to minor friction in 1869—1870, 1872, 1874—1875, 1895, 1898, 1911, 1912. The first (1862), a combined attack by Derwisch Fâshâ from the north and Serdar Ektrem 'Omar Pâsha from the south in the Zeta valley as a reprisal for the support given to the rising led by Luka Vučkalić in the eastern Herzegovina, forced Nicola by the threat to Cetinje to conclude an unsuccessful peace in Skutar. The second war was declared in 1876 by Montenegro in alliance with Serbia in order to prevent by the new intervention in the Herzegovina which had begun in the summer of 1875 in Nevesinje. His victory over Muktar Fâshâ at Vrbica and at Bileća and the defeat of Serbs were followed by a truce and the intervention of Russia in 1877. Sulaimân Pâsha succeeded at heavy cost in fighting his way out of the Herzegovina through the Zeta valley into Albania, but in 1877 Nikola took Niškić and Antivari and in 1878 Dulcigno. The Treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878, Articles 26—33) recognised the independence of Montenegro and granted it, after cutting down very much the terms of the preliminary peace of San Stefano, a broad ring of land around the original land of Montenegro with Antivari, Nikšić, Banyani, Pira, Kolatina, Spuz, Podgorica, Žabljak and the district of Gusinje. The latter, as a result of the opposition of the Albanians, was exchanged for Dulcigno in 1880. The area was increased from 4,366 to 9,086 square kilometres, with over 300,000 inhabitants, including 12,500 Catholic Albanians; there was on the other hand a considerable emigration of Muslims from the new territories.

The third war with Turkey was the first Balkan War, which Montenegro began on Oct. 8, 1912, before its allies, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece; but while the sandžak of Novi Pazar and Upper Albania were easily occupied, Skutar, the main objective, was only taken after a long siege and with the help of treachery on April 23, 1913. After the allies had quarrelled among themselves, Montenegro also took part in the second Balkan War against Bulgaria. By the peace of Bucarest (Aug. 10, 1913) it received the south-western half of the sandžak of Novi Pazar (with Plevye, Biyelo Polje and Brane), the greater part of the Metohia plain (with Peć and Gjakova), the valley of Gusinje and lands round Lake Skutar, increasing its area by 5,937 square kilometres to 15,017 square kilometres, with 437,000 inhabitants.

In the Great War, King Nikola reluctantly declared war on Austria-Hungary on Aug. 5, 1914. After the capture of the Lovćen (see above) the Montenegro

negrina laid down their arms unconditionally on Jan. 16, 1916 and the country, which had gone back a great deal since 1912, was administered by an Austrian military general-gouvernement. The king went first to Italy, then to France, never to return again, for after the War he was deposed along with his sons on Nov. 29, 1918 by an assembly in Podgorica on the charge of treachery.
MOORS, a rather vague name still applied in the sixteenth century to certain elements in the Muslim town population of various countries and especially to the inhabitants of the Mediterranean ports of North Africa. The word, presumably of Phoenician origin, corresponds to the ancient local name of the natives of Barbary reproduced by the Romans as Mасси, Massiri and by the Greeks as Massuprosoi (Strabo, xvi. 825). The term Massiri was used by the Romans in a general way for the Berbers who came into Spain in the form Mero, and it was by the name of Mero that the people of the Iberian peninsula throughout the whole period of Muslim rule knew the Arab conquerors and Arabized Berbers who had come to settle in Spain from the other side of the Strait of Gibraltar. The name Meroes passed into various European languages: French Moors, English Moors, German Moeren. At the time of the *Reconquest* the name Moriscos was applied in Spain to these Muslims (usually crypto-Muslims) who had remained in the country until their final expulsion in 1610. The Moriscos went voluntarily to North Africa, where they were known to the natives as Amuliers while Christian travellers gave them the general name of Moors.

In modern times the Moors to the European were therefore the urban population of the North African ports, irrespective of the proportion of immigrants from Spain. Since then the word has been generally used with the meaning Muslim of the towns of the western end of the Mediterranean (cf. such expressions as Moorish bath, Moorish coffee, etc.).

The name Moors has also been given to the Arab or Berber peoples, pure or mixed with negro blood, who live to the north in the Senegal in the province of St. Louis where it is given the ancient name of Mauritanis (see below), and to the offspring of the marriages of Arabs from South Arabia and Cingalesse who form an important Muslim colony in Ceylon (c. 300,000).

(E. LEVY-PROVENCAL)

The land of the Moors is MAURITANIA or MAURITANIA. This name which has been derived either from a Phoenician word Masparis or *the Western* or with more probability from the name of a tribe living before the Christian era in North Africa, was applied in ancient times to northern Morocco (Mauretania Tingitana) and to the north-west of Algeria (Cassarica Mauretania). At a later date, by extending the application, Europeans have given the general name of Moors to the Arabo-Berber peoples of Mediterranean and Saharan Africa. Then gradually they came to distinguish out of this mass the groups with which they came more frequently into contact (Tripoliains, Tunisians, Algerians, Moroccans), so that the name Moors came to be limited to the people of Spanish (Muslim), Jewish or Turkish origin of North Africa and particularly to the nomads of the western Sahara, who traverse what Ahmad al-Shikiti (in Al-Wasti, Cairo 1320 A.H.) called the "land of Shikiti," from the name of its chief negotiator; this country is bounded, says the author, by the Atlantic Ocean, the valley of the Sahil al-Hamu, the plain of the Halba (plain of the Brekka) on the right bank of the Senegal and by the two towns of Walata and Niam (Nenin); if, like him, we take into account all inhabited areas, we ought to extend it to the east as far as the meridian of Timbuktu.

Mauritanis, which now forms one of the eight colonies of French West Africa, is only a part of this vast area. It lies to the north of the Senegal between this river, the Atlantic Ocean and the marigot of Karkoro; to the north and east, a frontier settled by agreements separates it from the Spanish Sahara (June 27, 1900; Oct. 3, 1904; Nov. 27, 1912) and from the territories of the south of Algeria (agreement of June 7, 1905) and from the French Soudan (decree of April 17, 1913). It has an area of 835,000 square kilometres, 289,000 inhabitants, the density of population being 0.34.

Except for the banks of the Senegal, the country is steppe or desert, and only suitable for stock rearing. To be brief, it is a military frontier district defending on the north the more favoured lands of the Senegal rather than a country suitable for development by colonisation.

I. GEOGRAPHY

A semi-circular range of hills of no great height, worn by erosion but often difficult of access, starts as it were out of the ocean to the south of the Rio de Oro and reaches the middle course of the Senegal after running round the contours of an ancient gulf of the Quaternary period. The Aïr Tunar and the Tagant separated by the depression of the Khat form as it were the cornerstones of this system and are continued to the north-west in the "petrified sea" (a plain scattered over with rocky islets) of the Tiris and by the arêtes of the Aïr Suatif, to the south by the Kgalia and Asaba.

The interior of this gulf consists almost entirely of sands, brought from the desert by the predominating north-east winds. The dunes in the south are all fixed and are called "dead"; in the north they are shifting and constantly changing. Like the other dunes of the western Sahara they run in the direction of the wind, N.E.-S.W., and are separated from one another by contours of firm soil along which traffic can go.

The Shumamah is a plain, formed of lands of alluvial origin, along the lower Senegal and as such particularly suitable for cultivation; as we go up the river it is known as Litama and then as gidimaka. Other plains, those of the Brakna and the Gorgol, are more remote from the river; they contain permanent pools of water to which their girdles of high trees gave a characteristic appearance (toumert). To the north of the Shumamah and the land of the Birkan stretches a series of dunes among which may be mentioned those of Amaiilah. The contour of the Inghiri continued by that of the Amaiiala separates the latter from the similar ranges, the Aïdhar and the Azrael, which stretch to the Tiris; they are difficult to cross but between them the Tijjir supplies an easy route. Beyond to the north-west, the Tassafat and the Swatfal Abu-Abdy are great plains of demudation.

On their convex face, the Aïriler and Tifelt are prolonged to the north in the massif of the Koudiat Ijel and by that of the Zemmur, separated by the Tissel-kaf, towards the north-east by the cliffs of the Djar Aïriler and the Hânk and by the plateau of the Eglab, which stretches to the
great sand-duunes of the Igidi, to the east by the Uthe Tishit which runs to Walata. Between these lines of rock, great ridges of moving dunes make passage difficult but provide good pasturage for the hawks; these are from north to south, the Erg El-hammam, the Machtir, the Waran, the Aderaf and the Aukar. Lastly, to the north of all these masses of sand, the Gabbalah, Keret and Vettu are traverse without water, of hard and flat soil, which run as far as the Haumada of the Dra.

The coast consists of dunes and plateaux with numerous sabkhas or salt lakes. There is usually a large sand-bar; nevertheless the sea, which is very rich in fish, gives a livelihood to a population of fishermen.

The Sahar, in the proper sense of the word hardly extends by a line marked by Cape Ti-niria, Mejriya [Moundjeria], the northern bank of the Tisurant [depression of Kha], the southern margin of the Aderaf and Walata. It is especially dry on both sides of the Aderaf; to the west in the region of Port Etienne and in the dunes bordering on the Tiris, and especially to the east where to the south of Walata, the Maysa, Iqaf and the western part of the Erg Jebel, still almost unknown, form a waterless no man's land; this district is visited only by antelopes, gazelles and ostriches, and by the Nusai, hunters who can manage to go for days without water and live like their game on green stuffs.

To the south of the line above given, the steppes gradually changes to forest as we near the river. The climate is very hot; the influence of the sea is not felt beyond a score of miles inland. Subtropical rains fall as far as the north of the Aderaf.

II. POPULATION.

At the earliest period to which the chronicles and native traditions go back, Mauritania seems to have been peopled by negroes. Later, in the course of centuries, it received various immigrations of Berbers, especially Saâhaddja and Zanata, Arabs and probably also of Jews. The Saâhaddja came first, certainly before the Hadya; later the development of the coast-Saharan commence brought to the few towns that had been built, merchants of varied origin (Arabs, Berbers, Zanata, Nafdis, Lottana, Natawa, etc.); at different periods also, Jews came there to seek refuge from persecutions, the last of which drove them out of Tuti at the end of the xvi century; lastly the Arabs belonging to the Ma'lik group in their turn invaded the country from the xvi century onwards, bringing with them more Zanata or driving them in front of them.

The Jews have been completely absorbed into the Berbers (form it, they are believed, the foundation of the caste of smiths, masa'alle) or into the Fula, so that it is not possible to estimate their numbers at the present day. The negroes, who have been gradually driven towards the river by these waves, are represented by approximately 50,000 Tuaregs (Tahir), 21,000 Sarakole and 13,000 Wolof, Fula and Bambara. The Arabic-Berber Moor number about 570,000.

III. HISTORY.

a. Prehistory. Such researches as have been made in Mauritania, notably in the Aderaf and in the Aukar, have revealed there, as throughout the Sahara, the existence of important prehistoric sites; if it is not possible to date them, they are at least evidence of a very early population whose remains seem to connect them with the negroes. These conclusions are further confirmed by the native chronicles and traditions, and perhaps we ought to connect with these remote inhabitants of the country the Sibeyr, to whom the Moors attribute the creation of the palm-groves of the Aderaf and who are said to have built a town, the "city of the dogs", on the site of the present Aruggi, ten miles N.W. of Atar. What seems probable in any case is that these black Mauritanians were more or less subjects of the first kingdoms known to the southwest of the desert: that of Tukir, which ruled Senegalese Futa, that of Vihana, the capital of which was on the site of the modern Cumbi, 100 miles S.W. of Walata and that of Diara which succeeded them and ruled the whole of the western Sudan. To the north, the lands of the negroes no doubt matched with the lands in which the Saâhaddja and Zaliga Berbers led a nomadic life in the south of Mauritania.

b. The first Saâhaddja invasion. We do not know at what date the Saâhaddja invaded Mauritania, but it was certainly a very early one. It is possible that expeditions by the Arab emirs to al-Maghrib al-Akhir, beginning in the latter years of the seventh century, which marked the first contact of the Saâhaddja with Islam, may have driven them to the south but their first incursions into the Tiris, into the Aderaf and to the Tisurant were probably much earlier. Their conquest of the country, it is true, seems to have been fairly slow and it was not, it appears, till the xii century that they succeeded in reaching the banks of the Senegal for the first time.

c. The first Saâhaddja kingdom. At the beginning of the ninth century, a certain number of Saâhaddja tribes (among them the Lemutna, the Guellila and the Beni Waref) occupied the Aderaf, with their advanced posts in the Tisurant, and made raids into the Haul (Hodh) against the negro Soninke empire of Ghana. The Lemutna supplied them with chiefs at this time, and one of them, Tilutan (d. in 835 or 837), succeeded in imposing his authority on all the Berbers and making twenty negro kings pay tribute to him. The chief towns of his dominion were Aruggi and especially Andaghass, forty miles N. E. of the site of the modern Kiffa (Kiffa). Andaughass seems to have been founded in the seventh century by the Soninke and its fame as a centre of trans-Saharan trade brought it a large foreign population, already in part converted to Islam: Berbers of different branches and Arabs. In spite of this brilliant start, this Lemutna dynasty lasted only a short time and disappeared in 919. Each tribe then led an independent existence and the emperors of Ghana were able to extend their power towards the Tisurant and to take Andaughass at the end of the tenth century.

d. The second Saâhaddja kingdom. Towards 1020, the chiefs of the various Saâhaddja tribes agreed to combine again as in the time of Tilutan and thus to resist the encroachments of the Soninke. The power was placed in the hands of a Lemutna called Tarrina, who seems to have been the first really Muslim Zuñgi ruler. He went to Mocca and his enthusiasm as a new convert led him to a holy war on the negroes, in which he lost his life (1023). His son-in-law Yahya b.
brainless of the tribe of the Goudaïs succeeded according to the custom which made the supreme command go to the two tribes ultimately. Like Tarsins, he was a zealot and on returning from the pilgrimage, he brought from Morocco a holy man, 'Abd Allah b. Yasin, to whom he entrusted the task of educating his brothers, who were still very ignorant of the principles of Islam. The saint was at first well received by the Sanhadjas and he made them build the town of Arzncas near the site of the modern Tziftis. But soon his commands appeared too difficult for the nomads, who rebelled against him. He sought refuge with his disciples in a ribâd or fortified monastery on an island in the ocean (sometimes identified with Tifera) and they were henceforth known as the ri'ât-Murathâi (the men of the ribâd), a word which has been corrupted in Europe to Almoravids under which name they have become famous.

The Almoravids. Their reputation for sanctity spread very rapidly and attracted many disciples to them. When 'Abd Allah had gathered around him a sufficiently large body of men, he led them against their rebellious brethren and against the negroes. In a few years they subdued the whole of the western Sahara, from Taflah and the Dra to the Senegal. In 1050, Yahyâ b. Ibrahim died, and Yahyâ b. Umar, chief of the Lamtuna, became the political head of the confederation. 'Abd Allah b. Yasin remained the religious chief. While the first recaptured and plundered Autlaghast, the second attempted the conquest of the Maghribis. But soon they were both slain, Yahyâ in a rising in the Adrar in which the negroes of the Takrâr tried in vain to help him, and 'Abd Allah in lighting the Bardingal was heherits of the plains of Morocco, 'Abd Bakr, brother of Yahyâ, was then for some time supreme chief of the Almoravids, then to gratify his ambitious nephew Yahyâ b. Tisftin he handed over to him his conquests in North Africa, keeping only to himself the sovereignty of the south. He drove himself to a holy war against the negroes and to their conversion to Islam. He succeeded in driving them back towards the river and in taking Ghana in 1076 and the capital of the Takrâr in 1080, extending his teaching, the tradition says, as far as the lands of a Mandingo prince of the Upper Niger. He was slain in the Tagant in 1087 and his death marked the break up of the Sanhadjas in Mauritania; each tribe regained its independence.

The Tashumah and the negro reaction. Between this date and the end of the sixteenth century we know very little of the history of Mauritania. We only suspect that the influence of the negro kingdom of Mali must have extended up to the Adrar and Tagant and that a new Marrhubout Berber element formed by the Tashumahs of Sä'as came and settled in the country. The Tashumahs seem to have at first taken up the mantle of the Almoravids and to have made themselves the champions of the ajjâhid against the negroes. But after a few successes, they were driven back from the region of the river and fell back upon the Tirif and Adrar, where they gave up fighting and devoted themselves to study and religious devotion. The successes of the negroes then became serious. Wolof, Soumaks and Túcujors recaptured a whole part of Mauritania and might perhaps have succeeded in subduing the Berbers, who were exhausted by their campaigns of conquest in the Mediterranean region, if the coming of the Mašil Arabs had not checked them.

The Mašîl in Mauritania. It is not possible to date this new invasion exactly, it is, however, certain that it was not a single effort. It was almost down to the nineteenth century with little groups filtering into the Sanhadjas encampments and at length submerging them.

Setting out from Egypt, the Mašîl passed along the northern border of the desert and reached the Ocean to the south of Morocco in the first half of the sixteenth century. They then entered the service of the Marinid rulers of Fâs, who used them to keep in subjection the provinces beyond the Atlas and to collect taxes. These undisciplined nomads very soon took advantage of their privileged position. Measures had to be taken against their brigandage and their threats to overrun Morocco, and military expeditions were sent against them. Either as a result of these reprisals, or because they were called in by the Sanhadjas to help them against the negroes, or because a year of drought drove them in search of new pasturage, some of them, belonging to the confederation of the Dwi Hasan or Beni Hasan, went down towards Mauritania. But the chronicles do not say why. In any case, having helped to drive the negroes back towards the river, supported by the Znàtta Kanta who came from Taflah at the same time as the first of them, they reduced to vassalage the Sanhadjas of Upper Mauritania (Ijel and Zemmîr) in the sixteenth century, Western Mauritania, Wadans and Tagant in the sixteenth and the Adrar and Lower Mauritania in the sixteenth century. Throughout the long period from the sixteenth century to the present day we find the authority in the hands of a certain number of Udiya tribes: the Ulad Rîds, the Mghâgis, Ulad Mûrûk, the Brâhâs, the Tràza and the Ulad Yahyâ b. Usman. Other Beni Hasan also went south, but barely reached Mauritania. The Ulad Dim has always remained in the desert zone and the British seem to have passed some years a little to the north of the Senegal before migrating to the region of Timbuktu.

The Mašîl and the Sûltâns of Morrocco. From their first sojourn in the south of Morocco, these Mašîl long retained the character of Makhten tribes; under the Sa'diads and ShâHs, many of them vassal contingents of the Mašîl tribes. This status gave their migrations southwards the appearance of a conquest in name of the Sultana. This was no doubt the legal justification of the tribute which they exacted from the conquered Benînas; it also explains why the rulers of Fâs or Marrakesh sometimes claimed as theirs the territory of Mauritania, why they sent several expeditions there in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, why they granted investiture to certain chiefs and lastly why the author of al-Wârif, after consulting several learned men, thought that the "land of Shingâl" should be included with the Maghrib and not with the Sultana.

The Sanhadjas reaction. Whatever was the actual success of the Arab conquests in Mauritania, it was not effected without violent reaction on the part of the Sanhadjas. The poverty of the Tashumahs, the negro danger and the looseness of links between the various bodies of invaders facilitated the settlement of the early Arab invaders. But the tyranny of the Mašîl towards the Berbers
brought them in the xvith century to such desperation that a general rising broke out in the form of an attempted restoration of the Almoravids led by Naji'il al-Din, a taxraubert descendant of the Lamtuna. This individual, who camped in western Mauritania, first preached a holy war against the negroes, being sure of re-uniting the various contingents against the traditional enemy. Then, having given the troops sufficient training in a campaign which brought them across the rivers to plunder the left bank, he turned openly against the Almoravid. This was the celebrated "War of Bashibah", in the course of which the Arabs were held in check for thirty years; but in the end quarrels within the Sanhajda ranks destroyed their strength and in 1674 the defeat at Tin Yeftel doomed them to vassalage.

In much the same way in 1745 the Idi-Abdij Berra of the Adrar had to bow before the Maqal and at the end of the xiii century we find them again rising against the Arab amir and assassinating him. Finally in the Tagnit, the Sanhajda Ida'ish well led by their chief Muhammad Shenf regained independence at the end of the xvith century. They almost succeeded in seizing the Adrar in 1852, drove the Zanzara Kunta out of the Tagnit and extended their power to the Senegal, for the side of the amirs who are still reigning and claim to be true descendants of the Almoravids.

The rule of the amirs. All over, from the xvith century, the political situation of the tribes became stabilised, and regular little nomad states seem to have been formed, usually under Arab chiefs. Thus we now find the dynasty of the Ulad Ahmad b. Dannun reigning among the Tarara with distinguished sovereigns like 'Ali Sandara (1702-1727), who, supported by the petty Mavalah, delivered his tribe from Brikama domination, and especially Muhammad al-Hajib (1847-1850) whose long reign is marked by the first Moorish resistance to European penetration. Among the Brikama also, the Ulad 'Ali Allah amirs played a preponderating role after the war of Sahibah, and their possessions extended from the Tagnit to the Gulf of Guinea. Later, and particularly from the xviith century, their power declined. In spite of the brilliant reign of Ahmad ibn (1818-1841) and their desperate resistance to the advance of the French caused them to disappear from the political scene. In Adrar the Ulad Yahya b. Ilman also furnished great leaders: Ahmad ibn Muhammad (1871-1891) who was able to keep his turbulent subjects at peace with their neighbours and who tried to develop trans-Sahara commerce, and Ahmad ibn Sid Ahmad (1891-1899) who, by his military successes earned the title of "Amir of war". Lastly, in the person of Bakar ibn Soud Ahmad, a descendant of Muhammad Shenf, the Tagnit produced the greatest Moorish ruler of the xinith century.

The rule of these amirs was continually beset with great difficulties, produced by their rivalries, the lack of discipline, rebellion and intrigues among their subjects, by the warlike raids of the negroes, and particularly by the efforts of Europeans to establish their rule on the Atlantic coast and on the banks of the river.

A European empire on the coast of Mauritania. It was in the first half of the xvith century that the Portuguese visited the coast of Mauritania and the north of the Senegal for the first time. At the instigation of the Infante Henry the Navigator, expeditions followed which brought back slaves, gold and gums. After João Fernandes had gone to Wadan in the eastern Adrar, where he spent some months among the Sanhajda in 1449, a permanent settlement was founded in 1448 on the island of Arguin, which afforded excellent conditions of security. From there the Portuguese endeavoured to extend their power into the interior and to command the great caravan routes which led from the Sudan to Morocco; to them are attributed the fortresses, now in ruins, near Wadan and at Aruggi. But it is certain that for a short time they extended their relations as far as the capital of the negro empire of Mali on the Upper Niger, it seems that they did not own factories for any length of time except on the coast.

The trade of Arguin flourished for two centuries in the hands of the Portuguese, then of the Spaniards and it extended as far as Lower Mauritania through Portindelle (corruption of "Port d'Addi") from the name of an emir of Trâra, a not very good roadstead where banter was carried on. The French at a later date established themselves at the mouth of the Senegal (1625), then the Dutch at the same time with Spain took Arguin in 1638, which the English took from them in 1665 and a struggle for influence began among these three nations which lasted for a century. Arguin and Portindelle continued to change hands, while France developed her trade along the Senegal by building factories. Finally the Treaty of Versailles (Sept. 3, 1783) recognised her exclusive sovereignty over the Atlantic coast from Cape Blanc to the mouth of the Sénégal. The wars at the beginning of the xixith century brought the English back there for a time, and it was only in 1817, three years after the treaty of Paris, that France definitely took possession of the country. Arguin and Portindelle had in the meantime been almost completely ruined as a result of these vicissitudes. The French conquest. Down to 1852 England retained the right to trade at Portindelle, which allowed the Trâra chiefs and in particular Muhammad al-Hajib to play off against one another the two nations who seemed to threaten her independence, and thus to gain a footing on the left bank of the Senegal. The position of the Europeans with regard to the natives was however difficult and trade with them was permitted only on payment of heavy customs dues. It was only in 1854 with the appointment of Faidherbe as governor of Senegal that a more vigorous policy was introduced into Lower Mauritania. In four years he reduced Walo on the left bank to submission and drove the Moris out of it and forced the emirs of Trâra and Brikana to sign a treaty, which if it did not abolish the customs, at least recognised that France had a right of sovereignty over the peoples living near the river and guaranteed freedom of trade there.

For nearly fifty years these treaties were respected and the Moorish chiefs, too much occupied in maintaining peace among their subjects and in defending themselves from the intrigues of their contemporaries, no longer thought of coming into conflict with French troops; commercial agreements were made which extended as far as with the Ida'ish of the Tagnit and one treaty was even made with the emir of the Adrar. This period also saw a great deal of exploration of the interior; after
Mungo Park (1795-1796), Caillé (1825), Caillé (1843) and Pautz (1850), Vincent, Bu el-Mughad, Bonnel, Alian Sal, Mage, Falcond, Abbe, Soliellet, Quiroga and Cervera, Doual, Soller, Fabert, Doumet, Blanche, Gravel and Charanda contributed to our knowledge of this country and prepared the way for its occupation.

In the last years of the sixteenth century the troubles of which Lower Mauritania was the centre finally had repercussions on the trading centres on the river which became daily more serious. The insecurity hampered commerce and in proportion as the memory of the vigorous policy of Faidherbe became obliterated, marauders ravaged the country down to the left bank of the river, right into the administered country. The conquest of Mauritania had to be planned in order to protect effectively the colony of Senegal and with this object an expedition was made to use the influence of the marabouts, tired of a perpetual warfare, of which too often they bore the expense. The diplomatic action of M. Coppolani, Commissaire Général of the government since 1902, judiciously supported by police operations, brought about the occupation of the Tiris country in 1903, of the Brékna country in 1904 and of the Téragan in 1905.

This rapid advance, however, was checked before the anti-foreign propaganda of a manouit of the Haoua, Ma' al-Amin, son of Muhammad Fadil, who after spending a long period in Upper Mauritania, had been settled for some years at Smara near Sagiat el-Hammah. His prestige as a musician, supported by the veneration shown him by the Moroccan soukran, was not long in winning him the support of the greater number of the Moorish tribes and especially of those of the Adrar, the emir of which had been brought up in his entourage. At his invitation, Coppolani was assassinated and a cousin of the Sultan Massel Idris came to lead the Djihân in Mauritania. A success gained by him at Nyanilim led to nothing, but on the return of a delegation of Moorish chiefs who had gone to seek help from the sovereign of Morocco, a general offensive was begun against the French troops (1908). To put an end to an agitation which threatened to become dangerous, Colonel Gouraud conquered the Adrar in 1909 and his victory was completed in 1910 by the death of Ma' al-Amin and in 1913 by the capture of Tighr and joining up with the troops of the Haoua. The conquest of Mauritania by the French was thus practically completed. The march of el-Heiba, son of Ma' al-Amin, on Marrakech in 1914 revived some inclination to rebel among the Moors, but the destruction of Smara in 1913 checked this and France now only had to secure the protection of her colony from raiders from the Sahara.

IV. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE.

The negroes are settled agriculturists who have their villages mainly in the Shamaah and the Gergol and in the uninhabited region of Senegal. The Moors have a few villages (the principal are: Ayar, Shingari, Wadon, Tijijin, Tighrit) with palm groves. The few farms in the Adrar, the Téragan and the Dher. They are great nomads who live under cone-shaped tents of camal skin and follow the rainfall with their flocks. Those who wander in the midst of the steppes oscillate between the river and the desert, except the Téragan of western Mauritania, who, on account of the dryness of their country, move over a much greater area and sometimes even reach Tiris and Adrar 'Ifras. The people of the Adrar go down as far as Téragan, and on the north at one time were in contact with the Tekes of the south of Morocco around the Sagiat el-Hammah. Their supply of water is very scanty and it is not an exaggeration when Feucher calls them "the most wretched of mankind".

Their groups have been much gradated by the constant influx of Moroccans. Before French rule, the Haoua, pure Arabs, formed the noble and warrior class who protected the encampments and lived by cattle-rearing and marauding. The Zouaves or marabouts, generally Sanhaja of Zanat Berbera, paid an annual sum called chafe to the Haoua for their security; they were likewise breeders of cattle, but also included among them merchants and men of letters who were regular travelling universitaires; the more or less open practice of sorcery served them as a means of defence against the continual raids of the zgaga of the Haoua. The Zouaves or tribunates (ahlumi), Sanhaja Berbers, were the exploited. The feudal dues which they paid to the Arabs (horma) did not always exempt them from periodic payments to the marabouts nor from arbitrary sums levied upon them by one or the other. They were in part agriculturists. The Haoua, freed slaves, formed tribes of serfs, usually better treated than the preceding. Finally the Haoua and the marabouts owned numerous slaves in which they did a busy trade. On the fringes of all these groups, the Malian, the griot (goum) and the Nmaa were respectively the workmen, poets and singers and the slaves who supplied the encampments of eastern Mauritania with meat.

The barter between these castes were in theory rigid. A certain number of marabouts, however, and even of zgaga succeeded in escaping in arabic trade, like the Ida'ash of the Téragan, and devoted themselves to the adventurous life of the Nmaa hunter (goumor) just as "penitent" Haoua sometimes adopted the pious life of the Zouaves (Tissah).

French administration has left this traditional organisation intact, only suppressing slavery; it has, however, checked the abuses of the Haoua by putting a stop almost everywhere to the payment of the hormas and ghafers.

Economic Life. Mauritania has only one port, Port-El-Houari, on the peninsula of Cape Blanc; it is, however, only a fishing centre. The coast of the Senegal is used as far as Podor in the dry season, as far as Bakel in the winter months. No road has yet been made, but the most important points are linked up by automobile or caravan services. The telephone is in use only in the south, but its place is taken by the wireless, which connects Mauritania with Dakar, Casablanca, Agadir, Flamans and Timbuktu.

The principal source of wealth of the country is stock-breeding: 51,000 camels, 3,800 horses, 339,000 cattle, 2,000,000 goats and sheep, 66,000 asses. The abundant game (antelope, gazelle, ostriches, guinea fowl and bustards) supplies further need for the inhabitants. Among agricultural products, wheat and barley are the most important.
the plateaus, millet, rice, oats, wheat and barley. In the south gum is a traditional article of export (1,250-2,500 tons a year).

The natural resources of the country have hardly been investigated as yet. We may mention, however, the salt of the Såhghat Ifyel, which has for long supplied the caravaners to the south: along the coast a few salt-pans are worked by the Moors. The annual export is 4,700 tons.

Industry is in a very rudimentary stage and confined almost entirely to the manufacture of leather goods which form the equipment of the camelers and the furniture of his tent. Fishing supplies the inhabitants near the coast.

A certain number of caravans transport merchandise from the north to the south along the coast and through the Adrar and Ténit to the trading centres on the river and the Sádín. They take with them animals, gums, salt, dates, ostrich feathers, skins and leather, and bring back cloth, arms, powder, candles, sugar, tea, spices and earthenware and supply the markets of Átar, Sånlif, Wadân and Tåigitch. As a result of the insecurity in the desert there is no longer any regular trans-Saharan trade.

V. POLITICAL LIFE.

The negroes are ruled by their village headmen and chiefs of districts. The Moors are grouped in tribes under the authority of a shatkhi assisted by a council of notables or djaaks. Sometimes several tribes are combined in a horatary union, the rules of which surround itself with a regular court generally recruited from among the Zála or Harêto. The shatkhi or mint is practically all-powerful; only the right to judge in civil matters is not completely his; the kâdž exercise it. The mint further reserves to himself a kind of right to supervise their judgments through the intermediary of his private kâdž who forms a sort of court of appeal.

The French administration has been superimposed on this traditional organization. A Lieutenant-Governor, residing at St. Louis, on the right bank of the Senegal, is the head of the colony and is assisted by a military commandant, an inspector of administrative affairs, a minister of finance and political affairs, a secretary for finance and a general of public works. The local administration carried out by administrators or officers is divided into eight districts (ëtrakta, Bëshka, Gogol, Gidimaka, Assaba, Ténit, Adrar and Baie du Lévrier) and seventeen sub-divisions or administrative posts. It controls the native administrative and judicial organization.

The Moors pay the Kûraic taxes (rakàt and andar) from which their riding-camels and gums alone are exempt. The negroes pay a poll-tax and a tax on cattle. Indirect contributions are paid by the markets, the salt-pans, the carrying of arms, the exploitation of the woods and ferries. The Budget for Mauritanie for 1930 was 14,613,000 francs.

VI. LANGUAGE.

The language spoken in Mauritanie is Arabic, the haurenia or language of the Sádín, the "whites". Some 7,000 Zângues in the south have retained a Berber dialect related to that of the dialects of southern Morocco. At Wadân and Tåigitch the language used (Áñet) which is a form of Souinke is now spoken only by a few individuals. Lastly the negroes of the river have retained their own language.

VII. RELIGIOUS AND INTELLECTUAL LIFE.

History does not tell us what was the religion of the Sånlifja before their conversion to Islam; we can only think that they had to some extent been influenced by a monotheistic faith like Judaism or even Christianity. Their first contact with Islam probably dates from Uthman b. Affâ's expedition to the south of Morocco (681), but it is certain that their real conversion was much later and can hardly have been earlier than the energetic proselytizing campaign of 'Abd Allâh b. Yâsîn. At the present day all the inhabitants of Mauritanie are Muslims of the Mâlikî rite, but many of them and more particularly the warriors and the Nâdîl have only a very superficial acquaintance with their religion and take little interest in it; superstitions and sorcery further corrupt their faith almost everywhere, revealing the primitive state of the people and negro influence. Islam is not really known and practised, except among the tribes of marabouts; among the latter, a mystical tradition and a fairly advanced culture have made themselves felt and for this reason they play an important role in the society of the Tijûniya; the part of a kind of sacred body such as is found nowhere else in the Muslim world of the west. This is no doubt a remote consequence of the Almoravid movement, revived for a time in the war of Babba, and of the peculiar situation of these Muslim nomads, who have here long been the advance-guard of the white race, face to face with the negro fetish-worshippers of the Senegal and Sâdín. Perhaps, like Reman and Polchari, we ought also to give credit to the influence of religiosité in the desert. In any case in thus assuming a kind of sacred character and surrounding it with a magic prestige, certain Berbers have had a regular revenge of their anoum-propre on the pride of race of the Arab invaders and have opposed to their tyranny and brigandage a defensive weapon which has not been without effect.

The principal brotherhoods of Mauritanie are those of the Tijûniya and of the Kâdiriya; their influence extends into the lands of the negroes. The first are represented by the Tijûniya of the Ténit and Adrar, who claim to be the first and say they came from Tabelbala at the beginning of the viith century. Since the early years of the viith century they have been connected with the branch of the Tijûniya in Fas. The second are much more numerous and influential; they have several branches; that of the Bekkîya dates from the viith—viiith centuries and is represented from the bend of the Niger to the Dâgân and Adrar by the tribe of the Kûnta. About a century ago it received fresh impulse in a new "path" and its autonomy. In Lower Mauritanie was secured by the great prestige of the Shâkhi Sidiya, of the Uld Biri (d. 1924). We may also mention the branch of the Kâdiriya, founded in the early years of the viith century, which enjoyed particular fame some 20 years ago under the direction of Mâ' al-'Ainin and his brother the Shâkhi Sa'd Bîd. These two branches have lost their importance since the deaths of these famous individuals. Lastly the Kâdiriya are still represented by the some 600 members of the
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Ghadfa brotherhood, whose practices are regarded as heretical by the other Muslims.

Shingiti, benefiting by its situation on the routes of the caravans which came from western Morocco or Sebka for the oases of Egypt or the Senegal, was at one period an intellectual centre, the reputation of which extended to all the western Saharan and to the Sudan. We see this in the fact that it was able to give its name to all the Moorish tribes (Shingiti) and to the territory in which they led their nomadic life and that the tradition of the country makes it one of the "seven holy cities" of Islam. It has now lost its old prestige. In the 11th century the fame of the medrasas of Timbuktu must have offered serious competition to it. At the present day Shingiti is seriously threatened by the sands of the Warar and its trade is much reduced. Its position is an increasing importance; the insecurity and eccentric development of the North African and the Sudan have led to the almost complete disappearance of the trans-Saharan trade by which it lived and in particular of its natural in a land of nomads. It has been rather under tents and particularly in the marabout encampments of western Mauritania that intellectual culture has developed. Universities have been created there where the teaching of the Kur'ān, theology, law, grammar and logic still flourishes. Some of them have known outbursts of glory under famous teachers, who have sometimes created schools of mystic initation, like those directed by the Shāhīn al-Makhṣūṣī, Mīr al-ʿAʿīn al-ʿAdī, or the Sufi school. To the Abū Muhammad Sāliḥ, also a kind of university in the Timbuktu which produces almost all the jurists of Mauritania.

A whole original literature has been able to develop. Kur'ānic matter, Hadith, law according to Mālik Shāhīn al-Lūṭī, and his commentaries, are its essential elements, with the doctrines of the Sufis and their mysticism. But historical studies have also been made and still have their eager followers, especially among the Ulūd Dāma (Timbuktu). Lastly, poetry is held in honour among all the tribes, warriors and marabout alike, and supports a whole cast of troubadours, the griots, who enjoy the favour of the courts of the emirs.


**MOREA** is the usual name in mediaeval and modern times for the peninsula of Peloponnesus which was regarded in ancient times as the "capital" of Greece. The name Morea is first found in the 11th a.d. in the subscription to fol. 143 of the Greek manuscript Brit. Mus. Add.

**(F. DE LA CHAPELLE).**

**MORADABAD** (Marādābād), a district in the Rohilkhand division of the United Provinces of India and also the chief town of it. The district has an area of about 3,300 square miles and a population of 1,200,000 of whom over 420,000 are Muhammadans. Nothing is known of the early history of the district. In the Muhammadan period it was successively ruled by the Sultans of Delhi, from whom it was occasionally taken by the Sultan of the Moghul, the Moghuls, the Khiljis, and the Nawahi of Ouda until it was ceded to the British in 1801.

Moradabad is the principal town in the district; it is situated on the Delhi-Bareilly road and on the main line of the Ouda-Rohilkhand railway. It has a population of 75,000 of whom over half are Muslims. The town is a Moghul foundation of the second quarter of the 11th century. Its founder was Rustam Khān who also built the Dāmān Masjid, an inscription testifies, in 1672. The town takes its name from Murūd Bakhsh, the ill-fated son of Shah Dājān. It rapidly ousted Sambhal from its place as the chief town of the district. Its industries are florishing (chiefly textiles and brass-work). It was a mint of the Moghul Emperor and was the residence of Ahmad Shāh Durrānī during his invasion of India in 1760. Sambhal is a very ancient site but has lost much of the importance it possessed in mediaeval times. It has an old mosque, an interesting example of Pathan architecture which has even been claimed as a converted Hindu temple. It is said to have been built by Bābur but it is undoutedly earlier. Amroha is the great Muhammadan centre of the district, the majority of its population being Shāhīn and Saiyids. The chief saint of the Saiyids is Sharaf al-Dīn Shāh Wiliyāk, a descendant of the tenth Imam, who came here about 1350. His tomb is still shown here. The Dāmān Masjid is a Hindu temple converted into a mosque in the reign of Kālhābād. It is much visited by pilgrims, mainly Hindus who seek relief from mental distress through the power of Šadr al-Dīn, a former sufi, into the mosque, whose virtues are still believed to be efficacious. There are over a hundred other mosques in the town.

**Bibliography:** H. R. Nevill, District Gazetteer of Moreh, Allahabad 1891.

**(J. ALLAN).**

MOREA, the usual name in mediaeval and modern times for the peninsula of Peloponnesae which was regarded in ancient times as the "capital" of Greece. The name Morea is first found in the 11th a.d. in the subscription to fol. 143 of the Greek manuscript Brit. Mus. Add.
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28th (cf. M. Vogel — V. Gethaften, Die griechisch-
ischen Schriften des Mittelalters und des Renais-
sance, Leipzig 1909, p. 28, 466, and also Byzantin-
isch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, iv. 73). Originally
the name Morea did not apply to the whole
Peloponnesus but only to the outer mountains of
Ichithya and the lands around them as well as
the whole district of Ellis. Reliable references show
that even in the xivth century the place-name
Morea was equivalent to Ellis; later the name
became gradually extended to the whole Pelopon-
nesus and with this meaning it is still used not
only by the Greeks but also by other peoples of
east and west.

Alongside of the original form Morea (Μόρεα, with
synonym Μορέα, Μορα), we find other divergent
forms in Greek literature: Μοραία, Μοράια, Μοραί
Μοραία, Μοράια, Μοράια, Μοράια, Μοράια. In
eastern sources of the medieval and modern period
along with the predominant form Μοραία (mainly
in Latin-Italian documents of the xiiiith—xivh
century), Μοραία (particularly in documents of
the xivth—xvith century), Μοραία (properly Italian),
Μοραία (French) we also find: Αμοραία, Λαμοραία
(see in Greek documents as early as the xiiiith century).
The origin of all these forms is to be traced to an
inaccurate separation of the article from the noun
Μοραία — Μοραία — Μοραία.

In Muhammadan texts we find seven main forms
of the name Morea = Peloponnesus: Λαμοραία, Λαμοραία,
Αμοραία, Αλμοραία, Μοραία, Μοραία, Μοραία.
The first five are properly Arabic, the last
Arabic-Turkish. There are however Arabic texts,
which have the old classical name of the peninsula
although with certain variants (cf. below).

As to the derivation of the name Morea, it has
puzzled scholars greatly for centuries. Some scholars
of the xivth century wanted to connect the name
with Morea (Ital. More). These were said to have
settled in the Peloponnesus at one time. This
derivation of the place-name, which has even been
adopted by modern scholars, agrees neither with
historical tradition nor with philological laws. At
one time the suggestion put forward by Emerson
(History of Modern Greece, 1. 60) and adopted by
Fallmerayer found many supporters; it connected
Morea with the xiiith century, see supra, note 3.
This view has been challenged by Kopitar (Wiener Jah-
bücher der Literatur, r. 1859), 111-120 and
again by Zinkeisen and Hopf as decidedly “mis-
taking and fanciful” and rejected by several later
Greek and Slavonic scholars. At the present day
it is generally thought that Morea is derived from
the Greek word μοράε = “mulberry-tree”, as Prof.
G. N. Haidzidakis (in the periodical ‘Aitex, vol. v.,
1894, p. 290, 401, 549, Παλαιολόγιοι Μελέτες,
Athens 1900, p. 29-99) has brilliantly shown on
the basis of philological arguments. In Ellis where —
as already mentioned — the name Morea, now
applied to the whole of the Peloponnesus for some
centuries, first appeared, the planting of the fields
with mulberry-trees is said to have been very common
in the middle ages. These trees were indispensable
for the silk industry which was at one time very
flourishing in the Peloponnesus and no less in
Patras. Authors of the Empire (Flivy, Hist. nat.,
iv. 4; Panatinaiki, v. 5, vi, vi. 36, 23, vii. 21, 5)
also tell us that Ellis in those days produced
ceres, i.e. a material related to silk. In any
case, as early as the xivth century, the Greeks
thought that the place-name Morea was connected
with the mulberry-tree. This is evident for example
from Joh. Lennclavius (Annales Sultanorum Ottom-
orum in Turcia sua lingua scripti, 1596, p. 63):
“Nonem ipsum (curt Morea) derivant Graeci: num-
que arbore moro quod tota regio scilicet arbor
hæce frequens est”.

In the medieval Muslim writers there is a
confusion between Amurria = Amorios in Phrygia
and Lamurria = Moreas, Peloponnesus. But Amur-
ria (or Amurilia, Amurilia, Amorilia etc.) in Abu-
I-Kásim Firdawsi can only be Amo-
ria, which used to be described as the capital
and “eye of the kingdom” of the Rūm. In the
geographical table of al-Tūsī (middle of the xiiith century) and of Ulugh Beg, Amurria
should rather be identified with Amorios than
with Morea = Peloponnesus (cf. P. Karolidis, in
Wissenschaftliche Jahrbücher [‘Ereniq] der Uni-
versität Athen, iii. 1909, p. 288—297; A. Hanritis,
in Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, iv.,
1921, p. 63 sqq.). In the little map by the Arab
Idrisi, of the year 1119 a. D., Belbûnins = Pelo-
ponnesus is given (i.e. the old classical name of
the peninsula). On the other hand, we find Moria
= Moreas = Peloponnesus (i.e. its medieval and
modern name) in the Arabic geographical table of
the Paris MS. 2214, which is supposed to contain
the cosmography of Ibn Sa’ud of the year 1276 a. D.
based for the most part on Idrisi (1154 a. D.;

The Muhammadan peoples really only became
acquainted with the Morea in the xiiiith century
a. D. Hellenistic culture was long extinct there
and Christianity had become predominant. At
the end of the fourth century (395 a. D.), Alaric
had laid almost the whole of the Morea waste and
destroyed many towns and sanctuaries famed in
ancient times. About two centuries later, c. 580 a. D.,
the Avars (a Turkish nomadic people) allied with
Slav tribes are said to have invaded the Morea
and settled permanently. It should be expressly
noted that it is only late and tendentious sources
which tell us this. What scholars of the xivth
century put forward as a historical fact, namely
that an independent Avar or Avar-Slav Kingdom,
initiated to Byzantine or Greek Christian influ-
cence, existed in the western half of the Morea
for 288 years (589—876), must be relegated to
the realms of fable (cf. E. Curtius, Peloponnes, i.,
Gotha 1851, p. 86). It is certain, however, that
considerable ethnological changes took place in
the middle ages in the Morea. In the xivth
century in the reign of the Byzantine emperor
Constantine V (741—775), if not earlier, numerous
Slav tribes had pushed their way into the Morea,
which had been much depopulated from 746 by
a terrible pestilence. This epidemic had also made
great gaps in the population of Constantinople,
which Constantine V is said to have endeavoured
to fill with people from the Morea; this imperial
edict must have further contributed to reduce the
Greek element in the peninsula. It may be assumed
that the Slavs who at this time were settling
mainly in Arcadia and Messenia, Ellis and Laconia,
sought and found new homes in the Morea, which
had been favoured by nature with a milder climate,
not only as hostile robber hordes but also as
peaceful colonists from the north.

According to Schaufark (Sächsische Altertümer,
German transl. by Wittke, vol. ii, p. 192),
the spread of the Slavs over the Morea can be fixed
between 746 and 799. Nevertheless there can be no question of a complete abysishment of the country nor of a complete annihilation of the Greek element in it — as Fallmerayer and his followers hold. The immigrant Slavs in Greece proper cannot have been very numerous. They were really nomad herdsmen and peasants, who settled here and there in the open country. Their level of culture much have been very low. On the other hand, the Hellenic element in Greece proper and no less in the Morea had always had control of the coasts and of the towns and fortresses in the interior, and it was moreover strong enough as regards culture to assert itself through the centuries and even to leave its mark on the foreign Slavs. The Slav settlers often caused trouble to the Byzantine government, so that the latter found themselves forced to send expeditions against them. For example in 732 A.D. the Athenian empress Irene ordered the Patriarch Staurakios to punish the Slav tribes of the Morea and the rest of the mainland of Greece. He appears to have had numerous troops at his command and was able to carry out his task satisfactorily in a few months. He subdued the Slavs and forced them to pay an annual tribute to the imperial treasury. He returned to Constantinople with many prisoners and considerable booty and celebrated a triumph in the Hippodrome there.

After some time, the Slavs again rose in the Morea against Byzantine authority. They became a great danger and even threatened the towns on the coast. Supported by Saracens from Africa, the Slavs in 807 (805 by another reckoning) blockaded Patras, but from the land. The citizens of this important town defended themselves bravely in spite of a shortage of provisions, water and other supplies. When the help sought from the imperial strategists in Corinth did not come, the citizens of Patras made a vigorous sortie. They put the enemy to flight and drove them far from their town. Greek superstition seems to have sacrificed the victory won at Patras over the Slav hordes to St. Andrew, the patron saint of the town. Nothing is recorded of the fate of the Saracen allies of the Slav besiegers of Patras. It is supposed that it was they who ravaged not only Patras but also Rhodes and other islands by the caliph's order in 807 A.D. With the defeat at Patras the strength of the Slavs of the Morea was broken. It is true that they again and again attempted to win their independence of the Byzantines by force of arms but without success. In 850 A.D., the doughty Byzantine general Theoktistos Rousensus subdued all the Slav districts of the Morea as far as the mountains on the Taggetos and Parson, where two real Slav tribes, the Esterites and Melingia, had settled. These two tribes survived longest, sometimes as vassals of the Byzantines and sometimes as their open enemies. As early as the ninth century A.D., began the conversions of the Slavs to Christianity to which is due also their gradual hellenization. The mixture of the Greek Moreotes (Turk. Moralia), with the Slavs undoubtedly contributed considerably to the former process.

The Normans in Sicily in the following period disturbed not only the coasts of the mainland of Greece but also the interior of various Balkan provinces of the Byzantine empire. The Norman king Roger II in his campaign in 1146 against Greece sailed round the Morea and occupied with-

out a blow — after successfully storming the strongly fortified Malvasia — Corinth, celebrated for and prosperous from its trade and industries. It was for this same king, that the Arab Idrisi composed his Nusht al-Ma'dhik, finished about 1152 A.D. According to this work, Morea (Beliomik), a flourishing and prosperous island of the Mediterranean, had 13 large and important towns, many citadels or fortified places and villages. Of the towns of the Morea Idrisi mentions the following among others: Corinth, "a large and populous city"; Patra (= Patras), "situated on a promontory", has a "famous" church (of the apostle St. Andrew); Arcadia (= the ancient Kyparissia), "a large and thickly populated town", whose harbour is visited by many ships; Iroda (= Navarino) with "a very commodious harbour"; Molotina (= Modon; q.v.), "a fortified town"; it was protected by a fort which commanded the sea; Coronia (= Koron), "a little town" with a citadel commanding the sea; el-Kedemona (= Lacedaemonia, the mediaeval Sparta), "a flourishing and important town, six miles from the sea"; Malissa (= Monemvasia, Malvasia), "a town defended by a very high citadel commanding the sea, from which the island of Crete can be seen"; Argolica (= Argolis), "a famous place and beautiful country"; Anahopolis (= Nafplia, Napoli di Romaina). According to Idrisi, Morea (the extent of which he puts at 3,000 miles) is connected with the mainland "only by an isthmus, the length of which is six miles" (= Hexamilion, cf. below). Only small ships could be taken through the isthmus from the Gulf of Corinth into that of Saron; ships of larger size had to sail all round the peninsula of Morea. The confusion in Idrisi between the promontory of Malea and Tainaron is not peculiar in medieval works. Idrisi's statements are not based to any extent on his own observations (cf. Geographie d'Idrisi, transl. by A. Jaubert, ii, 1849, p. 132 and also Th. Luc. Fe. Tafel, Die provincia regni Byzantini liber accedit. Europa, Tübingen 1845, p. 27).

We get much and varied information supplementing the Arab geographer's account of the Morea from various 18th century sources e.g. the Travels of Benjamin of Tudela (d. 1191) who starting from Saragossa visited the Greek east and other lands in order to become acquainted with the Jewish diaspora.

The conquest of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204 and the resulting division of the Byzantine empire, which had now collapsed, had a great influence on the future of the Morea. Boniface of Montferrat in 1204 founded the kingdom of Thessalonica in Macedonia which he took in exchange for Asia Minor allotted to him by treaty. By a comparatively slight effort he and his followers were able from Thessalonica to conquer within a year a great part of the mainland of Greece as well as the Morea. Two knights, William of Champlitte, Count of Champagne, and Godfrey of Villehardouin the younger, may be regarded as the men who brought the Morea under Frankish rule. When William of Champlitte had to leave the Morea in 1209, Godfrey of Villehardouin continued the work of conquest alone and organised the Frankish administration of the country which was henceforth known as the Principality of Achaea to Europeans. Soon after the Frankish occupation of the country, it was reorganised on western lines. But the feudal system did not find
its way into the Morea only after 1204. It had already existed in the country in the time of the Comneni.

The Frankish rulers built new citadels and forts in the plains and on the mountains, most of which survived into the period of Turkish rule. A number of sieges which were formed by the Franks in 1205 became after the middle of the twelfth century hereditary possessions of the Ottomans.

It must also be pointed out that the Venetians after the Fourth Crusade had secured important trading centres and depots on the Morea. The Republic in this way acquired the province of Lacedaemonia, Kalabryta, Monod and Patras, and, in addition to the last two seaports, some of the surrounding country including the possessions of a number of distinguished families of the Byzantine aristocracy. During this period, Venice succeeded in extending her territory and commercial influence and privileges further in the Morea and even in taking possession of the whole of it (cf. below).

The fourth prince of Achaea (Morea), William of Villehardouin (1245–1278), the second son of the above-mentioned Godfrey, had vigorously completed the conquest of the country. In 1245 he forced Monemvasia, which had so far remained independent in alliance with the Greek kings of Nicea, to capitulate under certain conditions. The same ruler also conquered a number of Morean tribes who had shown themselves hostile to Frankish rule and who played a prominent part in later times when the Turks occupied the country. To keep in check the wild tribes of Zacoonia and Laconia, William II of Villehardouin in 1249 built near the ancient Sparta, on a hill jutting out in front of the Taygetos, Mysitra (Mysitra), the fortress of the same name. A Frankish-Byzantine town soon grew up around this fortress which became a centre of art and classical studies. The town of Mysitra was destined to be the capital of the later despots of the Morea, and even in the period of Turkish rule it did not completely lose its old importance. Frankish rule in the Morea, which reached its zenith under William II, was destined to suffer a severe reverse within his reign. In October 1259 a fierce battle was fought between Castoria and Monastiri (Pelagonia) at Longos Vorilla. In this battle fought the armies of the Despot of Epirus Michael Angelos and of the king of Nicea and later Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Palaeologos. As a result of this victory on the part of the illegitimate son of the despot Michael Angelos, the Sebastokrator Johannes, the troops and allies of the former suffered a reverse. Even William II of Villehardouin sought safety by flight only to be shortly afterwards enticed from his hiding-place and captured. He was not released till 1262, after taking the oath of vassalage to the Byzantine emperor and ceding him four important fortresses of the Morea: Mysitra, Malna, Geraki and Monemvasia, as well as a considerable part of Laconia. The Byzantines thus gained important bases in S. E. Morea from which they were able to reconquer the whole peninsula, which was all the more necessary as William II of Villehardouin only kept his pledge of fealty for a short time.

Relations between the Muslim peoples and the Morea now became closer. At the end of 1262 the Sebastokrator Constantine, a step-brother of the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus, landed in the Morea at the head of a large army which consisted mainly of Macedonians and Turks. This step-brother of the Emperor came to the Morea as administrator of the Byzantine lands there and occupied all the citadels which William of Villehardouin had been forced to cede in order to secure his release. The Byzantine governor took up his residence in Mystra. Soon afterwards open war broke out between the Franks and Byzantines. To strengthen the latter there landed at Monemvasia in the spring of 1263 a new Turkish army corps of 5,000 (according to others 10,000) mercenaries in the service of Michael VIII Palaeologus, led by two men named Malik and Shalik. We have no accurate record of the origin and descent of these Turkish chiefs who, so far as we know, were the first to appear in the Morea. They must have been either Saldjiks or Turks of other descent who had no shame about selling their services to Christian rulers. The Turkish mercenaries under Malik and Shalik contributed greatly to the successes which the Sebastokrator Constantine gained over the Franks at the beginning of 1263. Along with Greeks, mainly from Zacoonia and other provinces of the east, Slaves from the Morea, Dasmuls (of Greek-Frankish descent), the Turkish mercenaries attacked from Laconia, which was the capital of the Frankish principality. The bands of Malik and Shalik then pressed into the highlands of Skorta. Here they ravaged at will. With the approval of the Sebastokrator Constantine, they plundered the villages, killed and slayed cattle. In these circumstances the Skortians were forced to pay homage to the Byzantine emperor and to operate with his army against the Franks. Constantine’s army, composed of so many different racial stocks, occupied the market-town of Velogosti (near Megaloportes) and burned it, without however being able to take its citadel; they then conquered Kalabryta and burned the famous Latin monastery of Isos. But soon afterwards they suffered a terrible defeat not far from Olympia.

In the spring of the year following (1264), the Sebastokrator Constantine continued the war on the Franks. He had no success and also quarrelled with his Turkish allies, whose pay was six months in arrears. Malik and Shalik at once left him with their men for this reason and retreated undisturbed to the district of Karytaina. Constantine tried to win them over again but they went to William of Villehardouin who accepted their assistance. Thereupon Malik and Shalik with their followers went over to the camp of the, as they thought, generous Frankish leader in the conviction that the latter would keep his word. By the accession to the Franks of this Turkish force, the tide was turned in their favour. The Turkish chiefs who were inspired by an ardent desire to avenge themselves in battle on their false employers, now advised William II of Villehardouin’s knights to meet the imperial Byzantine army on the frontiers of Messenia and Arcadia. While the Frankish-Turkish army was going through the pass of Makryplogi (between Megalopolis and Kalamos, i.e. the line of the modern railway), they were attacked by an ambush of the Byzantine army, whose leader was no longer the Sebastokrator Constantine but the strategos Alexius Phylis, Makremos and Alexius Kabbellarias. Twice the vanguard of the Frankish-Turkish force led by Anselm de Toucy had to give way before the numerous Byzantines who occupied the heights of the pass of Makryplogi, but finally they won the
hostly contested summit of the pass, from which they ousted the enemy. The Turks under Malik and Shalik followed up and completed the victory. The leaders of the army so dismally defeated sought refuge in the neighbouring caves of Gardiki where they were besieged by the Turks. The latter took the caves and led their occupants prisoners to William II of Villehardouin. The latter thereupon ordered the Turks to raid and plunder the districts of Morea previously occupied by the Byzantines, notably the districts of Zacoia, Helos, Vatika and Monemvasia.

After the battle in the Makryplagi pass came the news that Skourtinians had again taken up arms against the Franks and stormed the fortress of Bachelet (Arakovon) and Karytaina. As the valiant Godfrey Brunieres, Baron of Karytaina, who had always been able to keep the turbulent Skourtinians in check, was no longer in the Morea, William II of Villehardouin ordered the Turkish leader Malik and his men to go to Skorta to put down the rising. Terrified by the ravages and cruelties of the Turkish mercenaries, the surviving Skourtinians submitted to the Prince of the Morea and begged for mercy which was granted them.

The Chronicle of the Morea, which has survived in four languages (Greek, French, Catalan and Italian), is the only source which tells us of the activities of the Turkish mercenaries in the Morea (1259–1265). The same Chronicle adds that the Turks in 1265 sought permission to leave the Morea and to be allowed to return to their Asiatic home. Malik took his leave in the friendliest fashion from the Prince of the Morea and began his journey home. The Chronicle however specially mentions that individual Turks preferred to settle in the Morea. They were baptised and married morean women. About the first half of the xivth century, there were still descendents of Malik's followers there, baptised Turks settled in Elia. It is natural to think that the modern villages in N.W. Morea of Maliki (Demos Vrapson) and Turkochori (= "village of the Turks", Demos Tritaias) owe their names to the Turkish settlers in the time of William II of Villehardouin. This prince gave two of Malik's followers who remained in the Morea the rank of knighthood and even granted them fees. According to the Catalan version of the Chronicle of the Morea, Malik himself married a noble Frankish lady, a widow, through the intermediary of William II of Villehardouin. It is a historical fact that Turkish-Moreot relations date from the second half of the xiii century. After the death of William II in 1278 we find a reference to estates which this prince had given to his Turkish allies and which were occupied about 1280 by the soldiers of Galerano d'Ivry, who acted for a time as governor of the Morea for Charles of Naples and Sicily, Charles I and his immediate successors in rule over the Morea had not infrequently Turkish warriors in their service. From the beginning of the xivth century it it infrequently happened that Mahommadan pirates from Asia Minor raided and plundered the coastslands of the Morea. Sometimes they had allies of the Christian faith, notably Catalans.

About the middle of the xivth century, an important change took place in the administration of the Byzantine possessions in the Morea. The Emperor Johannes Kantakuzenos in 1349 created an appanage for his second son out of these lands which he called the despotea of Mystra and which lasted till the Ottoman conquest (1349–1350). In this period fell the rule of the first despots of Mystra, Manuel Kantakuzenos, the second son of the Emperor. He assisted the Franks of the Morea to ward off the Turkish attacks, which had reduced the once flourishing Corinth and the country round to such misery that the Christian lords in 1358 were forced to send an urgent appeal for assistance to their sovereign, the titular Emperor of Constantinople and prince of Achaia, Robert II. The latter gave a ready ear to their appeal. On April 23, 1358, he gave the Florentine Grand Seneschal Niccolo Acciajoli and his descendants the extensive district of Corinth as a hereditary barony. The princely family of the Acciajoli survived in the Morea and on the mainland of Greece for two centuries, during which they had much to do with Muslim peoples. A series of circumstances, including the irritations of the Turks as early as the middle of the xivth century and the advance of the Ottomans, whose strength was steadily increasing, brought numerous Albanian refugees to Greece. The first despot of Mystra, Manuel Kantakuzenos, had them settled in various deserted regions whereby they became distinguished as warriors, agriculturists and as hunters. Thus we find them in Arcadia and Laconia where they seem to have come in large numbers. Later another 10,000 Albanian families were peacefully settled by another despot of Mystra, namely Theodoros I Palaeologos (1384–1407), son of the Byzantine Emperor John V. According to reliable sources, these 10,000 families left Thrace and Accarnania with their cattle and goods and chattels on account of the Turkish raids and for other reasons and reached the isthmus. There they pitched their camp and sent messengers to Theodore I with the request that they might be allowed to settle in his Morean territory. Theodore I acceded to their request and allowed them to spread over a considerable part of the Morea.

The story of G. Basio (Dell'istoria della Serre Religione et Illustrissima Militia di F. Gio. Gerosa voylentina, vol. ii., Rome 1594, p. 126–129) to the effect that the Turks had occupied Patras in 1378 and conquered the Moreo shortly before must be relegated to the realm of fable. About this time, there were again great changes in the Morea. The Company of Navarre, which in 1380 had entered the service of the titular Emperor Jacob de Beaux of Constantinople and prince of Achaia and were seeking their fortune on Greek soil, became after the death of the Emperor in Tarso in 1383 absolute masters of a great part of the Morea. In 1386 the Company made Captain Pierre de St. Exupery (Bordo de S. Supur) their leader. The latter was able to extend his power and influence in the Morea by inciting the Turks and also the Greek archons against Theodore I. During the period 1395–1402 he even bore the title of hereditary prince of Achaia (which was given him instead of money by king Ladijan of Naples). Sometimes before, a vigorous and enterprising Florentine, Nerio I Acciajoli (Sept. 29, 1394), had been playing an important part on the mainland of Greece. This man, a nephew of the Niccolo I Acciajoli, already mentioned, had acquired considerable territory in the Morea, partly by inheritance and partly by purchase. Shortly before his death he attained the height of his glory when he was appointed by king
Ladislaus of Naples as hereditary Duke of Athens and the lands belonging to it. In 1389 the Venetians occupied the important fortress of Nauplia and set about the conquest of Argos. The despot of Mystra, Theodoros I Palaeologus, the son-in-law of Negri I Acciajoli, at his father-in-law’s instigation anticipated the Venetians and occupied Argos. As a result, hostilities broke out among the Christian states, which could end only to the advantage of the Turks. The despot of Mystra replied to the demands of Venice to give up Argos by saying he could only do so with the Sultan’s approval. Later the Venetians joined up with the Navarese. Through treachery Bordo of S. Superan succeeded in taking Negri I Acciajoli prisoner on Sept. 10, 1389. The latter remained for nearly a year in the hands of the leader of the Navarese but in the end obtained his freedom.

An epoch-making event was the great battle on the field of the blackbird (June 15, 1389) at Pritsina, which decided Turkish rule for centuries in the Balkans. A Turkish army appeared in the Morea at the end of 1392 under Ewrenos Beg in order to aid, at their request, the Navarese against the despot of Mystra. The Turks thereupon occupied a number of strongholds in the peninsula. Negri I Acciajoli, who had been appointed governor of the Morea, now pledged himself to the Turks and to Sultan Bayazid and to be his vassal. After the death of Negri I Acciajoli, a fatal quarrel broke out between his sons-in-law Theodore I of Mystra and Charles Tocco, during which the Turks won important successes on the mainland of Greece. The fear of danger from the Turks probably induced Charles Tocco and Theodore I to make up their quarrel. After long negotiations with the Greek national party in Athens, who hated the Latin, Turkish forces under the Pasha Timurtash entered Attica from Thessaly. At the end of 1394 or in the first seven weeks of 1395, the Venetians occupied Athens including the Acropolis, after driving back the Turkish besiegers. Theodoros prepared to advance against the Turks on the isthmus. The latter, however, defeated on Sept. 28, 1396 at Nicopolis the flower of the chivalry of Hungary, Germany, and France and thus laid the foundations for their dominion over the lands below the Danube. Bayazid thereupon decided to attack the remnants of the Byzantine empire as well as the little principalities of the mainland of Greece. He therefore sent his generals Yağılı, Pasha of Rumelia, and the already mentioned Ewrenos Beg with an army of 50,000 men to cross the isthmus again. Yağılı occupied Argos; Ewrenos Beg at the same time fell upon the Venetian possessions in Messenia. The prince of Achais, Bordo of S. Superan, and Theodoros I of Mystra found themselves forced as a result of the Turkish successes to pay tribute to the Porte. Laden with inculcable booty the armies of Yağılı Pasha and Ewrenos Beg returned across the isthmus and in 1397 even occupied Athens for a brief period. In addition to Greek sources, Turkish writers record the "city of the wise", as Athens is frequently called in Muslim works, was taken by Sultan Bayazid’s men (cf. J. H. Mordtmann, in Byzaṭ-Neẓirciḥ, Jahrb., iv. (1923), 346–347). As a result of his troubles, especially the Turkish raids, Theodoros I of Mystra became utterly tired of his position. He therefore resolved to sell his towns and citadels to the knights of St. John of Rhodes, who after negotiations readily purchased Corinthe, Kalabryta and Mystra in the years 1400–1402. But they could not establish themselves permanently in the Morea, for the Greek national party in the country, especially in Mystra, rebelled against the sale, which the Sultan, the suzerain of Theodoros of Mystra, also declined to recognise. Theodoros therefore cancelled the sale and compensated the knights partly in money and partly by ceding the county of Salona and the barony of Zitara. Theodoros I had been able to take these lands from the Ottomans after their defeat at Angora in 1402.

Sultan Selim I (1403–1411) abandoned any claim to suzerainty over the Morea. At this time the influence and power of the Venetian colonies in the Morea were increasing. In 1407 the Venetians occupied Lepanto. In the following year, they seized Patras and the country round it and from these two strongholds which lay opposite one another, the so-called little Dardanelles, they were able to keep in check the Turkish pirates who made the Gulf of Corinthe unsafe. At an earlier date, the Albanian family of Spata had settled in Lepanto and had occasionally made common cause with the Turks. Patras at this time was ruled by the archbishop Stephan Zaccaria in name of the Pope. As he suffered a great deal from the Turks, he pledged the town and the country round it with the Venetians. The latter also occupied the seaport of Astros in Zaoncia. They restored the fortifications of Nauplia and other strongholds in their possession. The Republic of St. Mark in 1406 and 1411 concluded treaties with Sultan Selim I, by virtue of which they secured their colonies in the Morea and the East generally. But in the reign of Murât II (1421–1451) danger again threatened from the Turks. The Venetians were however able to take the necessary measures for the defence of their possessions in the Morea. In the districts of Nauplia and Argos as well as in their flourishing Messenian colonies they settled numerous Albanians who loved fighting. In Corinth and Attica also the Albanians were welcomed by the Acciajoli. The Albanian element was therefore very strongly represented in the Morea in the first half of the xvi century; later they spread to the islands around the Morea. In the wars of the Greeks and Venetians against the Ottomans, the Albanians frequently distinguished themselves; on the other hand, their morals left much to be desired. To this day we still can find descendants of these Albanian colonists in the Morea and in the adjoining territories.

After the battle of Angora, at the time when Frankish power in the Morea was declining, the Byzantines vigorously resumed their efforts to reconquer the whole peninsula. Theodoros I of Mystra had previously wanted, with Venetian support, to erect on the isthmus a great bulwark against the Turks which would make access to the Morea impossible for them. Manuel II Palaeologus again took up Theodoros’s plan and began to put it into execution with vigour. Not far from Corinth on the isthmus, which was usually called "Hexhamillon" in the middle ages, he built a wall 24 stadia long from sea to sea with castles at each end and in the middle and no less than 155 strong towers besides deep ditches. The building material was taken from older walls and defences. In the course of 25 days (April 8—May 3, 1415), i.e. at a most rapid rate, the great wall was completed which, like the
ismus itself, was called "Hexamillion"; the greatest hopes were built upon it, but they soon proved deceitful. The Turks usually called the wall "Ges-
eckliter. In 1416, Manuel II left the Morea after re-impersonating his usurpation upon the prince of Achaia Centaurea II Zaccaria and humbling several Greek and Albanian archons, some of whom he carried off with him to Constantinople.

The peaceful relations which had existed between the Byzantines and the Ottomans under Sulaiman I and Baysarz suddenly ceased when Murad II ascended the throne. In 1423 he ordered the celebrated Pasha Turakhan to clear up the small states. With an army of 25,000 men, which was joined by the Duke of Attica Antonio I as the Sultan's vassal, Turakhan sent out from Thessaly to obey his master's orders. The celebrated Hexamillion wall proved an insufficient bulwark against the onslaught of the Janissaries. Turakhan had the most of it destroyed and advanced into the Morea. The despot Theodore II of Mystra could scarcely have checked the Ottoman floods which swept into his land, plundering and murdering. Mystra, Lontari, Gardiki (on the Makaryplagi pass) and other Byzantine and Latin towns fell into Turakhan's hands. But he suffered one serious reverse. The Moreots captured a portion of his army in the pass of Lomares, where they were victorious and took much booty of, to be more accurate, recaptured their own property. In the Arcadian town of Tavita (the modern Davia, on the road from Tribolitha to Wytina), the Albanians assembled and chose one of themselves as their leader and decided to attack Turakhan on his way back from the south. In the battle that followed, the Albanians did not stand their ground but fled. Turakhan pursued them and slew many besides taking some 800 prisoners. These he put to death and, according to the Turkish practice, built towers of their skulls. Heavily laden with plunder, Tur-

khan returned soon afterwards across the isthmus to Thessaly. He had however in 1433 not yet completed Murad's order to subdue the Christian states of the Morea.

Soon after the withdrawal of the Ottomans, Manuel II Palaeologos besought Murad II for peace and concluded a treaty with him, by which the despot of Mystra was to pay an annual tribute of 100,000 hyperpyra to the Sultan and farther to declare his readiness to give up the Hexamillion wall. Venice, whose colonies in the Morea had suffered much from Turakhan's raids in 1423 and were continually troubled by Muslim pirates, recommended the Ottoman powers to interest them in this united front. This appeal for unity, however, fell on deaf ears. The various Christian rulers of the Morea quarrelled among themselves in spite of the critical times and even took up arms against one another. The Albanian inhabitants followed their own inclinations entirely and even began separatist movements of a political nature.

It is remarkable that the Greek political consciousness was strengthened in the Morea in this period of political confusion. Mystra became the centre of a kind of renaissance and a centre of learning and study of classical antiquity. In this period there appeared in the Morea a great scholar who was a philosopher of the Platonic school and also a fervent patriot of radical tendencies in social and political reforms. He was Georgios Gemistas or as he called himself "Plethion". His teaching was of a mystical nature. It was directed against Christi-
the Turks of the Thessalian plain. An Albanian clan settled in Phthiotis, whose autonomy had been recognised by the Sultān, joined the victorious Palaeologoi. The latter also occupied the little town of Vitrinitza (on the Gulf of Corinth) which the Turks had ceded to the Venetians. He installed a chief of the Pindus Wallachians who lived in Fannar (at the foot of the Ithome mountains).

The battle of Barna (Nov. 10, 1444) brought a change in the Balkans which was fateful also for the Morea. The Turks reinforced once again turned their attention to the south. Nero II Acquavola of Athens found favour with Murad II after most humbly promising to be his vassal and to pay the usual tribute. In order to save their colonies in the Morea, the Venetians also made a treaty of peace with the Turks soon after the battle of Barna. It thus came about that the Palaeologoi were left to face the Turkish onslaught quite isolated, a danger which they apparently did not clearly realise. After Nero II Acquavola had again recognised Turkish suzerainty, Constantine Palaeologus with a large force invaded Attica and besieged Athens. The consequence was the Nero II Acquavola turned for assistance to Murad II. The latter demanded that Constantine should evacuate not only Attica but also all the Turkish territory which Constantine had seized in the course of 1444 on the mainland of Greece and in southern Thessaly. Constantine replied to Murad II through his ambassadors that he would keep the lands he had won. Murad II was furious at this manly attitude of Constantine II. Incited by Nero II and Turakhan, the Sultān resolved on a campaign into the Morea. By his command powerful Turkish forces were assembled in 1446 at Serres in Macedonia from Europe and Asia. Constantine Palaeologus and his brother Thomas also raised a very large army for that time which was assembled on the isthmus. In the winter of 1446, Sultān Murad II led his army from Macedonia to the isthmus, without meeting opposition. He encamped at Mingei (the modern Muğla) and began to get his artillery and other arms ready. On his able picked staff was the experienced old Turakhan who, as already mentioned, had been twice in the Morea and therefore knew the country and the people. According to the historian Chalcocondyles (ed. von Dörck, ii. 114), Sulthan Murad's camp on the isthmus was the best organised that had ever been known. A bloody battle developed for the gateway to the Morea. The Turks with their artillery bombard the Hexamilion wall for days. A Serbian Janissary succeeded in leaping over the wall under the eyes of the Sultān and others followed him. The defenders so far as they were not killed by the Janissaries took to flight in a panic. The wall was thus in the hands of the Turks, who entered the Morea either through the gates or through the breaches their guns had made. In the Chronicle of Georgios Phrantzes the date of the capture of the Hexamilion wall, the "last bulwark of liberty in Greece", is given as Dec. 10, 1446. The Chronicon breve of Ioannis Chios in Casuarina gives Dec. 14, 1446, a date which has been accepted as correct by most modern historians.

The brothers Constantine and Thomas endeavoured to collect the scattered and flying troops, but in vain. The brothers therefore fled into the interior of the Morea. Sulthan Murad II ordered Turakhan to pursue the Palaeologoi with 1,000 men and he himself with his army marched along the south coast of the Gulf of Corinth towards Patras. He burned the lower town, laid waste the country as far as Clarentas and then turned eastwards to Corinth. In the meanwhile Turakhan had returned from his pursuit of the Palaeologoi with much booty and many prisoners. The Palaeologoi now began to negotiate for peace with the Sultān. They declared themselves ready to cede the lands in Greece proper and in Thessaly which they had acquired in 1444 and to pay an annual tribute. On these conditions the Sultān left them in possession of their lands in the Morea. The Emperor John VIII Palaeologus died on Oct. 3, 1448, and on Jan. 6, 1449 his brother Constantine, the despot of the Morea, was solemnly hailed as Byzantine Emperor in the Metropolitan church in Mystra. Of course he ascended the throne with the permission of Murad II, whose tributary he was. An event of importance in the history of the world soon afterwards took place on the Bosporus. On May 29, 1453, Constantinople was taken by the Turks; the valiant Constantinople died defending the city and thus the line of Byzantine emperors came to an end. When his brothers Thomas and Demetrios heard of the fall of Constantinople they sent envoys to Muhammad II asking to be allowed to retain their lands in the Morea, on payment of the usual tribute. After many humiliations, their request was granted them. The remainder of the period of Palaeologoi rule was a brief one and their authority only nominal. In 1455 30,000 Albanians in the Morea rebelled against the Palaeologoi. In July 1454 Venice sent Vettore Capello to the Morea, to settle certain business of the republic and at the same time to make peace between the Palaeologoi and the Albanians. But their effort failed. In the meantime Muhammad II had ordered Turakhan's second son "Omar to intervene in the Morea on behalf of the Palaeologoi (end of 1455). He succeeded in putting down the Albanians. The Palaeologoi were now able to enjoy their lands as vassals of the Sultān. For a few years they paid their tribute regularly, then they refused to pay with various excuses. At the same time they endeavoured to form alliances with western rulers against the Turks, a thing to which the Sultān could not remain indifferent.

The rule of the Palaeologoi was gradually approaching its end. The west scarcely troubled itself about the brothers of the last Byzantine emperor, who were not united and yet had to gather their last forces against the Turks. When a fleet belonging to the Pope Callistus III appeared in the Aegean, Thomas Palaeologus took courage and announced his refusal of tribute to Muhammad II. Already the latter had received no tribute from the Palaeologoi for the past three years in spite of repeated warnings. He therefore thought it was time to settle matters himself in the Morea and to teach his rebellious vassals a lesson. In the middle of May 1458, Muhammad II came to the Morea with a large army, laid siege to Tarsus, a village in two districts N.W. of Nemea and N.E. of the Lake of Pheneos, and forced it to capitulate. The citadel of Rapoli in Arcadia, to which many Greeks had fled with their women and children, surrendered after two days' stubborn defence. Muhammad II turned from Arcadia to N.W. Morea. Patras, the headquarters of Thomas Palaeologus, was abandoned.
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by its citizens. The garrison left in its citadel did not dare to offer resistance. The Sultan seized the town of Patras very generously. By July 1456, Muhammad II had reached Corinth after taking Hostissa (Argio) on the way. On Aug. 6, 1458, its commanders left the citadel to negotiate its surrender with the Sultan. The loss of Corinth to the Turks seriously alarmed the Palaeologoi. The negotiations for peace, which were now begun, were conducted by Mathaias Asanis. The Sultan then made peace with the deserts of Morea but the price was a high one. In the beginning of the autumn of 1458, Muhammad II left the Morea to return to the north via Athens, which shortly before had passed into his hands. The sources do not agree regarding his activity in the Morea in this year.

As a rule, Mahmmad's campaign in the Morea in 1458 is regarded, by modern historians also, as one of destruction. It is true, he was generous to the deserts of Patras and left the Corinthians unharmed after taking their city. He carried off however a large number of Christians to Constantinople and its neighbourhood. These settled there as artisans and peasants and formed the productive element in the capital of the Ottoman empire.

In the year 1458 Muhammad II for administrative purposes combined his possession in the Morea with Thessaly and placed the newly constituted province under the governorship of Turkhan's son 'Omar. The Sultan had hardly left the country when the Palaeologoi again began to stir up trouble. Muhammad therefore deprived 'Omar of his office in Thessaly and the Morea and decided to go in person to the Morea again in order to be done with the Palaeologoi once and for all and make the whole peninsula a Turkish province. Demetrius Palaeologus was not the man who could defend and save Mystra. He did shut himself up in the citadel with the intention of defending it, but very soon surrendered it to the Turks. Demetrius after many adventures died as the monk Dorotheos in Adrianople in 1470 (cf. Th. Spadugino, i Commentari di..., de l'Origine de principi Turchi, Florence 1557, p. 43 sqq.). After disposing of Demetrius, the Sultan turned his attention to his brother Thomas. When the Turks had occupied Mystra he had not dared to do anything to defend his lands. He was rather seeking to leave a way open to escape from the Morea, if necessary. One town after the other fell almost without resistance into the hands of the Ottomans. Thomas Palaeologus embarked with his family at Porto Longo (at Navarino) for Corfu, which he reached on July 28, 1460 but went on 3 months later to Rome where he died on May 12, 1465. After the disappearance of his chief opponents, Muhammad II continued his victorious march from Messenia to Northern Morea. He left the Morea towards the end of summer 1460. The plan which he had decided on when he entered the Morea, was practically carried through. Except for a few places, the peninsula was now Turkish territory. Zaganos Pasja was installed as governor of the Morea by the Sultan and entrusted with the reorganisation of the peninsula, which had become much depopulated and was a great deal poorer economically. In 1458 and again in 1460 Muhammad II combined the Morea with Thessaly for administrative purposes. This union was later dissolved. As early as the 15th century we already find the Morea a sandjak by itself with 109 sianets and 342 timar. Down to about 1570, the residence of the governor was by turns in Corinth, Loudari or Mystra, then in Nauplion and in 1586-1587 in Tropolon (cf. below). The division of the country under Turkish rule, usual from the middle of the 16th century, into 22 or 25 provinces or beylik is partly suggested by nature and partly a survival of the older Byzantine organisation.

There is no doubt that the Turks introduced their own feudal system after their occupation of the Morea. The Turkish-Muslim element in the country was thus able to expand. Even during the first period of Turkish rule (1458-1687), other factors contributed to this, like the immigration into the Morea of Muslims from other parts of the Ottoman empire, the conversion of Christian Morocytes to Islam, the carrying off of Christian women into Turkish harems, etc. While in the north of the Balkan Peninsula and in Asia Minor, countless Christians had adopted Islam either voluntarily or under compulsion, the Christian element in the Morea at the time of the Turkish conquest was morally strong enough to remain in the mass faithful to the Christian religion. Comparatively few Morocytes became Muslims, and these were principally Albanians, who always adopted Islam more readily (cf. thereon: C. Jirelesek, Studien zur Geschichts und Geographie Albanien im Mittelalter, Budapest 1916). As in Asia Minor, Bosnia, Crete etc., so in the Morea also members of the nobility and middle classes, especially those of Frankish origin, had adopted Islam in order to retain possession of their estates. There were also in the Morea crypto-Christians, as well as people whose Islam was very superficial. These were usually called nardhat (impure) in the Morea. These superficial Muslims, who continued to retain much that related to Christian worship, lived mainly in what is now the province of Olympia and were almost all exterminated during the Greek War of Liberation (cf. the articles by Photios Chrysaanthopoulos-Photakos in the Athens periodical Ephestia, vol. ii, 1886, p. 1). The Bardaniotes were also for the most part superficially Muslims. As to the survival of the Greek Morosaic element, there are theories current in modern literature which can hardly be right. It is said for example that Sultan Muhammad II's ordinance regulating the relations of the Christian subjects to the Ottoman empire benefitted also the Christian Morocytes. But it is wrong to credit Muhammad II with any such ordinance (cf. Fr. Giese, in Dk., xli., 1931, p. 264 sqq.). It is however a historical fact that the Greek Orthodox Church contributed a great deal to maintain the Christian element in the Morea as in the East generally. The Christian clergy of the Morea were frequently able to maintain a privileged attitude towards the Turkish officials and thus to further the interests of their co-religionists. The Christian Morocytes were also often cleverly able to avoid having their children taken by the Turks for the Janissaries. The Christians of the Morea held this, the "blood tax"; to be the greatest degradation they suffered under the Turkish yoke and a dreadful disgrace to their race. After the death of Sultan Salamis the Magnificent (1566), the lot of the Christian Morocytes gradually became worse. Ownerless lands were confiscated by the Sultan and given to his soldiers or allotted to the mosques as waqfs or given to private individuals as gifts. During the
long period of Turkish rule in the Morea, the largest and best part of the land was in Turkish hands. As a rule, Christians were not allowed to own large estates. The peasants had to pay over annually the fifth of the produce of the land and pay all kinds of annual taxes, were never sure of their property, nor even of their wives and children, and suffered unseparably in every way from arbitrary Turkish rule.

In view of the abuses of the Turkish authorities, the Christian Moreote preferred to abandon the fertile regions and retire to barren lands and into the mountains, where he could breathe more freely and more easily escape the despotism of his rulers and shape his course of life a little more pleasantly. We thus find that within the period 1460–1821 the mountains of the Morea were predominantly inhabited by Christians. Of the factors which contributed to the survival of Greek culture in the Morea during Turkish rule special stress must be laid on the political concessions which were made to them by the Ottomans. These lay mainly in the freedom to govern their own communities. Greek local government, as we find it during Turkish rule, is said to have been a continuation of old Greek institutions. In the period from 1715 to 1821, if not earlier, the freedom of the Greek community was not infrequently limited by the Turkish authorities. They interfered indirectly in the appointment of local officials and made propaganda for their favourites. It even happened that the Kedijabashi, through the influence of the Turks, were not only appointed for a number of years, but were also able to hand down their offices to children and grandchildren. Undoubtedly, those Moreotes were better off who lived in towns or villages which were allotted to the sacred places of albania or to members of the Ottoman imperial family. The town of Dimitsana in Gortyna for example was originally a waqf of Mecca under the protection of the Sultan’s mother.

The peace between their Turkish rulers and Christians could only be external. In the Morea also there were the so-called “Klefs” who would not submit to the existing government and took up arms against it. Against them the Turks used the Armotoli force, a gendarmerie of Christians organised on military lines. In the period from 1715–1821 the Turks for the security of the country built watchhouses (derbent) in which a garrison was stationed to watch those who passed, especially at the passes. The Derbenecia (बेल्केर दरबेन) between Corinth and Argos and the Derbenia of Lontari, the passes between Arcadia and Messenia (Makriplagi; of above) were all very important. The Mainotes in their wild mountains felt little of the Turkish yoke, which weighed heavily on the rest of the Morea. The Mainote tribes who were distinguished for their valour, were from 1460 to 1821 in constant rebellion against every foreign power. The Porte found itself forced to recognise officially the independence of Maina, in return for which the Mainotes were to pay tribute, but did not always do so. Although the Christians in the Morea were exempt from military service, the warlike spirit which they had so often displayed in the Frankish period continued to survive. An eloquent testimony to their love of freedom was the fact that they continually took up arms against their Turkish oppressors, sometimes alone, sometimes with allies. For a long period after the year 1460, when Sultan Muhammad II had made the greater part of the Morea a province of his empire, this land became the scene of desperate fighting between Turks and Venetians, in which the latter had the majority of the Christian population on their side. The great champion of the Christians, Skanderbeg [q.v.], the leader of the Venetian mercenaries, died in 1468. Two years later, Turkish rule over Euboia was firmly established and they could record further successes in the Morea.

In the spring of 1499 a new war between Venice and Turkey broke out. On Aug. 29–30, 1499, Lepanto had to surrender to the Turks. In 1500 Sultan Bayazid II ordered Yaşlı Pasha to blockade Modon with his fleet, while he himself set out by land from Constantinople with a well-equipped army for the Morea. On Aug. 9, 1500 (according to Hâddjî Khalifa: on 14th Muḥarram 916), Modon [q.v.] fell after a long siege in the presence of the Sultan. Bayazid II turned the cathedrals at Modon and Koron into mosques and offered up thanks in them and gave these towns to Mecca as waqf. He then paid attention to the defences of the newly acquired towns and to the repopulation of Modon. In 1502–1503 Venice concluded a treaty of peace with Turkey in which she surrendered her Messenian colonies and also Maina, which had in the meanwhile been taken by a son of Krokondilos Kliadas in name of the Republic. In 1532 the Morea became the scene of notable battles. The emperor Charles V had decided to intervene in the Morea. A considerable fleet assembled in Messina in June 1532. The Pope and the Knights of St. John, the Genoese and the Sicilians also showed a readiness to join the expedition, the leader of which was the Genoese Andrea Doria (Turkish: Andrevirius). After repeated and costly attacks, the allies succeeded in taking a considerable part of the lower town of Koron. The Turks who had retired into the citadel of Koron were forced to capitulate. From Koron Andrea Doria turned his attention to Patras, which also capitulated. He then returned with rich booty. Sulaiman I, who was now on the throne, gave the sandjak of the Morea to Muhammad Beg, a son of Yahyâ Pasha and commissioned him to reconquer the fortresses taken by Andrea Doria. Sulaiman I declared war on Venice in 1537. Kâstîm Pasha, the sandjak-beg of the Morea, was commissioned to conquer the Venetian colonies in the Morea. Nil al-Din Barbarossa had inflicted several defeats on Venice in her colonies, and she had besides every reason to complain of her allies, the Pope, Paul III and the Emperor Charles V. In the summer of 1540 Venice made peace with Sulaiman I in order to save what was left of her possessions. The majority of the Venetian colonies in the East, including Nauplion and Monemvasia, was the price paid. The Turks endeavoured to populate once more their new possessions in the Morea. About 1550, there were about 42,000 Christian families in the whole Morea. We know nothing definite of the Muslim population at this time. It may be assumed however that, then as later, Muslims were in a minority. Even when Ottoman power was at its height, the oppressed Moreotes, always desirous of liberty, rose against their oppressors. In the xviTh century the lot of the Christians in the Morea is said to have been unbearable. The Turkish sources of the xviTh century are of considerable importance for the history of the Morea. These are the "Survey of
the World" (Zaikin-nama) of Hadsch Khalif (d. Oct. 1657) and the Travels (Siyyihat-nama) of Ewliya Celebi, who visited the Morea in 1663 and 1670. There is no fuller work on the Morea than the latter among Muslim sources. Ewliya Celebi's narrative was based on personal observation and enquiry and is distinguished by a vividness of description and to some extent by a tendency to exaggerate. In the treatment of the Morea, given in his vol. viii., it is hardly possible to trace his literary sources. What he tells us about Muslim buildings and religious orders is of importance, and his account of the Christians is also of value. He naturally takes the Ottoman point of view (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Siyyihat nāma, vol. viii., Stambul 1925; Fr. Dabinger, G. O. H., p. 219 sqq.; Fr. Timocent, in E.G., vol. xvii., 1926, p. 299 sqq.). When Ewliya Celebi visited the Morea, various Muslim orders and corporations had settled there. They included fakirina brotherhoods, dervish orders, some of which were anti-Islamic, and Shi'ite Bektashiyye. The existence of such brotherhoods, which were widely disseminated in the Greek east from the 16th century, can be proved for the Morea as late as 1828 (cf. F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Saracens, vol. i.-ii., Oxford 1929).

At the end of 1683 another coalition against the Porte was formed by Venice, Poland, Germany, Russia and the Pupi. Francesco Morosini was appointed by his government to begin operations against the Turks as speedily as possible. He was given command of the allied naval forces. After 48 days of fighting by land and sea, Koron was stormed by Morosini. In the period from the late summer of 1685 to July 1686, Morosini, Count Otto Wilhelm von Königsmark and Hauzubal von Degenfeld took from the Turks Old and New Navarino, Kalamata, Modon, Zarnata, Passava, Celefa and Vitilo as well as other fortified places in southern Morea. The Seraskier Ima'm Pasha was defeated in several battles and had to retire to the interior of the Morea. Hasan Pasha, who was in Maina, negotiated with Morosini and surrendered voluntarily. The Turkish garrisons of many towns, on the other hand, offered a desperate resistance. It cost the Venetians and their allies much time and heavy sacrifices to take Nauplia. The capture of the latter contributed a great deal to increase their confidence. By the end of 1687 Morea up to Monemvasia was Venetian. Continual Turkish raids, however, continued to disturb the security of the peninsula. By the peace of Carlolitz (Jan. 26, 1699), the Porte had to cede the Morea to Venice. The seas of the Morea and of the mainland of Greece were now open to Turkey as well as to Venice. For the last period of Venetian rule in the Morea (1669-1715 or 1718), the reader may be referred to L. Ranke, Zur vieständischen Geschichte, Leipzig 1878, p. 377-361. The services of Venice to the peninsula in the period 1688-1714 must not be underestimated, especially as she had found it at a very low level.

The occupation of the Morea by the Venetians now attracted the attention of western scholars to the celebrated peninsula. The Turkish empire, which had been able to profit a good deal by the troubles in Europe at the beginning of the 18th century, resolved at the end of 1714 to reconquer the Morea. Many Greeks felt that the Venetians had not respected their rights in religious and family matters, were hostile to their own government and wanted the Turks back again (cf. De la Montesquieu, Fêtes, vol. I., p. 462). Except for a few larger towns which offered some resistance, the land was easily taken by the Turks and hence the Morea once again became Turkish. The history of this conquest was written by several contemporary writers.

The peace of Passarowitz (June 10, 1718) ceded Morea finally to the Turks. We are most fully informed about their rule from 1718 to 1821. The extant sources, especially in Greek, enable us to study the period to the smallest detail. After 1715 many Christians again adopted Islam. A census taken in 1720 gave 60,000 male Christians of 11 years of age and over. The Muḥammadan inhabitants are said to have been in the minority at this time. On the other hand, the Turkish element increased in the period 1769-1780 while the number of Christians diminished considerably, as did the total number of the population. From 1715 to ca. 1780 the Morea was governed by a Paša, the Morean, who had three funkcije and the title of muşir; his period of office was indefinite. He was usually assisted by two other Pashas and were under him and were granted two funkcije. A change was made in 1780. From this date to 1821 the government of the Morea was no longer given to a particular Paša but to a simple muşăgji of the Porte, who was however given the title of Paša. The higher offices were held by a snakhebilegd, a dejterekbeyaga and a Christian dragoman. Under the official system of administrative divisions, the Morea was divided into 22 districts. In this period Christian local autonomy gained more strength. After the many disappointments they had suffered from the western powers, the Moreotes now looked to Russia to liberate them from the Turkish yoke. From the time of Peter the Great the bonds between Greeks and Russians had been growing stronger. In the middle of the 18th century, Russian propaganda increased very much among the Orthodox of the Balkans. Under Catherine II. the Russians easily succeeded, with the help of Greek agents, in stirring up Greek notables and clergy in the Morea to rebel against the Turks. Among these the most distinguished was the influential and wealthy Panayotis Mpenakis of Kalamata. This secret propaganda did not escape the Turks. By 1767-1768 the Christians were preparing for rebellion. On Oct. 15, 1768, Turkey declared war on Russia. Russian fleets, whose equipment left much to be desired, appeared in the Mediterranean. On Feb. 17, 1770, Theodoros Orloff landed at Vitylo and received a warm welcome from the Moreotes; but as the ships had neither sufficient armament, guns or munitions, the first enthusiasm of the Greeks soon died down. On July 24, 1774, a treaty of peace was concluded at Kastik Kaimardhi between Russia and Turkey. Full religious liberty and other concessions were granted to the Christian subjects of the Turks. About three months later, the Porte granted a general amnesty to the Christians of the Morea and resolved to clear the land of Albanian bandits. After 1770 the Porte had confiscated a number of Christian estates in the Morea and granted them to mosques and imāres. By the treaties of Kastik Kaimardhi and Kalmali Kanan (10th March 1779), the Turks promised to return these or to compensate their owners, but the promises were not kept. Nevertheless, the Moreote
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Christians benefited considerably by the treaties between Russia and Turkey; this was not however the case with the treaties later concluded (June 10, 1878; and Dec. 29, 1912). The right given to the Christians of the Morea to trade under the Russian flag contributed to their economic expansion in the period 1775–1821. Intellectual relations between western Europe and the Greeks of the Morea became closer and closer after 1799. A new generation grew up among the Greeks of the Morea and other provinces. Since the peace of Paris of 1815, the Morocotes and other Greeks had become convinced that only their own efforts could relieve them of the Turkish yoke. Careful preparations were made in anticipation of the right moment. In the spring of 1821 open rebellion broke out among the Greeks of the Morea, when the Turkish governor Khamîrî Phâcî was besieging the rebel ‘Ali Phâcî at Yeniça. Soon after the beginning of the rising, in which a prominent part was played by Theodoros Kolokotronis, a famous Kretan family, the Moucamen were masters of the lowlands and even occupied several strongholds. At the end of 1822, however, the Porte commissioned Ibrahim Phâcî, the adopted son of Mehemâd ‘Ali of Egypt, to put down the Greek rising. Ibrahim Phâcî landed his forces in Messenia. He was not able to restore Turkish rule over most of the Morea, but he failed to put down the Greek rebellion. In the meanwhile, philhellenism had made progress in Europe and America, and it thus came about that the cabinets of Europe began to take an interest in the question of Greek freedom. On July 6, 1827, England, France, and Russia concluded a treaty in London, by which the Morea and other parts of the Greek mainland were to form an independent republic but to pay tribute to the Porte. The Turks insisted on their point of view and declined the intercession of the great powers as regards the rebel Greeks. On Oct. 20, 1827, the combined fleets of the above-mentioned powers destroyed the Turko-Egyptian fleet at Navarino. On Jan. 18, 1828, Johannas Kapodistrias came to Nauplion, having been elected President of the Greek Free State by the National Assembly of Troizen. On Aug. 6, 1828, England concluded a treaty with Mehemâd ‘Ali of Egypt for the evacuation of the Morea by the Egyptian troops. French troops, led by General N. Magis, soon afterwards landed in Messenia by order of Charles X to drive the Turko-Egyptian troops out of the Morea. In the autumn of 1828 Ibrahim Phâcî withdrew to Egypt after turning the Morea into a heap of ruins during his 5½ years in the Peninsula. After long diplomatic negotiations, much quarrelling among the great powers and disagreement between the Morocotes and the other Greeks, Prince Otto, the second son of the philhellenic Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, landed at Nauplio on Feb. 6, 1832 as the first king of Greece. Henceforth the Morea formed a part of the kingdom of Greece. During the rising of 1821–1827 and later, many Morocote Muslims adopted Christianity. To this day, many buildings and inscriptions and especially place-names recall the days when the Morea was under the Crescent.


MORISCOS, (Moriscos), the name given in Spain to the Muslims who remained in the country after the capture of Granada by the Catholic Kings, Ferdinand and Isabella, on Jan. 2, 1492 and the destruction of the last ruler of the Nasrid dynasty.

It is mainly from Spanish sources that we learn the history of the Moriscos’ down to their final expulsion from Spain. Arabic texts relating to them are very rare; the only record at all detailed is that of the Maghribi al-Maqqari, a contemporary of the exodus of the Moriscos, in his Nafâ al-Dîn.

In proportion as the Spanish "reconquest" proceeded, groups of Muslims gradually increasing in
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number found themselves under Christian rule. These Muslims for the most part remained attached to their religion and the largest bodies of them were in Aragon and the district of Valencia; they kept up relations with their co-religionists of the kingdom of Granada. But the latter were suddenly placed in the same position with the fall of the capital of the Nasrid kingdom. The treaty for the capitulation of Granada contained, it is true, a large number of clauses safeguarding the liberty and property of Muslims, granting freedom for their beliefs and for the practice of the Muslim religion. But these clauses were not long respected and very soon attempts were made to convert the people of Granada under the stimulus of the Cardinal de Cisneros and the Archbishop Hernando of Talavera. Camerino in particular began his work in 1494: he tried persuasion at first, then he tried to withdraw from the city by burning them as many Arabic books as possible dealing with different branches of Islamic learning. His efforts did produce a few successes among the conversos, but also caused a rising which began in Granada in 1496, in the Albayzin quarter (al-Tabayt) and soon spread throughout the hill country of Alpujarras (al-Buxtar, q.v.), between the southern slopes of the Sierra Nevada and the Mediterranean, and spread to the towns of Almería, Baza and Guadix and the Sierra Nevada of Ronda. The result was in 1501 the promulgation of a law which gave Muslims a choice between leaving Spain and adopting Christianity. It does not seem however to have been strictly applied and the Moors of the kingdom of Granada, retiring to the mountains, enjoyed practical independence for over half a century.

But this first edict brought about the conversion of the majority of the Muslims of Castile. As to the Moors of Aragon, in spite of a few restrictions on their statutes they were not much disturbed and orders were given to this effect to the Inquisition. Nevertheless in the early years of the 16th century we find the Muslims of Albarracín, Teruel and Manises being converted on masse. The reaction became stronger, encouraged by Joan the Foolish, then by Charles I. In 1526 the Moors of Valencia received their order of expulsion. The situation remained somewhat confused down to 1556, a date at which a series of vesantaneous measures were decided upon in Madrid and began to be applied against the Moors who still remained in Spain: the use of the Arabic language was forbidden them; it was in any case losing ground daily, even among the communities which remained Muslim; they were also ordered to abandon their worship, their costume and to modify their manner of life. This time the Moors of Granada and Alpujarras did not hesitate to rebel openly. The rising once again started in the Allanzac of Granada in 1568 and spread to the mountains; it was at first led by an individual named Ibn Umaya, the Abenhaimaya of the Spanish chroniclers and afterwards by 'Abd Alá b. 'Abdó (Abenhamao). It took costly expeditions to put down this movement, and the war lasted for several years, conducted successively by the Mares of Montjúic and Don John of Austria. The final decree of expulsion was not issued by Philip II although he had the intention of doing so in 1582. It was Philip III who signed it in 1609 and in this and the following years, a large number of Moors — estimated at half a million — had to cross the sea without hope of returning.

Islam was definitely uprooted from Iberian soil.

According to the Arab authors, the great edict at the beginning of the 16th century was a most cruel hardship for the Moors. A large number died on their enforced journey. Many went to France, from which they tried to reach Muslim lands. A few colonies of Muslims from Spain settled in Egypt and Constantinople. But the majority went direct from Spanish ports to North Africa, their nearest refuge. There they were known as Andalus and where they were not always welcomed, at least in Morocco, with open arms. The principal settlements were those at Salé and Rabat on the one hand and Tetouan on the other, where their descendants still form the most prosperous and most industrious section of the population. The Andalus of the seaports of the Atlantic coast of Morocco soon began to devote themselves to piracy: the celebrated Moroccan corsairs were almost all Moors, who had retained the use of the Spanish language. On the other hand, the Moroccan Sultan organised corps of picked troops from the Andalus and they played a prominent part under the Sa'idana, especially in the conquest of the coast. There was also a small colony of Moriscos in Fès. In Algiers, a new colony, settled in the towns of Tlemcen, Oran and Algiers. At Tunis they were well received by the Bey 'Uthman: they settled together in two quarters which took their name (cf. TUNIS, iv., p. 886). Those who had not been town-dwellers settled in little villages which soon became prosperous and still have a characteristic Spanish look. Such are the villages of Soliman, Grombalia, Djeddedj, Zaghwan, Sebou, Tébessa and Gafet el-Andalous (Kaf al-Andalus).


(E. Lévy-Prévraçal)
Climate. The climate of Morocco has been defined as "an Atlantic variety of the Mediterranean climate" (Gentil). This however must not be taken to apply to the whole of the country; the different regions differ as much in regard to temperature as in the distribution of rain. On the Atlantic coast the climate is relatively mild in winter and cool in summer; only small differences are recorded between the coldest month and the warmest (5° at Mogador and 10° at Rabat). On the other hand, the seasons and even the daily ones increase the farther one goes inland. They become excessive in character in eastern Morocco where the climate is distinctly continental. The rainfall is equally lacking in uniformity. Brought by the West and S.-W. winds, the rains are abundant in the autumn, the winter and the beginning of spring; but they are very rare during the summer. The Atlantic coast has everywhere a copious rainfall although the quantity which falls decreases as one goes from North to South (Tangier: 32 inches, Casablanca: 16 inches). It also enjoys the benefit of an atmosphere which is saturated with moisture even in summer. The interior is not so fortunate. The rains diminish in quantity from West to East. The mountain masses always form an exception. They condense the moisture in the form of rain and even snow which, although it is by no means perpetual, nevertheless covers the high summits of the Atlas mountains until the beginning of the summer. Eastern Morocco on the other hand, isolated by the barrier of the Middle Atlas, is not subject to oceanic influences and only receives, except in the immediate neighbourhood of the Mediterranean, rare and irregular downfalls of rain.

The flora reveals a striking fashion these variations of climate. Forests of evergreen oak, of oak and of cedar clothe the peaks of the High and the Middle Atlas and of the Rif. The cork tree is found in extensive forests in the massifs of the Zaizir and Zaytun and as far as the region of the Atlantic (forest of the Ma'mura). The thuya and the arganier (a tree peculiar to the S.-W. of Morocco) are already more disseminated. Poplars, willows, elms and tamarisks form a fringe of verdure along the wadis. The olive tree is met almost everywhere in its wild state. But, as the rain-fall decreases, the forest gives place to scrub where the jujube tree and the mastic abound, then to prairie and steppe. The prairie, which hardly goes beyond the limits of the maritime plain, is the home of plants which are used for fodder and of bulbous plants. The steppes, the home of shrubs and hedges (artemisia, dain, alfa) which are adapted to a dry soil and to extreme variations in temperature. The steppes cover a part of the interior plains of Western Morocco and practically the whole of Eastern Morocco, where they extend to the neighbourhood of the Mediterranean. As regards the desert, it is devoid of vegetation in the hawmida [see Sahara], although the cases form spots of verdure in the midst of the general desolation.

Hydrography. The structure of the country and the relative abundance or scarcity affect the hydrography. Morocco is thrice richer in running streams and in subterranean waters than any other country in Northern Africa. Wadis (wells) are here more numerous; their courses are longer and their volume larger. A number of them even deserve the name of rivers. The waters flow in three different
directions: towards the Atlantic, towards the Mediterra-
ness and towards the basalt of the Sahara. The
Atlantic rivers are in all respects the most important.
They can be divided into three groups: those of
the North (Likkos and Sebî), those of the centre
(Bô Râgag and Umm al-Rabû), and those of the
South (Tensift and Sus). The Likkos drains the
districts of the Gharb; the Sebî, those of the Middle
Atlas, of the Zarhûn, and the southern slope of
the Rif. On emerging from the mountains it takes
numerous turns and windings across the alluvial
plain and reaches the ocean after a course of 300
miles. Although subject to considerable variation in
volume, according to the season, it never dries up
completely. It is even navigable in its lower course.
The Bô Râgag and the Umm al-Rabû ran for a
part of their course through the Central Plateau,
the Moroccan "Meseta". The irregularity of their
courses makes them useless for navigation. The
Tensift, to the North of the High Atlas, the Wadî
Sûs to the South, which are much less in volume
approach more nearly to the classic type of wadi
of Northern Africa. The watercourses of the Sahara
(Wâl Ghi, Wâl Zas, Wâl Darâ) diminish in volume
and are farther away from the mountains and
end by disappearing in the sand. The Darâ alone
reaches the Atlantic, but it only flows intermittently
in its lower course [see the article Dârâ]. As for
the Mediterranean rivers, they are only torrents
with violent and rapid floods. The Muluya alone
forms an exception. It collects water from the slopes
of the Middle Atlas but only reaches the sea in
much diminished volume on account of the loss it
suffers in crossing the steppes.

Although the common characteristics of all the
countries of Barbary are found in Morocco, the
greater or less differences in relief, the differences
in climate, the peculiarities of vegetation bring in
their train a diversity more marked than in Algeria
or Tunisia. The combination of these different
elements determines the existence of regions which
differs from one another in their configuration,
their resources, the density and manner of existence
of their population. We may distinguish six such
regions: Northern Morocco, the basin of the
Sebû, Central Morocco, the country of the Atlas,
Eastern Morocco, and Moroccan Sahara.

Northern Morocco. Northern Morocco com-
prises a mountainous zone (the mountains of the Rif
properly, so-called which are to the North-West
continued in the "domes" of the Djebala as far as
the Strait of Gibraltar) and regions less rugged in
character which to the South-East and the West
form the transition into the adjoining countries.
The mountains, split into deep ravines by the
courses of the wadis, for the most part only leave
between their last escarpment and the sea-shore a
narrow strip, or a few basins enclosed by the
rocky promontories. A few cuttings which run
across the ranges afford communication between the
two watersheds. The Rif, therefore, must seem
to be a world very little accessible to influences
from without. Arab influence has scarcely grazed
it. The population has always vigorously opposed
the political measures of the sultans as well as the
attempts of Europeans to settle themselves there.
Crowded into a limited territory, since the highest
parts of the mountains are useless, the Rifians find
their chief means of subsistence in the cultivation
of vegetables and fruits. A number of them gain
from temporary emigration an addition to their
resources. They are not nomadic but inhabit villages
perched on the slopes. Towns are represented only
by Shfaâwan and Wazân, religious and commercial
centres, situated on the northern side and the other on
the southern side of the Djebala. Towards the South-East, plains interposed with
mountain masses extend as far as the Muluya. The
lack of rain gives to these plains (Selwân, Gîret)
the aspect of steppes more fitted to a pastoral
life than to agriculture and a settled life. Towards
the West the lowlying coastland, still a very
shallow border at the strait of Gibraltar, in-
creases gradually from the North to the South
between the Atlantic coast and the last slopes of
the Djebala. This district commonly called the
Gharb is a corridor. It still keeps in this respect
its historical significance, but its economic
value is diminished by the stagnation of its waters
in the hollows in the flat bottoms of the valleys,
and by the insecurity resulting from the proximity
of the warlike tribes of the high mountains. A
few townships have however succeeded in establishing
themselves, either at the crossing of roads such as
al-Keûr al-Kabûr [q.v.] or in proximity to the
coast like Centa, Taourirt, and Larseche (see the
articles Tîtîwân, Cru泰安, Taourılı, al-KeriQıll). The
valley of the Sebû. The valley of the Sebût lies between the Atlas and the Middle Atlas.
Moroccan Meseta and the Atlantic. The situation
of the region, the abundance and variety of its
natural resources makes it of exceptional value.
The Sebût links up the whole of it. Through its
tributary the Ingalou, the valley of which leads to
the pass of Télil, it makes communication with
the rest of Barbary easy. The mountain masses
there (Zerhûn, Zalâgh, mountains of Gerûn) offer
no insuperable obstacles to communication. The high
plains of Seût and Meknes are contrasted with
the lower plains of the Sharaûr and the alluvial
plains of the lower course of the Sebût. The in-
fluence of the Atlantic is felt far into the interior
and combines with the numerous streams that flow
into the Sebût and its tributaries and the Atlantic
waters to promote the development of all forms
of vegetation. Forests cover the higher slopes
of the mountains; fruit-trees flourish on the sunny
slopes and cereals on the high plains; the merga,
temporary marshes produced by the Sebût, in its
lower course, are used for grazing until they are
sufficiently dry to be of use to agriculture. This
combination of circumstances, so auspicious for
human habitation, has made the valley of the
Sebût a centre of intensive settlement. The most
diverse ethnic elements have settled together and
mixed there. All types of habitation are found as
well as all degrees of attachment to the soil from
immobile to settled town life. Human activities
are displayed in the most varied forms (grazing,
agriculture, arboriculture, commerce, industry). The
country villages, douses of "moulâia" in the plains,
villages of houses of clay in the mountains, are
numerous, the towns are flourishing. Mawli Idris
is the sacred city of Morocco, Seût on the borders
of the plain of Séût and the high limestone plateaus
lives by trading with the people of the mountains
and the industry of its weavers and makers of
slippers. Fis and Meknes are among the great
cities of Morocco.

The first of these towns has remained to this
day the political, religious, intellectual and economic
centre of Morocco. It has resisted all the usual
cause of decline. From all time the ownership of the high plains of the Sebta has been bitterly contested. Their possession has been the condition for the establishment and survival of the dynasties which have succeeded one another in Morocco. Their political significance and role in history correspond very exactly to their geographical position and economic value.

Central Morocco. Between the valley of the Sebta, the ranges of the Atlas and the Atlantic, covering about a quarter of habitable Morocco, lies the region called by the geologists the Moroccan Meseta. It includes districts of very different character, the only feature uniting them being the possession of a common substratum, the Hercynian peneplain covered almost everywhere by sedimentary horizontal formations. Differences of structure and of climate distinguish clearly the various parts: the Atlantic plain, the plateaux of the centre, and the interior plain of the Haur. The maritime plain lies along the coast from Rabat to Mogador. Very narrow at its northern and southern ends, it broadens near the centre (Dukkata, Skhirya) to a width of 50 miles. To the rains and the constant moisture from the vicinity of the Atlantic, the abundance of running streams and subterranean waters, the natural fertility of the soil further adds to the conditions for prosperity. The Djerba or black lands which run in an unbroken line behind the coast from the Béragrag to Tensift are admirably suited for the growth of cereals. The rural population, almost everywhere settled, is therefore considerable. The land of the Dukkata has 40 people to the square kilometre, a density very much greater than that of the other districts of Morocco. The towns of the coast, Salé, Rabat, Casablanca, Mazagan, Azemmour, Safi, Mogador [q.v.], benefit by the richness of the hinterland. The importation of agricultural produce has at all times been a branch of commerce, and has been much developed since the settlement of Europeans there. While facilities for communications and the continental relations with the valley of the Sebta opened the plain to Arab influences, the ports of the coast maintained contact with abroad and permitted the infiltration of European influences.

The interior is much more broken. The ground rises gradually up to a height of 2,000-2,500 feet. The predominant formation is plateaux terminated on the north in the very old massif of the Za’tar and Zayán, which are really mountains in character, in the south in the equally old but less elevated massif of the Kabyrta. These plateaux deeply cut into by the course of the Umra Rabî’ overlook on the west side the lowlying outcrops from the top of cliffs, and slope gently on the S.E. to the plain of Tâdil. This is a depression, over 120 miles in length, running to the north into the heart of the Middle Atlas where it terminates in a cal de sac, while it broadens greatly in its southern part. A low pass enables communication to be made between the Tâdil and the Haur of Marrakesh, a basin shut in by the High Atlas to the north, the Middle Atlas in the east, and the Oued Oued in the north and the hills of the Shiyâdja in the west. The economic value of this inner region is very unequal. On the mountains of the north the rains and streams support forests and the natives devote themselves to cattle-rearing. The plateaux of the centre, covered with a surface of limestone have great stretches of bare rock and cultivation is barely possible. The Tâdil is no better favoured except in the zone adjoining the Atlas, watered by torrents descending from the snow. The plain of the Haur would also suffer disastrously from drought, if human industry had not averted this danger. An ingenious system of irrigation has transformed the country round Marrakesh into a vast palm-grove and resulted in a particularly dense population (100 to the square kilometre). Comparatively large towns (Amânia, Demnait, Tâmaqarith) and especially Marrakesh [q.v.] have been enabled to rise and prosper. Between this region, already half Saharan, and the high lying plains of the Sebta, the plateaux of the centre and the mountains of the north which come down to within a short distance of the shore, a barrier which the attitude of its inhabitants makes still more difficult to cross. The Zayán, the Za’tar, the Zemmâr, over whom the authority of the Maghians has never been very securely exercised, have more than once cut direct communication between Fès and Marrakesh. These two cities have been at different periods the capitals of distinct and even hostile kingdoms.

The region of the Atlas. In spite of the marked differences between the different elements of the Atlas, the whole region nevertheless has general characteristics of its own. Between Atlantic Morocco on the one hand and Saharan Morocco on the other, the Atlas lies on an almost insurmountable barrier. Only the few transverse fractures in the Middle Atlas permit passage between the basin of the Sebta and the Saharan oases, while in the High Atlas valleys running right into the heart of the massif give access to passes opening on the valleys of Sîla and the Wâdi Darâ. Moister and colder, the Middle Atlas is covered with forests which are denser and more extensive than those of the High Atlas. Both however are great watersheds. From the Middle Atlas come the great rivers of the Atlantic slope (Sebta, Gilh, Unum Rabî’, Wâdi T’Ahil), from the High Atlas the Tâdil and the Tensift. The lands of the Atlas are nevertheless poor. The high mountains offer little to support mankind. Human activities are found mainly in the zones of contact between the mountains and the plains (dés) of the Middle Atlas and in some specially favoured valleys of the High Atlas. Except in the Middle Atlas, where the nomadic mode of life results in the exodus in the bad seasons of the inhabitants who lead a pastoral life, and on the plateaux of the High Atlas on the Atlantic side (Hâns, Shiyâdja) the inhabitants, of which are mainly engaged in cattle-rearing, the natives are settled. They live in villages perched on the slopes and terraces between wadis or scattered along the valleys. There is nothing approaching a town in size. These regions, defended by the nature of the country, have almost completely escaped outside influence; they are still almost exclusively in the domain of Berber tribes (Berber) in the Middle Atlas and Shilou in the High Atlas. The customs and institutions peculiar to this people (cf. Berbers) have survived to a greater extent here than in any other region of North Africa. In particular their political organisation is still most rudimentary: municipal republics administrated by a djama’a in the Middle Atlas, feudal lordships ruled in patriarchal and despotic fashion by a few powerful families in the High Atlas. The people of these regions have also always opposed vigorously the
central power; the authority of the Makhzen over the Berbers of the High Atlas has never been exerted except through the local chiefs. As to the tribes of the Middle Atlas they have retained to the present day almost complete independence. Even the most vigorous sulhun have never succeeded in forcing them into subjection for any length of time.

Eastern Morocco. Eastern Morocco may be described as the continuation of the Central Maghreb or which it has the distinctive characteristics. In it, as in Orania, we have a telt zone and a zone rising by successive stages up to 5,000 feet. The upper valley of the Muluya separates them from the Middle Atlas. The monotony of these vast spaces is only broken by the outcrops of gair, flat beds of rocks cut up by erosion and by the depressions of the ghot [q.v.]. Rested by the winds, exposed to the rigours of an extreme climate, these lands are only fit for the pastoral life led by the nomads who raise sheep. The valley of the Muluya is no better favoured, except in the vicinity of the Atlas, where villages surrounded by vineyards with a settled population are found along the tributaries of the river. As to the Tell, hills of no very great height (the most important being that of the Beni Sfounen which does not exceed 3,000 feet) divide it up into compartments occupied by plains (plains of the Awilsh Manar, on the coast, of the Trifta, of the Angud which in the south reaches the cliffs in which the high plateaux end). The dryness of the climate frequently gives these plains a steppe-like character; only the western part of the plain of the Angud with a fertile and well watered soil1 lends itself to cultivation. Then the climate makes it hard to procure grain. But this region owes its importance less to its natural resources than to its situation on the natural route between Atlantic Morocco and the rest of Barbary. Udjda [q.v.] which commands the passage, has thus been enabled to escape various causes of decay that have threatened it. A border district, eastern Morocco has always been a disputed region, a march for which the lords of Tinmen and Fès have contended. The authority of the latter was never solidly enough established here to impose itself on the settled inhabitants of the mountains and on the nomads of the plateaux and the plains. In the French occupation the country was left to anarchy and disorder.

The Moroccan Sahara. The Moroccan Sahara is the N.W. corner of the Sahara. There we find the general characteristics of this desert region [cf. Sahara]. Only the parts adjoining the Atlantic and the threshold of the mountains offer favourable conditions for man. In the plain of Sis [q.v.] shut in between the Atlas and the Anti-Atlas, the rivers and the irrigation canals enable shrubs to grow. The Dar'a, Zis and Gis are in their upper courses fringed by a thin border of cultivated land, pasturage, vineyards, and, in their middle course assure the growth of palm groves of modest size. It is best known, if not the most prosperous, is that of Taffilt [q.v.]. The richness of this region, only relative it is true — of these cases is in contrast with the desolation of the rocky plateaux (hammuda) which form the greater part of the Moroccan Sahara. These natural conditions determine the mode of life of the inhabitants. Some lead a nomadic life and drive their flocks up and down the plateaux; others are permanently settled on the Sis, in the high valleys and in the oases. Sis contains numerous villages and even towns (Àqadir, Tiznit, Tafiltuat) the cases have a settled population in the gair. Those of Tafiltat, Tamgret, Bu Inbi and Ifigig carry on a certain amount of commerce between Atlantic Morocco and the Sahara. But this very circumstance has prevented them escaping as completely as the lands of the Atlas from the political and intellectual influence of Western Morocco, especially Tafiltat where considerable groups of Arab chieftains have been long established in the midst of Berber populations. But, although the present dynasty actually came from Tafiltat, the people of this region have frequently escaped Shari'ah authority.

Begun in the last years of the sixteenth century, methodically pursued since the French occupation, the scientific exploration of Morocco is not yet completed. From the results so far attained one thing is clear: the lack of uniformity in the country. Thus its geography may explain to some extent the historical development of the country.


 Cf. also: Archives Marocaines; Villes et tribus
Atlantic coast, it barely extended beyond the mouth of the Rif Seagrat, and in the interior to the massif of the Zizhif. The plains and the mountains of the Rif, Middle and High Atlas escaped the authority of Rome. It was the same with the Sahara. The expedition of Sostius Paulinus, who in 41 A.D. advanced as far as the capital Afit, remained an isolated incident.

To defend herself against the rebellions of her own subjects and to protect the country from Berber invasions, Rome had to keep in Tingitana an army of ten thousand men, to build strategic roads and to establish fortified posts on the sides of the triangle: Sala, Zarhbit, Tingis. With the exception of Volubilis, the importance of which has been revealed by its ruins, methodically excavated in recent years, and which was undoubtedly a centre of influence of Roman culture on the people of the interior as well as a military base, the towns were all on the coast. They were Lixus and Tingis raised to the rank of "colonia", and Ceuta. They owed their prosperity mainly to trade with Spain to which were exported oil and wheat, the two main products of the country. On the whole, however, Rome's influence on Morocco was superficial and had left little trace.

Without any real firm hold on the country, weakened by native risings and by the quarrels between the dominions and the orthodox, Roman rule was to collapse suddenly at the beginning of the 6th century. Germanic invaders, the Vandals, came from Spain and in 429 A.D. conquered without opposition Tingitana which they gave back a few years later to the Romans. Soon afterwards the western empire disappeared and the natives seized the opportunity to become independent. The Byzantines, who in the 6th century destroyed the Vandal kingdom, were content to reoccupy the two strongholds of Ceuta and Tangier. The rest of Morocco was in the hands of the Berbers. The latter were divided into a large number of tribes, of whom the principal were the Ghomara on the Mediterranean coast, the Barlangana [q.v.] on the Atlantic coast between the Strait of Gibraltar and the mouth of the Sebta, the Meknès, in the central district, the Maqura, on the western slope of the High Atlas and on the coast from the Sebtab to the Sfr; the Haskita between the Sfr and the Dar'a; the Lamja and Lamtanes on the left bank of the Dar'a. These Berbers were all of Sanhadj stock; some possessed Christianity or Judaism but the majority still followed the old nature worship. The Arabs conquered brought them a new religion: Islam.

The introduction of Islam. The Arabs appeared in the extreme Maghreb at the end of the 8th century A.D. Tradition relates that Sidi Usba, the founder of Kairouan, in 684—685 undertook an expedition which carried him as far as the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. This raid, however, if it ever took place, was too transitory to have any permanent results. But at the beginning of the following century, Mesh b. Nusairi [q.v.] who had just completed the conquest of Ifriqiya, took Tangier, installed a governor there and set himself to conquer and convert the natives. He succeeded without much trouble. Attracted by the hopes of gain, the Berbers adopted Islam and enrolled themselves in the armies which were invading Spain. They were not long, however, in

Morocco before Islam. Morocco, like the other parts of North Africa, has probably been inhabited from a very remote period. We know, however, nothing definite about its earliest inhabitants. The traces which they have left, weapons and tools of chipped flint, pottery, rock-paintings, some of which represent animals of the quaternary period, now extinct, megalithic monuments identical with those found all round the Mediterranean basin, give us no information in this respect. At most, we may suppose that the primitive population consisted of emigrants from southern Europe, the Sahara and perhaps from Egypt. The fusion of these diverse elements gave birth to a race, the members of which, frequently different in type and physical features, were united by a community of language. The ancient writers called them Libyans and Moors. They were the ancestors of the present Berbers [q.v.].

The first historical fact known, and that only imperfectly, is the appearance in the 4th century B.C. of the Phoenicians on the Moroccan coast. The sailors of Tyre and Sidon built lacustrine there, where they exchanged goods of eastern origin for local products (cattle, wool, hides and slaves). But Phoenician influence was exercised mainly through the intermediary of Carthage when it in turn had become the metropolis of a great maritime empire. The Carthaginians rebuilt the ruined factories and added new ones. In the middle of the 5th century, Hannibal, in the course of his celebrated "periplos" established on the Atlantic coast seven colonies of which one was at the mouth of the Sebta. Rassadir (Melilla), Septem (Cíutat), Tingis (Tangier), Lixus (Larache), Sala (Salé) were the principal Carthaginian establishments. It does not seem, however, that Carthage sought to extend her power into the interior.

It was not until the 3rd century B.C. that contact with the native chieftains and the recruitment of mercenaries from the country. Morocco remained independent, but the tribes who inhabited it were not organised into states, except perhaps in the east, where ancient writers mention in the period of the Punic Wars the existence of a kingdom of Mauretania or Maursia, extending along both banks of the Muluya.

The destruction of the Carthaginian empire hardly altered this state of affairs. For two centuries Rome administered only the "Province of Africa" directly and left the other regions of Barbary in the hands of native chieftains under a more or less severe protectorate. Northern Morocco shared the fate of Mauretania down to the annexation of this kingdom to Rome in 40 B.C. The region to the east of the Muluya formed part of Caesarea Mauretania. The lands stretching from the Muluya to the ocean formed Mauretania Tingitana, an imperial province governed by a procurator. When the empire was reorganised by Diocletian, it was attached to Spain.

Roman Morocco never covered more than a small portion of the modern Morocco. On the
rising against the Arabs. Dissatisfied with the share allotted of lands taken from the Christians in the Peninsula, and exasperated by the exacting ways of the governors of Tangiers, they took up arms in 740 on the call of the porter Maïara [q.v.]. The rebellion was both religious and political in character. With the same readiness with which they had adopted Islam, the Berbers adopted Kharidjite doctrines from the east, teachings which also appealed to their egalitarian tendencies and to their spirit of independence. The army sent from Syria to establish order was destroyed on the banks of the Sebt (742) and the extreme Maghrib was lost at once to the caliph and to orthodoxy. Berber principalities were organised in the Rif (see Sifilmasa); in the west, the Bargawata [q.v.] recognised the authority of a certain Sidiûl, founder of a rival religion to Islam, who had composed a Qur‘ân, that is a sacred book, in Berber. None of these little states was strong enough to impose its authority on the others and to collect all the Berber tribes under one rule.

It looked for a time as if the Idrissid dynasty [q.v.] were to play this part. Idris I and his successor Idris II, actually enforced their authority over the greater part of the tribes of northern Morocco and successful expeditions extended their kingdom from the shores of the Mediterranean to the High Atlas and from the Atlantic to beyond Tlemcen. Ardent champions of Islam, they imposed their religion on those peoples who did not yet practise it or who had abandoned it after once adopting it. The conversion of the extreme Maghrib to Islam is their work much more than that of the Arab conquerors. Zealots defenders of orthodoxy, in spite of their 'Alid origin, they fought the Kharidjites with the same vigour but did not, however, succeed in completely extirpating the heresy. It is not without good reason that legend has transformed these rude warriors into saints, the one Idris I, patron saint of Morocco, the other Idris II, the patron saint of the city of Fès [q.v.] which he had founded. The building of this city had enduring results. It gave northern Morocco a religious, political and economic centre which it had lacked since the disappearance of Roman rule, and favoured by its position, Fès prospered rapidly. It survived all causes of decline, even the collapse of the Idrisid power.

The Idrissids indeed rapidly declined. The various groups which had recognised the authority of the founders of the dynasty were not long in establishing themselves on their own and fighting with one another. These controversies were taken advantage of by the Fatimids and the Idrisids and the Umayyads of Spain, who during the tenth century A.D. disputed the possession of the extreme Maghrib. With the assistance of the Miknasa, the Umayyads in the end remained masters of the country. They were in their turn ousted by the Maghrawa [q.v.], whose chief Ziri b.'Atiya, abandoning the cause of the Umayyads, seized Fès where his descendants ruled for three quarters of a century.

The Almoravids and the Almohads. The extreme Maghrib seemed to be condemned to anarchy and to be broken up among small factions when the Almoravid invasion came [cf.'_ALMOARAVIS_']. After having first of all subjected all the lands south of the High Atlas, they established themselves solidly on the northern slopes, at the foot of which Yüsuf b. Taq bí founed Marrakush [q.v.] in 1062, these Saharan hordes turned to the centre, east and north of Morocco, sweeping everything before them: Fès, Tangier, the Rif, Oran and Tlemcen fell before them. The Berber principalities of the Maghrawa, the Bargawatayya and Banû Fams disappeared. In less than twenty years, Yüsuf b. Taq bí founded became sole master of the extreme Maghrib as far as Algiers. To these territories, already so vast, was soon to be added half of Spain. Summed by the Muslim emirs who were threatened by the king of Castile, Yüsuf b. Taq bí checked the Christian advance at Zallák (1086), then dispossessed the petty Muslim rulers to his own advantage. Morocco was thus extended across the Straits of Gibraltar as far as the Ebro and to the Balearic Islands. The fortunes of the Almoravids were, it is true, as ephemeral as they were brilliant. In contact with Andalusi civilization, the Saharan rapidly became decadent. The rigid orthodoxy, which had been their strength, relaxed; theirs in their turn were regarded as infidels, "anthropomorphists" (mufassarimun), whom it was lawful and even meritorious to fight. It was in the name of orthodoxy that the Mas'udi, the founder and the Hûdâta of the High Atlas, who had the leadership of Ibn Tûmân, and 'Abd al-Mu'min entered into the struggle against the Almoravids.

This struggle ended in the displacement of the Almoravids by the Almohads [see ALMOHADS and 'ABD AL-MU'MIN]. In seven years (1119-1126 A.D.) 'Abd al-Mu'min conquered all Morocco; Sidjilmansa, Oran, Tlemcen, and Ceuta fell one after the other into his hands. Next came the turn of Salé, Fès, and finally of Marrakûsh, the gates of which were opened to him by the treachery of the Christian mercenaries. Muslim Spain was also conquered with the exception of the Balearic Islands. Even in Africa, the Hammadid kingdom of Bougie was conquered in 545-546 (1153-1152). A few years later (554-555 = 1160) a new expedition led 'Abd al-Mu'min into Idrísiya and secured him possession of the interior and of the coast, which he took from the Normans of Sicily who had occupied it some time before. Morocco in the strict sense of the word was now merely a province in the vast Berber empire. The unification of these territories under one ruler had important consequences for the Maghrib. It facilitated the diffusion in North Africa of the Hispanic-Moorish civilization, which was to be perpetuated in Morocco after it had disappeared from the Peninsula itself. Further it brought into the extreme Maghrib a new ethnic element: the Arab. 'Abd al-Mu'min, as well as his successors, on several occasions deported Hilîli tribes from the Central Maghrib and Idrísiya, where they continually created unrest, to the sub-Atlantic plains where other groups of Arabs joined them of their own free will.

The Almohad empire was too vast, it comprised regions of too different a nature, peoples too foreign to one another to last long united. The Almohad caliphs were powerless to restrain the separatist tendencies which revealed themselves on all sides. In the first half of the xiiith century A.D., the Almohad empire broke up. Idrísiya and the Central Maghrib recovered their independence; local dynasties set up in Tunisia (Hafsids) and Tlemcen ('Abd al-Wâliids). The extreme Maghrib ended by slipping away from the descendants of 'Abd al-Mu'min who were replaced by the Merinids [q.v.].
The Merinids. Berbers of Zanatta stock, driven by the Hilâlî Arabs on to the plateau of Oran and into the central valley of the Muluya, the Banû Merin had at first entered the service of the Almohads, then turned against them, when the power of the dynasty began to decline. By perpetual razzias they made themselves masters of almost all northern Morocco. After the death of the caliph al-Qādir, who had been able to arrest their progress for a time, their leader Abû Vaḥṣî (1043-1058) seized Fès, Mekeks, Rabat and Sijilmāsa. The capture of Marrākūš (1269) by Abû Yūsuf, successor of Vaḥṣî, marked the final triumph of the Merinids. Heirs of the Almohads, the first Merinids endeavoured to reconstitute the empire of their predecessors. In Spain, they enforced their authority on the Muslims of Andalusia. In Africa, they endeavoured to take the central Maghrib from the 'Abd al-Walīds. They were successful when Tiemsien, besieged seven times in sixty years, finally fell into the hands of Sultan Abû ʿl-Ḥasan (1337 a.d.). Ten years later, the same ruler took Bougie, Constantine and Tunis, but his hold on these was very insecure. At the end of barely a year, Abû ʿl-Ḥasan, defeated by the Arabs, found himself forced to abandon Ifriqiya, the Hafsids returned to Tunis and the ʿAbd al-Walīds to Tiemsien, while the sultan's own son Abû ʿImrân rose against him in Morocco. Attaining to power, Abû ʿImrân renewed his father's efforts. He re-occupied Tiemsien and Tunis, it is true, but could not retain them (1360 a.d.). The Hafsids and 'Abd al-Walīds recovered their kingdoms almost at once.

Separatist tendencies thus triumphed and on this occasion in a most definite fashion. The extreme Maghrib, the history of which had hitherto been so often that of Barbary, began to live its own life. The Merinid kingdom, while its boundaries in the east were still vague and changing, already corresponded roughly to modern Morocco and the Merinids may be regarded as the first strictly Moroccan rulers. Lacking the religious prestige of their predecessors, they endeavoured to secure the moral authority which they lacked by taking as their patron saints the sultans of ʿIṣlām in the Maghrib. The cult of Mawālī ʿĪdrīs in the xivth and particularly the xvth century assumed an importance which it has retained to the present day. No less characteristic is the development of intellectual life and the arts. The Hispano-Moorish civilization never flourished more brilliantly in Morocco than in the Merinid period. The rulers attracted to their court the poets, men of letters and lawyers of the Iberian Peninsula and the Jewish Maghrib. The university of al-Kanawiyat attracted students from all the lands of the western Muslim world. Fès, which the Merinids, abandoning Marrākūš and Rabat, the capitals of their predecessors, chose as their royal residence, was given splendid buildings by them, palaces, mosques and madrasas. It was at the same time a commercial city in which African and Spanish merchants mixed with Christian traders.

This brilliant exterior, however, was quite deceptive. Merinid Morocco was never able to organise itself on a solid basis. The central power was very weak and did not succeed in imposing its authority everywhere. The accession of each sultan was an occasion for outbreaks. The pretenders who arose always found supporters readily, either among the Arabs or the Berbers. Powerless in the interior, the sultans were no more fortunate in their enterprises against their neighbours, the Central Maghrib or against the kings of Granada. Their prestige and their authority could not survive these checks. The Merinids in the strict sense disappeared from the scene in 1455, after the assassination of the sultan by an Idrisid sharif. The Banû Wāṭās, descended from a collateral branch, the chief of whom seized the power in 1470, had themselves a wretched existence. Their kingdom broke up into a large number of independent little groups, principalities at Fès and Marrākūš, Berber republics in the Atlas, Marabout fiefs in the Rif, the ʿGharb and in Darʿa and Šūtā. The sultans were quite powerless to prevent this decomposition.

The Christian offensive and the revival of ʿIṣlām. Of all the causes which combined to enfeebles and discredit these rulers, the principal was undoubtedly their impotence against the offensive of the Christians against the Maghrib. In 1415 the Portuguese took Ceuta, in 1465 al-Ḳasr al-Ṣâghir, in 1471 Tangiers. They thus secured themselves a base of operations in the north while by the occupation of Asīlā and Anfās (Casablanca; q.v.) they secured a footing on the Atlantic coast. In the early years of the xvth century, they built fortified posts at Santa Cruz (Agâdir) and Mazagan (q.v.) and took by force of arms Saḥ and Azemmûr (q.v.). Holding all places of importance except Larache [see al-Sawtiyya] they brought under their protectorate all the lands near the coast (Saḥwiya, Ḥija, Dukkalā), forced the natives to pay them tribute and to hand over to them strategic points up to the environs of Marrākūš. Their expeditions had no other aim than plunder, no other result than to exasperate the inhabitants who saw their towns destroyed, their donars burned, their women and children massacred or sold as slaves.

Menaced in the west by the Portuguese, Morocco was threatened in the east by the Spaniards also. The latter completed the reconquest by the taking of Granada (1492). Thus free to go further afield, and still fired with the religious enthusiasm of Ximenès, they too went over to fight the Muslims on African soil. The occupation of al-Mārs al-Kabîr (1507) and of Oran (1509) and the establishment of a Spanish protectorate over the kingdom of Tiemsien constituted a serious danger to the Muslims of Morocco.

The threat from the Christians produced an awakening of religious sentiment. This renaissance of ʿIṣlām in the xivth and xvth centuries, the results of which are still to be felt at the present day, is beyond question the great event in the history of Morocco since the Idrisid period. The way for it had, moreover, been prepared by the Ṣifiri teachings imported from the east and by the development of the brotherhoods in which the adepts of these doctrines were organized. It also found a favourable soil owing to the persistence of maraboutism among the Berbers. The ṣāhlah or the charlātan, who had always been an object of public consideration, became readily identified with the šīʿah, sharif, the possessor of the tawārīkh. Co-operating with one another, these plural individuals became the religious leaders of the people of Morocco. They strengthened orthodoxy, excited the zeal of the faithful, preached the holy war, and led the defenders of the faith into battle. The ascendency
which they exercised, the wealth they accumulated in their zāwiya, made them independent of the sultan. They thus became temporal leaders also, all the more readily as the sovereigns could not fulfil their office of defenders of Islam owing to lack of energy and also of means. The activity of these religious leaders was always of a local nature; it was only effectively exercised within a limited area and did not extend over the country generally.

The religious solidarity thus established, the kind of common conscience thus created, did not put a check to the political dynamism until the time when the sāḍi’ī sharīf took direction of the movement and exploited it for its own benefit.

The Sharīfī dynasty. a. The sāḍi’īs. The sāḍi’ī sharīf benefited by the prestige which the religious awakening had restored to the descendents, real or presumed, of Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet. Coming from Arabia at the end of the sixteenth century and settling in the valley of the wādi Dar'a, while another branch of the family settled at Tāfīlāt (Hasan or 'Alīd sharīf), they were not long in acquiring a considerable influence over the tribes of the south. Thus they were naturally led to support the people of the south, who were exposed to the attacks of the Portuguese of Santa Crun. In 1521, the sharīf of Tāfīlāt, requested by the Muslims to put himself at their head against the Christians, agreed to do so. Supported by the marabouts who gave him valuable assistance, he began hostilities against the Portuguese. The holy war regularly waged secured to his son, 'Abd al-‘Alī and Muhammad al-Mahdi, the possession of the whole of southern Morocco up to the Umm al-Rabī'. The intervention of the Merbīlī sultan in the quarrels which broke out between the two brothers only resulted in his own downfall being hastened. Muhammad al-Mahdi took Fās in 1550: the freezing of an attempt to restore the Merbīlī in 1554, with the help of the Turks of Algiers, assured the definite triumph of the sāḍi’īs.

The coming of the sāḍi’īs meant a regular reconstitution of Morocco. Muhammad al-Mahdi and his successors imposed their authority on the whole country, protected it against foreign foes and increased the extent of their territory by distant conquests. They finally triumphed over the difficulties created by the Turks of Algiers, and at the battle of al-Kārīf al-Rabī in 1578 arrested a counter-offensive of the Portuguese. Ahmad al-Manzūr (1578–1610) occupied Tībīkūt [q.v.] and destroyed the Aṣkī empire of Gao. For half a century the Moroccans were masters of the Western Sahā, from the banks of the Senegal as far as Bornī. The plunder taken on this campaign of conquest enabled the sultan to keep a splendid court, the heri tradition of which was modelled on the Ottoman court, and to adorn his capital Marrākūsh with magnificent monuments.

To the same period also belongs the organisation of the mākhūn [q.v.]. The early sāḍi’īs had relied for support on the Arab tribes of the south. To these al-Manṣūr added the Arab tribes of the region of Thameen and ’Udīya driven into Morocco by the Turkish conquest. These zāhīs, as they were called, received lands around Fās in return for the military service they were forced to give. Reinforced by a regular army formed of renegades, Spanish Moors, and negroes, trained by Turkish deserters, the mākhūn provided the sultan with the means of preserving order and levying taxes; it was thus the essential instrument of sāḍi’ī government and tended to become the government itself.

This instrument proved sufficient in the hands of an energetic ruler but was insidious in weaker hands and in moments of crisis. The sāḍi’īs very soon found this out. The tendencies to disruption which had been held in check by the energy of al-Manṣūr broke out again on his death. The dispute for the throne set his sons against one another. One of them, Zaidān, ended by triumphing over his rivals but could not prevent the break-up of the empire. Larache was occupied by the Spaniards; Fās cast off sāḍi’ī authority. The Andalus of Rabat and Salé [q.v.], enriched by their piracy, formed an independent republic. Finally the sāḍi’īs, although they had owed their elevation to the religious movement, now found the marabouts raising against them. Delivered from the restraints which the distress of al-Manṣūr and his successors had placed upon them, the latter began to gain more and more hold over the people and contributed to the ruin of the sāḍi’ī authority. Soon was the control of one of them, Sidi ‘Ali; Tāfīlāt was under the Hasani sharīfī, the Ghārī under al-‘Alīyāḥī, leader of the "volunteers of the faith". In the centre, the power of the marabout of Dīlī (a zāwiya on the upper course of the Wādi 'L-Abdī) increased. Muhammad al-Hāddī, his leader, victorious over the sāḍi’īs and over al-‘Alīyāḥī, lord of Salé and Fās, seemed on the point of founding a new Berber empire from the Atlantic to the Mulaya. Inaccessible, in spite of the support given them by the English and Dutch, of disposing of their adversaries, the sāḍi’īs now held only Marrākūsh and its immediate environs. The last representative of the dynasty died in 1600, assassinated by the abīlī of the tribe of Shāhīsī.

b. The Hasāntī sharīfī. The disintegration of Morocco was arrested by the coming of the Hasāntī sharīfī. The latter had taken advantage of the disorder to assert their authority in Tāfīlāt, then by expeditions, which par took of the nature of brigandage, to conquer and to warfare in Morocco. One of them, Mawīlī Mūḥammād, had even tried, without success, to take Fās from the Dīlīs. His successor Mawīlī al-Raqīd (1660–1672) was more successful. He took Fās, disposed of Qhālān, an adventurer who had established himself securely in the Ghārī, destroyed the zāwiya of Dīlī, reconquered Marrākūsh, thus reestablishing it as a piece by piece the sāḍi’ī empire. Installed by force of arms, the sharīfī dynasty recognised the necessity of securing the moral prestige which their origin could not give them. They therefore sought to attract to their side the sharīfī family. They hesitated between the sharīfī of Wāzānī, whose patronage was a guarantee even for the rulers.

The work begun by Mawīlī al-Raqīd was continued and brought to a successful conclusion by his successor Ismā‘īl (1672–1729). During the first fifteen years of his reign, he did not cease to wage war on the rulers who disputed the districts of Marrākūsh and Sīdī with him. While fighting his enemies, he was engaged in building up an army which would work his will. To the mākhūn formed by the Shārīs and Uḍīya he added a body of black slaves, the 'Abīd al-Bukhārī (Bushker), the property
of the sultan; their children were specially trained for military service. The number of effective in this corps by the end of the reign numbered one hundred and fifty thousand men. The sultan was thus able to reduce to obedience the Berbers of the Atlas and the upper Muluya. Defeated and disarmed, the latter were kept in control by garrison placed in kasbas built at the exits to the valleys or commanding the lines of communication. The notables whom the sultan had taken into his service or united to himself by matrimony alliances forced their tribemen to live in peace. The bidul al-mulukina, i.e. the country where tribute was regularly paid, extended over almost the whole of the extreme Maghrib. The pacification of the interior did not cause Mawlii Ismaili to forget the obligations imposed upon every Muslim ruler to fight the infidels. He therefore continued the holy war against the Christians of the coast. He reoccupied al-Mahdiya, Larache, Asilah, and Tangier, evacuated by the English in 1684, but could not take Ceuta from the Spaniards in spite of a siege or rather uninterrupted blockade for seventeen years. He was no more successful in his enterprise against the Turks of Algiers, who disputed with the Moroccans the possession of the plains of eastern Morocco and the ifri of southern Oran. The expeditions which he directed against the Algerians ended in failure, and the lower course of the Muluya continued to be the boundary of the sharifian empire. In spite of his lack of success here, Mawlii Ismaili is nevertheless the great figure of the Hashemi dynasty, the model the Moroccan sultans have set themselves to the present day. Morocco, however, remained what it was before, i.e., an aggregation of different groups, the cohesion of which depended on the personal energy of the sovereign. The processes of administration were in no way altered; the shahif enforced obedience by drastic executions; he squandered his subjects to the utmost to get the money necessary for the building of his capital Meknes [q.v.], the palaces of which were built by the forced labour of the natives and of Christian slaves.

On the death of Mawlii Ismaili, a reaction set in. For thirty years his sons fought with one another. The real masters of the situation were the ‘Abd who made and unmade sultans as they pleased. One of them, Mawlii ‘Abd Allahi, was proclaimed and deposed six times. He succeeded, however, in triumphant over his competitors by playing the Berbers off against the ‘Abd, the importance of whom gradually diminished with the wars. The remedy, however, was not much better than the disease. This period was for Morocco one of misery and ruin. The authority of the sharifs emerged much weakened from it.

Mawlii Muhammad (1757—1792) succeeded, however, in restoring it. Inhabiting the energy and vigour of his grandfather Ismaili, he brought the rebel Berbers back to their allegiance, and by the taking of Maragna in 1769 destroyed the last trace of Portuguese power on the Atlantic coast. Convincing, on the other hand, that the weakness of the central power was mainly due to a lack of financial resources, he endeavoured to procure money by encouraging the development of foreign trade. He inaugurated a mercantile policy, concluded treaties of commerce with Denmark, Sweden, England, and France and endeavoured to attract foreign merchants to his kingdom by founding for them the town of Mogador [q.v.] in 1764. Heavy taxes, however, severely impeded the progress of this policy. Morocco remained a poor country and did not open itself as it had been hoped, to European penetration. It also remained in a perpetual turmoil. Under Mawlii Yezid (1792—1794) the country was once more handed over to anarchy. Mawlii Slimani (Sulaiman) (1794—1822), after at first being able to restore order, had to spend the last ten years of his reign in putting down the continual risings of the Berbers of the middle Atlas; in the course of one of these expeditions he actually fell into the hands of the rebels. This rebelliousness caused the sultan much misgivings; he also wanted to prevent the infiltration of foreign and anti-Muslim influences which he believed would aggravate it. He forbade his subjects to leave the country and restricted a minimum their intercourse with Christians. The diplomatic and consular agents were relegated to Tangier, and access to the interior was made almost impossible for Europeans. His successors followed his example. Down to the end of the sixteenth century, Morocco was more rigorously closed than it had been in the time of the Merinids and Sa’dians and even in the early days of the Hashemi sharifs. In spite of this systematic isolation, the sultans had nevertheless to face the same difficulties as Mawlii Slimani and had no more success than he in overcoming them.

For half a century the domestic history of Morocco was a series of rebellions which the sovereigns had great difficulty in suppressing. The regions remote from the centre, Rif, Tafilalett, Figuig, eastern Morocco, escaped the authority of the sharifian. In the very heart of the country, the Tuareg cut communications between Fes and Marrakesh, forcing the sultans when they wanted to move from one capital to the other to make a great detour by Rabat. The empire broke up more and more. Mawlii al-Hasan (1873—1894) postponed for a few years the inevitable collapse. His reign resembled that of Mawlii Ismaili. At the head of his army, the artillery of which had been reorganised by a French military mission, he was continually in the field raiding the rebels and tearing down kasbas. He re-established order. In the region of Udaif, forced the people of Sus to recognise his khalif, reduced to obedience the Za’aar and Zayaf, endeavoured to extend the magnificence country by expeditions against the independent Berbers, endeavoured to develop his influence in the Saharan regions and to restore his authority in Tiffou. But he died before completing his task and all had to be begun again.

Morocco and the Christian powers. The situation was the more critical that the fate of Morocco could no longer be a matter of indifference to the European powers. It increased the enmity of some and aroused the curiosity of others. In spite of their desire for isolation, the sultans had not been able to break every link with Europe. They had also to take account of the proximity of Spain, established for three centuries in the presidios of the Mediterranean coast, and of the French who had replaced the Portuguese in Algeria [q.v.]. The conquest of the old Rempont, destroying all the sharifian hopes of extension eastwards, had caused great irritation in Morocco. 'Abd al-Kadir [q.v.] found followers among the peoples of this country and support hardly disguised on the part of the makhzen. This hostile
attitude resulted in the Franco-Moroccan war of 1844. The sharifian army was crushed at the Battle of Isly, the ports of Tangier and Mogador bombarded. The moderation of France alone enabled the mahkzen to come fairly well out of this unfortunate escape. Henceforth, the relations between France and Morocco remained peaceful, although the impotence of the sharifian government to guarantee security on its borders forced France to military demonstrations like the K. Skaassen campaign (1859) and the wadi Gir expedition (1870). Spain in turn being unable to obtain satisfaction from the protectorates directed against her garrisons decided also to resort to arms. The campaign of 1855–1856, ended by the victory of O'Donnell, revealed the military weakness of Morocco. The treaty of Tetuán (1860) granted Spain, along with some trifling territorial aggrandisement, an indemnity of 100,000,000 reals. To pay this debt, the sharifian government had to raise a loan in London on the security of the Moroccan customs and to accept the control of European commissioners. For the first time foreigners intervened in the domestic administration of the empire. The French thus made was continually enlarged. The exercise of the right of protection, the erection of a lighthouse on Cape Spartel, served as a pretext for diplomatic negotiations and for the extension of international control. European ambitions were not dissimulated. In order to protect itself against them, the mahkzen tried to play one off against the other and confined itself to granting, as it did at the conference of Madrid (1880), concessions devoid of all practical significance. Mawlā al-Ḥanān excelled in this different game and the viceroy 'Abd al-Azīz, who directed affairs during the early years of the reign of 'Abd al-'Aziz, Mawlā al-Ḥanān's successor, displayed no less skill. Morocco was thus the object of a very keen struggle for influence. England wanted to maintain her economic preponderance along with the control of the Strait. France wanted to ensure the security of her Algerian possessions and of the roads leading to the Saharan mines occupied in 1901–1902. Spain appealed to her "historic rights"; Germany lastly was preparing to seize the opportunity to acquire openings for her commerce and emigrants.

The Moroccan crisis and the establishment of the French protectorate. Such a position could not last. The intentions of Sultan 'Abd al-'Aziz precipitated the crisis. The weakness of the sovereign and his immediate desire for European innovations displeased the stricter Muslims. The modifications in the fiscal policy made by the Bērīt disturbed the people already taxed to the utmost. Rebellion broked out everywhere. A pretender, the rāyf Illā Ḥamānī, rose in the region of Tarāz and routed an army sent against him. It was in vain that France by the agreements of 1901 and 1902 endeavoured to organise the activities of the mahkzen against the rebels and to postpone the inevitable catastrophe. On the failure of this effort, France decided to arrange with England and Spain to settle the Moroccan question and prevent the dismemberment of the empire. In return for recognition of the protectorate du fait exercised by England in Egypt and the granting to Spain of a sphere of influence in northern Morocco, these two powers recognised the right of France to act as her interests best demanded. France hastened to propose to the sultan a plan for reforming the sharifian administration. The intervention of Germany prevented its realisation. On March 31, 1905, William II landed at Tangier and in a sensational speech posed as the defender of the independence of the sultan. On the advice of the German representative, 'Abd al-'Aziz appealed for the constitution of an international conference to study the reforms to be introduced into the Maghribi. The conference met at Algiers (Jan. 15—April 7, 1906) and affirmed the three principles of the sovereignty of the sultan, the territorial integrity and economic freedom of Morocco. It did not, however, settle the Moroccan question. The two international bodies which it decided to set up, the police for the ports and the state bank, both capable of being of great service, could not take the place of the general reforms necessary for the salvation of the empire. Disorders continued, acts of hostility against Europeans in Morocco itself and acts of brigandage on the frontiers increased in number. Not being able to obtain satisfaction for outrages on its subjects, the French government ordered the occupation of Udiya and Casablanca in 1907. The country was then pacified around these two centres and order restored in eastern Morocco and in the Shawiya to the great benefit of the natives themselves. The Spaniards in their turn for similar reasons intervened in 1908 in the adjoining region of Mellila and after a severe campaign in 1909 occupied Salwān and a number of strategic points.

During this period war broke out between 'Abd al-'Aziz and his brother Mawlā 'Abd al-Haft, proclaimed sultan at Marrakesh and then at Fas. Supported by the anti-French party, the rebellion was victorious. All the powers, including France and Spain, recognised him, after he had promised to respect the agreement of Algiers, the international treaties and all the engagements entered into by his predecessors. France and Spain announced their intention of not prolonging their occupation of sharifian territory. The Franco-Moroccan agreements of March 4, 1910, and the Hispano-Moroccan of Nov. 19 of the same year, stipulated that the occupation should cease as soon as the mahkzen should have a force sufficient to guarantee the security of life and property and peace within its frontiers. This settlement seemed all the more desirable since there had been occasional friction between France and Germany which had only been smoothed over with great difficulty, the most serious being the affair of the deserters from Casablanca in Sept. 1908. A disquieting state of tension remained between these two powers, although France had endeavoured to give satisfaction to Germany in signifying, by the agreement of Feb. 8, 1909, her willingness not to impede the economic freedom of the territories of Germany. The aggravation of the situation in the interior hastened the dénouement. The sultan's rule was no more effective than that of his predecessors; the executions of the sharifian agents in the spring of 1911 provoked a rising of the Arab and Berber tribes in the region of Fas. Besieged in his capital and on the point of succumbing, the sultan appealed to the French. They decided to send an expeditionary force to the help of the sultan but, after hearing his commander to avoid any injury to the independence of the sultan and any occupation of new territory. Vigorously commanded by General
Moltke, the military operations had the desired effect. Fis was relieved on May 21, and after certain police operations necessary to secure the peace of the district, the expeditionary force turned to the coast. But, while the danger was thus banished from the interior, unexpected complications arose. Spain, taking advantage of the occasion to take possession of the sphere of influence reserved for her by the agreement of 1904, established herself in Larache and al-Kasar, Germany, feeling the moment was decisive, claimed compensation in her turn and sent a warship to Agadir. This demonstration provoked the greatest alarm in France and in Europe generally. In the end, however, a peaceful settlement was reached. After four months of difficult negotiations, the agreement of Nov. 4, 1911 put an end to the dispute. Germany abandoned all political claims to Morocco and admitted with certain reservations, chiefly of an economic nature, the principle of the French protectorate. There was no longer any obstacle to the establishment of this régime, which the Sultan accepted by the treaty of March 30, 1912. This diplomatic document stipulated: the maintenance of the sovereignty of the Sultan, the representation of and protection by French diplomatic and consular agents of Moroccan subjects and interests abroad, the carrying out, with the collaboration of and under the direction of France, of a number of administrative reforms, judicial, financial and military, intended to give the sultan an empire a new régime, while safeguarding the traditional prestige and honour of the Sultan, the practice of the Muslim faith and the institutions of religion.

The French protectorate now extends over the whole of Morocco, but the Spanish sphere of influence enjoys by the agreement of Nov. 27, 1912 complete autonomy from the administrative and military point of view, while Tangier and its environs form an international zone, the status of which is not yet definitely regulated.

The establishment of the protectorate was to have had as its first result the restoration of the authority of the shah, whose support was essential for the carrying out of the reforms. This could only be attained by a considerable effort. The central power was weaker than it had ever been at the time when the conclusion of the protectorate treaty put an end to the crisis. The kilid al-makhzen was almost non-existent. France had to conquer Morocco for the Sultan. The name of Marcellin Lyautey, appointed High Commissioner and Resident General, will remain inseparable from the history of the pacification of Morocco, like that of Baguen in the history of the conquest of Algeria. Very difficult in itself, for it brought the French into contact with warlike tribes, some of whom had never recognised the authority of the mahzen, the task was further complicated by events abroad.

Order had hardly been restored around the chief towns, Fas, Meknes, Marrakesh and communication restored between eastern and western Morocco, when the War of 1914 broke out. For a moment it was feared that the French were going to abandon the interior and fall back on the coast, but the progress of the pacification of the country was only slowed down, not interrupted. All the conquered positions were retained and the rebels held on all fronts. The counter-offensive of the rebels in the Taza corridor, along the Middle Atlas and in Sba were crushed. The War finished, the offensive was resumed to reduce the districts still unsubdued (Mghila Atlas, south of the High Atlas, upper valley of the Moulouya). Three years of difficult fighting (1921-1924) ended in the occupation of all Morocco of value*, i.e. those regions of economic, political or military importance. The Rifian offensive in 1925, however, threatened to compromise all the success achieved. A Rifian chief, 'Abd al-Kurtus, had gathered around him the greater part of the tribes of northern Morocco and inflicted serious reverses on the Spaniards and forced them to abandon a portion of the territory which they had occupied. Crossing the Spanish zone, he invaded the valley of the Wargha and threatened Fas. The resistance of the posts echeloned along the frontier gave reinforcements time to reach the scene of hostilities. Checked in the autumn, the Rifian advance was definitely crushed in the spring of 1926 thanks to the combined action of France and Spain. At the moment of writing, the conquest may be regarded as completed: only a few tribes of the Central Atlas and of the oases of the Sahara have not yet been reached by the French, but their reduction is only a matter of time.

The administrative reorganisation has kept pace with the pacification. The old machinery has been retained but submitted to a control which guarantees the native's against abuse of their power and excesses by the agents of the mahzen. Technical services have been created to give the country the works necessary for its economic life. The remarkable results obtained in all fields have been facilitated by the influx of European immigrants and capital. Morocco seemed condemned to vegetate. Now it is being completely transformed. A new epoch is beginning, very different from any that have preceded it.


be possible to estimate the total population of Morocco to within a few hundred thousands.

The total usually given is 5,000,000, of whom a tenth, 500,000, are in the zone of the Spanish protectorate. This population is very unevenly distributed and its density varies with geographical conditions. The most thickly populated part is that of the plains of western Morocco between the massif of the Jbilia in the north and the Great Atlas in the south: (Sahar, Shāwiyah, Tādil, Dukkala and 'Abda. The density of the population also varies with the fertility of the soil. The population of the region is estimated at two fifths of the total. The mountainous regions, Jbilar, Rif, Middle Atlas are not thickly populated, as we might have expected from the comparatively dense population of Kabylia in another mountainous region of North Africa. As to the Saharan zone, outside the belts of oases in the Wādi Gīr, the Wādī Zīs (Tātīlāt) and the Wādī Dar'ā (Drâ), it is very sparsely inhabited.

6. Elements of the population. The population of Morocco consists for the most part of Berbers and Arabs, the former being the older element and the latter invaders. As to the Berbers, who do not seem to be a homogeneous race and whose origin is obscure, see the separate article on them. As to the Arabs, they are in a minority, but it is often difficult to attribute an exact ethnic origin to certain tribes or confederations, so much have the Arabs and Berbers become mixed since the Muslim conquest, and intermingled either by peaceful or warlike methods. It will be more prudent and will give a more accurate result if we distinguish in Morocco between those who speak Arabic and those who speak Berber (see below VII. LANGUAGES). The former live entirely in the plains, while with the exception of the massif of the Jbilar, the inhabitants of the mountains speak Berber.

3. Berbers. Three main groups may be distinguished among the Berbers of Morocco: in the north the Rifans and the Beni Zāhas; in the centre the Zuğla (Shāhīdja) and the Brarb (Barbour), who form the population of the Middle Atlas; the third group is that of the Jbila (cf. the article Jbila) who occupy the western part of the High Atlas and of the Anti-Atlas, as well the plain of Sīla. In addition to these main groups, we may mention the Djilala, arabised Berbers, to the N.W. of Fās, and the Ħāṛīt (plur. of the Arabic Ḥārīf), who seem to be regarded as an intermixture of Berbers and Sudānese and form the basis of the settled population of the zone of the Saharan oases.

4. Arabs. The early invasions at the time of the Muslim conquest do not seem to have appreciably modified the ethnology of the country. Down to the xiii. century A.D., the country districts of Morocco were almost completely Berber; it was the great Almohad ruler 'Abd al-Mu'min [q.v.] who was the first to introduce into Morocco Hilāli Arab tribes hitherto settled in the Central Maghrib or in Ifriqiya; these importations, continued by the successors of this prince and by the Merinid dynasty, soon drove the Berber element into the mountains or absorbed and arabised it. Evidence of such assimilation is still found in the fact that tribes with clearly Arab names contain sections whose names show their Berber origin. These Arab tribes, who are all settled in the
plain, may be divided into two main ethnic groups: the Banû Hläil (q.v.) and the Ma‘ilî. The latter occupies almost exclusively the valley of the Upper Muluya as well as the lands south of the Atlas. The Banû Hläil occupy the sub-Atlantic plains and the steppes of Eastern Morocco.

3. Jews. There are about 150,000 Jews in Morocco, mainly living in the towns. There are also a considerable number among the tribes of the Great Atlas. They also form the principal element in the population of the two little towns of Dehdü and Demmät (q.v.). The origin of the earliest elements in this Jewish population is obscure: it is difficult to ascertain whether they were Jews who had migrated from Palestine or were Judaized Berbers. The modern element is made up of Jews who fled from Spain to Morocco in the xvith century. The former call themselves al-Miğ馄hîs (Palestinians) and are called forarîtîs (foreigners) by the Spanish immigrants, who are practically all settled in the towns of the coast and are rapidly becoming Europeanized.

4. Miscellaneous elements. The negroes, of whom there are considerable numbers in Morocco, do not however form a distinct group there. In the north we find many, who are almost all of slave origin. The predilection of the townspeople of Morocco for black concubines, noted for their domestic virtues, has brought into the population, especially in bourgeois circles, a very considerable amount of negro blood. To the south of the Atlas in the oases, the intermarriage of negroes and Berbers has produced the Ḥārîfîn. Finally: the negroes of the Siûdân, since the Middle Ages, have always been esteemed as mercenaries to form the imperial guards, especially since the taking of Timbuktu by the armies of the Sa‘dîan Sulṭân Ahmad al-Mansûr (q.v.).

Large numbers of Muslims from Spain, whether of Arab origin or descendants of Christian inhabitants of the Peninsula, have contributed to form the population of the towns at various times: Cordovans banished by al-Ḥâkam I at the beginning of the third century A.D. after the "revolt of the suburb" and Muslims expelled from Spain at the "Reconquesta".

We must not omit the influence that may have been exercised on the population of Morocco by Europeans (renegades, who had adopted Islam, mercenaries recruited outside Morocco and settled in the country), and finally we may note that frequently the sultans have purchased women for their harems in Constantinople.

IV. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE.

1. Country. The population of Morocco, although for the most part rural, nevertheless has a larger proportion of town-dwellers than Central Barbary and, like the rest of North Africa, might be divided into nomadic and settled; this division does not at all coincide with that into Arabs and Berbers; there are still nomadic Berbers, while certain Arab tribes are becoming settled on the lands which they cultivate.

It has been shown that the nomadic or settled life of the country-people in North Africa does not depend, as was long thought, on ethnic factors, but is entirely conditioned by geographical considerations. It is the rule for dwellers in the mountains to be settled while the people of the desert steppes, forced to move about in search of pasture for their flocks, are nomads. There are however means between these two extremes and especially in Morocco, where we find semi-nomads, who move only short distances, principally to the borders of the various mountains of the centre and south. But generally nomadism is the outcome of pastoral migration and its geographical area is in direct relation to the rainfall and therefore to the nature of the vegetation.

It is in eastern Morocco, in the steppes which lie to the east of the Muluya, and to the south of the Great Atlas, towards the Sahara, that we find the principal groups of nomads in Morocco. In eastern Morocco, we may mention among the large tribes which lead a nomadic life the federation of the Bent Gil, between Bérgent and Fijig; on the other side of the Atlas, the Att Seddät, the Att Djäil, the Att Bäîlî, the Att-ül-Mrîbî; lastly to the south of the Dâr‘a (Dra) country, the Rgâls, the Şikárma and the Awwâl Dîmîn. As to the semi-nomads, we find them, outside the Middle Atlas, in the great plains of the Gharb, in the north, the Khânina and the Şiyâdma, in the south, where a pastoral life has not yet completely disappeared before a more settled state of society.

Nevertheless Morocco is, of the three countries of Barbary, that which has in its rural population the largest proportion of settled people, of fixed habitat and living not only in tents but also in houses. The latter are rarely found isolated in the country, but on the contrary are grouped into villages of more or less importance and more or less near one another, according to the density of the population.

The type of dwelling varies with the district. In the mountains the houses are built of unbaked bricks or stone with a gabled thatch or a flat roof. In the plains, the tent predominates, more or less fixed to the spot, and with it we find more and more the hut of branches with a conical roof called na’semla. In the Saharan oases, the population collects within a walled area or ṣâbur (ṣîbur, from the class. ṣîbr); these conglomerations sometimes possess the elements of town-life. The villages are called duar (dâwûr) in the plains, and ṣîbur in the mountains. In some hill regions we find survivals of cave-dwelling.

2. Town. Among the towns of his country, the Moroccans distinguish a certain number that he definitely regards as cities (ḥâjrâyîna). These are Fâs, Rabat-Salé and Tetwa (Tâvâ), which have been more than others subjected to the influence of Spanish culture. It must however be noted that in the majority of the other towns we can still find traces of the existence of colonies formed by Muslims from Spain, especially from the xviith century onwards. The population of the non-ḥâjrâyîna towns is found to be composed of rustic elements but little urbanised. This is the case with Udja and Massâg (country Beduins) and also with Tangier (countrymen from the hills). Marrâkush and Meknès owe their special urban character to the fact that as capitals they have contained the courts of two Şîhâth dynasties, both of Beduin origin; they are masbahîyîn towns in which the standard of civilization does not reach the refinement of the ḥâjrâyîn Spanish towns. The ports Tangier, Larache, Massâg, Sâfî and Mogador were for long the only points of contact between Morocco and European influences, politically as well as commercially. Lastly in the mountains,
little towns like Sefrou, Wadz, Sefra, Drat, Demnàt owe their existence to political reasons. The two first were founded as bulwarks against the Portuguese advance in northern Morocco in the sixteenth century. Demnàt and Drat are mainly Jewish towns. As to Sefra, it seems probable that it is a survival of an old Berber town. We may also mention as towns of secondary importance, on the Mediterranean coast, Ceuta, completely Europeanised for several centuries, on the Atlantic coast Ázila (Aqsal), Casablanca, which owes its origin to the port of Anfa, Azemmour, Agadir. In the interior, el-Karâ el-Kabîr (el-Kar, Spanish spelling: Alcazarquivir), Taza, Tzédîntî. Several ancient towns have now disappeared, e.g. Nakkar and Bîdîs on the Mediterranean, Têt to the south of Marrakesh, the two Agmât and Tinglalaî to the south of Marrakesh and several others, descriptions of which have been given by the geographers like al-Bakîr, al-Idrîsî and Leo Africanus.

As a rule, the Moroccan town is grouped round a citadel or château (pop. château) which is the seat of authority. Under the protection of the citadel lie the felted or Jewish quarter. All around spreads the town proper or medina with its great mosque, markets and châtrias [q.v.]. It is surrounded by a rampart (khir) beyond which there are usually the suburbs more or less rural in character. The town itself is divided into quarters (kaoum) with streets (sanne), alleys (aras) and squares (rabâa).

e. Economic Life. The country people, whether settled or nomadic, who form at least four-fifths of the population of Morocco, live on the land, either by agriculture or stock-raising, most often combining the two. Those in the highlands grow cereals (wheat, barley), certain leguminous (broad beans, chick-peas, vetches) and fruit trees. They also exploit their forests in a very primitive fashion (thuyas, cedars). The people of the plains devote themselves mainly to cereals and the rearing of cattle, sheep, camels, horses and asses. In the oases of the south, the population cultivates the date-palm and understands the art of irrigating the land.

The rural industries are very primitive. They are limited to supplying the necessary implements of agriculture, and weaving wool into the material for garments, tents and carpets. The Berbers of Sàs show a certain aptitude at metal-working (arms and jewels). Sàs no longer exports the cane-sugar and copper, which formed considerable articles of trade under the Sàdîans.

Each tribe has a certain number of markets (sâf) which are held in the open country and bear the name of the day on which they are held. It is in the sâf that the peasant sells his produce and buys the manufactured articles that are brought by the merchants from the towns. Cereals are preserved in silos (maânwa); in the Great Atlas and to the south of it we find fortified storehouses, which belong to the community and are called agûdir.

It is in the towns that we find industrial activity concentrated. Each trade, which originally formed a guild (bunot), is grouped in one street which bears its name. In it the articles are made and sold. The stocks are kept in the fondhûs (Ar. fondât) which correspond to the khân and wâlah of the east. Some products, like grain, oil, coal, wood, are sold in special places called rabâa.

The monopolies of exporting (sûs) corn and hides established by the sultans at the end of the sixteenth century have now been abolished. Several European products have become of the first necessity in Morocco and form the subjects of an important traffic: cotton goods, tea and sugar and candles. For the history of the weights and measures and coins in use in Morocco before the establishment of the protectorate see the works by Massignon and Michaux-Bellaire quoted in the Bibliography. The very vivid picture drawn by Leo Africanus of the commercial and industrial activity of Fas in the Middle Ages is still very valuable.

The Jews, who devote themselves specially to certain trades that flourish in larger centres (goldsmiths, embroiderers), also play an important part as brokers. The citizens of Fas, who have a large number of converted Jews among their number, had almost a monopoly of the import trade of Morocco, especially from England, and for this reason had little colonies in the sea-ports.

The Berbers of Sàs like to settle in the towns as grocers (aabîsil) and having made their fortunes return to the country. Since the war of 1914 many of them have migrated to France as labourers and they settle in groups, according to their original tribes, in the suburbs of certain large industrial towns.

V. Political Organisation.

It is only at rare intervals and for short periods that Morocco has been entirely under the authority of the sultan: whence the distinction between the territory subjected to the government (bîlûd al-makhzen) and the territory unsubjugated (bîlûd al-raîâ). As a rule, the makhzen territory included the towns, wâlahs and plains. The mountains, on the other hand, remained more or less independent, according to the degree of power possessed by the sovereign. For further details cf. the article MAHÆZEN.

Outside the towns the population is grouped into tribes (kaubâla). Several are sometimes grouped together under a common name, without however being a confederation in the strict sense of the word; this is the case with the Ghomara in the north, the Hâla, the Dukkâla, the Shâwiya in the south. The tribe is subdivided into sections (rubûl, khamsa, sâcherà), which are subdivided into sub-sections comprising a certain number of villages of tents or houses.

The tribes who own the sultan's sway are governed by a qâdî appointed by the makhzen. His duty is to allot and levy the taxes, to raise contingents of soldiers and keep good order. He has under his command a shâhiq for each section under whom are the makhâliyâ of the sub-sections.

For the distinction between makhzen, qâdî (vulg. qad), and makhzen tribes see the article MAHÆZEN.

In the tribes not subject to the makhzen, political activity is confined to the qâmûs, i.e. an assembly of men able to bear arms. The qâmûs deals with all the business of the tribe, civil, criminal, financial and political. It administers justice following local custom (Arabic türb, Berber türf). It elects a shâhiq (Berber wâshir) who is only an agent to carry out its decisions. Alongside of the qâmûs of the tribe, there are qâmûs of the sections and sub-sections but their powers are limited.

All the tribes of the bîlûd al-raîâ are divided into opposing factions or tâf. When a tribe of
a certain tax is assessed, those neighboring tribes who belong to the same faction take up arms and come to its assistance.

In the towns, the mahkzen is represented by a governor whose official title is shaif but in certain large towns he is often called khalif. The title of 'mali has been sometimes given to the governor of Oujda. The shaif of the town, generally speaking, has the same powers as the shaif of the tribe and acts as judge in case of any violation of the law. He has an assistant or khalif. Alongside of him, the mulhit supervise the corporations, fix their average prices and looks after public morals.

The shaif has under his orders the mahkzen of the quarter and his police (mahkzeniya) carrying out his instructions. Among the officials sent by the mahzen to each town may also be mentioned the 'abir or inspector of endowments (habúr), the trustee of vacant inheritances (wekil al-qurrala), popularly hím-muwa'iri (ahab 'muwa'iri), the collector of local taxes and market-dues (amin al-mudfi'd). Lastly in the harbours and frontier towns, the customs are collected by officials called umaní (eg. ammar).

Justice is administered by the shaif or by the húb, as the case may be. The latter deals with questions of personal law; official reports on the cases are drawn up by the 'abir. In technical cases he appeals to experts: master-masons, agriculturalists, veterinary surgeons (wekil en-nufar), arbák et-ta'al, fálta, hafir). The legal opinions (fatwa) given by eminent jurists on the same question being often contradictory, the Sharifian government has recently created a court of appeal (ma'fiis al-isti'maf) at Rabat.

Landed property takes a number of different forms. In the first place, there are the state domains; they are either managed directly by the mahzen (crown-lands) or are allotted to tribal tribes in return for the military service for which they are liable; others of these lands may be granted in temporary or definite ownership to private individuals by imperial edict (alziir or tanfi'd). The húb lands may be urban or rural. In the towns, they are not infrequently cover half the area. They are let out under special conditions which give the tenants special privileges, misfah and gazz (class. Ar. 'izzah). In the country, the húb lands consist mainly of fields and orchards. In all cases, the revenue from these lands is set aside for the maintenance of buildings of a religious character or of public utility (mosques, colleges, schools, fountains) and for the payment of the officials attached to these establishments.

In Morocco, there are vast tracts of land which are not the property of any one individual, either as a result of the insecurity prevailing or of the sparsity of the population. These lands belong undivided to the whole tribe; they are called common lands (húd al-djmn'ah).

Lastly, lands which have come to belong to private individuals (mulk) by inheritance or purchase have their character confirmed by a certificate of ownership (mulkkiya).

The old Muslim imposts (sukhut and 'arib) have recently been merged into a single tax, the tertib. In addition to this tax, from which the state draws the essential part of its revenues, we may mention the duties levied at the gates of towns and in the markets (mukhar), unpopular with the people and not countenanced by religion, and the urban tax on buildings (gadhra). In addition to these, the main taxes, there is the haddiya or present offered to the sulthan on the occasion of the three great Muslim festivals. The gadhra or poll-tax paid by non-Muslims and the násika or payment for exemption from military service by certain Arab tribes have been abolished.

VI. RELIGIOUS LIFE.

a. The Berbers before Islam. For lack of documents it is difficult to get any accurate idea of the religious beliefs and practices of the Berbers of Morocco, before their conversion to Islam and it is only from the survival of animistic cults which can still be observed in the country, that we can guess what the primitive religion was. The figures on two carved stones found in Morocco seem to be evidence of the existence of a solar worship. On animistic practices surviving in modern Islam in Morocco, see below d. Islam in Modern Morocco.

b. Conversion to Islam. At the time of their invasion, the Arabs found that in the districts around the towns the people were more or less under the influence of Jewish and Christian teachings; but there is little doubt that they did not practise these religions in their true form. It will be more correct to think of them as professing Judaism or Christianity rather than as real Jews or Christians. It seems evident that these influences had prepared the Berber population around the mountains to adopt the new monotheistic religion, which the invaders imposed upon them. The two earliest invasions, that of 'Uqba b. Nafi' in 640 and that of Musa b. Nuṣair in 661, could result only in a very partial and superficial Islamisation, for very few Arab elements remained in the country. Islam, a town religion, was for long confined to larger centres. The Berbers generally became converted in the hope of escaping the excations of the conquerors; but when the latter wanted to treat them simply as tributaries, they did not hesitate to apostatise, on seven different occasions, if we may believe the Arab historians. One thing is certain, that while remaining Muslims, they were not long in trying to cast off the authority of the caliphs of Baghdad by adopting the heterodox doctrines of the Khārjīs (q.v. and the article AL-SHIFI'I). The Berbers of Morocco went even further when part new local religions arose among them more or less based on Islam, with their own prophets and Karun. After the attempt at rebellion by the Berber of Tangier, Mäsaara (q.v.), which was quickly suppressed, the Barghawata recognised as their prophet one of their number, Salih b. Tarif, who gave them a religion and a Karun in the Berber language. This religion, whose progress of which was opposed by the early Moroccan dynasties, seems only to have been finally exterminated by the Almohad rulers of the sixteenth century. This Barghawata movement was the most lasting; we also note that which was created by Hāc-Mim (d. 315 A.H.) among the Ghumâr, near Tebwaït.

In spite of these reactions, Islam, having become the official religion of increasingly powerful dynasties, gradually gained ground and penetrated slowly into the Berber mountains, but it is only from the death of 'Abd al-Mu'min, who destroyed the religion of the Barghawata and put an end to the rule of the 'anthropomorphists' (musajzimin) Almo-
ravida, that we can date the complete unification of Islam in Morocco. Till then, Islam had had in Morocco champions who were soldiers rather than theologians, and who after forcing the people to adopt Islam at the point of the sword, were unable to instruct them in it. It required a Berber of the Great Atlas, Khm Tamtar (q.v.), a theologian who had been educated in the east to come back to his country and to secure the devoted support of a mass of followers in order to found the movement, which was political as well as religious, of the Almohades (q.v.) or "preachers of Jawhār" (q.v.).

If the Almohad reformation was only temporary in Morocco, it was nevertheless strong enough while it lasted to obliterate in the country all trace of schism or heresy and to establish thoroughly in it the school of Mālik b. Anas (q.v.) which it still follows.

c. Evolution of Moroccan Islam. From the time of the fall of the Almohad dynasty, Moroccan Islam rapidly acquired features of its own. Islam was defeated in Spain, was gradually driven out of it, then attacked in Morocco itself by the Christians of the Peninsula. The western frontier of the Dar al-Islām was brought back to its own territory and then thrust farther back. Islam in Morocco, attacked by Christianity and forced to gīhād, became an active principle. It required all the moral forces of the country, even those of which the orthodoxy seemed doubtful; in order to utilise them, it did not hesitate to absorb them by covering them with a more or less superficial veneer of orthodoxy. It was at this period that the cult of dead and living saints, and to a certain point Shari‘ism, which had hitherto only existed alongside of Islam in Morocco, were adopted into it and received a kind of official recognition from the maulūn.

Before the Marinids, Islam had required the constant assistance of the temporal power to maintain itself and advance. From the time of this dynasty, sprung from a Berber nomad tribe, the roles are inverted; it is now the sovereigns who utilise Islam to increase their own power, and try to monopolise it by creating official colleges for religious instruction (madrasa); the first of these (Madrasa al-Safārīn) was founded in 679 (1280) by the Sultan Abī Yūsuf al-Fās, the capital of the dynasty, which made it the great centre of Muslim culture in Western Barbary (cf. Fās). The immediate successors of the Marinids, the Bānti Wajša, established in the same town the cult of their founder Idrīs II. The mausoleum in which he is said to be buried was henceforth an object of great veneration. He is the earliest in date and the most important of the innumerable canonised Muslims who are the objects of a regular cult in Morocco, even on the part of the religious leaders and the aristocracy. When the cult of Idrīs was established, his descendants — more or less authentic — claimed the title of shari‘ and soon played a preponderating part in Moroccan society, as a political and moral influence. The power of the Idrisid shari‘a was soon reinforced by that of another shari‘a descended from "All through al-Jassān and this is the origin of the two great groups of shari‘as in Morocco, the Idrisid and the Afd. To the latter belong the two Shari‘a dynasties, the Sa‘di‘an and Filā‘ī, the latter still in power, from the moment of their accession to the throne, the influence of the shari‘a on the destinies of the country became more and more preponderant.

The phenomenon of shari‘ism is closely connected on the other hand with the development of religious brotherhoods (cf. the article Tārīkh). Although we find evidence of their existence at the end of the Almohad dynasty (Hudayyā, Māghīyīn, Aghūrīyīn), it is only as a result of al-Dijīshī’s (q.v., d. 1645 A.D.) campaign in favour of a gīhād against the Portuguese, that we find the principles of the brotherhoods, as we know them to-day, first coming into existence.

d. Islam in Modern Morocco. Here we will only give a survey of the principal points of detail in which the people of Morocco differ from the rest of the Muslim community as regards the practice of their religion. With the exception of a few isolated groups, still little studied, who are credited with heterodox or heretical practices (Zkāra, in the neighbourhood of the Rni Znās, in eastern Morocco, Bidsāw, in the Ghardaïa, not far from al-Kṣar al-Khelīr), all the Muslims of Morocco are Sunnīs and since the Almoravid period have followed the Mālikī rite, which prevailed in the west over that of al-Awāzī. It is in the towns that the population observes most strictly the duties of religion. The Berbers and the Berbers of the mountains are rather lukewarm Muslims. The Dijīsh, however, between Fās and Tangier, are very devoted to Islam, show great piety, and Qur‘ānic studies are very much in favour with them; it is from them that are recruited a great number of schoolmasters who practise their calling in the plains (cf. Sunrat). It is also practically only among the hillmen of the north and south that we find a mosque in every village.

In spite of the great distance they have to traverse, the Moroccans like to accomplish the canonical pilgrimage. A considerable number settle in the east (there are Moroccan colonies in Alexandria and Cairo); the importance of these colonies had even induced the Sultan Abī al-A ḫa to appoint a Moroccan consul, mānīn al-Maghrībī, for Egypt.

In addition to the two canonical festivals of Islam (Iṣlāh kār and Iṣlāh shabīr), the Moroccans celebrate the festival of the birth of the Prophet (mīlād, class. mawlid) and that of 'Aghīr (10th Muharram). The mīlād, established in Morocco by the Marinids, has become a kind of national festival, since the accession to power of sovereigns claiming descent from the Prophet; this festival in Morocco almost surpasses in importance the two canonical feasts.

The peculiarities just mentioned would not be sufficient to give Moroccan Islam a special character, nor would its religious brotherhoods, if the latter were confined to the practices of religion or exaltation of the faith and to satisfying the need for conscious mysticism among their adepts. These religious brotherhoods are fairly numerous: Tījānīya, Darjwāna, Tā‘lī‘īya, Tāl̲ī‘īya, Kāshānīya (q.v.) etc. But alongside of these brotherhoods, whose members are almost exclusively recruited from the literate or well-to-do classes of the towns and country, there are popular brotherhoods in considerable numbers, in which preoccupation with religion gives place to charlatanism practices and sanguinary displays. Such are the Dijīsh, the Tsa‘wa, the Mrīt, the Dīghīshiyta. Some of these brotherhoods recruit their members ex-
clusively, from a particular class of society; thus the ṭalā (class, rūūtal) is a brotherhood of marksmen, and the Guūsaa, a negro brotherhood. All these brotherhoods have this feature in common that their founder has become a famous saint (wūff). The cult of saints is highly developed in Morocco and undoubtedly was so before the introduction of Islam, which found itself obliged to tolerate it. There are however very different categories of saints, from the venerated patron saint of a capital or of a district to the local holy man whose name is forgotten, between whom comes the ṣa‘īy which tomb is marked by a bībah (chapel surrounded by a dome), more or less elaborate. The more humble saints are recognised by the circular wall (būyq) which surrounds their tombs. These venerating individuals, male and female, have attained sanctity by very different ways, some in their lifetime, by their learning, devotion, asceticism, miraculous powers (bāraka), sometimes even by more or less mystic mania (ma‘āwishī); the others, after their deaths, have been distinguished by miracles, apparitions etc. The warrior in the holy war (ṣīlah, ṣīlah), alian fighting against the infidel is frequently beatified — hence his name of mu‘āqib (pop. mūqib — French sanct). The English “marabout”!). But the early significance of this term was frequently lost sight of and the term mu‘āqib came to be generally applied to saints, who never took part in a ṣīlah in their lifetime. Mu‘āqib thus came into general use as a synonym of the other words used for saint in Morocco: wūff, ʿayyās, ṣa‘īy. But it is the only one applied to the descendents of a saint, who possess the bāraka of their ancestor. Among the Berbers, the saint is called atīrān. The names of great saints have ma‘āqib prefixed, the others the title ṣa‘īy, while women saints of Berber origin are called ṭalā.

The saint to whom sanctuaries are most frequently dedicated — modest though they are (ma‘ākīm, ḍāltwa) — was not a native of the country but the famous patron saint of Baghdad, 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Kūdir al-Gīlānī, popularly called al-Dūlah, who undoubtedly never visited Morocco. The saint whose cult is surrounded with the greatest splendour is the famous Mawlü Idrīs, founder and patron saint of Fès. Among the other great Moroccan saints may be mentioned: Mawlā 'Abd al-Salām ibn Maḥīțah, patron of the Dūlah, buried on the Djebel al-ʿĀlam; Mawlā Abū 'Ijīūt ibn Maḥīțah, in the north of Fès; Sīdī Muḥammad ibn CPU, patron of Mecknūn and founder of the ʿĪsah; Mawlā Abū Sūllīq ibn Mūsīb, at Asemīr; Mawlā Abū Yā‘sār (Bu‘āzīz), in the Tābīrī; Sīdī Abū 'Ijīūt al-Sabti (Sīdī Bel-ʿAbbès), born at Cenaa and patron of Marrūkūn. All these and others less famous are the subjects of a hagiographical literature which will be dealt with later.

Devotion to individuals canonical in their lifetime, or after their death is in Morocco not confined to Muslims. The Jews have also their saints, relatively as numerous as the Muslim saints. Some of the Jewish saints have acquired a reputation so great that even Muslims revere their tombs: e.g. those of the Rabbi 'Amīn in Arjān, near Wazān and of Rabbi Ben Zimor at Safi. On the other hand, the Jews of Morocco show a special reverence for certain of the great Muslim saints of the country.

The area, surrounding the tomb of each of the principal saints is sacred (ḫūnār) and hence regarded as an inviolable ʿāsylam; among the best known are the ʿāsylam of Mawłā Idrīs in Fès and that of Mawłā 'Abd al-Salām b. Maḥīțah in the mountains of the northwest. These pieces of ground are the exclusive property of the families who are descended or claim to be descended from the saint, they are exempt from state taxes; more than that, the descendents of the saints have the right to levy for their own benefit certain special dues, by a privilege officially recognised by the sultan. The levying of these dues is not the only way by which the saint’s chapel benefits its descendents.

The principal source of income is the offerings of pilgrims when visiting the tomb; this is the ʿayyās. In general once a year, there is a kind of patronal festival at the tomb of the saint which is called mōṭūm (class. Ar. muḥāṭum); a vast crowd, some of them from a considerable distance, gather there to pay their devotions to the ʿayyās and to see the display of fireworks given in his honour. On this occasion the offerings flow in and are shared among themselves by the saint’s descendents.

In these circumstances, it is usual for every sanctuary of any importance to be regularly organised. The chapel which contains the tomb and the buildings attached to it, an oratory and guest-house, is called the sūrīya. It is superintended by a māḥfūdād who collects and distributes the revenues. These do not come entirely from the sūrīya. The sūrīya often owns lands, sometimes extensive, which are let out and the profits shared with the tenants. They are called ṣāḥib and the tenants are called ʿassāb. These farms, sometimes acquired by purchase, often come from bequests or donations (būlūk) from pius private individuals.

We can thus see how certain famous and wealthy sūrīyas may exert a moral and political influence in the country round them, independent of their religious influence. The latter is however also very important. The great Moroccan sūrīyas are centres of orthodoxy and give life and vigour to Islam in the country. Some are centres of mysticism and they are always centres of religious instruction. This explains the enviable position occupied in Moroccan society by any group of descendents of a famous saint, or of marabouts. If their ancestor had, in addition to the virtues for which he was canonised, the honour to be a descendant of the Prophet, they are at the same time shorff, which further increases their material privileges. The descendents of a saint who was not a shorff try to claim this origin for him by inventing more or less fictitious genealogies. The marabouts who have in this way “infiltrected” into the social category of the shorff are very numerous in Morocco. A Moroccan sūrīya is not only a centre of hagiolatry; it is also in the majority of cases a body of shorff and the centre of a religious brotherhood or of a branch of one, or of a secondary order affiliated to a brotherhood. The sūrīya itself may have offshoots. Many of the establishments of this name are daughters of a mother sūrīya and are sometimes at a considerable distance from it.

Hagiolatry, religious brotherhoods and shariātism thus form three special aspects of Islam in Morocco, which are profoundly intermingled, and it is diff-
cult; to study them separately. For a detailed account of the principal families of shorfā in Morocco of genuine sharif origin or simply marabouts see the article shorfā. Here we shall only mention the principal ones whose origin is considered authentic by the Moroccan genealogists. They are descended from al-Ḥasan and ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḵāmīlī through the latter's three sons, Idrīs, Muḥammad al-Nafṣ al-Zabīyā and Muṣḥ al-Dīwān. The descendants of Idrīs or Idrīsīdīs, are subdivided into Ḏīṭṣīyān (Ṣhāḥibīyān, ʿĪmrānīyān, Ṭalībīyān, Qaṭālīyān, Dabāṣḥīyān, Ḳattāṭīyān, Ṭalāmaṭīyān) (descendants of Muṣ̄īf), ʿAbd al-Salām Ibn Mūṣḥīn, buried on the Djaūl al-ʿĀlam, whence their name, and are themselves divided into Ṣhabṣāḥīyāntīn, Ṣaḥīnīyāntīn, Ṣabīnīyāntīn and ʿĀṣālīyāntīn). The descendants of Muḥammad al-Nafṣ al-Zabīyā are the shorfā of Ṣiddīqīmīs or ʿAlīs (Ṣīḥīyān; nībạ from Taftālīlī), i.e. those of the reigning Ṣhāhīz dynasty; lastly, the descendants of Muṣ̄īf al-Dīwān are the shorfā ʿAbdīyāntīn, who take their name from the great saint of Ṣaḥḥ al-ʿĀbd al-Ghālibī. We also find in Morocco, but in small numbers, Ḥusaynīdī shorfā, also descended from ʿAlī through al-Ḥassān, the brother of al-Ḥasan; these are the shorfā called Ṣīḥīyāntīn and ʿIrākiyāntīn, who came from Andalus. The great marabout families are that of the Nāṣirīya from Tāmhūrī in Darā, the ʿArṣāmīya (q.v.) in Taftālīlī, the Darālīyān and Wāṣālīyāntīn to the northwest of Fās. The shorfā ʿArṣāmīyāntīn (ʿArṣāmīyān of Ṣerīnān), whose chief is also head of the great brotherhood of the Ṣayyida-Tuḥānīs (cf. above), have for long played a considerable part in politics and have been the object of particular attention from the Ṣadīqīn. Even more than the other representatives of the great marabout families, they have in fact rendered great services to the central power by using for its benefit the great moral and political influence which they possess among that part of the population, which is lukewarm or hostile to the Ṣadīqīn. They have meditated in the most successful fashion between the ʿAlīs and the unmarried body of the people.

The shorfā are thus at the head of Moroccan society. Some have assumed the power, others are the equal in influence with the rulers who in return show them great deference. We shall see that they have occupied a very high place in the intellectual life of Morocco since the end of the middle ages. Lastly shorfānism, an important social factor, has been able still further to strengthen itself by the support which maraboutism has brought it, by incorporating itself in it, and the religious brotherhoods which very frequently spring directly from it.

e. Survivals of Berber cults. The cult of saints, accepted and even recognised, as we have seen above, by Ṣaḥḥīn, is in Morocco much earlier than the introduction of this religion. Indeed, alongside of saints of note, there are others who are essentially popular, in the country as well as in the towns. In the large cities like Fīs, the great saiydae venerated by all classes of society rub shoulders with humble marabouts whose names show clearly their popular origin; these are Sīḍī Ḥalīf (Rev. the Ĥidden One), Sīḍī ʿĀmm el-Khāṣir (Rev. Good Evening) or Sīḍī ʿAbd Allāh (the reverend gentleman who procures what is wanted) and notices are given of them by hagiographers like the author of the Salāt al-Anfāṣ (cf. E. Lecl-Prévenans, Les Historiens des Chorfa, p. 353 infra). The humble, often anonymous Ṣaḥḥiṇs, which abound in Morocco, undoubtedly are to be connected with earlier mythic individual practises, already worshipped in the same place before the coming of Islam. Besides this devotion to popular saints, there are the animistic cults, which we see everywhere in Morocco observed by the lower classes of the population; worship of high places, of caves, springs, trees and rocks. These cults are now being seriously studied and the results will perhaps enable us to reconstruct without too great risk of error, the type of religion practised by the Berbers before the introduction into their land of the three great monotheistic religions.

It is hardly possible to separate from these animistic cults that of Mawliwīya Yaḥyā in Morocco, who always has a saḥaba beside thermal springs whose curative virtues are recognised.

Survivals of paganism in every case completely foreign to orthodox Islam may be found everywhere in Morocco; they are hardly distinguishable from what one finds in other parts of Barbary. The rites which accompany birth and the ceremonies connected with it (giving of the name and circumcision), marriage and death are now beginning to be well known. They constitute practices quite foreign to the prescriptions of the Sunna but they are not regarded by those who follow them as in any way heterodox.

It is especially in the life of the country people that we see most clearly traces of pre-Islamic practices. Many of them are strangely like agricultural customs of the Romans. The Moroccan peasant has retained the use of the Julian calendar, no doubt introduced into the country by the Romans; it is of course much more suitable for the needs of agriculture than the Muslim lunar calendar. The names of the months are retained in their Latin form with little change: January is ʿaynār from the Latin Ianuariūs. The beginning of the solstices in Morocco is the occasion of a festival celebrated, especially in the country, under the name of ḍūḡūs; the festival of the summer solstice (ʿanṣra) is also celebrated and on that day it is usual to have fireworks. Similarly the ʿarbah, which are still observed by the peasants of Morocco, are completely foreign to the canonical prescriptions of Islam. They are mainly ceremonies of inauguration (of death and rebirth of the land, first day of labour, first day of harvest); rites to protect the crops from the evil eye, or to preserve the ʿarbah which they contain while standing, finally special rites to secure rain and good weather. These various ceremonies, to which ethnographers like Biarnay and Westermarck have already devoted detailed studies to which the reader may be referred, are sometimes closely linked up with ceremonies prescribed by Islam; thus the different pagan rites for producing rain (carnival processions, a large spoon dressed in women's clothes and solemnly carried round) do not exclude the worship of saints specially noted as rain-makers like Mawlibi Ṣaḥḥīn, so the celebration of the orthodox ceremony of ʿarbah. It is also in the worship of ṣpūṭīs (juṣṭaṣ, pūṣṭa, juṣṭaṣ, plus ṣpūṭa) that we find manifestations of a strongly Islamic stamp associated with quite profane rites. This cult is especially practised by the lower classes of society, and in the towns
particularly by women. The djinns are regarded as supernatural powers, who have to be conciliated to avert their evil influence or fought when they attack them. The rites which deal with them are either explanatory or intended to overcome these. In spite of the many sacred formulæ of Islam, which are found in the celebration of these two kinds of rites, one gets a strong impression of paganism from them; they undoubtedly remain, practically what they were before the introduction of Islam into Morocco.


**VII. Linguistic Survey.**

Two languages are spoken in Morocco: **Berber** and dialects of Arabic. Berber is the oldest language attested in Morocco and we have no evidence of an earlier language being used; as to Arabic, it was introduced by the Muslim conquest of the vii-th and viii-th centuries. But until the arrival in Morocco of the Banai Hilall and of the Sulaim (xii-th century), it seems that Arabic, the language of an essentially urban culture, was spoken mainly in the towns while the country people continued to talk Berber; it was only after the occupation of the plains by the Arab tribes that their language spread there. With the exception of the region of the Jbiles to be mentioned later, the highlands of Morocco alone have remained faithful to the Berber language, while the towns and lowlands are at the present day almost completely Arabic speaking.

In his *Annuaire du Monde Musulman* (p. 162) L. Massignon gives a proportion of 60% of Berber speakers (3,200,000 to 2,200,000). A. Bernard
thinks this exaggerated and reduces it to 40%. (cf. Arabophones et Berbérophones au Maroc, 1924, p. 278).  

A. Berber.  

1. Berber dialects. According to the works of E. Destaing, the Berber dialects of Morocco can be divided into two main groups.  

The first is the northern group which includes the dialects of the Rif, those of the Bui Znäsen and of the Berber-speaking tribes of the neighborhood and those of the Ait Segrhâshen, Masmâida, Ait Warain etc. to the north of the Middle Atlas. These dialects are characterised phonetically by their strong tendency to spirantisation of the dentals and palatals. In comparing these dialects with those which in Algeria the natives call Znâatya, E. Destaing has been led to describe the group as the group of Zanâa dialects.  

The second or southern group includes, according to the same author, the remainder of the Berber dialects of Morocco; he distinguishes two sub-groups:  

a. that of the Tamunsîq, the dialect spoken by the Brab of the Central Atlas, from the vicinity of Meknès to the edge of the Great Atlas; the dialects of the north are also distinguished from those of the south. It is with this sub-group that we should connect the dialect of the Sanhadjâ d-es-Srârî, an important highland confederation to the northeast of Fas, and perhaps also the language of the sections of the Ghrâmîa who still speak Berber.  

b. Sub-group of the Tamosq, the dialect once spoken by the Masmûda of the Great Atlas and by the Shiûb (usual French orthography: Chénab) of Sûs and the Anti-Atlas.  

The three groups of Moroccan Berber dialects seem to correspond very exactly to the three main ethnic divisions of the Berbers of the country: Zanâa in the N. E., Sanhadjâ-Zanaga in the centre and Masûmida in the south. Going back to the old division of the Berbers given by Ibn Khaladîn, E. Destaing proposes to make the first group correspond to the Butr tribes and the two others to the Barânis tribes.  

For the bibliography of Berber studies see the list of works given by E. Lanost at the beginning of his Met et Choses Berbères, Paris 1920, p. xvii.; since that date see the Moroccan bibliography annually published by Hespèris. A map showing the division of Morocco between Arabic and Berber is given in the articles by A. Bernard and P. Monnast, Arabophones et Berbérophones au Maroc (in Annales Soc. Géogr., vol. 35, Paris 1924). For the north, there is a more accurate map by R. Montagu and Pennès published at the end of the Manuel de berbère marocain (dialecte rifain) by Justimard (Paris 1926).  

There is no evidence of the existence of another language before Berber in Morocco. Very few of those "Libyan" inscriptions have been found which, although they are not yet read, are admitted to be in old Berber; one was found in the Roman ruins of Tamuda, a few miles S.W. of Tetuas, and is preserved in the museum of the latter town. Other Libyan inscriptions have been found in the region of Pelitiane.  

The earliest evidence of the use of Berber in Morocco is given by the Geography of al-Bakri (11th century) who says that the prophet Hâ-Mim, killed in 937 A. D., had given the Berbers a Kur'ân written "in their own language". This can only refer to their Berber speech; the same author tells us that the Baraghwata had also a Berber Kur'ân from their prophet Sâlih. (d. in 750). For the beginning of the Almohad period, a passage in Documents inédits d'histoire almohade, p. 67, says that at this time Berber was spoken on the Umm Rabi'. It is in the same work that we find the earliest recorded phrases in Moroccan Berber (Tamarsîq dialect) transcribed in Arabic characters (cf. p. 26, 30, 36, 38, 39, 67, 117).  

Ibn Khaladîn seems to have been the first to interest himself in the creation of a scientific system of transliteration of Berber into Arabic characters. Using certain graphem methods used by specialists in English, he invented compounds of letters to render sounds peculiar to Berber (ç, û [u emphatic] and 3). Unfortunately Ibn Khaladîn, who in his Muslimîmima gives interesting chapters on the urban and Beduin Arabic dialects, does not seem to have devoted any attention to the Berber language; one of the few passages to be noted in his book, as far as Morocco is concerned, is his reference to the existence of Berber speaking peoples among the Sanhadjâ tribes settled in the valley of the Wargha and around the fortress of Amarna (cf. Histoire des Berbères, ed. de Siane, text, i, p. 273, l. 11). For the beginning of the xvith century, Leo Africanus (p. 28) gives us more detailed information. The five Berber ethnic groups (Sanhadjâ, Masûmida, Zanâa, Hawwâra and Ghrâmîa) have a special language which they call uqal amârîq (uqal masûmâq), I.e. "noble language" (cf. the present name of the Tamamq dialect) (ed. Schefer, i.). Berber was still the language of a part of the Ghrâmîa, for, he says, Arabic is used by almost all the people (op. cit., i. 29). It even looks as if the Šâwiya ("Sonâva") of the Tamosq still spoke Berber ("African language") like all the other Šâwiya of North Africa with the exception of some who lived to the south of Tunis (op. cit., 1, p. 83).  

We have to come down to the Danish Consul G. Hôst, in the xvith century, to find the first Moroccan Berber vocabulary collected from a fârîq of "Tamenâr", a place probably in the region of Agadir (cf. Efterretninger om Marocco og Fas, Copenhagen 1779, p. 125—133).  

2. Berber literature of Morocco. Although Berber was the language of the Moroccan dynasties which followed between the Idrîsids and the Sa'dîs, it does not seem that, contrary to what was done in Egypt for the Turkish of the Mamlûks, Berber was made the subject of grammatical studies in Morocco, nor that it was used for the purpose of literary expression. A passage in the Khûfûs recalls the fact that Khûbâs were pronounced in Berber in the great mosque of Fas but the text of them has not been preserved. The celebrated Almohad reformer Ibn Tumâr is said to have composed in Berber theological and legal treatises which have now disappeared. The Berber Kur'ân of the Ghrâmîa and Baraghwata have also disappeared although al-Bakri has fortunately preserved some extracts in an Arabic translation. The only texts which we now have are translations of or commentaries on religious works of the type of the Khûfûs of al-Kairûzân or of the Mukhtâs of Ejdâ; all these Berber texts come without exception from Sûs, whether because this region
had a more advanced culture or its dialect with a more elastic consonant system and clearer vowed system was better suited than others for transcription in the Arabic alphabet. The Moroccan Berbers have a large stock of fables, legends, songs of love, war and work etc., many of which have already been collected by French and German students of Berber (see Berber literature, written and oral cf. Henri Basset, Essai sur la littérature des berberes, Algiers 1920).

Among Arab authors the Berber language is also used by the non-Arab languages: barbary, Berber: raifia, "jargon"; in the Documents inédits d'Arôis; almahade we several times come across the expression al-batun al-khawārini, "the Moroccan language". In Moroccan Arabic, Berber is usually called "khebûh".

B. Arabic.

The Arabic dialects. The Arabic language was introduced into Morocco in at least two stages: first in the eighth century at the time of the first Muslim conquest, then in the sixth at the coming of the Banû Hilal and the Salair. Down to the coming of the latter, who were brought to Morocco by the Almoravid ruler Vaqûb al-Mansûr, Arabic seems to have been spoken almost exclusively in the large towns of the north, where it was used by a considerable Arab population who enjoyed a double prestige, religious and political. It was the language of religion and law. From the towns Arabic spread among the people of the surrounding country, and al-Idrisi (Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, text p. 99, transl. p. 90) already notes that in the sixth century the Berber tribes of the southern hinterland of Fès (Banû Yûsuf, Fandakla, Bahût, Zawâwâ, Maggâsa, Ghiyâya and Safâlgûn) spoke Arabic.

It is this linguistic influence exerted by the towns on the country around them that explains the arabisation of the mountainous country of the Jbala (plur. of Jbât, "highlander") while the rest of the Moroccan highlands remained Berber speaking. The land of the Jbûla, in the wide sense, stretches in the form of a crescent from Tangier to Taza. It was surrounded by a cordon of towns: Nakût, Bâdis, Tigliks, Tetwân, Ceuta, al-Ês-Ês, Tàngier, Arâla, al-Ês al-Kabîr, Imsouâ, Asâgin, Banût Tûrât, Wâllîf, Fès, and Taza, which were the only ports or marketplaces for the tribes of the region; besides, the massif itself was traversed by the most important commercial routes of Northern Morocco: the roads from Fès to Tangier, to Ceuta, to Bâdis, to Nakût and to Ghasmâsia; it was therefore natural that being subject to the direct and indirect influences of the towns, the highlands of Jbûla should be the first region of Morocco to be arabised. The process was further favoured by several other factors: 1. the existence in the mountains of numerous large villages, almost towns, which became secondary centres of Kûrânic culture; 2. the settlement almost everywhere in the xth century among the Jbûla of Idrisid sharifs who, driven from Fès by Mûsâ al-Êsi, founded independent principalities in the mountains, which became centres of Muslim urban culture; 3. in the tribes of the Jbûla furnished a considerable part of the contingent which went to wage the holy war in Spain, and returned home after being more or less arabised by contact with the great Muslim towns of Andalusia; 4. lastly, the rebellions and civil wars which so frequently disturbed Muslim Spain, the emigrations or expulsions caused by the progress of the Christian reconquest, brought to Africa, from the rising at Cordova (in 814) down to the xth century, an important element which settled in the region of the Jbûla either in the towns around the mountains or in the villages of the highlands (resettlement of Têtwân, foundation of Shakhûwân) bringing there along with the Arabic language, the prestige of their cultural, intellectual, and material superiority.

This rapid sketch of the spread of the Arabic language in Morocco explains why, after studying the question, three categories of Arabic dialects have been distinguished:

a. Urban dialects; b. highland dialects; c. Bedouin dialects; and we may add: d. the Jewish dialects.

a. Urban dialects. In Morocco not all the town dialects are "urban dialects". There are towns like Casablanca, Mazagan, Safi and Mogador (and to a certain degree Meknûs and Marrûkûsh) the population of which is entirely or for the most part of rural origin and where the absence of an old nucleus of town-dwellers has not enabled them to become urbanised. The Moroccans however distinguish quite clearly such places from towns with a really urban culture, more or less influenced by Andalusian culture. The principal towns with urban dialects are Fès, Rabat-Sahâ, Tetwân, Tanza, al-Ês al-Kabîr; Tangier, Wâzân and Shakhûwân also have urban dialects but these are much more or less contaminated by the surrounding highland dialects. Meknûs and Marrûkûsh have been influenced by the Bedouin elements introduced by the sahâiri groups into the dialects of these two old capitals. It is interesting to note the case of Azemmûr: where the old town of Azemmûr al-Êeddarî has an urban dialect, while the new town, which has in recent years grown up beside it, stands around the sanctuary of Mawlî Abû Shakhîr (onâgi Bu Shakhîr), uses a Berber dialect. The urban dialects of Morocco form one group with those of the western part of the Central Maghrib, notably with those of Tlemcen, Nedroma and Algiers. Their phonetic characteristics are the loss of the interdentals of the classical language, the affricative pronunciation of r, the frequent attenuation of g to gñ: in Fès, b, m, ë, t and dûn assimilate the dû of the article and are treated as "solars"; the simple dûn is pronounced like the French j (Persian j), but when it is geminated, it gives dû in Fès and Ë in Tangier. The x is often pronounced very close to the French ouvr r.

As peculiarities of the dialect of Fès, we may note the construction khebetu "she has written it" for khebet + ë, and the use of an invariable relative ë representing the old dialectal ë. Tangier and Tetwân have a preposition ë to which is used before nouns (m-ë-dîr ë "to the house") but not before suffixed pronouns. To translate ë, Marrûkûsh uses ë: the dialect of this town uses certain Berber adverbs: ëben "because", ëdîl "only".

All the urban dialects use the characteristic prefix of the present indicative: ë in the north, ë in the south. Fès uses one almost as much as the other.

A. Highland dialects. These are at least as well known as those of the towns. In 1926 I published notes on that of the Telûl and the
Rhônes in the north of Taza; in 1922, E. Lévi-Provençal published texts, prefaced by a grammatical sketch, of the dialects of the middle valley of the Warga; since then I have had an opportunity of studying those of the Bni Hûsîmar (near Tetwân), of the Mesûtâ (near Bîdes) and of the Ghîzwa (near Shîkhrâm). The highland dialects are of course more differentiated than the urban dialects. The tribes which use them belong to two political clans probably originally of different racial origin: the Ghûmâra, the old inhabitants, and the Sahhâdja, the invaders. In the present state of our knowledge it does not seem possible to make the dialects coincide with political or racial boundaries; but we can nevertheless recognise two main groups of highland dialects:

1. The northern dialects, extending from the Straits of Gibraltar to the south of Shafâhâmân and embracing in the east the confederation of the Ghûmâra.

2. The southern dialects, from Wazzân to Taza, used by two great classes of tribes: first, the Sahhâdja tribes of the valley of the Warga: Sahhâdja of the Central Warga, Sahhâdja of the Sun and of the Shade, of Mûshût and of Gheddo; secondly, the Butr tribes, more or less closely related to the Zanata and occupying the lands north of the region of Taza: Mersûn, Butr, Toul, Maghrîbûn and Mokhâm. It seems to be a historical fact that these Zanata and Sahhâdja peoples only settled in their present habitats long after the first Arab conquest; the Sahhâdja of the Central Warga certainly now occupy lands which before the Almoravid period were peopled by the Ghûmâra. We should therefore regard these southern highland dialects as younger than those of the northern group. The slight differences noted between the two groups may then be due to two main causes: 1. an evolution of the neighbouring urban dialects which would have taken place during the period between the amalgamation of the Ghûmâra and that of the Sahhâdja-Zanata; 2. the non-identity of the Berber substrata.

To the two main groups: Ghûmâra and Sahhâdja-Zanata, we may perhaps add two little islands in the south, the highlanders of the region of Şefrû to the south of Fâs (Biald, Bni Taghla etc.), and the Qibrîyâ to the south of Taza: these probably constitute the last vestiges of a continuous Arabic-speaking bloc which stretched to the south of the Fâs-Taza corridor, the existence of which in the xiii century we know from al-Idrîsî. Phenetically, the Moroccan highland dialects are characterised by the profound changes undergone by the Arabic consonantal system as a result of the spirantisation of the dental and post-palatal occlusives. We find the interdental /t/ and /d/, which do not represent the classical interdentals /t/ and /d/, having given in these dialects t and d respectively, which remain occlusive only at the beginning of the word or after a consonant or geminated; but after a vowel we have /t/ and /d/: /mâr "daughter" plur. bâtr; after a vowel also /t/ is pronounced as a resonant like χ of modern Greek. The representative of the group /d/ of the classical language is usually /d/, sometimes hardened to /d/ but among the Ghûmâra we have /d/ (emphatic /d/). The sound /d/ is fairly common. The short vowels are commoner than in the towns: many of the short vowels and /ɔ/ of the classical language are preserved: this is how we find a considerable number of imperfects /R / R / R and a few /R / R / R. As to morphology, the fem. personal suffixes *-âm ( < -âm) and pl. -âm ( < -âmâm) are characteristic; they are the complement of the series began by the masc. -âm, *-âm ( < -âm). Among the northern Jhîla we find the use of a suffix -âm marking the plural: it seems really to be a borrowing from Lalla. The dual, reserved for names of parts of the body which occur in pairs and for names of various measurements (of weight, length, volume and time) is in Jhîla: zaâdhâmân "two months", yištâh "his hands". The relative, pronominal and adjectival, is ے. The classical construct state (zdâj) is very rare and is only found in a few stereotyped phrases; it is in general replaced by analytical constructions in which the preposition 0 "of" is used, expressing possession as well as the material of a thing. Most everywhere the prefixes of the 3rd pers. com. and of the 3rd pers. fem. of the sorât are ے (and not ے: dëtkh "thou writest, the writes". The passive participle of hollow verbs is often of the type mâzâ: mâyâh "sold", mâyâh "filled up". Finally we may note a few traces of a passive of the form zdâj: zdâj "to be taken". As evidence of conservatism we may add the fact that in the dialects of Taza we have the word /z/ "mouth" which seems to have disappeared since old Arabic.

Just as the urban dialects of Morocco may be linked with a number of urban dialects of Algeria, so have the highland dialects of Morocco correspondents in the latter country. W. Marçais, who is the first to have isolated and described this group of Maghribî dialects and prefers to use the name of "parlers villageois" for them, classes along with the dialects of the Moroccan Jhîla two other similar groups, also characterised by the dispersion of the Arabic consonantal system (Liquidation, affrication, spirantisation), by the use of different forms of syntax and structural forms taken from Berber, and by the juxtaposition of Arabic elements sometimes strangely archaic and very abundant Berber elements. These are firstly the Ouar group of the Tørân in the country which extends from Lalla Mâghînta to the sea, a mountainous country traversed by the roads connecting Tiemenec, the capital of the Baut 4 Abî al-Wâd, with the ports of Humân and Arshût. It is with the dialects of the Tørân that the dialects of these Moroccan Jhîla show most agreement.

The second group, which differs more, is that of the highland dialects of Eastern Kabylia, a mountainous region of the department of Constantine, traversed by the roads connecting Constantine with the ports of Illijdêll and Colla; this was also the old habitat of the Kutâmâ, whom their support of the Fûtîmî movement must have caused to be rapidly arabised. Alongside of these three groups of highland dialects (Jhîla, Tørân, Eastern Kabylia), W. Marçais describes a fourth in the villages of the Tunisian Sîbel, which lies in the coast zone traversed by the roads which connect Kairûtân with the ports of Sûs, Mâdhîya and Monastir. These Tunisian dialects, of which that of Takrûn, studied by W. Marçais, is a specimen, are however much arabised and hardly seem to have been subjected in their phonetics, morphology, syntax and vocabulary to the profound
Berber influences which characterise the first three groups.

In spite of their divergencies, which are due mainly to pronunciation and to the local use of words and phrases corresponding to two very distinct forms of culture, the urban dialects and the highland dialects cannot be either historically or linguistically separated. The fundamental disparity is that which exists between the urban and highland groups and the Beduin group. It is the townsmen who have taught the highlanders to speak Arabic, but the urban dialects, used by individuals whose intellectual activity is greater, have evolved more rapidly. They are also more sensitive to external influence, literary and political. These facts added to the predominance of Berber blood in the highlands suffice to explain why the dialects of the Jbla still seem coarse and quaint to the townsmen. On the other hand, the towns have been frequently repopulated, wholly or in part by people from the neighbouring hills. All this explains the family resemblance which the linguist finds between the dialects of the towns and those of the hills; perhaps the latter, being more conservative, are also the more interesting for the history of the language. W. Marçais regards them as valuable representatives of the Arabic spoken in the country district of the Maghribi before the coming of the Banû Hilal and the Sinlains (cf. W. Marçais, Textes arabes de Takrissena, vol. i., preface, p. xxviii.).

The principal features which are common to the urban-highland group and which distinguish it from the Beduin group are the following:

- loss of the classic interdentals;
- pronunciation of ḥāf as ḥ or hamza (and not g as among the Beduins);
- tendency to the syllabic grouping of Ṱṭ h as Ṱṭ when ṯṭ is not a laryngal nor a sonant;
- rarity of the construct state;
- suffix of the 3rd pers. masc. sing. in -ā or on (and not -ā, as among the Beduins);
- relative rarity of the addition of personal suffixes, but regular use of the (analytical) phrase with ḥālit, ḥādit ḥālit, "my house;"
- diminutives of Ṱṭ Ṱṭ becomes Ṱṭ Ṱṭ type ḥālit ḥālit, "little dog;"
- diminutives of the types Ṱṭ Ṱṭ becomes Ṱṭ Ṱṭ type Ṱṭ Ṱṭ, (Class. a) and Ṱṭ Ṱṭ becomes Ṱṭ Ṱṭ, (Class. a) "a little red;" ḥālit, an adjective of the type Ṱṭ Ṱṭ, (Class. a) becomes Ṱṭ Ṱṭ, (Class. a) "black;" (plur.);
- reduction at the plurals of the C1 C2 C3 C4 to C1 C2 C3 C4, (Class. a), (Class. a) "keys;"
- use of a verbal prefix to mark the indicative present: ḥār or ḥā'; in the towns and ḥā' in the hills;
- in the singular of the perfect, the feminine person is generally used for the masculine: ḥā' (Class. a), "she has written (ms.), whereas we find in Rabat for the plural, an analogous form ḥā'wh and at ḥā'; in the towns and ḥā' in the hills;
- in the imperfect of the defective verbs, the plural is formed on analogy of the singular: yeṭā, "they remain;" yeṭā, "they weep;"
- Beduin dialects. These are in Morocco the dialects of the plains: the Atlantic plains from Azrila to Mogador with its continuations into the interior, the valley of the Moulida, the plateaus of eastern Morocco and the region of the Moroccan Sahara (Wādi Ghir, Wādi Ziz etc.), they are still little known; only that of the Hawr al Jīlah has been studied, but only in Europe and from authorities who had already travelled a good deal elsewhere. That of the Dukkala of the north (Ullāt Ǧaṣir, Ullāt Freq), have myself examined it corresponds in almost all its details to the dialect of the Ullāt Bhati of Sada (Oran) on which W. Marçais has written a monograph. There is no doubt that on examination one can divide the Beduin dialects into groups characterised by more or less conservatism; should those of the Maqqil perhaps be separated from those of the Banû Hilal? Perhaps a distinction should also be made between the dialects of the purely Arab tribes and those of the Atlantic regions where powerful Berber tribes (Gheba, Gharqā, Dukkala, Hamaghīlā) have been arabised and more or less submerged by the Beduins. It should be remembered that in the historical period the latter have been infinitely less stable than the tribes of Berber origin (speaking Arabic or Berber); whether because they were taken to form the ḥālit, which guards each large towns (environ of Fès, Meknes, Rabat-Salé and Marrākṣīs) or because they were transported far from their original homes as a measure of repression (case of the Shūrā), the Arab tribes of the Atlantic plains have become much broken up and mixed. The Beduin dialects which have most chance of having preserved their original character are those of the tribes of the Saharan steppes who have remained relatively stable and intact: Ban Ǧil, Ḥilāya, Ḥilwī Marū, Ḫūl Ǧūrī etc. In any case, the following are the main characteristics of these dialects: firstly the ḥāl, is pronounced as g (= ḥāl masʾūdat), and it is already this pronunciation which for Ibn Khaldūn characterises the Beduin dialects of his time. The ḥālit, ḥālit and gālīt ṭāli are retained with their interdental value. The short vowels are indistinct: the sound ū is almost completely absent and many short unaccented vowels sound practically like a labial ū. Characteristic is the appearance of an extremely short transitional vowel of a character, which is developed after ṯū, ḥū and ṭū placed before a consonant or an ṭū, ḥū, ṭū, "great" (plur.), ḥūḍā, "he sits down;" ḥāḏīṣa, "tablet;" ḥālūl, "green apple;" ḥālīl, "full;" thin (plur.), ḥālāl, a similar sound is found after ḥū ṭū and ḥū ṭū, ḥū ṭū, ḥū ṭū, ḥū ṭū, c. e. ḥāla, ḥāla, ḥāla, "crown;" ḥāla, ḥāla, "a blow;" ḥāla, ḥāla, "pomegranate;" ḥāla, ḥāla, "sugar;" ḥāla ḥāla, "piece (of cloth);" ḥāla ḥāla ḥāla, "sound;" by analogy the combinations ḥū ṭū and ṭū ṭū when the ṭū corresponds to a classical ṭū, a reduced sound is used for ṭū and ṭū; e. g. ḥāla, ḥāla, "the (little) place;" ḥāla, ḥāla, "the entrails;"

The retention of the accent on the first syllable causes "projected" syllabic forms: yekhā, the writer, plur. yekhā, yechā, Morocco; nīkha, "musket;" ḥālā, "my cow;"

The personal suffix of the 3rd pers. masc. is -ā. The dialectal preposition translating "of" is nīf or in. from the class of -ā, according as the word before it is feminine or plural, this preposition becomes nīf or nīf (i.e. or nīf (i.e.)).
It does not seem that the Beduin dialects know the use of the verbal prefix indicating the indicative present. In the plural personal forms of the defective verbs, there is a reduction of the diphthong:  ❮gila❯, from the verb  ❮gila❯ "to fly";  ❮nial-jidt❯ from the verb  ❮nial❯ "to forget".

We may also note the use of a preposition  ❮to❯;  ❮gila-mal❯, "he told us".

From the point of view of vocabulary, some words are characteristic of Beduin dialects:  ❮dawiri❯ "to make, do",  ❮bati, bati, bati, to wish",  ❮yemen, yemen, yesterday",  ❮jarara, jarara, jarah, now", from the classical  ❮dawiri-wawi❯. We may add the particle  ❮naf❯ used to indicate interrogation:  ❮wala naf❯, "have you seen so and so?" and the phrase  ❮naf, naf❯, "he no longer comes".

Jewish dialects: The Jews who emigrated from Spain have, as a rule, retained the use of an archaic Spanish; many have also learned Arabic for business reasons. Alongside of the Spanish Jews, we have in the Berber highlands and in the towns of the interior: Moroccan Jews of unknown origin whom the former called  ❮forareaa❯ (Span. "foreigner"); according to the district, they speak Berber or Arabic, but in the towns their dialects have not yet been studied. They have a literature in an Arabic dialect written in Hebrew characters (and called, certainly wrongly: Judaism-Arabic):  ❮pisyaan❯, songs at family festivals (cf. Tadjouri, in  ❮Hzrurin❯, iii, 1923, p. 408-420), and songs in songs dealing with real happenings; some of these texts have been printed at Fès and Constantine; a newspaper written in an Arabic dialect and printed in Hebrew characters called  ❮lis-barayya❯. The Library of the University has been published at Tangier for a number of years.

5. Relations of the linguistic groups of Morocco to one another. Morocco appears to the philologist a wonderful field for the study of the influence of the substiratum on an imported language, since the language of the substiratum, i.e. Berber, is still alive alongside of the Arabic and quite well known. The results of the examination are very meagre: the phenomena actually ascribable to the action of the substiratum alone are insignificant; this may, however, be due to the fact that Arabic, a Semitic language, and Berber, a proto-Semitic language, are not sufficiently differentiated.

From the phonetic point of view, there is hardly any sound change found in the highland dialects of the arabized Berbers, for which a corresponding change cannot be found in the dialectal phenomena of old Arabic; only, perhaps their tendency to spirantization should be connected with the identical tendency observed in the northern Berber dialects found in the confines of the Ifni country.

If we consider the morphology, we see that in the highland dialects the verb has lost feminine forms of the plural of the old Arabic, which still survive in some Beduin dialects and are still found in Berber. A Berber origin has been sought for the use of the initial prefix indicating the present of the indicative; but similar prefixes are found in Egypt and in Syria where there are very different substirata.

Certainly Berber is the scheme  ❮to, to❯ —  ❮t❯ which forms mean indicating truded  (to-mawasad, "trude of a mason") and names of abstract qualities (to-beeza, "vagularity"), it is however curious to note that in modern Berber, this scheme has not this significance and is only used to form the feminine and occasionally the diminutives.

In the syntax of the highland dialects, we find indissoluble traces of Berber influence: plural treatment of singulars applied to liquids (water, urine), phrases translated or stereotyped, e.g.  ❮bati❯,  ✗kuddari, ✗kuddari, "kuddari's brother," with retention of the Berber particle indicating belonging to, -in.

But it is in the vocabulary that the Berber substiratum makes its influence felt most. Whether surviving in the highland dialects or borrowed in the Beduin dialects, many of the terms relating to country life are Berber (names of plants, animals, rocks, agricultural implements and tools); they have often retained in Arabic the Berber pseudo-article  ❮a❯, which, still felt to have its original value, makes them unfit to take the Arabic article also; alongside of the singular in  ❮a❯, we usually have a Berber plural in -ba also retained. It is curious by the way but intelligible to find in the highland dialects words of Arabic origin with the Berber article. These must be Arabic words borrowed and berberized at a time when the Jellia still spoke Berber and which have been retained just as they were in their Arabic dialect after being arabicized, e.g.  ❮a-jaf❯, "ditch," pl.  ❮a-jafir❯; in Tangier, the name of the mosque is called  ❮a-hlir❯; at Rabat, two words imported from Europe have a Berber form:  ❮a-zaf❯, "the sultan's boat" and  ❮a-zaf❯, "tea."

Some Berber words have survived in the administrative language of the Mekhzen:  ❮a-feg❯, "a wall of earth surrounding the sultan's camp";  ❮a-akhir❯, "a pasture reserved for the sultan's animals";  ❮a-fer❯, "it is to punish the guilty";  ❮a-rira, a-sycint❯, "a sharp maker of arrows."

The Beduin dialects naturally contain much fewer Berber elements than the urban dialects and still less than the highland dialects; their rustic vocabulary nevertheless made numerous borrowings from the technical vocabulary of the previous Berber tillers of the plains.

Within the Arabic area, the highland and urban dialects have borrowed a certain number of terms relating to the rural activities of the Beduin; they are as a rule revealed by the pronunciation of  ❮al❯ as  ❮a❯. The Beduin dialects in their turn borrow from the towns their words relating to a more advanced culture; but, for economic, political and, to a certain extent, aesthetic reasons, they give more than they borrow.

Some words, which are used in the urban and highland dialects as well as by the Beduin dialects but are unknown in the Spanish and Maltese dialects, are perhaps of  "himiti" origin; the principal seem to be  ❮al❯, "horse",  ❮al-afir❯, "bear" and  ❮al-afir❯, "to see".

In addition to the Berber and Arabic elements, the Moroccan vocabulary contains a fairly important number of European loanwords. They come from the vocabulary of a higher culture and relate to the flora (in cultivation or its products), to agriculture, to food and dress, to furniture and housing, sometimes even to parts of the body. They are Greek or Latin borrowings of the old period, Romance or Spanish for later periods; but neither their meaning nor their phonetic treatment enables us always to be able to date accurately the time of their introduction and their origin.

These "European" loanwords are naturally found in larger numbers in Northern Morocco, which
has been more subject to Mediterranean influences which, through refugees from Spain, have been felt as far as the northern part of the Middle Atlas. The Beduin dialects have escaped these influences (cf 1. Simonet, Glosario de voces bereberes y latinas usadas entre los Morosques, Madrid 1883; 2. Schuchardt, Die romanischen Lautwörter im Berberischen, Vienna 1918; 3. G. S. Colin, Etymologie maghrébin, in Herzog's 1926 and 1927); 4. A. Fischer, Zur Lautlehre des Marokkanischen [chap. ii., III. und IV.], Leipzig 1917).

Between the two extremes marked by the most conservative Beduin dialects and the most characteristic highland dialects lies a whole gamut of intermediate varieties, which are in the transitional stages; they include the highland dialects which are characterized by the presence of the plain south of the Sahara, as well as certain dialects of Beduin type used in the Atlantic plains, notably in the nom-adyan towns. "But however extensive and deep may have been the interpenetration of the two types, it has not abolished their fundamental likeness" (W. Marqais).

In spite of the profound differences which separate them, the highland and Beduin dialects of Morocco (and of the Maghrib) agree in one essential and characteristic morphological feature: the forms sing. $a-s$, plur. $a-m$ in the first person of the sorist. Now this fact is attested in the 17th century for Almoravie Spain and Norman Sicily, i.e. in languages from which Hilali influence is clearly excluded; it is also found in Maltese; it must then be admitted that the two groups of dialects have independently brought about this innovation, which seems to have remained exceptional in the dialects of the east. The two groups agree also in the loss of short vowels in open syllables; this phonetic peculiarity is also found in many eastern dialects; but it is curious that it has become general in the Maghrib while the dialects of Spain and Egypt do not have it.

It is in the Documents inédits d'histoire almoravide [we find the first information about Moroccan Arabic (in 975), "in order that", "aita", "of", first persons of the sorist in $a-s$ (sing., $a-m$ (plur.)), but we have to wait till D. de Torres to find a few phrases transcribed (cf. French travel, Paris 1356, p. 341, 342, 349). Moussat, who was stationed at sea by the Moors in 1760 and was for a long time a prisoner, has left us a Dictionnaire arabe-français, in French and Moroccan, in transcriptions (cf. Histoire de la Capitale..., Paris 1683, pp. 328-359). The first grammatical notes were collected by Hest (cf. Histoire..., 1779, ch. 8, p. 202-210), who has also given us a Berber-Danish-Moroccan Arabic vocabulary (op. cit., p. 128-133). It is to Fr. de Domlayci that we owe the first monograph on Moroccan dialects, which is also the first serious attempt to study of Arabic dialects, the dialect which he deals with is that of Tanger (Grammatica linguae marroc-carii, Vindobonae 1800). Since then, there has been a number of studies; for works before 1911 see the bibliography given by W. Marqais in Teissier arabes de Tanger, p. 207-213; for later works in the bibliography in Teissier arabe de Rabat by L. Brion (now in the press).

2. Literature of the Arabic Dialects. Like all popular literatures, the literature of the Arabic dialects of Morocco is essentially poetical. The only texts in prose are those which have been collected recently by European students of dialects.

In the Arabic poetry of Morocco two periods must be distinguished: the first extending down to the beginning of the Sa'dian dynasty; the first known texts are those which Ibn Khaldun gives at the end of his Muqaddima among the specimens of the poetry of the towns. To these we may add a mass of poems composed in honour of the Prophet (Mu'addis) of which numerous collections exist in manuscript. Leo Africanus (ed. Scheffer, ii., p. 430) says that under the Marmides, poets used to compose verses in "valgar African" on the Mawlaid and also on erotic subjects. These were recited in the presence of the sultan, who gave prizes to the winners of the competition. From this group cannot be separated the poems which accompany classical Moroccan music, "Andalusion" music, many of which must have been composed in Morocco; these were collected and classified by al-Har,ik, a musician of Spanish origin who had settled in Tetouan. All these poems belonging to this first period are written in the Spanish Arabic dialect, which after the great success of the Cordovan Ibn Ku'man (xxrth century) became the classical language of the new poetic genre called sa'di, which had this in common with the mu'addis that, while employing like it new metres, its prosody was based on the classical metre on the complexity long or short of the syllables, but the sa'di differed from the mu'addis in that it was written in the Spanish dialect and not in the classical language.

The main characteristics of the poetry of the Moroccan dialects of the first period are attention to the quantity of each syllable as in Latin and the use of the Spanish dialect.

The second period, on the other hand, is distinguished by a system of prosody founded exclusively on the number of syllables in each verse (as in French) and by the use of a special language called melhun, a kind of waw adapted to literary purposes, based on the Moroccan dialect but influenced partially by the Beduin dialects. It is noteworthy that this poetry is of Berber origin and, it was under the benimining dynasty of the Sa'dians and the Alawids that it rose and flourished.

The first known author of a sa'di written in melhun appears in the xixth century: he was Abcr Firis 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Maghribi, who was one of the poets of the Sa'dian Sultan al-Mansur al-Dhahbi (1578-1602). His fame is still great and is preserved in the provest 'Uli min khi al makhrawi, which means "Nothing that is long is of interest except the palm-tree and the Al-Maghribi". Other poets followed him. It was at this time that the saint 'Abd al-Rahman al-Majnun al-Dakhili (b. in 1569) wrote his mystic sa'di, "bheblu maqru bi, heblu maqru bi, heblu maqru bi" which means "Nothing at all is of interest, except the palm-tree and the Al-Maghribi". The works passed from the poets to Tiemezam, an important centre of melhun poetry; first Sal'm b. 'Abd Allah al-Mindir al-Tilmanzi, author of the celebrated 'Afaj, who left his native town to live at the court of the first Alawid Sultan Muhammad, but the Shari (d. in 1664) and al-Raghi (d. in 1672): a pupil of al-Mindir, Abdmal b. al-Taribi, hounded from Tiemezam in 1672 by the Turks, also came to settle in Morocco among the Ben Znians. But we have to come down to the xixth and especially the xxth century for the coming of a whole school of poets writing in melhun. The three principal centres of literary activity were Fes, Meknes and
Marraksh. The subjects treated are most varied: love poems, mystic, erotic and satirical (discussion between a white woman and a negro, between a townswoman and a Bedoin woman etc.), political (on the occasion of the French conquest and the establishment of the protectorate), didactic (manufacture of powder, target-shooting, falconry) poems or burlesques (parodies of khtas declared by the students at their fêtes).

Among the numerous authors we may mention: Si Muhammad b. Sulaimân, Si Al-Thânim al-Madâghi, al-Qaïûdî, al-Hanbî; we owe humorous khtas to Si Al-Madâni al-Tarâkiî est Marraksh; Si Kâdûr al-Haïrî, who was buried at Melkens specialised in mystical and ethical poetry. The Arkâb b. Layalînî, whom Mihi b. Muhammad b. Saïd b. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Harâbî of Tetwân (d. 1845) also wrote mystical khtas in melhâm which are collected at the end of the lithographed edition of his Dîwân (Tunis 1331; Fâs, n.d.). At the beginning of the xxth century, Al-Saïdâtî in Fâs was composing political khtas.

Melhâm poetry has completely replaced poetry in the Spanish dialect; it constitutes a very vigorous branch of literature, much in favour with all classes of society; we frequently find almost illiterate authors, and people say that their talent is a poetic gift given by God (mas'ûd); on the other hand, even the rulers have not disdained this popular poetry and one of the last Alâïdî Sulâmî, Mawâyî Abî al-Ifrîqî, wrote numerous khtas in melhâm which have been collected in a Dîwân lithographed at Fâs.

Alongside of this men's poetry, there are the songs of the women (songs of women working at the mill, songs of gleaners, songs of family fêtes, Ibabellâhs), the children's songs which are often strangely conservative, epigrams and proverbs (cf. A. Fischer, Das Liederbuch eines marokkanischen Singers, Leipzig 1918; C. Soneck, Chants arabes du Maghreb, Paris 1902 (Nes. 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 74, 84, 85, 88, 89, 94–97, 115 and 116 are Moroccan); E. Lévi-Provençal, Un chant populaire religieux du Djebel Marocain, in Revue Africaine, 1921; H. de Caunes, Les geants de Sidi Allal ben Ahmad ben-Mulâ, Maroc, Paris 1894; on the poetry melhâm in general, cf. Abî al-Muqâtab al-Ghâthî, Kâfîs al-Kâmî 'an Abî al-Sâîdî, Algiers 1904, p. 49–93; S. Baray, Notes d'ethnographie et de linguistique nord-africaine, Paris 1924 (songs of women and children); L. Brunot, Proverbes et dictons arabes de Rabat, in Hespèris, 1928, with Moroccan bibliography of the subject).

III. OTHER LANGUAGES. A sketch of the languages of Morocco which only took account of Berber and Arabic dialects would be incomplete, for other elements of secondary importance have to be considered:

1. Classical Arabic, the official language is used only in writing, for sermons, lectures and conferences; it is never the language of conversation. But as religious studies are considerably developed in the towns (especially Fâs) and also among the jbâla (Kur'ânic studies and especially ibtâî), many words of classical Arabic have been introduced into the popular dialect by the educated classes. The phonetic peculiarity to notice in borrowed classical words is the retention of the short vowels of the classical language, as a result of the process of elision; e.g. classical tâhir, plz. tâhirî, "decreed of the sultan", borrowed by the popular dialect in the form tâhir, whence a dialect plural gâshîh. Several Kur'ânic expressions or phrases of exegesis hence passed into everyday language as adverbs: tâhirî "guilty" (taken from Kur'ân vi. 153), bâ et-tâhibî "slowly", lit. "in commenting on", moâ šâhî "perhaps". Morocco, as a whole being little arabised, seems incapable of borrowing a part of the classical vocabulary and adapting it to its own dialect. Its borrowings from classical Arabic almost always look like borrowings from a foreign language.

2. Spanish was the only language spoken by many of the Muslims of Spain, who in the xvi th century and especially in the xviii th took refuge in Morocco, mainly at Tetwân and Rabat-Salî. Moutte, who was taken a hostage by the Mâarîf in 1670, says that Spanish was as common there as Arabic; his remark is probably true only of the towns already mentioned. The descendants of these emigrants from Spain, later learned Arabic and forgot Spanish, under the influence of Islamic culture. Not having been subject to the latter influence, the Jews of Spanish origin still speak an archaic Spanish, sprinkled with Arabic terms modified to the inflexions of Latin morphology.

3. At the present day, in the palace of the sultan, many servants of both sexes still speak Subsidien dialects, but these seem to have had no influence on the Arabic dialects of Morocco. No trace has so far been found of the existence in Morocco of secret languages; one could hardly put in this category the argots of certain guilds (butchers) or those of the students, the originality of which consist simply in transposing certain letters of each word of the ordinary language and in the addition of certain rearranged syllables.

(Georges S. Colin)

VIII. INTELLECTUAL LIFE.

More especially since the end of the middle ages, Morocco has occupied a place by itself, often important, in the history of Muslim civilisation. From this point of view of intellectual life, it was for long under the tutelage, more or less marked, of neighbouring countries, and it was only from the time it became an independent state with well-trained ministers drawn from the tribal leaders that it could show independence in this respect also. The great activity at the centre of learning in Arab Spain down to the end of the xiii th century had undoubtedly an influence in Morocco, but it was after the return of the Iberian Peninsula to Christianity, that, owing to the migration of refugees from Spain to Morocco, where there happened to be ruling princes anxious to further Islamic studies, it was able to preserve the last and only centres of study in the Muslim west. In any case, in spite of the relatively large number of scholars which it has produced in various branches of 'ilm, this country is far from having inherited in the eyes of the rest of Islam the reputation and intellectual prestige, which Spain enjoyed when it was a Muslim country. However, it may be said that the towns of Morocco have always held in recent centuries a large proportion of men of letters, much attached to their traditional cultus, to such an extent that this culture, to the end of the xvi th century at least, never allowed the slightest place for modern sciences, the study of which, if it has gradually become more or less established in the Muslim east, has never interested the west.

The characteristic feature of this culture, which
as essentially founded on religion, is that it has remained unchanging. In this country, where only a few years ago tradition strictly regulated all acts of public and private life, it is not surprising that the intellectual ideal has always remained the same. It has already been remarked that the Moroccan faqīḥ of to-day, whether he be magistrate, teacher, or official of the Sharīṭan government, possesses the same stock of knowledge as a faqīḥ of the periods of the Marinids or Sādīns. The same instruction has been given him and by the same methods. He has received first of all an elementary education in the Koranic school [see Mawṣūṣ], he has learned the Kur’an by heart, often completely, and some of the elements of grammar. Next he became a student (māEntre), and the faqīḥ al-Uṣūl, which he studied, is governed by no rules or programmes other than the traditional ones. He first of all studied the “mother-works” (mawḥūṣ), compendia made to be memorised readily, on theology and grammar (usually the Mawṣūṣ of Ibn ‘Ashīr and the Aṯurūmīya). It was only then that he entered upon a more thorough study of more advanced texts, usually commentaries (ṣahrā) or glosses (ṣāḥīḥa) on works (mata) of established reputation and exclusively Islamic in character. The whole trend of his studies is toward a better knowledge of the theology of the law.

The result is that in most cases in Morocco men of learning are almost entirely jurists and that they differentiate between purely Islamic sciences (mawḥūṣ) and profane learning (fusḥa) with some contempt for the latter. We understand also why the part played by Morocco in Arabo literature is primarily in the domain of subjects directly connected with the Kur’ān and the Sunna, theology, law, and usul.

The centres of learning have varied with periods and historical circumstances. The early ones seem to have been the points nearest to Spain, Ceuta and Tangier. The foundation of Fāṣ and the building in this city of the great Mosque of the Kairawānīs (Dżāner al-Kairawīyīn) initiated the establishment of a centre of culture in the interior. A little later, Marrākush, the capital of the Almōravids and of the Almorawide, became by desire of its rulers the centre of attraction for Maghribi scholars and even for a certain number from Spain. But it is from the Marinid dynasty, who saw in the development of educational centres in Morocco a means to make themselves popular in the country and to acquire prestige in the eyes of the Muslim world, that the rise of Fāṣ as an intellectual centre dates: it was the metropolis of learning in the country from the sixteenth century. Not only did the Marinid princes make it the political capital but by the foundation of a series of colleges or madrasas (in Moroccan modern) around the Dżāner al-Kairawīyīn and mosque of New Fāṣ, they were able to attract to this city a host of students from all parts of the country and to give it the renown for learning, which it still jealously claims to-day. In the Marinid period, madrasas were also multiplied outside Fāṣ. Meknes, Salé and Marrākush had their own which shows that regular education was given in these towns.

In addition to the part played by the madrasas, there was the activity of the šāwīya, directly connected with the development of maraboutism and šārīṭan in the country in the period when the Spaniards and Portuguese were trying to estab-

lish themselves in Morocco in the eighteenth century. The šāwīya, religious centres, headquarters of the Dżāber, naturally became centres of teaching. At the time when Fāṣ could only with difficulty keep its character as the principal centre of learning in the country, the šāwīya, in which teaching was carried on, became more and more numerous; e.g. the šāwīya of al-Kalīla in the Middle Atlas, the šāwīya of Tingrūṭ in the land of Da’ūr, the šāwīya of Wāṣītan in the north. The most famous scholars were frequently either heads of brotherhoods or šāyṣ, who taught in the motherhouse of their order.

We do not intend here to give a detailed sketch of the Arabic literature of Morocco, but will be content with a few general indications and names distinguishing where possible, between Islamic and profane sciences.

It was not till the Muslim west adopted the Maḥrivī rite that Morocco began to produce work in the domain of šorīṭ in close accord, as already mentioned, with the school of Spain. In this period of intellectual dependence, the relations between the two countries were confined and the Maghribi students down to the eighteenth century considered a journey in Cordova, Marcia or Valencia necessary to finish their course. The cast did not yet seem to exert the attraction that it did later. At this period, besides, the Islamisation and Arabisation of the Berber masses was still very recent. Only a few names may be mentioned for this early period:

Darrā al-Iṣāmī, of whom much that is recorded is legendary; the famous reformer Ibn Taḥṣīn [q.v.], creator of the Almohad movement and author of several risāla or ṣaḥāda on his teaching; the šāyṣ ‘Abū ‘Iyāṣ [q.v.], born at Tafṣīn in the first half (1053), d. at Marrākush in 554 (1159), author of numerous works on Muslim learning, of which the most famous are the Kāliš al-Sharīṭ and the Ḥajar al-Aṣwaṣ with a collection of biographies of learned Malīkis, entitled al-Maṣāḥīṣ.

During the modern period, on the other hand, the number of learned Moroccans becomes more and more considerable. The best known are for Fāṣ: Ibn Battīr (eighth century A. D.); Ibn Fājkī (nineth century); the scholar of Meknès Ibn Ghārī (1019); ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Kādī (1082); ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Idrīs Manṣūr († 1179); Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Salām al-Fāṣ († 1214); and Ibn Radīw (Yahyā al-Sarrāq) († 997); Schākhī b. ‘Alī († 956); Ridwān al-Dżīlī († 991); Mahamad b. Kāsim al-Kasāf († 1024); Ibn al-‘Irāqī († 1228); for al-Ṣafā: Abu l-Ḥasan al-Salqīnī, commentator of the Nāṣrīzawan, (al-Dżarīzī [q.v.]) and Ahmad Zarrīk (nineth century) commentator of the Ṣaṣrīta of Ibn Abī Zaid al-Kairawān; al-Waḥsharī († 955); al-Manṣūrī († 995); Ibn ‘Ashīr († 1040); Māyānī († 1072); for philology: al-Malākhī († 807); Ibn Zakīr († 899). Their works have for the most part been recorded and will be found detailed either in Brockelmann, G. A. Z. or in Benreresheb’s work on the individuals mentioned in the Ṣafā’s of ‘Abd al-Kādīl al-Fāṣ. Only a small number have been printed in Western libraries; but on the other hand, they all form the foundations of the collections of manuscripts formed and preserved in the imperial palaces and mosques of Morocco.

Some Moroccans scholars have written works on šaṭā or collections of ṣaḥīḥs, in addition to books of a strictly Muslim character. None of
them can claim any great originality and purely literary slims are rare. Poetry, as a rule—when it is not didactic (argumin)—is religious or mystic. At the courts, there were always a few literary men maintained by the princes, who were the panegyrist, often very loyal, of their patrons.

It is at the courts also, especially from the sixteenth century, that we find the few historians who have given us original chronicles or compilations.

Their works, planned on a singularly curious conception of history, have nevertheless the merit of giving us the only detailed information about the political history of the country in the period of the author or immediately preceding it. Those which date from the Middle Ages are however much the best. The kind of work not only did not improve later, but because simply dry chronicles in which events are related in a brief and colorless fashion.

The early historians of Morocco—if we except the Berber genealogists about whom we do not know very much and the contemporaries of the Almoravid dynasty. A little later, the Almohads find a historian in the person of a companion of the Mahdi Ibn Tumart, Abul Bakr al-Baidhak al-Sanadik, the interest of whose me molos contrasts strikingly with many later chroniclers. Alongside of the work of al-Sanihak may be placed the chronicles of Ibn al-Kattan and of Abd al-Wahid al-Marrakush as of high value. But it was in the Marinid period that the historian found most favour in Morocco. Leaving out Ibn Khalidin, whom Morocco is not the only one to claim, we may mention Ibn Idhari, a scholar of Makkur, to whom we owe a history of North Africa, Spain, the Bayan al-Maghrabi, that of Ibn Abi Zar'a, author of a history of Fés and the Moroccon dynasties, Rawd al-Kureish, Ibn Mariq, author of the Musnad, a monograph on the sultans Abu al-Hassan Al'Ali, Ibn al-Ashur of the family of the kings of Granada, author of the Rawdat al-Nasrin. Under the Saadians, the principal historians were al-Fiqih, al-Franti, and the Nasab al-Hadii; finally under the Alawis, al-Zayanti and Akebina.

Geography is represented in modern Moroccon literature only in the form of itinera or accounts of the travels of pilgrims, in which the description of the country passed through only occupies an insignificant place. Nevertheless, the geographer al-Idrisi and the great traveller Ibn Battuta were of Moroccan origin.

The biographical literature of Morocco is considerable. The collections of masalikh, saints, monographs dealing with families of chayfa or religious brotherhoods are abundantly especially in the modern period. There are also collections by town or century, some of which are of a certain interest, even from the point of view of history. All these biographies have been surveyed in E. Levis-Provenchel, L'Historien des Chorfa. The most notable biographers down to the middle of the sixteenth century are Ibn 'Askar, author of the Darurat al-Nasir; Ibn al-Kadi, author of the Darurat al-Nasir and the Qa'idat al-Fadilat; the historian al-Franti, author of the Safwat man nabihr; and al-Franti, author of the Nihayat al-Matshat and the Idhrat al-Durar.

As to medicine and natural science, Morocco down to the sixteenth century was closely dependent on Spain. The physicians of the Almoravids and Almohad princes were from Spain, like Ibn Balja (Avenpace), Ibn Tufail, and the celebrated Ibn Rustad (Avenroos) and Ibn Zubir (Avencoar). In the modern period, we find at the courts of the sultans several physicians of Moroccan origin who have left works. The chief were, in the Saadian period: Abd Muhammad al-Kasim Waiz al-Quasssal, in the Alawid period: Ibn Shukr, 'Abd al-Wahhab Adarrak, Ahmad al-Dara', Abul Mir'ahib al-Asaf al-Marrakush, Ahmad Ibn al-Halalji and 'Abd al-Salih al-Akama.

Finally two famous Moroccans studied the exact sciences of the sixteenth century: 'Abd al-Hassan b. 'Umar al-Marrakush, author of a treatise on astronomical instruments, part of which has been translated by Sadilout, and Ahmad Ibn al-Bannus, to whom we owe several works on arithmetic, geometry, algebra, astronomy, astrology and alchemy.

At the end of the sixteenth century, the reign of Mawsil al-Hassan was marked by a kind of renaissance in Muslim studies in Morocco, particularly characterized by the need which writers felt of getting their works printed to make them more widely known. The lithographic press of Fas acquired a certain importance at this time and left to publish texts which had hitherto circulated only in manuscript. Among them, there appeared at Fas the three volumes of the Antiqat of Ahmad b. Dhakar al-Kattani [q.v.], an excellent biographical dictionary of the celebrities of the northern capital. At the same time, there was published in Cairo the great Moroccon history of Ahmad b. Khulil al-Nasiri al-Salawi [q.v.] entitled Kitaab al-Ittibar al-Makbar al-Magribi al-Aqb.

The establishment of the French protectorate in Morocco and the remarkable spread of French civilization in the large towns have already profoundly modified the intellectual ideals of the younger generation in Morocco. It is however still too early to forecast the orientation that Arabic literature will take in this country in the years to come.


MORÓN, Arab. Mawsil, a little town in the south of Spain, on the right bank of the Guadalquivir and at the foot of the Sierra de Morón for the S.W. of Cordova and S.E. of Seville. It was in the Muslim period the capital of a kibar...
of district and an agricultural centre with numerous olive-groves. At the beginning of the tenth century, it was one of the centres of resistance of the famous rebel 'Abd al-Rahman II. His citadel was captured by the troops of 'Abd al-Rahman III in 911 (923). In the next century, during the period of the petty kingdoms of the taifas, Morón was the capital of a little Berber dynasty, the Banu Dammar, Abadís from the region of Gubes in Tunisia. The first member of the dynasty to declare his independence in 433 (1041) was Muḥammad b. Nuh; his father Nuh b. Abi Tarid had lived at Morón from 1013 without actually recognising the government of Córdova. Muhammad b. Nuh soon excited the jealousy of the 'Abduládi of Seville al-Mu'tadid who made an attempt on his life. He died in 449 (1057). His son Manad Tarid al-Dawla, who succeeded him, was soon besieged at Morón by al-Mu'tadid and in return for life and liberty surrendered the town in 458 (1066). Morón and its territory were annexed to the kingdom of Seville and henceforth shared the fate of the capital.


**Moron.** [See Moore.]

**MOSTAGANEM (MUSTAGANEM).** A coast town on Algeria, eight miles E. of the mouth of the Shelf (q.v. Long, [Greenwich]) does not occupy the site of any known ancient town. There is no natural harbour here; two capes, not particularly well marked (Kharuba and Salamander), leave vessels without protection against winds from the north and west. It is therefore not as a port that al-Bakri (xiith century) mentions Mostaganem for the first time. He describes it as a town situated "not far from the sea" (it is less than a mile away) living on the produce of its rich territory, notably the cotton plantations. From this time onwards it was surrounded by a wall which strengthened its natural defences. The old town occupies a triangular plateau formed by the sharp bend of the Ain Sefra and the wall runs along the top of the ravine. On the point of this natural stronghold, the Almoravid Yūsuf b. Taqiyy is said to have built in 1082 a fortress which was later called Burdi al-Maḥṣal, from the name of one of the tribes of the neighbourhood, and is now a prison. Like the other towns of the coast, Nedroma or Algiers, Mostaganem was probably given a small Almoravid garrison. Thus strengthened, the town would serve as a place of refuge against an attack from the sea and one could keep at a distance the Berber tribes of the hinterland, who belonged for the most part to the Maghrībīa confederation. It must thus have developed to some extent. In the middle of the xiiith century, Idris tells us that it had bazaars and baths; he emphasizes the abundance of the water, which irrigated the gardens and orchards and provided mills.

The name of Mostaganem does not figure in history throughout all this period when the Almoravids in theory held the central Maghrib. The decline of the Almohads enabled the Maghrībīa to become completely masters of the country. In 1267 and 1277 the Zaïyāda sultān of Tlemcen Yaghmorbaṣa reduced these turbulent tribes and incorporated their lands in the empire which he had founded. In 680 (1281) he entrusted the government of Mostaganem to one of his cousins, al-Zarîm b. Vajrī, a descendant of one of the collateral branches of the family of the Banū Zaïyān, in spite of the lack of confidence he had in those relatives whom he had deprived of the throne. These fears proved well founded. Al-Zarîm, having raised the Maghrībīa to rebel, declared himself independent. Yaghmorbaṣa had to march on Mostaganem; he blockaded the town strictly and the rebel surrendered after obtaining permission to cross to Syrja.

Like all the coast region, Mostaganem in 735 or 736 (1335-1336) passed to the Merinid Abu l-'Hasan, who was engaged in the siege of Tlemcen. In 742 (1340) the victorious sultān built a mosque in Mostaganem. We have an inscription attesting this foundation of the interregnum of the Moroccan princes. Regained by the sultāns of Tlemcen, the town suffered disastrously from their weakness. The Sowaid Arab of the great Zoghba confederation became undisputed masters of the whole district. Mostaganem led a precarious existence. Léo Africanus at the beginning of the xvith century says that it occupied only a third of its former area. He credits it with 1,500 hearths, however, tells us of the weavers and of the roadstead to which ships from Europe came. He says the river runs "through the city", which shows that in addition to the old stronghold on the left bank there were now quarters on the right bank. In the Turkish period we know of two suburbs: Tidjit (the New) and Mattar (the Old). In 1536 Khair al-Din [q.v.] considerably strengthened its defences. Shaw at the beginning of the xvith century speaks of the citadel (the Fort of the East) which, built on a height, commanded the town and vicinity. In 1850 the garrison consisted of some hundreds of Turks and Kulliagh. The French took them into their service and put them under the command of the Kâib Ilīrām. Distrusting the loyalty of the latter and thinking he had an agreement with the Medjīber, an unsubdued tribe of the neighbourhood, General Desmiches occupied the town in 1833. The troops whom he stationed there were attacked by 'Abd al-Kādir. The vexatious results of the treaty signed by Desmiches with the Emir forced Clauzel to retake Mostaganem (1835). Under Bagesand, Mostaganem became the point of disembarkation and the centre of operations against 'Abd al-Kādir. It was there that in 1847 the first battalion of Algerian Tirailleurs (Turcos) was raised, and the town has since been an important centre for recruiting native troops.

Mostaganem has developed considerably since the early days of the French occupation; it has now over 27,000 inhabitants. Its harbour, which owes nothing to nature, has been improved by two jetties which still afford only a rather mediocre shelter to shipping.

MOSTAGANEM — MOSTAR


MOSTAR, the capital of the Herzegovina in the kingdom of Jugoslavia, one hundred miles S.W. of Sarajevo, on the Sarayevu—Mostar—Dhenvrovin railway. By the new (Oct. 3, 1929) division of Jugoslavia into nine banats, Mostar passed to the coast banat, the capital of which is Split (Spalato). The picturesque town lies two hundred feet above sea-level on both banks of the Neretva (Narenta) between the slopes of the Povdvet and the Hun. The old quarters of the town (Kounak, Carahya etc.) are in the east, the new in the west. In 1929, the number of inhabitants was 18,038 (in 1921 a little more: 18,176). Mostar covers an area of 16 square kilometres, has 2,916 houses, 33 mosques, a Serbian Orthodox and one Roman Catholic church. Mostar has a district mufti and a sharitul judge (zyhiri). Its trade is considerable as is its production of fruit, wine and tobacco. The climate is warm and rainy.

In the time of the Roman empire, there was a colony in this place of Mostar, which was destroyed during the period of migrations. In the centuries following, the immigrant Slavs conquered Zamunyade district with its capital Blagay (near the modern Mostar). According to the Dalmatian writers Orbini and Luccari (both at the beginning of the xviiith century), the new town of Mostar was founded in 1440 by Radivoy Gost, a vassal of Stefan Vukic Kosača, afterwards Duke of St. Sava. In historical documents the earliest mention is in 1452 of the two forts on the Neretva bridge (in castell al ponte de Neretva); the name of the town itself is not found till 1499.

It was only after the Turkish conquest of the Herzegovina (1485; cf. v. Hammer, G. O. A. 4, 1. 638), which resulted in the decline of Blagay that the new settlement began to develop rapidly, first as an important strategic point in the Neretva valley, then as a prosperous commercial town in addition. Since it grew up around a wooden bridge it was called simply Most (bridge), Mosti [of Mostar, properly Mostari (plur. "the bridges"). This "place of the bridge" was by 1522 the residence of the Turkish sandjakbeg of the Herzeogovina, who had previously lived in Foča. According to Hidjdži Khalfa, the crossing of the Neretva was exceedingly dangerous: the wooden bridge, being on chains, had no piers and swayed so that "one only crossed it in fear of death." The inhabitants therefore petitioned Sultan Sulaiman to have a stone one built in its place. The architect sent by the Sultan, the celebrated Sinan (q.v.), is said to have declared it impossible to build a bridge at this point, whereupon a local architect built the fine bridge which crosses the river in a single bold arch, thirty yards in length and sixty feet high. This is said to have been done in 1564 (1565—1567). The two Turkish chronograms given by Ewliyya Celebi and Çavtart to Čorbu and Keniz xahi actually give this date. This bridge not only gave Mostar its name but formed its chief sight, as it still is. The French traveller A. Pouillet in 1568 says that its "fabrication est plus hardie, sans comparaison, & dix fois plus digne que celles qu'on n'en trouve guère qu'ailleurs, y et estime une merveille" (cf. Giacinto zenafrica, musée de Bosnia i Herzegovina (hereafter quoted as: G. z. m.), xx [1908], 49). A modern traveller regards the old bridge at Mostar as the finest in the whole world (R. Michel, Fahrten in den Rheinlanden, Bilder und Skizzen aus B. und der H. [Vienna and Leipzig, 1913], p. 31). In his earlier book on Mostar he describes this bridge as a "ricrement in stone". The building of the bridge was often ascribed to the Romans and indeed its foundations perhaps date from them but the modern bridge undoubtedly dates from the Turkish period and is "the work of Dalmatian—Italian architects" (J. de Asboth, An official tour through Bosnia and Herzegovina [London 1900], p. 257).

Ewliyya Celebi visited Mostar in 1573 (1664—1665) and gives in his diary a number of details about the town, e.g. that it has fifty-three mescobales, three thousand and forty solidly built houses of stone, three hundred and fifty shops and forty-five mosques. Of the latter he mentions eight by name: 1. Old mosque in the Carahya, built in 1478 (1473); 2. Hidjdži Mehmedbeg mosque, built in 955 (1557); 3. Mndjil of Hidjdži Ali agha in the Carahya, built in 1016 (1607); 4. Deutfarlapaša mosque, built in 1017 (1608); 5. Kočki Mehmedpaša mosque, built in 1027 (1617); 6. Huričmian, built in 1044 (1634); 7. Rizanmedži Ibrahim-Efendi-mosque and 8. Hidjdži ‘Ali mosque. For the other two mosques neither the chronogram nor the year of building is given. The finest and largest of all is the mosque of Hidjdži Mehmed Bey, which is usually called "Karároyzhegova dizamiya", The monograph, quoted below, by Pec gives the names of twenty-seven mosques and twenty-six vakufs (vakuf) and in each case he mentions whether their foundation records are preserved or not.

It the course of the xviiith and xviiiith century Mostar was several times threatened by Venetian troops (1652, 1693, 1717). At a late date (1763), the Herzegovina was incorporated in the wilayet of Bosnia and Mostar was only the residence of the musalim. This lasted till 1832, when the land was again made a wilayet and Mostar became the headquarters of the newly appointed Herzeogovinan wawt ‘Ali Paša Rizvanbeg.

During the Turkish period Mostar produced a number of men of note in Turkish and Muslim literature and learning. Among these were:

1. Dya‘i (d. 972 = 1566); 2. Derwish Paša (Bayezidagić; 1599 and in 1601 governor of Bosnia); 3. his son Ahmedbeg Šabilić and 4. Ahmed Rüşhić (born 1047 = 1637). The following learned men were natives of Mostar: 1. ‘Ali Dede b. Mujaši (d. 1097 = 1588); 2. Mujaši Ajiyžažade, called Sheyyo (d. 1119 = 1707). Mufti of Mostar, commentator of various works; 3. Ahmed Efendi Mostar (Mostarski, d. 1190 = 1776), whose fetwa (Fetva-ı Ahmed) were very popular in Bosnia, and 4. Mujaši Šiđić (Karabeg), Mufti of Mostar (murdered).
in 1878), whose comprehensive Ḥādiyya ... 'alā Mir'āt al-Ūṣūl was printed in Sarajevo (1316).

A few days after the murder of the last-named, Mostar was taken without resistance by the Austrian troops (Aug. 5, 1878) and on Oct. 5, 1808, annexed to the Danube monarchy, in which it remained till 1918. During these forty years (1878–1918) Mostar was frequently the centre of Muslim (and of Serbian Orthodox) opposition to the government. In Mostar originated also the Muslim agitation for autonomy in religious affairs (cf. i., p. 760), which went on for ten years (1890–1899). The leader of the movement, 'Ali Fahmi Džačić, the then mufti of Mostar, had to escape to Constantinople at the end of January 1902, where he was appointed professor of Arabic literature in the University, in which capacity he published among other things his book Hīrān al-Ṣāḥīb fī Sharh Aṣ'ār al-Ṣāḥīb ( Constantinople 1324). In connection with the struggle for religious autonomy, there was published (from 1906) the Muslim political paper Maṣūmil (in spite of its Arabic title written in the Serbo-Croat language); shortly before the World War, a Muslim periodical, Byer (*Fenir* from 1912) was started in Mostar and a Muslimanska biblioteka (Muslim Library) which attained thirty volumes.

Since the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in 1918, Mostar has belonged to Jugoslavia.

Bibliography: Haddżi Khalif, Rumuli und Bosna, geographically described, transl. by J. V. Hammer, Vienna 1812, p. 175; St. Novaković, Haddżi-Khalif ... o Balkanskom položenju (= Spomenik XVIII of the Roy. Ser. Ac., Belgrad 1892), p. 912; Ewliya Celebi, Seyahat-nâme, Constantinople 1318, ii. 481–486 (cf. also Gl. v. s. m., xx. [1908], 328–332); C. J. Jireček, Die Handelsstrassen und Bergwerke von Serbien und Bosnien während der Mittelalter, Prague 1879, p. 79–89; M. H. Mahbub, Starsa čučurja u Mostaru, in Gl. v. s. m., 1885, part ii. 101–113 (German in Wissenschaft. Mitteilungen aus B. und der H., i. 510–512); C. Pec, Mostar und sein Culturkreis, Leipzig 1891 (with plan); H. Renner, Durch Bosnien und die Herzegowina kreuz und quer, 2nd ed., Berlin 1897, p. 297–316; S. beg Bašagić, Kratka ippo u priložen listovi iz Herzegovine, Sarajevo 1900, p. 184–185 (= list of the Herzegowinian governors); L. Grgjić Bjelokosić, Mostar nekad i sad, reprint from Belgrad, Belgrad 1901; Die österr.-ung. Monarchie in Wort und Bildt: Bosnien und Herzegowina, Vienna 1901, p. 112–120; A. Walisz, Bosnischer Bote für das Jahr 1902 (Sarajevo), p. 224–225; Dr. M. Mandić, Potječanje Bosne i H. Zagreb 1910, p. 45–46; S. beg Bašagić, Bevajši i Herzegovin a u islamskoj književnosti, Sarajevo 1912, s. index; V. K. Konovala, Bosna i Herzegovina, Belgrad 1895, p. 165; V. Corović and M. Filipović, in Naredna enciklopedija, Zagreb 1926–1929, ii. 889; Almanah kraljevine Jugoslavije (Zagreb since 1930), i. 99 and 433–434.

(MOŠUL (AL-MWAYSIL), the capital of Diyar-Rabi‘a [q.v.] on the west bank of the Tigris, opposite the ancient Niniveh. Whether the town already existed in antiquity is unknown. E. Hertfeld (Archäol. Reis., ii. 207, 259) has suggested that Xenophon’s Mērōna reproduces its old name and that we should read

*Mērōna (= Mawsil); but against this view we have the simple fact that this town lay on the east bank of the Tigris (F. H. Weissbach in Pauly-Wissowa, R. E., xv., col. 1164).

The Moslems placed the foundation of the town in mythical antiquity and ascribed it to Rēwand b. Bilawarī Ṣajdaḫja. According to another tradition, its earlier name was Khawālian. The Persian satrapy of Mošul bore the title Būdīl-Ardashīr-šāh, so that the official name of the town was Būdīl-Ardashīr (Le Strange, Eastern Caliphate, p. 87; Hertfeld, op. cit., p. 208). Lastly Bar Bahālī said that an old Persian king gave it the name Bih-horme-Kowdī (G. Hoffmann, Antige aus syr. Akten fers. Māryr., p. 178).

As the metropolis of the diocese of Akhūr, Mošul took the place of Niniveh whither Christianity had penetrated by the beginning of the second century A.D. Rahban Iqāb-yābī called Bar Kūra about 570 A.D. founded on the west bank of the Tigris opposite Niniveh a monastery (still called Mar Iqāb-yā‘) around which Khurāw II built many buildings. This settlement is probably the fortress mentioned in the Syriac chronicle edited by Guidi as Ḥēbūrīyā (mentioning de Hertfeld, “citadel on the opposite bank”) (Nöldeke, S. B. Ab. Wien., xxviii., fasc. ix., 1893, p. 29; Sachau, Chronik von Arbelo, chap. iv., p. 48; Hertfeld, op. cit., p. 208) which later was developed into a town by the Arabs (Chronicle of Sīrīt, at the end).

After the taking of Niniveh by Utbā b. Farkād (20 = 641) in the reign of ‘Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the Arabs crossed the Tigris wherupon the garrison of the fortress on the west bank surrendered on promising to pay the poll-tax and obtained permission to go where they pleased. Under the same caliph, ‘Utbā was dismissed from his post as commander of Mošul and Harthama b. Arfaḏja al-Birīkī succeeded him. The latter settled Arabs in houses of their own, then allotted them lands and made Mošul his own town (muqāl); he also built a Friday Mosque (al-Balādghīrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 332). According to al-Wāṣidī, ‘Abd al-Malik (65–86) appointed his son Sa‘d as governor of al-Mawsīl while he put his brother Muhammad over Armiyā and al-Dijṣafe. According to al-Mu‘tāfī b. Tā‘ūs on the other hand, Muhammad was also governor of Adhurādājūn and al-Mawsīl, and his chief of police Ibn Tala‘id paved the town and built a wall round it (al-Balādghīrī, op. cit.). His son Marwān II is also described as a builder and extender of the town; he is said to have organized its administration and built roads, walls and a bridge of boats over the Tigris (Ibn Fakhrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 138; Yākūt, Mu‘jam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 683–684). The foundation of a Friday Mosque was also ascribed to him. Mošul became under him the capital of the province of al-Dijṣafe.

After Mu‘awwakullī’s death the Khārijīyya Musāwir seized a part of the territory of Mošul and made al-Haddīja his headquarters. The then governor of Mošul, the Khawāyī ‘Abdakan b. Muhammad, was deposed by the Taghlibī Ayyāb b. Abūmd who put his own son ‘Abbās in his place. Soon afterwards the ‘Abbās ‘Abd al-Lāh b. Sulaymān became the governor of al-Mawsīl. The Khārijīyya took the town from him and Musāwir entered into possession of it. Mu‘tāfī appointed the Turkish general Asṭāqīn governor of the town, but in Iṣīmā‘īl 11259 the latter sent his son Asḵārīn there as his
deputy. The latter was soon driven out by the citizens of the town who chose Yahşû b. Sulaimân as their ruler.

Hâshim b. 'Abd Allah whom Aṣṣaghtâ then sent to Mûsûl had to return after achieving nothing. The Taghitli Ishaţ b. Aytâb whom Aṣṣaghtâ sent with 20,000 men against Mûsûl, among whom was Hâmid b. Haamdân, entered Mûsûl after winning a battle, but was soon driven out again.

In 261 the Taghitli Khîlîar b. Ahmad and in 267 Ishaţ b. Kundadîj was appointed governor of Mûsûl by Mu'tâmid. A year after Ishaţ's death, his son Muhammad sent Hârin b. Sulaimân to Mûsûl (279); when he was driven out by the inhabitants he asked the Banû Shâhân for assistance and they besieged the town with him. The inhabitants led by Hârin b. 'Abd Allah and Hâmid b. Haamdân after an initial victory were surprised and defeated and burned by the Shâhân; shortly afterwards Muhammad b. Ishaţ was deposed by the Kûr 'All b. Dâwûd.

When Mu'tâqid became caliph in 279, Hâmidân (the grandfather of Saif al-Dawla) managed to make himself very popular with him at first, but in 282 he rebelled in Mûsûl. When his army was sent by the caliph against him under Yûsuf and Naqût, he escaped while his son Hûsain surrendered. The caliph of Mûsûl was stormed and destroyed and Hâmidân soon afterwards was captured and thrown into prison. Naqût was then ordered to collect tribute in Mûsûl and thus came into conflict with the followers of the Khâridjî Hârin; Hârin was defeated and fled into the desert. In place of Tuk-tamîr, who was imprisoned, the Caliph appointed Hâsan b. 'Alî governor of Mûsûl and sent against Hârin, the main cause of the strife, the Hamdânî Hûsain who took him prisoner in 283. The family thus regained the caliph's favour.

When after the submission of the Khâridjîs, raiding Kurds began to disturb the country round Mûsûl, Muktaft again gave a Hamdânî, namely Hûsain's brother Abu l-'Ishaţâ 'Abd Allah, the task of bringing them to book, as the latter could rely on the assistance of the Taghitli settled around Mûsûl, to whom the Hamdânîs belonged. Abu l-'Ishaţâ came to Mûsûl in the beginning of 293 and in the following year subdued the Kurds whose leader Muhammad b. Bilis submitted and came to live in Mûsûl.

From this time the Hamdânîs [q. v.] ruled Mûsûl, first as governors for the caliph, then from 317 (Naqût al-Dawla Hâsan) as sovereign rulers.

The 'Uqalliida who followed them (386–459) belonged to the tribe of the Bann Ka'b. Their kingdom, founded by Hûsain al-Dawla al-Mu'azzîl, whose independence was recognized by the Byzids, extended as far as Ta'bîk (Ishaţâ), al-Mâlûdîn and Kifâ. In 489 (1005–1006) Mûsûl passed to the Saljûqs.

The town developed considerably under the Atâbeg 'Imâd al-Din Zangî who put an end to the Saljûq rule in 521 (1127–1128). Mûsûl, which was for the most part in ruins was given splendid buildings by him; the fortifications were restored and flourishing gardens surrounded the town. Under one of his successors, 'îzîz al-Din Mas'ûd I, Mûsûl was twice unsuccessfully besieged by Saladin (1182 and 1185). A.D.; after the conclusion of peace 'îzîz al-Din, however found himself forced to recognize Saladin as his suzerain.

The town was at this time defended by a strong citadel and a double wall, the towers of which were washed to the east side by the Tigris. To the south lay a great suburb, laid out by the vizier Muqaddim al-Din Kâ'imâz (d. 595): From 607 his son Ba'dr al-Din Lâlit [q. v.] ruled over Mûsûl first as vizier of the last Zangids and from 631 as an independent ruler. In 642 he submitted to Hûlût and accompanied him on his campaigns, so that Mûsûl was spared the usual sackings. When however his son Malik Shâhîb b. Lâlit joined the Ballârs against the Mongols the town was plundered in 660 (1261–1262); the ruler himself fell in battle (van Berchem, Forschungen f. Töd. Nûlûdâ, 1906, p. 197 sqq.).

The Mongol dynasty of the Kâshârîs succeeded the Ikhânâs in Baghâdah and Sulâh Shâhî Shâhî, Usâin in 766 (1354–1355) incorporated Mûsûl in his kingdom. The world conqueror Timûr not only spared Mûsûl but gave rich endowments to the tombs of Nabi âûs and Nabi Dîjîrî, to which he made a pilgrimage, and restored the bridge of boats between Mûsûl and these holy places.

The Turkman dynasty of the Aq Koyunlû's (founder Baha) al-Din Kâzâ Osząmîn had been appointed governor of Dîyâr Bârîr by Timûr, was followed about 920 (1514–1515) by the Persian Shâshâ. After long fighting the Ottomans in 1647 (1637–1638) finally took the town from them. In 1677 (1667) it was visited by a serious earthquake, in 1756 (1743) besieged by Nâdir Shâh âşfâ'î and heroically defended by Christians and Muslims. It was then under a Pâgha of the local family of the 'Abd al-Dîjîlî who had ruled the town for a long period, fairly independent of the Porte. In the sixteenth century Mûsûl was an unimportant provincial town of the Turkish empire. After the World War the willâyet of Mûsûl after long negotiations was placed in the mandated territory of Irauç. The town has now about 70,000 inhabitants.

The Arab geographers compare its plan to a hexagon (faisûlân), i.e. to an elongated rectangle. Ibn Hawâşî who visited Mûsûl in 358 (968–969) described it as a beautiful town with fertile surroundings. The population in his time consisted mainly of Kurds. According to al-Mađûsi (c. 375–486), the town was very beautifully built. Its plan was in the form of a semi-circle. The citadel was called al-Murâshîbâ's and stood where the Nahr Zâbâû canal joined the Tigris near Ica'lâ or Bâsh Tâbiyya; cf. Hefersd, op. cit., p. 209. Within its walls were a Wednesday market (shâh-al-ez-râz) after which it was sometimes called.

The Friday Mosque built by Marûn stood on an eminence not far from the Tigris to which steps led up. The streets in the market were for the most part roofed over. Al-Mađûsi (op. cit., p. 136) gives the eight main streets of the town (discussed in Herfeldt, op. cit., p. 209). The castle of the caliph (Kâzâ al-Khalîfa) stood on the east bank, half a mile from the town and commanded Nîzâr; in the time of al-Mađûsi it was already in ruins, through which the Nahr al-Khawar flowed.

Ibn Dhu'lláh visited Mûsûl on 22nd–26th Safar 580 (June 4–8, 1184). Shortly before, Nur al-Din had built a new Friday Mosque on the marketplace. At the highest point in the town was the citadel (now Bâsh Tâbiyya); it was known as al-Hadâr, "the hunch-backed", and perhaps as the synonymous al-Dâfûdî (G. Hofmann, Auszüge aus
MOGUL — MOZARABS

mozarabs, the name given in the middle ages to those christians who lived in districts under Muslim rule and bore the stamp of Spanish Moorish culture. The term comes from the Arabic musa'abīh, the meaning of which is exactly that of the Spanish mozarabes; the Arabic form itself is found in documents in the archives of medieval Spain.

We know that in principle at the time of conquest the new subjects of the Muslim conquerors could either adopt Islam or continue to profess their own faith, in the latter case falling into the category of tributaries (aljuma; q. v.). The early Arab rulers of Spain showed considerable tolerance in this connection and the treaties of capitulation were definite on this point, at least if we may judge by one of them of which the text has been preserved and which was concluded between the Visigoth Theodemir, lord of the district of Murcia [q. v.], and 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Musa b. Nuṣair. This attitude of Spanish Islam to the Christians hardly altered in the centuries following until the coming of the Almoravids and Almohads. It is true there were occasional anti-Christian reactions under the first Umayyads which found vent in persecution. But these persecutions seem to have been dictated by political considerations rather than by the fanaticalism of individual rulers. The Christian communities of the large towns were the most active nurseries of the nationalist movements which broke out in Spain mainly in the ninth century. Among the most important we may mention that led by the Mozarab 'Omar b. Hāṣīm [q. v.], which passed far beyond the limits of a purely religious movement.

At Cordova in particular a few illuminati had to be sent to the scaffold because they insulted the religion of the Prophet. The Muslim judges seem to have sentenced them to the supreme penalty with considerable reluctance and the central authorities took the initiative in summoning a council, so that the church itself put a stop to the demonstrations of certain mystics like Eulogio and Alvaro.

In any case in the tenth century the Mozarabs of the caliphate were living in harmony with all classes of Muslim society and were themselves considerably influenced by Arab culture. They spoke Arabic, just as the Muslims spoke the Romance language, and were acquainted with Islamic literature. The reciprocal influences were therefore considerable and were to continue so till the end of the middle ages.

As regards administration, the Christian communities of Muslim Spain under the Umayyads were under the direct authority of officials chosen by themselves from their own number and appointed with the approval of the Muslim authorities. Their head, who is sometimes given the Latin title of defender or protector, was most frequently called Count (Comes, Sp. Comte, Ar. qānīn). The taxes which the Christians had to pay were collected by an agent called excepitor. To settle their differences they had a special judge (Ar. ḥāqī 'l-maqāra or ḥāqī 'l-ḥanūm, Lat. canon) who administered the Visigothic code (Elder Justinus, later the Fuero Jusgo).

The Christian communities of Cordova and Seville were among the most important but were less important than that of Toledo, which was during the caliphate the residence of the metropolitan (maqāra) of Spain. The clergy were under bishops (muhaf). Public worship was celebrated.
in the churches; there were monasteries (dair) with monks (râhil) in the neighbourhood of the larger towns: for example that of Armilâ (Guadalmellato) near Cordova.

The history of the Mozarabs of Spain is of course closely connected with the political history of Islam in Spain and with the "reconquista". But its development is mainly interesting as throwing light on the peculiar culture of Moorish Spain which remained alive even after the fall of Muslim power. The recent publication of a considerable number of documents from the archives of the cathedral of Toledo mainly of the 12th and 13th centuries enables us to estimate how great was the arabisation of all classes in reconquered Spain, which we find influencing civil, military and economic institutions and even ecclesiastical ritual (Mozarab rite). It is similarly to the Mozarab communities and their representatives who went to the north of the Peninsula that we must attribute the origin of a special art, Mozarab art, directly derived from Cordovan art and characterized by almost regular use of the horse-shoe arch and the vault.


(M. LÉVI-PROVENCE)

MSHATTÂ, a ruined palace in Transjordania.

Description of the building. The ruins of al-Mshattâ (the winter camp) lie east of the Jordan about 130 miles south of Damascus and 25 east of the northern shore of the Dead Sea, near the Darb al-Hadid, the pilgrims' road from Damascus to Medina and Mecca. It consists of a rectangular outer wall, defended by towers at the corners, each side being 157 yards long. The entrance gateway is in the centre of the south side and is flanked by two pentagonal half-towers rising out of an octagonal base, across which runs as far as the next round towers the long frieze 16 feet high and over 45 yards long, which has for the most part been taken to Berlin and which made Mshattâ a world-famous monument of early Muslim architecture and decorative art and a much discussed centre of interest in Oriental archaeology. The building of the whole area with the part where the battle was fought was planned in three sections of which however only the central one was carried through, at least in part. This again is divided into three parts: the entrance area, the central rectangular outer court and the royal residence. The plan by B. Schults (ed., Jahrbuch d. preuss. Kunstsammlungen, vol. xxv., 1904) shows a gateway and an entrance hall, both of which were intended to be vaulted, and a series of surrounding rooms, of which the oblong room to the right of the entrance has been said by Herzfeld and others to be a mosque because it has a niche in it which is taken to be a mihrab. Only the foundations of the parts stand still and the damage to the walls of this part however are still standing. In the large quadrangular court on the western side is a water-basin built of brick and traces of a second one mentioned by Tristram on the opposite side, so that Schults thought there were originally intended to be four for the sake of symmetry. The palace consists of a great hall with three aisles, a domed chamber and the living rooms at the sides. The long walls are about five feet high, of blocks of limestone and above that of brick (21 x 21 and 27 x 27, 65 cm. thick). The rooms at the sides to the left and right of the great hall with its three aisles, are all barrel-vaulted; the smaller vaultings still exist and, like the relieving arches of the doors, are remarkable for their pointed arches. Schults was able to reconstruct the façade which had fallen and was still lying on the ground. It consisted of three round arches on pillars corresponding to the three aisles. The hall was divided into three sections by pillars of which a few shafts and a Corinthian capital with painting and remains of gilding have been found. Holes and gutters at the bases and on the shafts suggested to Schults that the columns had originally been taken from another building and used again here. The horizontal termination of the façade also shows that this hall was intended to have a flat, and not a sloping roof, or actually had one. To give it its height the two supporting rows of pillars had a second story of pillars placed upon them, an arrangement usual in Syrian architecture also. The quadrangular hall of audience and ceremonial, entered from the oblong hall by a second door, was covered by a dome and three half domes of brick, all of which have collapsed. Dovetailing on the inside of the palace walls shows that it was intended to build on to the sides of the palace dwellings for soldiers and other retainers. On the evidence of these projections from the wall, Schults has prepared his reconstruction of the plan of these wings. The quadrangular surrounding walls with the round towers had barely been half built when the half-finished work was abandoned. The principal motive of the great frieze at the part of the wall containing the main gateway is a zigzag pattern in high relief which forms 44 half triangles. These triangular areas are, wherever the frieze was finished, thickly covered with tendrils in low relief. In the central part of the pairs of interlocking perpendicular and suspended triangles, bosses are set in high relief decorated with acanthus rosettes. The socket of the frieze is in the form of a modified Attic base consisting of a plinth and two toruses. The border which frames the frieze at the sides and above consists of a leaf kyma at the foot and a second larger crowning it. According to Schults photography, before the frieze was removed, the half left to the door up to the main border was finished but the right half only up to half-height of the frieze.

The patterns of foliage in the fields of the triangles show great variety. Here we follow the scheme of the official publication in the Jahrb.
d. præn. Kunstzümmungen, xxv. (1904), pl. viii.

The triangles A and B have within circles vines with birds picking grapes; in the apex of triangle A there is also a Chinese fabulous animal with a human head such as was very popular in Chinese sepulchral plastic art. In C the circles are interlaced and lotus flowers appear in addition to the vine tendrils. In D - I the vines which are here more realistic grow out of vases which are flanked by lions and winged griffins; buffaloes, panthers, lynxes and gazelles also relieve the foliage. In triangle J the tendrils grow straight out of the ground; this area also has the remarkable addition of men picking the grapes. Triangle L is the first right of the door and is the last to contain animals. The areas of the triangles of the right half show a quite different style. M - T have, it is true, still vines but of the greatest, lace-like delicacy and closeness of pattern which varies from triangle to triangle. U and V lastly are filled with palm-leaves and cone-shaped figures instead of vines and crowned with spirals.

Form and purpose of the building.

The plan is that of a ʿāqīya, i.e. the Arab type of camp, reproduced in building materials, and so called after the Lakhmids capital, with the prince’s tent or house on the central axis just as is described by Masʿūdī in his account of Sāmarrāʾ (cf. E. Hersfeld, Erster vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen van Samarra, Berlin 1912, p. 39 sq.). Māḥattā, Ukhkhirij and Sāmarrāʾ are descendants of this eastern type of palace. Just as the form could only be recognised as typical after the examination of Ukhkhirij in the Iraq and by the excavation of Sāmarrāʾ, so it was the investigation of H. Lammens that first elucidated the purpose of these buildings (La Bâtole et La Hirâ tous les Oméyâdes, in M.F.O., iv). Following Lammens, Hersfeld explained Māḥattā as a ʿāqīya [q. v.], i.e. a country palace which was built in the form of a ʿāqīya for an Umayyad as an occasional residence.

History of exploration, bibliography and date. After its first discovery by H. B. Tristram in 1872, Māḥattā was explained by his archaeological adviser J. Ferguson as a ʿAṣāfīn palace, built by Khurrwā II after his conquest of Syria in 614 A.D. It found a place in literature with this description in Tristram's The Land of Moab (London 1873). It was not till about the end of the century that Māḥattā became a subject of archaeological study and discussion when it was visited in 1898 by A. Musil and soon afterwards examined by R. E. Britmow and A. v. Domaszewski and published in their Provincia Arabia (1904-1909). In the meanwhile the Prussian expedition sent to take it down under B. Schula had already been there and the Berlin publication by Schula and Strzygowski appeared in the Jahrb. d. præn. Kunsts., 1904. To Professor Strzygowski is due the credit of having urged W. Bode to bring the façade to Berlin. Thanks to the interest displayed by the Emperor. William II in the plan and his friendly relations with Sulṭān 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, the latter, with the traditional generosity of an Oriental despot, gave the German Emperor a present of this ornament of the desert. As a result of his study of the architecture and decoration, Strzygowski dated Māḥattā between 720 and 660 A.D. M. v. Berchem with Clermont-Ganneau and Dunant decided on historical grounds for the Lakhmīd dating, i.e. that it was built as early as the

fourth century A. D. (Aux pays de Moab et d'Edom, iv., J. S., 1909, p. 401-408) while Britmow and Musil assumed a Ghassānīd origin. On the other hand in his review of Strzygowski (Z. Ä., xix., 1905-1906, p. 419 sqq. and Islamstudien, p. 276 sqq.), C. H. Becker championed the Umayyad dating, which E. Hersfeld in his Geœnis der islam. Kunst und des Māḥattāproblems (I. I., 1910, p. 27-63 and 105-144) supported with evidence from the history of art, and was strengthened by the appearance at the same time in M. F. O. B., iv., 1910, p. 91-112 of H. Lammens' study Bâtole et Hirâ. This Umayyad dating was defended by Māḥattā, Hirâ und Māḥattâ (J. d. præn. Kunsts., 1921) and finally crowned his work with the discovery of an inscription drawn up by Walid II himself recording repairs done by him; Walid II was murdered after a year's reign (126 = 743-744) and work on the building was not completed. This attribution found further support in a story quoted by H. Lammens (in J. Â., 1915) from Ibn al-Muṣaffâʾ, according to which Walid II was murdered by a man named ʿIbr̄ūrī while building a "town" in the desert, which was to bear his name. Lammens identifies this town with Māḥattā. Recently the Syrian desert palaces were again thoroughly investigated by the two fathers and teachers of the École Biblique St. Étienne in Jerusalem, Javausen and Savignac (Mission Arch. en Arabia III. Les châteaux Arabes de Querim Amra, Haran,ACH et Tabi, 2 vols., Paris 1922). As regards ʿAbd and Mahattā the two students came to the same conclusion, namely that they belong to the same period. As it seemed to them impossible to attribute them to the Umayyad period, they attributed them to the pre-Islamic period; as both buildings were left unfinished, they must have been built towards the end of a dynasty or kingdom. The discovery of idols at Mahattā also, they said, prevented its being attributed to the Umayyad period (cf. Diez, Die Kunst d. islamischen Volker, 11th. ed., 1926, p. 153).

Establishment of the Umayyad date of Māḥattā. The archaeological material at Strzygowski's disposal when he wrote on Māḥattā in 1904 was still insufficient for the proper appreciation of the historical position. It is not yet possible to have a complete conception of Umayyad art. Hersfeld who knew the lands in question by long residence and frequent travels was able six years later to approach the problem from much more solid premises. The most important monument from which deductions could be drawn was the Mihrāb of the Djamāʾ al-Khâṣṣakī, discovered by Sarre and Hersfeld in the meanwhile in Baghdad, which must be either pre- or early 'Abbāsid, and the decoration of which formed a parallel to that of Māḥattā (J. Â., i. 33 sq. and plate 1). The explanation of the niche in the chamber right of the gateway as a mihrāb had to be decisively rejected and indeed less emphasis had been laid on it by Hersfeld than by superlicial writers on the question for whom the "mihrāb" meant an easy proof of their point. Schula had previously ascertained on the spot that this niche is not a mihrāb, and a study of the plan and Schula's measurements shows a piece of masonry jutting 65 cm. out of the wall, containing a niche 1.62 m. broad and 1.48 deep. The fact that the mihrāb is never in a projection from the wall an exception
would prove nothing) as well as the breadth of the niche which would be exceptional, even in very large mosques of late date (such a depth is hardly ever found anywhere), prove that this can only be a tribunal niche or something of the kind.  

Kaş al-Tuba has in its south wall four similar semi-circular apse-like niches about 10 feet broad, which surely no Muslim archaeologist would claim as mihrabs.  

Mshattá, however, does not require such illusive evidence to prove its Umayyad date.  

The conclusive proofs are found in the variety of material used and architectural styles, in the application of the principles of the minor arts to the decoration of buildings, already noticed but not correctly interpreted by Strzygowski, and the variety of styles in the areas of the triangles which fall into four groups.

The combination of Ḥarrāk brickwork with Syrian stonework in the royal residence proves the cooperation of different groups of workmen working on the system of conscription which was revived by the Umayyads. The construction of the brick arches is also Ḥarrāk in form and, besides, they are pointed arches which were unknown before the beginning of the seventh century, so that it is impossible to put the date before 650 A.D. It was only in the early Muslim period that their use spread. We find Syrian tors profiles on the basilical building and North Mesopotamian profiles on the frieze. The pillars in the basilical hall are taken from older buildings as was the custom wherever possible in the early Muslim period. In the pre-Mahmudan period neither wooden frames in the arches nor material from older buildings were used (Hersfeld).

On the significance of the decorative façade we may add a little to Strzygowski's and Hersfeld's observations. Two points were hardly touched on in the previous discussion: that the frieze is to be considered and understood not only as the basis of a great façade which was planned but was never finished, and the origin of this system of decoration from Persian textile art, which alone could supply the foundation for it and explain the sudden appearance of this completely new world hitherto unknown in architectural ornamentation. The façade proper, planned above this architectural border, would have contained a pattern on a much larger scale just as we see on carpets. The thousand-fold opposed groups of animals still to be found on Russian carpets and textiles influenced from Persia and the Caspian of the seventh-sixth centuries and the zigzag friezes filled with tendrils each with a cypress (in place of a roseate) in the centre show the popularity and wide distribution and permanence of this motive. When it was taken over for architectural decoration, the popular textile forms, however, were translated into the traditional forms of the art of the land and time. This explains the different stylistic execution of the same plan by the stone-masons.

This historic breach with tradition, this surprising control over a differently oriented artistic tendency presupposes a radical change and reorganization of society and outlook. An artistic creed so perfect and complete in itself cannot possibly be explained by the ambition of some upstart of a desert sheikh but it presupposes in addition to enormous wealth and far-reaching power a highly trained artistic sense, which was only possible at the time of the Umayyad Court and actually existed there, as we know from many sources. Only a passionate builder and lover of architecture could visualize such a work and only at a court filled with scholars, poets and artists from all countries could the plans for it be drawn up. This illuminating empaniment from the Hellenistic façade with its pillar ed niches only be explained as the expression of a new outlook rooted in religion and proudly conscious of its quite different ideals, as was the case with young Islam. For the first time, the new teaching was given artistic expression, in a design on a figured ground, which was to develop into the frieze of inscriptions on the façades in Khārijid in the 14th century (cf. Diez, Churunichi Badanmā'ter, Pl. 182/2).

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(E. Diez)

**MU’ADHDHIN.** [See MA’RJDJ, I, H, 4 and ADHAN.]

**AL-MU‘A‘IYAD.** [See HISHM II.]

**AL-MALIK AL-MU‘A‘IYAD SA‘IR AL-DIN, Shaikh al-Mahmūd (so-called after his first owner) al-Khāṣṣāk (member of the bodyguard), a Cariassian by birth, was brought as a slave to Cairo and purchased by the Abu Bakr. When the latter became Sultan in 588 (1192) he gave him freedom, put him in the corps of pages (qāmūdar, q.v.), moved him to the corps of cup-bearers (ṣūrā, q.v.) and later appointed him to the bodyguard (khāṣṣāk, whence his nickname). Bakr's son, Nasr Faraj (q.v.), on his accession in 801 (1409) appointed him emir of a thousand and in the following year governor of Tripoli. He served as a troop commander in the battle of Damascus against Timūr, was taken prisoner, soon after his release again became governor of Tripoli and later of Damascus. The reign of Sultan Faraj was a period of uninterrupted fighting between the Sultan and his governors and Shaikh was always in the midst of intrigues; often he was on the Sultan's side, more often in rebellion against him. His relations with his rival, the powerful governor Nevwir, were similar. Finally the Sultan succumbed to the emirs, was deposed and put to death; the caliph ʿAbbas b. Muhammad al-Mustaʿin succeeded him in 815 (1412). This governor Shaikh who was in Cairo at the time, was appointed first minister (miṣlān al-emlāl) and retained power by filling all available offices with his followers. A rebellion of the Egyptian Beduins gave a pretext for deposing the Sultan al-Mustaʿin. The emirs demanded that a man of vigour should occupy the throne and in Shāhān of the same year chose Shaikh as Sultan. While he encountered no difficulties in Egypt, the governors of the Syrian provinces refused to recognise him. He had himself to go to Syria to bring them to reason. He gradually succeeded in taking one after the other prisoner, and after he had executed his chief enemy Nevwir his throne was secure. The last rebellion in 818 (1415) he put down with comparative ease.

The defeat of the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid in 804 (1402) by Timūr and the civil strife in the Manṣūr land had been utilised by the neighbouring rulers in the buffer-states between Egypt and the Ottoman empire to capture a number of towns and fortresses in southern Asia Minor up to a line Laren-luna-Ablun-lain, which had previously been under Manṣūr rule. Sultan Shaikh considered it as his duty to recapture these fortresses and again force these former vassals to recognise
his suzerainty in order to give his kingdom the necessary strength to resist its enemy, the Ottoman Sultan, and to protect the northern frontiers against the plundering raids of the Turkomans. The first campaign took place in 820 (1418). In spite of repeated demands, the prince Mahammad b. 'Ali of the house of Karamans would not surrender the town of Tarsus, which he had taken, although he was ready to recognize the Sultan's suzerainty on the coins and in the khatba. The Sultan set out from Cairo, receiving in Syria envoys from the families of Dhu l-Qādīrī, Kāramān and Rāmādān, who brought the submission of their chiefs. Malatya, Abulustain, Darenda and Tarsa were successively occupied, then Beheesah, Kahta and Karaks west of the Euphrates; the citadels of the two last-named were besieged, but the siege was raised when the commanders recognised the suzerainty of the Sultan. In the following year, a dangerous enemy of the Sultan, Karaz Yusaif, chief of the Black Sheppard, invaded Northern Syria in his pursuit of Karaz Yelek, chief of the White Sheppard (both called after their banners), plundered the towns in the N.W. of the Mamlik empire but then returned to Baghdad. The Sultan's successes were rendered useless by his return to Egypt, as the Syrian governors did not succeed in retaking the citadels. The Sultan therefore sent his son Ibrahim with a strong army to Asia Minor. The latter reached Kaisariya, appointed friendly chiefs as governors, while several hostile chiefs were taken prisoners and put to death and others slain in their flight. Ibrahim himself returned to Cairo in triumph but died there in 823 (1421) to the great grief of his father (the story that the latter poisoned him out of jealousy of his fame is absurd). Karaz Yusaif was threatening the eastern frontier, but he had to turn his attention to his enemies, a rebellious son and Timur's grandson Shah Rukh, and at the end of the year he was poisoned. The Sultan himself had suffered for years from an affection of the foot; his illness (probably inflammation) became so serious that he could scarcely leave his bed. He had installed his eighteen months' old son as his successor and his entourage formed a kind of regency. His death took place on the 8th Muḥarram 828 (Jan. 14, 1427). His kingdom was secure, the frontiers consolidated, but at home there was a lack of order. Beduins were plundering the country and Alexander was not infrequently exposed to attacks from the sea by Frankish pirates. Offices were freely sold and the people suffered much from the extortions of the officials. From time to time the Sultan deprived high officials of the profits of their extortions or imposed severe punishments on them. Taxes oppressed the country. The Sultan himself was brave and to the end of his life fulfilled his duties as a ruler in spite of his painful affliction — he had frequently to be carried. Although he led a life of pomp and gave popular entertainments, fireworks and feasts with great splendour, he was nevertheless a pious and humble Muslim, who in times of famine and pestilence took part in prayers in the penitential garb of the Sultan on the bare ground and like a pious Muslim observed a three days' fast in times of drought. He was harsh on Jews and Christians, dismissed them from government offices where they had clerical and administrative posts, and punished them in addition. The old strict regulations about dress were again enforced and all kinds of humiliations heaped on the "unbelievers".


AL-MU'AIYAD FI 'L-DĪN, ABU NAṢR HIRAT ALiKh B. ABU 'IMRĀN MUB'S B. DAWŪD AL-Sūfī, a Fiṭḥīm dā'ī of high rank, d. 470 (1087). At the beginning of his mission al-Mu'ayyad propagated the Ismā'īlī doctrine in the East, especially in Shiraz. He succeeded in converting the Buwayhid amir Abū Kālāhḏar [q.v.], but on account of opposition at home he went to Baghdaḏ and Mawlawi, and thence to Cairo, where he was received after some time at the court of al-Mustansir bi l-Dīn [q.v.]. He now became chief dā'ī and kāb of the Ismā'īlīs, and was probably in relations with the other great dā'ī Nāṣir-i Khusraw [q.v.]. Al-Mu'ayyad was sent in command of an army to help al-Baṣṣārī [q.v.] against the Turkomans. With his assistance al-Baṣṣārī inflicted a severe defeat on the Turkomans at Sīdjaḏ, took Baghdaḏ, and read the ḥutta in the name of the Fiṭḥīm Caliph. Al-Mu'ayyad was also in direct communication with the leaders of the Fiṭḥīm da'wa in Yaman. In addition to his capacities as a general he was possessed of great literary ability and a poet of no mean talent. His dīnān, which consists of panegyrics on the Fiṭḥīm Imāms al-Mustansir and al-Zahir, deals partly with philosophical subjects. Another important work, al-Mafā'Ili, contains 800 "assemblees," dealing with different theological and philosophical questions, including his correspondence with the poet-philosopher Abu 'l-'Ibl al-Mu'ārī [q.v.] on the subject of vegetationism (see D. S. Margoliouth, in J. F. A. S. [1902], 289 sqq.). His autobiographical work, al-Sirā, gives a detailed account of his mission in Shiraz and his admission to the court of al-Mustansir, and is carried down to 451 (1059). Besides being one of the few autobiographies in Arabic literature, it is of considerable interest for the history of the Buwayhids and their relations with the Fiṭḥīmīs. The MSS. of these works are preserved in some collections of Ismā'īlī works in Yaman and India.

separable comrade of Bayarid. When Sultan Mehmed heard from various sources, especially from a complaint in verse by Hājim Lutf Allah, Kādi of Siwās, who had been gravely insulted by the envoys of the prince, of alleged abuses at the prince’s court, especially the enforcement of the Quṣṭuğīchtī (zubārī, az-zubārī, az-zubārī), he sent a commission of enquiry which arrived in Amasiā when the prince was with Mu’ayyad on a pleasure trip to Ladiq. The result of the enquiry was the issue of an order for the execution of the two chief culprits, one of whom was Mu’ayyad (this hümûn-i hürfi is given in Feridūn, Mejam‘ūs-i Mīnâshāh, Constantinopole 1274, i. 270-271). From a note by Mu’ayyad in a book bought by him during his stay in Ladiq in Rabī‘ I 882 (June 1477) (the Zīd of Shems al-Din) the date is exactly fixed, as it was then in Feridūn should therefore be altered from 884 to 885; cf. Husam al-Din, Amaṣsī Tâṭhatī, Istanbul 1927, iii. 230 note 1). Mu’ayyad, receiving timely warning of the fate threatening him, escaped from Amasiā, provided with everything necessary by Bayarid, and after a short stay in Halab went to Dābūzār, where he completed his theological studies under the celebrated Dilāšt al-Din al-Dawwānī. When Mu’ayyad returned home, on hearing of Bayarid’s accession, he received an iǧālu (teacher’s diploma) from Dābūzānī. In 887 (1483) he reached Amasiā where his father had died three months earlier. After staying six weeks he went to Constantinople where his extensive learning soon gained him a reputation among the theologians. Bayarid appointed him miṣnur (rasselm) of the Kalenderkhāne-mechet in Constantinople. In 891 (1486) Mu’ayyad married the daughter of the famous legist Muṣlih al-Din Kandilīl (Mawâlim Kandilīl) who was the last Kādi-asker of the general of the Turkish empire and after the reforms by which this office was divided became Kādi-asker of Rumelia. Mu’ayyad had a brilliant career: in 899 (1494) he became Kādi of Adrianopole; in 907 (1501) Kādi-asker of Anatolia; in 910 (1504–1505) Kādi-asker of Rumelia and head of all the “alamāt”. In 917 (1511) the Janissaries who had taken the part of prince Seïlim plundered his house because his sympathies were with Ahmad, the favourite son of Bayarid. He himself was dismissed by the new sultan Sulṭân under pressure from the Janissaries. Seïlim I soon after his accession recalled however him to his old office as he saw in him the right man to carry through the important duties of a Kādi-asker. Seïlim took him with him on his campaign to Persia against Shīh Ismā‘īl. But on the way back Mu’ayyad was deprived of his office in Čoban Sūprī, as symptoms of a mental breakdown had begun to show themselves (920 = 1514). He died in 922 (1517) in Constantinople and was buried in Eiyrb. Mu’ayyad wrote a number of treatises on law and theology especially on Kū’rān exegesis. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 227 and Russel Mehmed Tāhir, Oğuzmâni Mu‘allafleri, Istanbul 1933, i. 355, gives a list of his works that survive in MS. Under the nom-de-plume of Khātemi, Mu’ayyad also wrote poetry in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. His great service to Turkish literature lies however less in his own original work than in the magnificent liberality with which he encouraged rising young talent, like the poets Nījrāt and Zāhu, the historians Kemâl-Paşa Zāde and Muḥyī al-Din Mehmûd, the jurist Abū ‘l-Ṣā‘īd and others. Mu’ayyad was also famed as a calligraphist. He was the first Ottoman to form a private library of over 7,000 volumes, a huge figure for the time.


**MU‘AYYID AL-DAWLA, ABU MANŞER RUYA B. KUKN AL-DAWLA, Bâyid governor born in Qumâda II 330 (= February-March 942), died in Djjurjûn in Shâbâb 373 (January-February 984). See the article Fâzîl AL-DAWLA, AL-MU‘AKHKHİR. [See ALLÂH, ill.]**

**MU‘AMMĀ, q. v. AGRAM, sometimes charade, a kind of enigma propounded in verse and rarely in prose; its meaning is made "blind" or obscure with the object of misleading the wits and the eye. It is formed by designating one or more words by various allusions to the letters forming it or them or by allusions relating to the pronunciation: the alphabetic value, the numeral value of the letters, misinterpretation or inversion (jawš). Very frequently no notice is taken of the vowels or of letters only connected with the spelling. Good taste is the rule.

There are several varieties of mu‘ammâ which will be found enumerated in the works given in the Bibliography.

The invention of the mu‘ammâ is attributed to Khalīl b. Ahmad, the inventor of proosy, while the Persians of course attribute it to ‘Alî b. Abî Tâlib. The following is an example of a mu‘ammâ on the name Fâzîl: Awwalân bârîllich inđâf, bâkîrî ‘l-tâbîî tâbîî, qaṣîrî ‘l-bâkîî, ‘l-bâkîî ‘l-bâkîî, wa-‘amînî ‘l-tâbîî ‘l-tâbîî wa-‘amînî ‘l-tâbîî ‘l-tâbîî. Its first is the third of [the word] mu‘ammâ (apple) = A; and the fourth of [the word] tuďhâ (apples) is its second = B; and the first of [the word] mu‘ammâ (apple) is its third = C; and the last of [the word] word (rose) is the remainder of it = D. Here is a Persian example on the word tutkî: Nâm-i Butam an mîk ìrtişt, haff att ìhàrîst ìrtişt, a word which is the name of my lady, this (woman) fair as the moon, is seen in Persian and Arabic. The word tutkî divided into two gives two written in Arabic means “six” and “five” which in Persian means “one”, whence we have 6 + 5 = 7.

MU'AWIYA, the first Umayyad caliph, son of Abi Sufyân [q. v.] and Hind [q. v.], was born in Mecca in the first decade of the seventh century A. D. Under the training of his father, the most influential personage in, if not the actual leader of the merchant republic of Mecca, he had an opportunity to be initiated into the principles of government as the Meccans understood it. Converted to Islam in the year of the fiṭrah or surrender of Mecca, he made himself useful to the Prophet in the capacity of secretary. Here he gained an insight into the workings of the new regime and learned to know the men with whom he was later to work or struggle: the autocratic 'Omar, the presumptuous 'Ali, a whole crowd of ambitious people, like Talhâ, Zubair and 'Aâishâ, sometimes redoubtable for their talents and capacity for intrigue, like 'Amr b. al-As [q. v.], and Maghâra b. Shu'â' [q. v.]. This dual training early matured the young Mu'awiyah who was remarkably gifted, and prepared him from the first for his high destiny.

In the caliphate of Abû Bakr he was sent to the conquest of Syria as second in command to his brother Yazîd; in this new field he displayed an astonishing activity and distinguished himself by military successes, like the taking of Damascus and other cities of the Phœnician coast. On the premature death of Yazîd, he took his place as governor of Damascus. In 'Omar's reign, with the addition of Arab armies, he added to this office the governorships of the other provinces of Syria. 'Othmân, who was related to him, confirmed him in these offices and still further increased his authority. Mu'awiyah gained the attachment of those under him and established in Syria during the twenty years of his governorship a model province, the best organized, and with the best disciplined troops of the young empire. Not having been able to prevent the assassination of 'Othmân, he was able cleverly to take upon himself the task of avenging him. This was to lead him to the caliphate and bring him into open conflict with 'Ali. Delaying his attack, he let his rival use up his forces and lose his prestige in civil strife and conflicts with the dissenters ('Othmânīya, q. v.) and others, who accused him of complicity in the murder of his predecessor. The Indecisive battle of Siffin [q. v.] resulted in the arbitration of Adhâb [q. v.]. In pronouncing that 'Ali should lose the caliphate, the verdict restored to Mu'awiyah liberty of movement. He had won over 'Amr b. al-'As to his side and at once used this valuable supporter for the conquest of Egypt. Encouraged by his military and diplomatic successes, he allowed his troops to proclaim him caliph and continuously harassed the provinces that still recognised 'Ali. Ibn Munam's crimes removed the last obstacle separating him from the throne. Mu'awiyah profited by it to inaugurate his reign in Jerusalem. To him the title of caliph merely meant official recognition of a fait accompli, the result of twenty years of labour and devotion to those under his governorship in Syria. To law-abiding men, he alone seemed capable of putting an end to the anarchy in which the empire had been struggling for more than ten years. In the course of a rapid campaign in the 'Irak in 41 (661), he acquired from Ħasan b. 'Alī a definite renunciation of his family's claims. The submission of the provinces to the east of the Tigris restored the unity of the caliphate. This
year is known as the year of reunion (al-`amādiyya).

One man continued to sustain in Persia the flag of the Abāsids, Ziyād b. Abī Isām [q.v.]. Mu’āwiyah won him over by a bribery procedure by which he recognised him as his half-brother, son of Abī Sufyān. This bold stroke secured him the support of the abest of the governors of the caliphate, a worthy rival of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ and Mughīrā b. Shābūs, already supporters of the caliph. Against the combination of these four brains all the plots hatched by the anti-Umayyad opposition were to come to nothing. On the death of Mughīrā, Ziyād added the governorship of Kūfa to his own of Basra and for eight years ruled the whole of the eastern provinces. By his ability and loyalty, Ziyād showed himself most worthy of the confidence placed in him. Freed from anxiety about this half of the empire, Mu’āwiyah devoted his energies to the pacification and development of the prosperity of other parts of his vast empire and to removing the traces of the long struggle from which it had emerged. He organized the Arab navy while his lieutenants actively pursued the work of foreign conquest. He took Cyprus and Rhodes and on two occasions his son Yazīd closely blockaded Constantinople. His great work was the creation of the Syrian army of troops blindly devoted to their sovereign. It formed the great military reserve of the empire for its successors, an inestimable nursery of soldiers and leaders. He was able to keep it in training by annual invasions of Byzantine territory: raids on a large scale rather than campaigns with a definite plan of conquest. By thus keeping the enemy engaged at home, he managed to defend his own frontiers very efficaciously. Taken at a disadvantage during his tense struggle with ‘Abīs by an invasion of the Mandäites [q.v.], he did not hesitate to purchase the withdrawal of those adventurers from the emperor. If after his elevation to the caliphate he rarely left Damascus — henceforth the official capital — to lead his armies in person, he nevertheless was still the "real organiser of victory". He saw to the comfort and equipment of the troops, doubled their pay and saw that they were paid with a regularity hitherto unknown. His rival ‘Ali said that on the call of Mu’āwiyah the Syrian army "would take the field without demanding pay, not two or three times a year only, wherever it pleased its leaders to take them". His intuition everywhere chose the ablest administrators, the best leaders among the Karājā and other tribes. To the names already mentioned we may add those of Daḥḥāk b. Kās, Abī l-‘Awār al-Sulami, Muslim b. ‘Uqba, Bāz b. Abī ‘Arjūr, Ḥabīb b. Maslama [q.v.]. By the help of enormous subsidies and by his magnanimity he was able to keep the members of the Prophet’s family, the ‘Alids and the Hashimites, quiet: Ibn ‘Abbās and Ibn Dī‘ār, ‘Āqīl, the brother, and *the two Ḥasan*, al-‘Hassanī, the sons of ‘Ali. He used the business experience of the Sarǧūnids to organise the financial administration. This fiscal reform gave him the resources required to maintain his armies, carry out desirable public works and pay the subsidies necessary to secure the success of his plans. He continuously interested himself in agriculture. He paid special attention to the development of the province least favoured by nature, the Ḥijāz. His example, which was copied by his relations and most influential contemporaries, brought this region a century of prosperity under the Umayyads such as it was never to see again. In the lands of Medina and Mecca and ‘Jāfī, Mu’āwiyah carried out great irrigation schemes, sank wells and built dams.

In Syria he strengthened his authority by a close alliance with the fellow-tribemen of his Khalīt wife Maisīn [q.v.] and through them with the other tribes of Ḥijāz and those from the Yemen; these groups formed the bulk of the Arab population of Syria. It was on these foundations that the hegemony exercised by Syria throughout the Umayyad period was built and consolidated. His policy towards Christians was a tolerant one. Lastly, he endeavoured to train his son Yazīd to be an heir capable of continuing his traditions of government, by checking certain tendencies of his well endowed but impetuous nature with its fondness for pleasure. Seeing his end approaching, he skillfully succeeded in getting Yazīd recognised as his successor, first of all in Syria and then in other provinces. These difficult negotiations were the last of his political successes. Mu’āwiyah was now entering on the twentieth year of his caliphate, in 60 (Oct. 679) and probably was in the 80th year of a life which had been marked by constant success. By the year 3 or 4 — contrary to the assertion of Ibn Durādī (Kitāb al-‘ibād, p. 256) — he must have reached manhood, for four years later he was secretary to the Prophet. In the course of the forty years of his public career, no serious check ever interrupted his progress. After the abdication of Ḥasan b. ‘Ali, he had *reigned without a rival, without losing any of the conquests of Islam*. Neither ‘Abd al-Mallāh, nor Ma‘ṣūr, nor Ḥārūn al-Ra‘shīd earned this praise, unique in the annals of Islam" (Dhahabī). He died at Damascus in the month of Ṣajdah of the year 60 (April 680) and was buried in the cemetery of Bāb al-Ṣaghīr where his tomb still survives. Before his death he entrusted the regency to Daḥḥāk b. Kās and to Muslim b. ‘Uqba until Yazīd should return from Anatolia. Companion and secretary of the Prophet, brother of Abū l-Ḥāfīz b. Ḥabīb [q.v.], "the mother of the believers", these claims have not preserved him from the hatred of the Shi‘is and the official maldefinitions pronounced by certain ‘Abdūl-Mu‘tadī caliphs. More tolerant to his memory than to that of his son Yazīd, orthodoxy generally agrees to recognize his right to the respect which is due to the Sarḡūnids. The Syrians long cherished the memory of his glorious reign and even beyond the bounds of Syria he had partisans among the Ḥanbalīs, called gā‘dī, the enthusiasts for Mu’āwiyah.

II. Mu’āwiyah’s policy. In the historical and anecdotal literature of the Arabs there are few collections which do not devote a paragraph to Mu’āwiyah’s "wise mildness and complete self-control" (Wellhausen), qualities which the Arabs include under the term ḫilm. By this supreme virtue they claim to recognize the true statesman. The Sufyānīd sovereign is said to have owed the greatest success of his career to it. "Mu’āwiyah’s ḫilm" thus became proverbial. A somewhat mixed virtue, essentially opportunist in character, it may be combined with astuteness, or the less scrupulous forms of diplomacy. In our hero this quality has been found even in the most difficult trials inflicted on his amour-propre. His smiling imperiousness was able to disarm the proudest of his adversaries, who were then completely won over by his generosity. With the golden chains of pensions
and rich gifts the ruler was able to hold in leash his most intractable enemies. When his friends expressed surprise at the vastness of certain donations, he would reply: "A war costs infinitely more." This was his favourite method of dealing with the 'Alids and Hashimids. He has been unjustly accused of having introduced the custom of publicly cursing the name of 'Ali from the pulpit of the mosque. There is no certain evidence of this practice before the time of the Marwānids.

The collateral branches of the Umayyad family supplied him with distinguished assistants. He was careful not to bring the more ambitious of them too much to the front or to leave them too long in office. He was studious to inculcate into all his relations the feeling that they must stand by one another and that this consisted in the blind execution of his orders. The Umayyads formed his natural supporters. He could not do without them. But the unsettled problem, of the dynastic succession made him distrustful of relatives called upon to share the responsibilities of power. He did not fail to keep a close watch over them. With men like Ibn 'Amir, Sa'id b. al-'As, Marwān b. al-Hakam [q. v.], of remarkable gifts and considerable influence, who did not conceal their aspirations, he came to terms in a way that effectually discouraged them from following the dictates of their ambitions. As to the sons of the Caliph 'Othām, they seemed to him too insignificant to cause him any diatribe. On the other hand, Marwān and Sa'id were appointed to succeed one another at about regular intervals in the government of the 'Abbasid, the cradle of 'Abbasid rule and of the ruling family. Mu'awiyah was unwilling to give them time to create in such an important centre a position for themselves and connections which might have compromised the future of the dynasty. Ultimately he decided to replace these two relatives by a nephew of his own, now almost grown up, the Sufyānid Walîd b. Uthā [q. v.]. In the important governorship of the Ṣufyān, which controlled the eastern provinces, Mu'awiyah showed his preference for Thaqafī officials, Mughira, Ziyād and the latter's son Ubad Allah. He appreciated the devotion of these men, who came from the shrewd society of the 'Abbasid, suspected by the other Umayyad families, compelled to rely on their sovereign, the author of their fortunes. For a moment, the extraordinary promotion of Ziyād and the confidence the Caliph showed in him suggested that he had him in view as his successor. In this attitude to his relatives, the interests of the dynasty surmounted all other considerations. The heir presumptive was young. Mu'awiyah wanted to save his Umayyad cousins from the temptation to set up as rivals of his successor. The first step was to do Yuzid rather a bad turn. If, instead of the inexperienced Walîd, Mu'awiyah had retained or restored for another period of office in the governorship of the Ṣufyān the energetic Marwān, there is no reason to think that this would not have turned the incipient Husain from the hopeless exploit of Karbala'

In the traditional view Mu'awiyah appears as the perfect type of Arab ruler. When writers, jurists, encyclopaedists and compilers of anthologies have to quote a trait or a saying illustrating kingship, or the conduct of states, they rarely hesitate to credit it to our hero. This unanimity which reflects so much to his credit has been transformed into censure by orthodoxy. Mu'awiyah is reproached with having transformed the ẓuhār, the vicariate of the Prophet, into walī, into a temporal sovereignty, with having, if we may use the term, secularized the supreme power, really a purely lay one, in the heart of Islam. This criticism is an attempt to throw odium on Mu'awiyah while in reality it calls attention to his great merit. In him the ruler, "the king", i.e. the organizer and administrator, appear very distinctly while they are difficult to find in his predecessors, painfully fighting against the outbursts of Bohān anarchy. This transformation of the patriarchal power had begun with 'Umar who was the first to realize the necessity for it and attempted to realize it. Mu'awiyah endeavoured to hasten its evolution towards more effective centralization, an extension of the powers and personal authority of the sovereign. To secure for the latter the advantages of external pomp, the prestige given by formalities, he gave more ceremony to the hitherto democratic appearance of the caliph at the Friday services. He appeared in the mawṣūr or pulpit, surrounded by a ṣūrā or guard — 'Ali had already had one — and remained seated while delivering his address, the ṣaḥīf. Some have thought to see in this attitude a sign of pride. This is to forget the primitive nature of the minbar as the seat of the ruler, the sovereign's throne, before it became of liturgical significance as the pulpit of the mosque, after the latter had become a building for religious worship. This charge of walī was also intended to render suspect the sincerity of the faith of the Sufyānids monarch. But austerity characterised his morals and private life. He was a good father and a devoted husband. We find him conscientiously performing his religious duties and dying at length a good Muslim.

The chroniclers unanimously find in the complex character of Mu'awiyah another trait besides ḥisn: political finesse, what the Arabs call sūhiyya. To be credited with this it was necessary to have in addition to diplomatic skill, a remarkable gift of eloquence, a sense of decision, a resourceful nature and a conscience broad enough not to shrink from the use of trickery. Mu'awiyah was reckoned among the five best Kurājih orators of his time. He was fond of saying "I have won more success with the tongue than Ziyād (b. Abīth) with the sword", Arab writers prefer to attribute these successes to the Machiavellian nature of the sovereign. He is said never to have shrunk from recourse to violence or to the use of poison when he wished to get rid of troublesome adversaries. To support this charge the cases of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Khalīl, Hasan b. 'Alī and Aṣhtar b. Mālik [q. v.] are quoted. But each of the examples is capable of a more natural explanation. We would readily put Mu'awiyah in the category of those statesmen to whom useless crime is naturally repugnant, too wise to allow themselves to be tempted by violent solutions but not scrupulous enough to hesitate in such an extremity, if reasons of state seemed to advise it. One of his successors, 'Abd al-Malik, called him "the cunning (mulāḥim) caliph". The pleasure-loving son of 'Alī, ruined by his easy life, forgotten and retired to Medina, did not deserve to be feared. The two other individuals above mentioned died by accident or were victims of private vengeance.

The poets, the "journalists" of the period, had an undeniable influence on their contemporaries. This influence the sovereign succeeded in controlling
and subjecting to dynastic interests. Himself very susceptible to the charms of verse, he would have liked to see poetry confine itself to developing patriotism, and renouncing satire which was a source of dissension among the tribes. The restorer of ḍāima, national unity, felt more than anyone the necessity for this concord to heal the wounds caused by anarchy. Powerless to prevent the incursions of poetchers into the field of politics, he endeavoured to win them over to his side by gifts and the use of tact. To win them over he had to have "a good press", and at the same time gain their tribes to the cause of order, for the tribes usually agreed with the ideas spread by their bards. He exploited his son Yazíd's relations and friendships with the poets to compromise them in favour of the Umayyads and make them less amenable to the advances of the reactionary parties. He paid for their panegyrics; he took them under his protection whenever their lack of discipline brought them into trouble with the local authorities. He did not hesitate to shut his eyes to some of their poetical outbursts, which seem to compromise the reputation of his own hearth; under the 'Abbasids such anarchy would have meant death. He further left it to these indiscreet auxiliaries to deal with abuses by officials and found in them a useful check on arbitrary exercise of authority by his lieutenant. It was at the same time a satisfaction of their amour-propre, allowed to the vanity of these rhapsodists, who were courted by all parties and intoxicated by the terror which their wit inspired. In return for this toleration, he was able to get less disinterested services from them. He imposed on them the duty of preparing public opinion in favour of the karā, the recognition, of Yazíd as heir-apparent.

To accustom the Arabs to this step so repulsive to their democratic instincts, to give the caliph leisure to calculate its chances of success, there was nothing so useful as the intervention of these heralds with their echoing phrases. It enabled him to remain discreetly in the background, ready to come out at the opportune moment.

The biased Mas'ūd himself cannot help admiring the pliant ease of Mu'āwiya's policy, *his* great generosity to his subjects and the benefits which he heaped upon them; winning their sympathy and seducing their hearts with such skill that they put him before their kinship and natural affections*.

Firmness in administration, skill in managing men according to their rank, cordiality, these are some of the qualities credited by this historian, the friend of 'Ali, to the successful rival of Fātimā's husband.

Let us now deal with the charges brought against him by orthodoxy. With the object of making them more readily accepted, the indictment is carefully put in the mouth of the austere Hasan al-Baṣri. *Mu'āwiya committed four crimes — one of them alone was sufficient to cover him with dishonour: he abandoned the nation to men of no repute, deprived it without consulting it (by the ḍāima of Yazíd) of the control of its destinies and that in the life-time (i.e., to the detriment) of numerous Companions and virtuous individuals. He chose as his successor an incorrigible drunkard, robed in silk and playing the harp. He tolerated Ziyád. Lastly, he condemned Ḥadīr b. 'Ādī [q.v.] to death*. The impartial historian will have little difficulty in clearing the sovereign from these charges, which reveal his political flair, his instinct for rule, which raised him high above the prejudices of his contemporaries. The measures for which he is blamed secured the caliphate twenty years of peace and prosperity, the longest period it ever knew.

To sum up, Mu'āwiya appears in the series of Muslim rulers as one of the most attractive individuals and one of all round ability. In him the Arabs see the very incarnation of sovereignty. In the opinion of Mas'ūd his successors at best could only try to copy him without being able to equal him. In spite of their little liking for the able Sufyán, the Marwānids frequently appealed to his traditions and the methods of government inaugurated by him. He was, beyond doubt, the least oriental and the most modern of the rulers of Islam. He did not disdain public opinion. One must be grateful to him for not having believed in the power of force alone in the management of men, for not having sought to reestablish, as the 'Abbasids were to do, the old Asiatic monarchies, for having preferred that his subjects should become voluntarily attached to him by winning their sympathies, for proclaiming that "the world is more surely led by the tongue than by the sword". This conviction led him to adopt several institutions of Beduin democracy — such as the waf'id, deputations from the provinces and the principal tribes — to consult the views of such assemblies on as many occasions as possible, to associate them openly with public business by recognizing their right of remonstrance. The astuteness of the sovereign knew how to direct these manifestations of the old individualism of the nomads and to bring them to cooperate with his designs. To quote the comparison of the Byzantine historians, he appeared as a ṣawā'ib in the midst of his ṣubā'ib; in the deliberations of his Syrian parliament, he posed as *prīmus inter pares*. He was gradually able to advance the political education of his subjects and to control the signs of lack of discipline. He was never perturbed by their criticisms nor by the satires of the poets. "I do not trouble" he said "about words so long as they do not lead to deeds". These liberal principles became restricted under the Marwānids and disappeared with the coming of power of the absolute monarchy of the 'Abbasids.

As is frequently the case with men who have grown old in politics, a long period of power — he exercised it without interruption for 40 years — had made him a sceptic. This benevolent scepticism was revealed in a knowing smile when, with eyes half closed, he used to listen without missing a word to the petitions and rejections of his visitors and pretended to be taken in by their customary excesses. From his youth, passed in the cosmopolitan city of Mecca, then in Medina in the very mixed society of the Companions, he had been in too close contact with his contemporaries to be under any illusions about their disinterestedness. He had not to invent, but no one managed better than he, that institution of government, the ṭalīf al-ḥalib, the rallying of hearts, an ingenious euphemism of the Karān, meaning the art of purchasing hesitating adherents. Other caliphs surpassed him in courage, in outward austerity, *sukhī*, in love of knowledge and other qualities that dazzle the eyes of the multitude. No one possessed to such a degree as Mu'āwiya the gifts of the founder of an empire: vision,
energy and promptitude in action, breadth of view, logical thinking, absence of antiquated prejudices, skill in adapting the prestige and ceremonial of his position to Arab taste, ability to use men and to deal tactfully with their prejudices so as not to offend them directly. This rare combination of qualities enabled him to extract order out of the chaos of Beduin anarchy. If we endeavour to appreciate fairly Mu'awiya's work with its inevitable deficiencies, one must take into account the intractable material on which he had to work and the resistance opposed by the inveterate individualism of the nomads. He succeeded not only in disciplining them but also in transforming them into conquerors, able to rule over peoples of superior culture, heirs to the oldest civilisations.

For achieving this result, the son of Mu'awiedd's old opponent has deserved well of Islam. In the list of those responsible for this great revolution his name should come after that of the Prophet beside the caliph 'Omar. Orthodox tradition likes to exalt the latter and present him as the second successor of Islam. Of European writers, Sprenger and von Kremer have popularised this view. In it we may recognise the reply of the schools of the Hujjat to the 'Irak legend woven round the memory of 'Ali. To their work we owe the fantastic proportions assumed by the personality of 'Omar; it absolves not only Abū Bakr, but even throws its shadow upon the Prophet. 'Omar is brought into the origin of all religious and administrative institutions, especially of all those that cannot decently be credited to the author of the Qur'ān. This exaggerated admiration of the Hujjat was to provoke the protestations of the 'Abbāsid. The counterblast of Shī'ah tradition was to place 'Ali alongside of 'Omar to direct him and if necessary to correct him. The indisputable merits of the second caliph lie elsewhere. In the midst of the terrible confusion that resulted from the conquests he was able to maintain the unity and cohesion of the empire, immeasurably enlarged, to bring the Arab culture into connection with the non-Arab peoples, to foster the dynamic successions and to bring about an economical and administrative reorganisation. Closely watched, harasscd by the selfish claims of his Medinese senate and its disturbing element formed by the redoubtable group of the "ten 'Abbāsidīn" or the "chosen" and the oldest friends of the Master, he succeeded in neutralising their restless activities, their desire for intrigue and in exploiting their greed and mutual jealousies. In the provinces the generals and governors showed an obedience scarcely less intermittent. 'Omar had frequently to resign himself to approving by sancti in radices in order not to lose touch with such undisciplined auxiliaries and to remind all of the existence of the vicariate of the Prophet. The day on which he thought of a more effective centralisation, of a less ideal set systematisation, assassination brutally delivered him from his error. The same fate was to overtake 'Utbān, when under pressure from the Umayyads, he took up the predecessor's programme where it had been interrupted. With 'Ali the caliphate collapsed into chaos and lost a quarter of a century of progress on the way to reorganisation. One province alone formed an exception: Syria, which had been governed since its creation by the Umayyads.

But for the intervention of Mu'awiya and his able lieutenants, the 'Amr, Ziyād and Marwān, the Muslim empire would have been transformed — like the 'Irak and Kjurān — into an arena to which the Arabs came to settle their petty tribal quarrels. Once on the throne, the Sufyānid worked to extend gradually to the rest of the caliphate the methods of government which had secured the prosperity of Syria. Encouraged by the results obtained in this country, he set himself to discipline the other Beduin tribe, according to the ideas ascribed to 'Omar, formed the "substance of Isām". From this rudis indigestus noes, this rebellious mass, gradually broken in by the influence of Syria, fashioned by teachers trained in his school, the first Syrian caliph recruited soldiers, then formed from them the cadres of a regular army: wonderful troops always ready to play their double part, the qālidh abroad, and at home the maintenance, against any threat from within, of the qāmil, the unity of the empire. Mu'awiya succeeded in impressing on these descendants of caravan-leaders of Arabia, nomads, all obstinate landmen, the importance of the mastery of the sea. Arab thalassocracy dates from this period. Forced to use primitive institutions, the jirān, tradition, sanctioned by the Prophet and the Medina caliphs, he endeavoured to turn them to the needs of a great empire. He managed at least to suppress the anarchical working of the jirān by regulating the dynastic succession. He organised the finances; he began by revising and reducing the enormous pensions granted by preceding governments without regard to services rendered to the state. Down to his time the central treasury of the caliphate had been supplied by intermittent and always unwilling contributions extorted from the provinces. Mu'awiya endeavoured to settle the amount to be paid by each province and to regularise its collection. Under him the treasury ceased to be a relief fund which the conquerors claimed to use as they pleased. His predecessors had had to empty it periodically to secure assistance, or neutrality important for the success of their policy. Hitherto semīl al-musulūn, the collective property of the Muslims; the treasury now became māl Alīshā, the treasury of the state, intended to cover general expenses, to secure the representation and the defence of the empire. These reforms made Mu'awiya the first sovereign, musallā of Islam, the first ruler to enjoy a definite authority, independent, unlike his predecessors, of the anarchical good-will of his subjects, and no longer at the mercy of an oligarchy interested in the maintenance of old abuses. The Medinese vicariate which developed from the triumvirate, could not long survive this coup d'état, this drastic solution of the problem of the succession to the Prophet. Before Mu'awiya, the caliphate had only had a nominal existence. For this figure, the son of Abū Sufyān substituted a reality; he created the Arab state: a creation seen darkly by 'Omar without having been brought to realisation.

Bibliography: We refer the reader to our Études sur le régime des califes omeyyades de Mahāva I, following our Califat de Yassid I (reprint from M.F.O.P., i.—iii.). The references are there given. One may also with advantage consult G. Levi della Vida, Il Califato di 'Ali secondo il Kitāb an-nāšir al-arabī di al-Balighari, in R.S.O., vi., 427—507; our Zīdān ibn Abīthi, vice-rei de l'Irāq, lieutenant de Mahāva I (extract from the same periodical, iv.).

MU'AWIYA II. 'UBAID ALLĀH. [See Abd 'Ubaida Allāh.]

(H. LAMMENS)
MUBALLIGH. [See Masjidin, I, D. e and H. 4.] MUBARAK GHAZI, an Indian saint. In all parts of the Sundarbans, the Mahommadan woodcutters invoke certain mythical beings to protect them from tigers and crocodiles. In the 24 Parganas it is Mubarak Ghazi who, in the Eastern parts of the Delta goes by the name of Zindah Ghazi, the living warrior. Mubarak Ghazi is said to have been a faiq (mendicant) who reclaimed the jungle tracts along the left bank of the river Hooghly. Every village has an altar dedicated to him and no one enters the forest nor does any of the boat's crew, who might sail through the districts, pass without first making offerings at one of these shrines. The faiqs in these dangerous forests, who claim to be lineally descended from the Ghazi, indicate with pieces of wood called jang the precise limits within which the forest has to be felled. Mubarak Ghazi, so the legend goes, came to Bengal when Radja Malak ruled over the Sundarbans. The saint happened to have a dispute with the chief who thought himself to be in the right, and on which the latter agreed to give his only daughter Shughla in marriage to the former, should his own opinion be proved wrong. This the Ghazi succeeded in doing and won his bride in consequence. Since no man saw him die, he is believed to reside in the depths of the forest, to ride about on tigers, and to keep them so obedient to his will that they dare not touch a human being without his express desire. Before entering a jungle or sailing through the narrow channels whose shady banks are infested by tigers, boatmen and woodcutters, both Hindus and Mahommadians, raise little mounds of earth and on them make offerings of rice, plantains, and sweetmeats to Mubarak Ghazi, after which they fearlessly cut the bracken and linger in the most dangerous spots.

This strange myth, there cannot be any doubt, is borrowed from Hindus to suit the taste of the superstitious boatmen and woodcutters.


MUBARAK SHAH, Muzzaf al-Din, the second king of the Saiyid dynasty of Dihli, was the son of Khizr Khan, the first king, and succeeded his father on May 22, 1421. The limits of his kingdom were then restricted to a few districts of Hindustan proper and Multan, and he was obliged to resist from an attempt to establish his authority in the Pandjab by the necessity for his being Gwalior, menaced by Huyang of Malwa, who raised the siege and met him, but after an indecisive action came to terms and retired to Malwa. From 1425 to 1427 he was engaged in attempting to restore one in Mewat, and received the formal submission of the rajas of Gwalior and Canwar (Fatehabad), but Muhammad Khan Awhadi of Bajana, whom he had taken prisoner, escaped and took refuge in Mewat, and the work there was to do again. Muhammad Awhadi, on being hard pressed in Bajana, fled to Ibratam Shihb of Dwainpur, and as the latter marched against Kali, Mubarak marched to meet him. Ibratam, who had been plundering Mubarak's dominions, avoided a conflict for some time, but on April 2, 1428, the armies met near Canwar and Ibratam, though not decisively defeated, retired.
the next day to Djaswâp. Mubârak then collected revenue in the neighbourhood of Gwâhor and retired by way of Bâysâna, which was evacuated by Muhammad Awhâdi, who had returned thither. For the rest of the year his officers were engaged in restoring order in the Pandjâb, ravaged by Djsârath the Khokar, and he in a similar task in Mewât, and in collecting revenue by force. In 1430 Fûlâd Turkmâna successfully defied the royal authority in Bhâtinda, and in 1431 a rebellion broke out in Mûlân and had no sooner been suppressed than Djsârath renewed his activity in the Pandjâb. The chronicle of the rest of the reign is a record of rebellions in the Pandjâb, Mûlân, Sâmân, Mewât, Bayûna, Gwâhor, Tûjdhâra and Iâwâ, and a rebel captured Lâtâh and attacked Dipâlîrâ. Lâtâh was eventually recovered, but the whole country remained in a disturbed condition.

War broke out between Isâhâm of Djaswâp and Hûshâng of Mûlân in connection with Kâlpî, the suzerainty officer, who belonged to neither and was supported by both, and Mubârak, marching thither, turned aside to inspect Mûhârakhdâ, which he was building, and then, on October 19, 1434, he was assassinated at the instance of Sarwar Alâ, whom he had dismissed from the post of minister in the preceding year.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kâsim Firâqû, Guûkân-i Sâbêtânî, Bombay 1832; Muntâzâh al-Turâthî and translation by L.t.-Col. G.S. A. Ranking; Tahâhârî Akhtâr and translation by B. Dé (both in the Bibli. Ind. Series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal); Yahûb b. Ahmad, Teâbîr-i Mûhârâb Sâhî, rare in MS., but reproduced by the authorities cited above.

(T. W. HAID)

MUBÂRIR AL-DIN. [MUHAMMAD B. AL-MUBÂRÂKHÎ, AL-MUBÂRÂKH.] AL-MUBÂRÂKH, Abu 'l-'Abbas Muhammad b. Yazîd al-Thumâlî al-'Azîdî, an Arab, philosopher, born on the 10th Dju'h al-Hijja (March 25, 826) in Bâseh, was there taught by Abu Qâsim al-Djânnî, Abu Qâsim al-Mâjâni and Abu Jahîm al-Sâjdî, the pupil of Ajmâ'û, in his early works, the Kitiâb al-Maw'aqûth al-Âshâr, he criticised the Kitiâb of Sibwâwî, but only a small number of his criticisms were well founded and of these only a minority were original (al-Suyûtî, al-Musâhir, ii. 188; ii. 323). Later he went to Baghdad where he became a very busy teacher, among his pupils were Nûfiswâlah, Ibn Durrastawâlah and Ibn Kâshân. His rival for favour at court was the Kûfân Thallâb, to whom he was far superior in ability and style; the rivalry between these two scholars seems to have been the origin of the later tradition of the opposition between the schools of Kûf and Baghdad. His episthel al-Mubârâk seems to refer to his skill in disputation, but there are a number of anecdotes explaining it in very different ways (Musâhir ii. 207, 312; Bahā'î, p. 116, 117; Jâhâd, v. 137, 339;). He died in Baghdad in Shawwâl or Dju'h Kâ'ba (October 898).

His chief work al-Fikrîyâr al-'Adâb is a typical example of the work of the old philologists as developed from their teaching. Without being tied down to any fixed arrangement or even aiming at cohesion in the separate chapters, it combines traditions of the Prophet, sayings of pious men, proverbs, many poems mostly of the older period, and also historical matter like the important chapter on the Khâridjâ (characteristic is the passage on p. 409 in Wright's edition;* in this chapter we shall mention something of everything in order by change to prevent the reader from being wearied and mix a little jest with the earnest so that heart and soul may be recuperated; similarly p. 428; exceptions like the chapters on simile p. 447 or on lametta for the dead and consolation p. 713 are rare). The important feature is the full grammatical and lexicographical commentary which he gives to every quotation. The work was given its final form with numerous additions and glosses by Abu 'l-Hasan al-Akhfash (d. 315 = 927). Al-Bâtalâyât wrote a commentary on it which has not survived (Musâhir i. 182, 11; 223, 4; there is an anonymous commentary in the possession of Iâmîl Efendi in Siâmbül. It was first printed in Siâmbül in 1886; editions: The Kitiâb of El-Mubârâk edited for the German Oriental Society by W. Wright, part 1, Leipzig 1864; 1892; reprinted Cairo 1808, 1823, with extracts from Dju'hâr on the margin, 1339; with two modern commentaries: Tahâhîr al-Kâmîl by al-Sîhâbîl al-Bâlâyî, Cairo 1841 (1925), 2 vols. and Bagha' al-Amîl min Kitâb al-Kâmîl by Saiyîd Ibn 'Ali al-Marâsaft (professor at al-Asfar), Cairo 1845 (1923), 8 vols., Cairo 345-346 (1927-1928); Das Khârizmischenkapiel aus dem K., transl. into German by O. Rescher, Stuttgart 1922. His second collection of material, the Kitiâb al-Maw'aqûth, met with less success, because, it is said, it had been transmitted by the heretic Ibn al-Râswânt; it is preserved with a commentary by Sa'id b. Sa'id al-Fârîqî (d. 391 = 1000; see Yâkût, l. 740, l. 740) in the Escurial manuscript 2, p. 111 and in Siâmbül, Köprüle, No. 1507-1508 (cf. Rescher, in Z.D.M.G., iv. 197; photograph in Cairo; Fibristis, i. 123). Of his numerous other works given by his biographers we only have the Kitiâb al-Tâzîr, Escurial 2, p. 534, r; the Kitiâb Namâ'â al-Mu'âashar, Kitiâb al-Mu'âshar, 2003 (M.F.O.B., v. 491) = 1324, 3178 (M.F.O.B., vi. 108), Escurial, 1700, fol. 59 v-58 v (r. Levi Della Vida, Les livres des chevaux, Leyden 1928, p. xxiii), his answer to a letter from Ahamad b. Wâbîqî on the question whether poetry is superior to eloquence, in Munich 791 and in a fragment in Berlin, Ablw. 7177 as well as the Kitiâb al-Mu'âshar we't-Mu'âshar as transmitted by Abu 'l-Asfîrî, in Damascus, Zâyîâ, p. 36, No. 113, 3. 2. His other works are only known from quotations, e.g. his Kitiâb al-Kitâbiyâr, which Ibn him, himself quotes, Kûmil, p. 760, r; the Kitiâb Sharh al-Nadhîfî, which Ibn al-Asfîrî mentions among his sources in the preface to the Nâshûa; the Kitiâb mu'âshar Fâsîhû wa al-Bâbâs al-Maw'aqûth (Suyî'î, Sharh al-Maghîbî, Cairo 1923, p. 195, 83); the Kitiâb al-Râwî, a collection of poems by contemporary poets beginning with Abu Nasr, Âdâbî, al-Djârî, Kitiâb al-Maw'ahîr, p. 29, 9; Abu al-Asfîrî, al-Maw'ahîr, p. 189, 46; the Kitiâb al-Adâbī in the causes of the poetical strife between Djârî and Farandak; 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Baghâdâ, Kâmînât al-Adâb, l. 305, 41; Kitiâb al-Shârî (i.e. Sharh Kâmînât al-Adâb), l. r., l. 195 infra.

AL-MUBARRAZ, a fort on the Persian Gulf, about a mile north of al-Hafif, surrounded by open villages and date-palm groves. The population of the fortress and of the hamlets that belong to it is given, sometimes at 10,000, at other times at 30,000.


AL-MUBDI', see ALLAH II.

AL-MUDAJJI', name of sūra lxxxi, which is also called al-madjda or al-adjinās.

MUDAR. [See KAR'A.]

MUDARI', the twelfth metre in Arabic prosody, which is very rarely used. Theoretically each of its hemistichs consists of three feet (masī'ilun fā'īlamun masī'ilun); in practice the third foot is lacking.

It has one ʿarāf and one ʿādāf only; masī'ilun fā'īlamun: masī'ilun fā'īlamun. Masī'ilun however must become masī'ilum. The first masī'ilum may lose its ma; in that case the form is fā'īlamun (= masī'ilum) and fā'īlamun. (M. BENCHER)

MUMADAWANA. [See SAINUN.]

AL-MUDDATHTHIR, title of sūra lxxiv.

AL-MUDHILL. [See ALLAH II.]

MUDIR, title of the governors of the Egyptian provinces, called mudiriyah. The use of the word mudir in this meaning is no doubt of Turkish origin. The office was created by Muhammad 'Ali, when, after 1813, he reorganised the administrative division of Egypt, instituting seven mudiriyah; this number has been changed several times. [K. KHERSTJAE]. At the present day there are 14 mudiriyah. The chief task of the mudir is the controlling of the agricultural administration and of the irrigation, as executed by his subordinates, viz. the mū'āthir, who administers a mahrās and the mū'āthir who controls the dā'im which is again a subdivision of the mahrās. Under Sa'd Pasha the office of mudir was temporarily abolished with a view to preventing oppression. Until that time they had been without exception Turks, but under Ismail Pasha, when the function was reinstated again, this high administrative position was opened also to native Egyptians.

Bibliography: A. B. Chay, Bey, Aperçu Général sur l'Égypte, Brussels 1840, ii. 172 sqq.; A. von Kremer, Ägypten, Leipzig 1865, ii. 8; Illyés al-Aiybû, Ta'īlil Mi'ir fi 'Abd al-Karim Ismā'īl Bâshâ, Cairo 1841, i. 52 sqq.; J. Deny, Sommaire des archives: équipes du Cairo, Cairo 1930, p. 130. (J. H. KRAMERS)

AL-MUḌIḌILA', title of sūra lxxvi.

AL-MUḌIḌAH. [See KAR'AH.

MUDIṢAṢIMA. [See TASHIRI.

MUDIṢAWWAZA. [See TUBURIAN, iv. 890 sqq.]

AL-MUḌIЯ. [See ALLAH II.]

MUDIIR AL-DIN. [See AL-ALAIM.]

MUḌIŻA (A.), part. act. iv. of ʿarāf, lit. "the overwhelming", has become the technical term for miracle. It does not occur in the Kur'ān, which denies miracles in connection with Muhammad, whereas it emphasizes his "signs", ʿaṣīr, i.e. verses of the Kur'ān; cf. the art. KORAN. Even in later literature Muhammad's chief miracle is the Kur'ān; (cf. Abū Nu'aim, Dal'il al-Nubuwwa, p. 743). Muḍiża and ʿaṣīr have become synonyms; they denote the miracles performed by Allah in order to prove the sincerity of His apostles. The term kărāmā [q.v.] is used in connection with the saints; it differs from muḍiża in so far as it denotes nothing but a personal distinction granted by Allah to a saint.

Miracles of Apostles and Prophets, especially those of Muhammad, occur in the ʿaṣīr and in hādiżh. Yet in this literature the term muḍiża is still lacking, as it is in the oldest forms of the creed. The Fiṣḥ Akbar, ii., art. 16, mentions the ʿaṣīr of the prophets and the kărāmā of the saints. Muḍiża occurs in the creed of Abū Ḥafṣ, 'Umar al-Nasafi (ed. Cureton, p. 4); ed. Taftāzānī, p. 165: "And He has fortified them (the apostles) by miracles contradicting the usual course of things". Taftāzānī explains it in this way: A thing deviating from the usual course of things, appearing at the hands of him who pretends to be a prophet, as a challenge to those who deny this, of such a nature that it makes it impossible for them to produce the like of it. It is Allah's testimony to the sincerity of His apostles.

A very complete and systematic description occurs in al-Idji's Muṣūšt. He gives the following definition of muḍiża: It is meant to prove the sincerity of him who pretends to be an apostle of Allah. Further he enumerates the following conditions: 1. It must be an act of Allah; 2. it must be contrary to the usual course of things; 3. contradiction to it must be impossible; 4. it must happen at the hands of him who pretends to be an apostle, so that it appears as a confirmation of his sincerity; 5. It must be in conformity with his announcement of it; the miracle itself must not be a disavowal of his claim (da'wā); 7. it must follow on his da'wā.

Further, according to al-Idji, the miracle happens in this way that Allah produces it at the hands of him whose sincerity He wishes to show, in order to realise His will, viz. the salvation of men through the preaching of His apostle. Finally, as to its effect, it produces, in accordance with Allah's custom, in those who witness it, the conviction of the apostle's being sincere.


MUḌITHH, the fourteenth metre in Arabic prosody, has theoretically three feet, consisting of two successive fā'īlum in every hemistich; in practice there are two feet only.

It has one ʿarāf, and one ʿādāf only; masī'ilun fā'īlamun: masī'ilun fā'īlamun. The foot fā'īlamun of the ʿādāf also, though seldom, that of the ʿarāf, may become fā'īlamun, on condition that masī'ilun retains its ma; it loses its ma when masī'ilun loses its ʿa.

Masī'ilum loses its ʿa, when the preceding fā'īlam retains its ma; it also loses its ma, when fā'īlam following it, does not become fā'īlam.

(MOH. BENCHER)
AL-MUFADDAL b. MUHAMMAD b. YA'LA b. AMIR b. SALIM b. AL-KAMAL AL-DABSHI, an Arabic philologist of the Kufan school. By birth he was a freeborn Arab; the date of his birth is not known. His father was a recognized authority on the events in the wars of the Arabs on the frontiers of Khurāsān in 30–90 A.H. (quoted in Thabit’s Annals). It is possible that his son was born in this region. As a partisan of the house of ‘Alī he took part in the rising against the ‘Abbasid caliph al-Mansūr led by Ibāth b. ‘Abd Allāh (q.v.), brother of al-Nafīs al-‘Abbash. The rising was put down by Ibāth and Mufaddal was taken prisoner, but pardoned by the caliph and appointed tutor to his son, the future caliph al-Mahdi, and in his train he visited Khurāsān. He then worked in Kufa as a philologist and teacher; among his pupils was his stepson al-A‘rāfī. The date of his death is variously given; the Fihrist does not give it at all while others give 164, 165 or 170.

Mufaddal, like his contemporary ‘Allamād (q.v.), bore the epithet and title of honour al-Samāwī, and was regarded as an authority on the poetry of the Dāshīlī. In contrast to ‘Allamād, he is celebrated for the reliability of his transmission. In his work, Kitāb al-Aghāni (v. 1), there are several stories illustrating this fact. While ‘Allamād was reproached with having inserted verses which he had himself composed into the work of the prominent poets of the Dāshīlī, Mufaddal is praised for handing down the old poetry pure and unaltered.

There was, of course, a great rivalry between the two Sāfārī which also finds expression in the stories of the Aghāni. Mufaddal is reported to have said that the influence of ‘Allamād on Arabic poetry had been most disastrous, to a degree which could never be made good again. To the question how this was and whether ‘Allamād had made mistakes in the attribution of the poems or linguistic errors, he replied: if that were all, it could be made good, but he had done worse than this. Since he was such an authority on the old poets, he was able himself to write verses in that style and he added inserted such verses of his own composition in genuine old Sāfārī so that now only very good critics of the old poetry could recognize them (cf. Aghāni, v. 172 and Yāqūt, Irshād, vii. 171). It is also recorded that al-Mufaddal once in the presence of the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik passed off verses of his own as the work of ‘Allamād b. Abī Sulaym. The Sāfārī which ‘Abd al-Malik was reciting began with da‘ī da‘ī and on the caliph asking for the missing nasīh he added several nasīh verses. Mufaddal however said quite rightly that there had probably been a nasīh before the surviving verses, but no one any longer knew it. ‘Abd al-Malik was thereupon forced to confess his forgery. It is interesting to learn that, as is recorded in this passage of the Aghāni, ‘Abd al-Malik was rewarded for his recitation but the sum given to al-Mufaddal was considerably greater. al-Mufaddal was given his reward, not only for his knowledge, but also for his fidelity and honesty in transmission (cf. Aghāni, loc. cit. and Yāqūt, loc. cit.).

Mufaddal worked in different fields of Arabic philology. He was considered an authority on rare Arabic expressions, celebrated as a grammarians and was also an authority on genealogy and on the Arab battles (‘Ayyām al-Arāfī). He wrote a number of books: a Kitāb al-‘Amthāl (on proverbs), a Kitāb al-Aref (on metres), a Kitāb Mu‘aṣṣ al-‘Āthār (on the meanings of poems) and a dictionary: Kitāb al-Alfiṣ. His principal work, however, is a collection of old Arabic šajā‘āt called the Mufaddalīyat, which he compiled for his pupil, the future caliph al-Mahdi. Mufaddal himself is said to have given another story of the origin of this anthology, which is one of the most valuable Arabic collections. When on one occasion Ibāth b. ‘Abd Allāh was in hiding in his house, he brought him some books to read at his request. Ibāth marked a number of poems and these he collected in one volume because Ibāth valued them as a good critic of the old poetry. This collection was later called the ‘Ibāthiyya al-Mufaddalī (ed. Flügel, Gramm. Scholien, p. 144, note 1). The Mufaddalīyat contains 126 poems, some complete šajā‘āt of many verses, some fragments of small size, while in Abū Tamam’s collection, the Hamūra, only little fragments of poems or separate verses are contained. The latter was compiled some fifty years later; at first it was much more popular than the Mufaddalīyat and more frequently annotated. But al-Mufaddal’s anthology is of quite outstanding merit. The great bulk of it is the work of pagan poets and muḥāfazzūn, while only 6 of the 67 poets represented were born Muslim. Two of the poets whose šajā‘āt are contained in the Mufaddalīyat were Christians. The poems, the date of composition of which can frequently be deduced from events mentioned in them, are in some cases very old. The earliest are those attributed to Murāǧīj al-‘Āthār, which probably belong to the first decade of the sixth century A.D. al-Mufaddal’s anthology offers a rich selection of the old Arabic poetry, the value of which is increased by the great age of the poems preserved in it. The name of its collector, who enjoyed a good reputation among his contemporaries for his reliability, also gives us a certain guarantee that we have in the poems of the Mufaddalīyat really genuine specimens of old Arab poetry.


LIKE LITERATURSTÖRER

AL-MUFID ABU ‘ABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. AL-NU‘AMI AL-‘ABASSII, also called IBN AL-MU‘ALLIM, a distinguished Twelve scholar of Baghdad under the Buyids, was born at the end of 333 or 338 (945 or 950), and came of an old Kuraish family which, as his second epithet shows, had a reputation for scholarship; he himself became, as his epithet shows, the teacher from whom all later students have derived advantage. While he took little active part in politics, he was a very prolific author. His correspondence, usually replies to queries, came from Mawṣil, Djurdjfan, Dinawar, Raqqa, Khwarām, Egypt and ‘Arabistan. His literary connections with other leaders of the Twelvers are seen in the fact that the Dogmatic mentioned third below is a critical commentary on Ibn Bihbīya’s Risālat al-Ifrījāt (published in a collected volume, Teheran
II. THE DECLINE OF THE MUGHAL EMPIRE.

III. MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE IN INDIA.

I. THE MUGHAL EMPIRE TO THE DEATH OF AKBAR.

A. Military Organization of the Mughal Empire.

The army which Bābur led into India, and with which he defeated at Panipat the army of Ibrahim Lodi, 100,000 strong, consisted of about 10,000 combatants, mainly cavalry, but comprising a corps of artillery and a small proportion of infantry, chiefly matchlockmen. Bābur’s son and successor, Humayūn, though hampered by the virtual independence of his brother Khān, governor of Kābul, who annexed the Panjab, and thus cut him off from the best recruiting grounds of the Muslim army in Northern India, Afghanistan, and Trasoxonia, was nevertheless able to lead into the field at the battle of the Ganges, near Kanauj, where he was defeated by Shāh Shāh, an army of 100,000 men. On his return to India in 1555 he left Kābul with an army of no more than 15,000 men, and it was his son and successor, Akbar, who was the creator of the army of the empire of which he was, in fact, the founder.

The empire was a military despotism. The governor of a province was entitled zājī al-dīn, or “commander-in-chief,” the governor of a purgāwa, or sub-district, khānī-khānān, or “commandant,” and practically all courtiers and officials, even those holding civil and judicial posts, were graded as commanders of horse. Thus we find Shāhīs Abu ‘l-Fadl, Akbar’s secretary, graded as a commander of 2,500; Rādījī Bil Dar, court wit and Hindi poet laureate, as a commander of 1,000; Sāyīd Mūhammad, Mur ‘Ad, a judge, as a commander of 900; and Shāhīs Fāiqī, the poet, as a commander of 400 horse. A command of horse was known as manṣūb (“rank”) or “dignity”) and its holder as manṣūdī (“officer”). Each of these nominally commanding 500 to 2,500 horses was classed as an amīr (“noble”), and each of those nominally commanding more as amīr-i hākī (“great noble”). These commands were nominal, conferred merely for the purpose of regulating the rank of the official holding them, and were styled manṣūb-i hādi (”personal rank”). Each of those actually exercising military authority had, in addition to his personal rank, sāzār (horseman) rank. Thus, a commander of 5,000 might be described as “commander of 5,000, with 4,000 horsemen”, that is to say, one ranking as a commander of 5,000, but supposed to maintain only 4,000 horsemen. In Akbar’s reign, apart from the rank held by the royal princes, commands ranged from 10 up to 5,000 horsemen, but at the end of the reign two or three nobles were promoted to commands of 6,000 and 7,000. In these two high commands there was no distinction of grade, but each of the other commands was divided into three classes, viz.: 1. those whose sāzār rank was equal to their personal rank, 2. those whose sāzār rank was half, or more, of their personal rank, and 3. those whose sāzār rank was less than half of their personal rank. Thus, a commander of 5,000 with 5,000 horsemen would be in the first class of his...
the troops being provided for by orders on the treasury for payments in cash. This edict caused much discontent, for the ḡāṭr system was, for many reasons, far more popular than the nákhr, or cash-payment, system. Under the nákhr system a muster-parade might at any time be made a condition precedent to the issue of a payment order; and a ḡāṭr might reap much profit by economizing in the administration of his fief, by rack-renting the landholders, and by encroachments, but the nákhr system furnished him with no such means of enriching himself. The edict was immediately modified, and though the nákhr system was introduced in the settled provinces of the empire, the ḡāṭr system was retained in the more recently conquered provinces of Bengal, Gudjārāt, and Sind, and, after Akbar's death, was restored, in many cases, in other provinces.

Another reform introduced at the same time, the ḡāṭr u-maḥbāllāt, or branding regulation, was resented even more than the substitution of the nákhr for the ḡāṭr system. It was seldom that ṭabqābāt maintained their full quota of troopers; "false musters were an evil from which the Mughal army suffered, even in its most palmy days. Nobles would lend each other the men to make up their quota, or needy idlers from the bazaars would be mounted on the first baggage pony that came to hand, and counted in with the others as efficient soldiers". It was to check such fraudulent practices that Akbar introduced the ḡāṭr u-maḥbāllāt regulation, which required the preparation of descriptive rolls of men and horses, the latter being branded on being passed as fit for service; and at muster-parades only these who produced branded horses were paid. This system originated, apparently, with the Sākūrīs in Transoxiana and Persia, and was introduced into India by 'Ali al-Dīn Khāldī in 1342, but was not enforced after his death until it was revived by Shāh Shāh in 1541. After his death it was again abandoned, and Akbar had great difficulty in reviving it, owing to the determined opposition to any measure designed to prevent public officials from enriching themselves by defrauding the state. Even he was obliged to exempt commanders of 5,000, or a greater number, of horse from its operation, though these were required to parade their contingents for inspection when ordered. In the later days of the empire, the regulation was not enforced, and when Bābur al-Mulk joined Muḥammad Shāh at Karnāl, to meet Nādir Shāh, a historian considers it worth while to describe his contingent as ṭabqābāt ma ḡāṭrī, that is, "actually present, not merely on paper"; and later, in 1750, an officer in Bengal receiving pay for 1,700 men was said not to have been able to muster more than seventy or eighty.

Besides the contingents of the princes and the ṭabqābāt there were the sovereign's personal troops. His body-guard was a corps known as the Wallāḥābād, composed chiefly of men who had been attached to him from his youth, and had served under him as a prince. Manucci refers to these as the emperor's slaves, and says that they numbered 4,000 under Awrangāzīb. Details of their pay are not given, but they probably received more than the troopers serving in the contingents of the ṭabqābāt. There was also a corps of élite first formed by Akbar, and styled the Ḍhādāl corps. Abu 'l-Faḍl, in a characteristically foolish passage says that they were so called because they were
fit for a "harmonious unity", whatever that may mean; but they seem to have been called akhāli because they enlisted singly in the personal service of the emperor, and were not brought into the service in bodies by a manṣubār. They stood, in rank, between the lower manṣubārs and the tābūnān, and received nearly double the pay of the latter. They may be compared to "gentlemen of the life-guard", and many were seconded from the corps in order that they might hold civil appointments. The proportion of three-horsed, two-horsed, and one-horsed troopers was the same in the akhāli corps as in the contingents of the manṣubārān.

A commander of horse, whether he held a ḍīfā or whether he drew the pay of his contingent from the treasury, made his own arrangements for its disbursement. He was entitled to retain five percent of the pay of his men for himself, and pay was not always allowed for a whole year; often only for six, five, or four months. Manitucci, writing of the army in the reign of Aurangzeb, says, "in respect of one year's service they receive six or eight months' pay. Even that is not all in coin; they are always foisted off as respects two months' pay with clothes and old raiment from the household. Over and above this, there is almost always due to them the pay for two or three years' service. The soldiers are obliged to borrow money at interest from the pārāfs, or money-changers. These men lend to them, it is true, but it is hardly ever without a command from the general or officer; and these latter have an understanding with them about the profit from interest, which they share between them. Sometimes the soldiers sell their papers to these money-changers, who for a note of hand for one hundred rupees will give them twenty or twenty-five. It is by these and such-like extortions that these generals ruin the wretched soldier, who, unable to find other means of gaining his bread, is forced to remain on in his service. Speaking generally, it is impossible for them to escape such extortions, for these disorders reign throughout all the princes' establishments. If any one resigns service at his own request, they deduct two months' pay. Nevertheless service in the cavalry was socially an honourable profession; a common trooper was looked upon as being, to some extent, a gentleman, and such were, even when illiterate, often used to the highest positions."

The infantry was, in every respect, an inferior arm. With it were classed doorkeepers, watchmen, runners and spies, gladiators, wrestlers and palanquin bearers, but the combatant branch consisted of musketeers or matchlockmen (farqāmānīs), archers, and spearmen. Akbar maintained a corps of 12,000 matchlockmen, the officer in command of which was styled dārgā. A secretary and a treasurer kept the accounts and disbursed the pay of these troops. The non-commissioned officers of the corps were graded in four classes, the first of which received 7½, the second 7, the third 6½, and the fourth 6½ rupees a month. The privates were divided into five classes, the pay of which ranged from 2½ down to 2½ rupees a month.

Besides this corps was a number of troops styled akhāli, of which one-fourth were matchlockmen and three-fourth archers. These were the troops allowed to the jāmākārī in the jargāns or subdistricts, to assist them in maintaining order and collecting the revenue. The non-commissioned officers of the matchlockmen received Rs. 4 a month, and the privates Rs. 3½ each. The archers were considered more efficient than the matchlockmen, for the matchlock was not an arm of rapid fire or precision, and an archer could shoot many arrows while a matchlockman was loading his matchlock. Neither matchlockmen nor archers could, as a rule, face cavalry in the field, and it was not until the emperors and their vassals were brought face to face with troops armed and drilled after the European fashion that they discovered that infantry was the queen of battles; but belief in the superior efficiency of cavalry died hard.

The artillery was divided into two classes, the heavy and the light. Bābur had an efficient corps of artillery, and used it with great effect, but the Muslims of India were not skilled artillerists, and the heavy artillery was usually officered and partly manned by Uthmānī Turks, Portuguese renegades of pure or mixed blood, and occasionally by other Europeans. The light artillery consisted of field-pieces carried on bullock-carts, wall-pieces on animals' backs, and sambūraks, or still lighter service-guns, carried on and fired from the backs of camels. The heavy artillery was drawn by strings of oxen, or, occasionally, by elephants, and, as the army gradually declined in efficiency the heavy guns increased in length and calibre until they became so heavy as hardly to be mobile, so that often they could not be dragged to their destination but were left stranded by their road. A defeated army could seldom save its heavy field artillery. All that it could do was to spike the guns and leave them. The ammunition was solid shot, sometimes of stone, sometimes of iron, and field guns and heavy guns in the field were sometimes loaded to the muzzle with the tough copper coin of the time, which took the place of case-shot, and did great execution at close quarters. The artillery also comprised a corps of rocketeers. The whole of the artillery was commanded by an officer entitled mir-i āṣīr, or "lord of fire". The officers were entitled jartābāz ("commander of 100") corresponding to a battery commander, and mirādāh (commander of 10), who had charge of a subdivision, or one gun. The wall-pieces and sambūraks, which were numerous, account for the enormous numbers of "guns" mentioned in accounts of armies in the field.

Akbar used elephants freely in battle, and brought them into the field in great numbers. They usually carried archers or musketeers on their backs. Their use as a fighting force was, however, soon abandoned, and would have been abandoned sooner than it was, had it not been for their imposing appearance, for it had long been established that they were more dangerous to their own side than to the enemy. To the last some elephants protected by armour were brought into the battle-field, but their use was confined almost entirely to carrying the generals or great nobles, and displaying their standards. The baggage elephants were assembled in rear, with those bearing the harem, the women remaining mounted on the latter during the battle, and protected by a strong force posted round them."

Under Akbar the elephants ridden by the emperor were called ḍhāṭā ("special"), and all others were arranged in groups of ten, twenty, or thirty, called ḍhālpī ("ring", or "circle"). In later reigns the same classification was employed, but with
a more extended meaning, khāṣa then including all riding, and faţās all baggage elephants. Manṣābās from 7,000 down to 500 were required to maintain each one riding elephant, and, in addition, five baggage elephants for each 25,000 of pay. It appears that these elephants belonged to the emperor, and were not even made over to the manṣābās for use, except in the field. In the Akbār Akhāri Abu’l-Faḍl says that Akbar "put several faţās under the charge of every grandee, and required him to look after them".

The commander-in-chief of the army was the emperor himself, but at the head of the military administration was an officer entitled Bakhshi-ul-Manṣūlahi, whose position may be described as that of adjutant-general and mustar-master-general. He was assisted by three bakhshis and a number of bīrūlaks, or clerks, and the duties of this department included enlistment, mustering, and passing the pay of both manṣābās and taḫīna, for which purpose they were obliged to see that the branding regulations, so long as they were enforced, were observed by those to whom they applied. Manucci says, "twice a year the bakshās holds a review of all the cavalry present at court, examines all the horses, and sees whether any of them are old and unfit for service. In the latter case he makes the owners get rid of them and buy others". These officers remained at headquarters, and from some authorities it appears that one of them had charge of the Wird-ul-Manṣūlah, or body-guard, but the Akbāri corps, which was commanded by one of the great nobles, had its own divān, or paymaster and quartermaster, and its own bakhshis, both officers being assisted by bīrūlaks. Certificates granted by the bakhshi were recorded by the waqf-a-nigar, or writer of the official diary, and were by him submitted to the suwar, or minister, who, after passing them, sent them to the office of revision and record, but pay was issued on the minister's order. In addition to the bakhshi at headquarters there were officers with similar functions attached to the governor of every province, their office being generally combined with that of waqf-a-nigar, or provincial diary-writer; and in imitation of the imperial establishments each great noble had his own bakhshi, who performed for him the same duties as those performed for the emperor by the imperial bakhshi.

It is impossible to estimate accurately the strength of the army in Akbar's reign, for the swar rank of the manṣābās is not given, either in the Akbar Akbari or in the Tuhaf-i Akbāri. He maintained 12,000 matchlockmen, and Blochmann estimates the whole strength of his army at 25,000, of which 12,000 were cavalry and the rest matchlockmen and artillery, but this seems to be much too low an estimate. Humayun could pass 6,000 cavalry into the field, and it is not likely that Akbar, with far wider dominions, would have been content, or could have ruled and extended his empire with a smaller army. It seems probable that Blochmann's estimate included only the emperor's personal, or household, troops. In the latter half of Shah-Djahān's reign the contingents of the princes and nobles would have numbered 435,000 if each manṣābār had maintained the full quota of his swar rank, but this they were not even expected to do. Fortunately a fairly exact return of the strength of the army is given in the Taḥdīkh-i-Imām. There were 8,000 manṣābārs of all ranks, 7,000 mounted Akhāris and barhānās, 200,000 cavalry, exclusive of the troops allowed to sāfīedāris for the maintenance of order and the collection of the revenue, and 40,000 foot matchlockmen, artillery, and rocketeers, of whom 10,000 were at headquarters and 10,000 in the provinces and the forts. It is not quite clear what is meant by the mounted barhānās classed with the Akhāris, for barhānās is the word used for the matchlockman, and horsemen certainly did not carry the cumbersome matchlock, and carbines and pistols had not been introduced, but it may be that a few men carrying a lighter musket than the ordinary matchlock were attached to the Akhāri corps. Of the army in the reign of Avarangbāb Manucci writes, "ordinarily the king keeps fifty thousand horse in garrison besides those in movement every day, an almost equal number. He has twenty thousand infantry, all Rāṭāpuris; out of them twelve thousand are in charge of the artillery; the rest are for guarding the royal palace, mounting sentry, etc. cetera".

The army of the Mughal emperors was not drilled. Muster parades consisted merely in the troopers passing in single file before the bakhshi, and the nearest approach to any manoeuvres was the participation of the army, or part of it, in a royal hunt, when the troops, aided by the people of the country side, acted as beaters, surrounded a large tract of country, and, day by day, closed inwards until in a small area was enclosed an enormous quantity of game, which was then daunted wholesale by the emperor and those who were permitted a share in the sport. Apart from this species of hunting styled ahkār-i-hūngar, the army was never exercised in any combined movements, or drill; but the individual trooper paid great attention to the training of his body, exercising himself with all his weapons, saber, spear, mace, battle-axe, buckler, dagger, and bow and arrows. The bow was considered a most effective weapon, as a horseman could shoot six times before a musketeer could fire twice. The trooper also went through various exercises for strengthening his limbs and his body, both with and without apparatus, the latter consisting of dumb-bells, waxdār, or Indian clubs, and the tham, a strong bow with a steel chain instead of a string, most effective in training these muscles employed by an archer. The horses were also trained in a sort of musketry.


B. Economics and Administration.

The Mughal Empire lived mainly by agriculture. The only metals available in quantity were iron and copper; both were relatively expensive, and local supplies of the latter were falling in the xvith century. The existence of coal was unknown, and of other minerals only lime, salt, saltpetre, and, locally, building stone were largely produced. The agricultural land was divided into areas known as
villages (dāl), usually, but not always, inhabited. The villages were grouped traditionally in larger areas (pargana), which were usually treated as administrative units (mughal). Most villages, but not all, were occupied by a community of peasants, held together by the tie of common ancestry; each member of these bodies had separate possession of the land which he cultivated, but the community acted as a whole, through the headmen (mukaddam), in the management of the village, letting surplus land to tenants, paying the revenue and other expenses, and transacting such other business as emerged.

The population was predominantly vegetarian. Most of the officials and the army was provided where required, but its supply lay outside the ordinary course of agriculture. The products of the land were mainly food, cereals, millets and pulses, with, on a smaller scale, sugar, vegetables, and condiments. Oilseeds were grown for local needs; opium was produced largely, and tobacco, a recent introduction, had spread rapidly through the empire; cotton and some other fibres, together with indigo and other dyes, were the chief industrial crops. Holdings were usually small, and were worked largely by the peasant himself with the aid of his family and the landless labourers of the village. Omen were used for village implements were few and primitive, and there was in general a scarcity of agricultural capital, necessitating prompt sales of produce at each harvest, to the peasant's loss and the middleman's gain.

Handicrafts were numerous and varied, but weaving was by far the most important. Cotton cloth was woven all over the empire, most of it for local consumption, but near the coasts production was directed largely to supplying overseas markets, while finer goods—muslins and prints—were carried long distances by land. Most of the consuming markets were conservative, adhering closely to established styles and patterns. There was thus little scope for invention; copying was safer than designing; and such developments as are recorded were the result of either patronage by wealthy amateurs, or the extension of the European demand. Silk-weaving was locally important in Bengal and Gujrat, in the latter case from imported material; jute and hemp were only of local importance, but in the xvith century an export trade in sacks and sacking was beginning to develop.

In peaceful regions commerce was active, and, for the period, highly organised. Funds were ordinarily transmitted by bills of exchange, which could be negotiated in all the principal towns, and in some centres outside the empire. Merchants were, however, disinclined to carry large stocks of commodities, and preferred to utilise their funds in money-lending; the rate of interest in commercial transactions was commonly about 10 or 12 per cent, but the charge was much higher when the element of risk was great.

External land-trade was almost limited to the two caravan routes westward by way of Kābul and Kandahār, though there was some small traffic with Tibet. By sea, Gujurat had old-established connections with the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, with East Africa, and with Sumatra, Malacca and further East; on a much smaller scale Sind had relations with Persia; while Bengal dealt chiefly with the south of India and with Burman and Siam.

During the xviith century all the sea routes were dominated by the Portuguese, who were concerned rather to exploit than develop; the chief extension of trade due to their efforts was the supply of cloth to Brazil and West Africa, but most of this was drawn from the Coromandel Coast, which was outside the empire until almost the end of the xviith century. After "factories" (i.e., agencies) had been established at Surat by the English (1611) and the Dutch (1617), an important trade with western Europe grew up in indigo and calico. In the middle of the century the indigo-trade yielded to competition from the West Indies, while the depopulation of Gujrat by the famine of 1630 transferred the bulk of the calico trade to the East Coast; Surat remained, however, an important centre until its supersession by Bombay. In the second quarter of the xviiith century the Dutch, followed by the English, established factories on the Hūgli in Bengal, and trade developed in silk, saltpetre, fine calico, and muslin. Towards the middle of the century a change of fashions in Europe produced a great demand for muslin and prints, which was met partly by Bengal, and partly by Madras, by this time technically within the limits of the empire.

The outstanding feature of all trade with India was the need for importing gold and silver. India bought little beyond the industrial metals and luxury goods, but was eager to sell produce for cash; and, since Western Europe could not supply what was most in demand, the operations of the trading Companies were necessarily so organised as to direct streams of gold and silver to India from those countries which would part with them, notably, at this period, gold from China, and silver, and later gold, from Japan. The seaports serving the empire were thus brought into a complex but efficient organisation, which took whatever they had to sell, supplied whatever they wanted to buy, and, so far as was possible, satisfied the demand for gold and silver.

Inland transport was necessarily less efficient. The Indus, the Ganges, the Djuama, and the waterways of Bengal were largely used, but the bulk of the empire depended on what were then called roads, unmetalled tracks, sometimes defined by lines of trees, with halting-places which were generally walled or otherwise defended against robbers, and usually furnished with supplies. Transport was effected by carts and pack-animals, generally oxen but in some places camels. Passengers travelled on horseback; in palanguins, or in carts drawn by fast oxen. There were excellent arrangements for the rapid transit of letters, but these were for official use, and were not ordinarily available for private persons, who hired messengers when required, or in a few cases, clubbed together to send messengers periodically.

Standards of life presented sharp contrasts. The mass of the population, peasants, artisans and labourers, lived in such extreme poverty as to elicit the commiseration of European visitors. An almost equally standard prevailed among the numerically important class of servants in the towns, whether freemen or slaves, who, however, enjoyed a more secure life than that of the rural population. The middle classes, comparatively smaller in numbers than now, were thrifty and frugal; and, even when wealthy, were careful to avoid any display which might lead to exactions by officials. The superior
grades of officers employed by the State were exceedingly well paid when allowance is made for the high purchasing power of money, and spent their incomes freely in extravagance and display, increased by the fact that on their death their property reverted to the treasury.

The prosperity of the empire depended mainly on three factors: the character of the rainfall, the degree of internal tranquillity, and the working of the revenue administration. The seasonal rainfall was, as it still is, uncertain, and any serious defect resulted in insufficiency of food. The difficulty of transport made it impossible to afford adequate relief on the spot, the people abandoned their homes to wander in search of food, and in contemporary narratives we read again and again of the then familiar features of deaths from starvation, cannibalism, and the sale of children into slavery. Recovery from such a calamity was a slow process, and the famine which desolated Gujarat and the Deccan in 1630–1631 left its mark for at least a generation. Exceptionally favourable seasons might also prove calamitous, though not to the same extent. There was no local market for the surplus produce, and prices fell to a ruinous level, and in official regulations low prices were treated as a calamity requiring relief on the same footing as drought or hail.

The dominance of the weather was inevitable; the other influences on prosperity were matters of administration. Here a clear distinction must be drawn between the general and the revenue administration, a distinction denoted by the current phrase wa'li wa-mal. The emperor was of course supreme in both branches, and was assisted at his headquarters by four principal officers, the Wazir or Prime Minister, the Wazir or Revenue Minister, the Bahshah (see col. 629*), and the Sadr, who was in charge of Islamic law and also administered the department dealing with charitable grants and endowments. The post of Wazir was not always filled, and when it was it always the duty attaching to it devolved on the Wazir. In practice the powers of these Ministers depended on the personality of the Emperor; under Akbar or Shah-Jahán they were definitely subordinates, while under Jahangir’s Prime Minister was at times practically the ruler of the country.

The system of general administration to which the Mughals succeeded in Northern India was not highly developed. The great bulk of the country was held by officers in assignment (a term explained below); the assignee was responsible for keeping the peace, and in practice had a free hand in the methods employed. Under Akbar a more effective system was established, which was maintained throughout the period. The empire was divided into provinces (sāhāk), each of which was in charge of a Viceroy (Sipahsāhār, Sāhahār), who at first was responsible to the Emperor for all branches of administration, but after 1595 was relieved of revenue work. Apart from the Viceroy, officers who may be described as Governors were stationed at selected places, with the duty of keeping the peace and putting down rebellion, a term which covered failure to pay the revenue due. The ordinary designation of these Governors was Fauqifār, but in outlying regions which were controlled by fortresses the Governor was the fortress-commander (śarifār), while in a few large assignments the assignee exercised the powers of a Governor. Cities were governed by officers designated Ketāwāl, who combined the functions of magistrate, police-commandant, municipality, and censor of morals. There was no regular police force at the disposal of these officers, who were expected to employ the troops they maintained as a condition of their rank, obtaining help when their own forces were insufficient. The efficiency of this organisation varied with that of the central administration, which depended mainly on the personality of the Emperor; by the close of the eighteenth century it was definitely breaking down, and conditions of anarchy were spreading over the empire.

It is difficult to state in precise terms the relation of this organisation to the extensive portions of the empire where internal jurisdiction remained in the hands of Hindu Chiefs; but apparently the Chief was regarded officially as assignee of his territories, and was expected to maintain order within them. If he failed to do so, the Viceroy or Governor concerned might intervene, but his action would ordinarily be directed against the Chief rather than against the people.

The revenue administration was controlled by the Wazir, sitting in the Revenue Ministry, which was known as Diwan, as opposed to Husār, or the Court, whence orders were issued by, or in the name of, the Emperor. Revenue at this period meant practically Land Revenue; the Imperial Treasury had receipts from other sources—Customs, Salt, Mint, Presents, Inheritance, and, under Awrangzéb, the Captivation Tax (ārūd), but, taken collectively, they were of little importance compared with the income obtained from the peasants. Under the system traditional in India, and embodied in Hindu law, every person cultivating land was required to pay a share of the produce to the King, who determined, within somewhat elastic limits, the amount of the share, and who also prescribed the methods of assessment and collection.

The first Muslim conquerors accepted this ‘King’s share’ as the ārūd to which they were entitled under Islamic law; the question of property in land was not raised, but occupants were ordinarily allowed to retain possession subject to due payment of the revenue.

In the Mughal period agricultural land fell into three classes: Chiefs’, Reserved and Assigned. The areas governed by the more important Chiefs were not assessed to revenue (ārūd) by the Wazir; that was the privilege of the Chief, and any payments which he made to the treasury were in the nature of a tribute, determined by negotiation. The treatment of the numerous smaller Chiefs is not on record; but the few facts which have survived are consistent with the view that assessment was made through them, and that they were allowed to retain a portion of the revenue in return for their services. In the regions which were directly administered, certain areas of land, described as ḍāhān, were reserved to furnish the treasury with revenue, and were managed by the staff employed by the Revenue Ministry; at first the local staff was under the provincial Viceroy, but in 1596 a Diwan was posted to each province, to manage all revenue business directly under the Minister, and in this way emerged the dichotomy into ṭāmān (revenue business) and fawqifār (general business) which henceforward characterised the local administration.

The land not reserved for the treasury was
available for assignment. Every officer appointed to the Emperor’s service was entitled to an income defined in cash, which represented both his personal salary and the cost of the troops he was required to maintain. For a short period in Akbar’s reign, this income was paid, as well as defined, in cash, but the ordinary practice in the empire was to assign to each officer an area (गढ़ी, तळ, या घर) estimated to yield as revenue the amount of his stated income; and the officer thereupon took charge of the area assigned to him, and assessed and collected the revenue in accordance, at least theoretically, with the general orders in force. If the yield proved insufficient, he could claim the balance from the treasury, while he could be required to account for any excess receipts; but in practice these matters seem usually to have been adjusted by bribery, for which there was also extensive scope in securing profitable assignments, and in getting rid of those which had been squeezed dry. Changes of assignment were ordinarily so frequent that an officer would have been unwise to spend money on fostering agricultural development, or to do anything beyond extracting the largest income which his assignment could be made to yield. The great bulk of the land was ordinarily assigned, the reserved area being one-sixth or one-seventh of the whole.

The share of the peasants’ produce claimed by Akbar was one-third; later, at some uncertain time in the first half of the xvith century, this figure became the minimum, with a maximum of one-half, which inevitably tended to become the standard. Three principal methods of assessment were in vogue: Sharing (चालिया अधार), Measurement (प्रभाबिकिया), and Group-Assessment (सम्मेल). In Sharing, the produce of each peasant was ordinarily estimated (or occasionally ascertained at harvest), and the prescribed share valued to determine the cash-revenue due for that season. In Measurement, a fixed charge, varying with the crop, was made on each unit of area sown; it might be fixed in either cash or produce and in the latter case it was valued at current prices. Under both these systems payment in cash was the general rule, but payments in kind were permitted in some backward regions where currency was scarce. In Group-Assessment, the official concerned came to terms with the headmen of the village to pay a sum fixed in cash for the year, thus avoiding the necessity of detailed assessments on individuals; this system tended to pass into Farming, when terms were made, not with the headmen, but with an outsider.

Each ruler determined at his pleasure which of these methods should be employed, and in what regions. Group-Assessment was the prevailing system at the time of Bībī’s conquest, and apparently was accepted by him. After the expiration of Humāyūn from India, Shāh Shāh introduced Measurement throughout his kingdom, and his methods were at first adopted by Akbar; the revenue claimed from each unit of area was at this time a stated quantity of produce, calculated to be one-third of the average yield, and, except in the tracts where payment in kind was practised, this amount of produce was commuted to cash at prices fixed officially for each season. Practical difficulties, however, in regard to commutation; and in 1579–1580 the revenue was put definitely on a cash basis, the charge on each unit of area being a fixed number of दाम (reckoned at 40 to the rupee) instead of a fixed weight of produce. Schedules of cash-rates adapted to the varying productivity of different regions were now drawn up, which remained in operation during the rest of Akbar’s reign. At some uncertain period, probably under जाहांगीर, these schedules were discarded, and a return was made to Group-Assessment, which was the standard system in the middle of the xvith century, and survived into the British period; Sharing was now practised only in backward tracts, or in some cases where the headmen refused to pay what the assessor thought a reasonable revenue, in which case he proceeded to detailed assessment on individuals, by Sharing or by Measurement according to circumstances.

Such was the history of assessment in the heart of the empire, but the outlying provinces were not brought into rigid uniformity, local conditions determining the system applied in each; while in the Dakhan provinces a distinct and elaborate system was introduced in the middle of the xvith century in order to promote recovery from the effects of war and famine.

It would be futile to criticise these varying institutions, for the value of all alike depended on the spirit in which they were worked. In administrative circles there was throughout the Muslim period a definite ideal of agricultural prosperity as the foundation of the State, its elements being extension of cultivation, improvement in the class of crops, and development of irrigation. Against this ideal operated the urgent need for the largest immediate revenue that could be wrung from the peasants. The course of the struggle cannot be traced in detail but the central fact is that by the middle of the xvith century agriculture had ceased to be an attractive career, and the peasants were deserting the land for other occupations; the resulting decline in agricultural production was the chief economic factor in the eventual collapse of the empire.

The remaining branches of the administration require little description. Customs duties were formally low, but their incidence was increased by arbitrary over-valuation and unauthorised payments required to secure prompt clearance of goods. In the towns, civil justice was administered only by the जाहीर; in the country, disputes were apparently decided summarily by the executive officials. Punishments for crime were summary and drastic, and were not always in accordance with Islamic law. By Indian tradition, local officials raised a large revenue for local purposes by a multitude of taxes and excissions of a most oppressive nature; these were prohibited by the Akbar, and again by Awrangzeb, but the system survived. Its worst feature was the levy of transit dues on internal trade, which were a cause of constant complaint by Indians as well as foreigners.

Special attention was given to the coinage, as being a recognised appanage of sovereignty. Gold, silver and copper were coined, all the coins circulating at their metallic value, so that the exchange rate between different denominations fluctuated; but gold was not in general circulation. The chief coin of the empire was the silver rupee, containing nearly 180 grains of almost pure silver; the principal copper coin was the दाम, of nearly 324 grains; and there were various smaller coins of both metals.

The unit of weight used in wholesale commerce-
was the maund or mow, which varied in different parts of the country. In the south of India it ranged about 25 lb; in Gujrat it was 33 lb, but in 1635 this was reduced to 37 lb; in North India, it was 52 lb. At Akbar's accession, was raised by him to 55 lb, by Djiângir to 66 lb, and by Shahji to 74 lb. In Bengal, it was 64 lb in the West, and 46 lb in the East. All these figures are given to the nearest lb. The unit for retail trade varied from place to place, but was ordinarily smaller than those which have been named. Measures of capacity were not used in wholesale commerce. The measure of length in the North was the gun or yard, which was standardised by Akbar at about 33 inches, and by his successor at about 40 inches, but the smaller unit survived; in the South the šānta, or cubit, of about 18 inches was used; in Gujrat the unit was about 26 inches; and in Bengal about 27 inches.
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II. THE DECLINE OF THE MUGHAL EMPIRE.

The decline of Mughal authority, already manifest during the reign of Awrangzeb, rapidly developed under his immediate successors. Bahâdur Shâh [q. v.] (1707—1712) was too amiable, Djiângir Shâh [q. v.] (1712—1713) was too vicious, Farrukh-shâyâr [q. v.] (1713—1719) was too feeble, to revive the empire. In seven bloody battles of succession, fought within six years of Awrangzeb's death, the imperial family attested its inherent lawlessness and declining power. Then it became the sport of rival factions. For a while the two famous Sâyid brothers, 'Abd Allâh and Husain 'Ali, of Bâhâ, became the joint mayors of the palace. But they were unable to consolidate the support of the Mughal nobles. In 1720 Äsaf Djiângir Nîâmân al-Mulk rose in arms. Husain 'Ali mediated against him, but was murdered with the connivance of Muhammad Shâh, the emperor whom he and his brother had set up in 1710. Shortly afterwards, his brother 'Abd Allâh was defeated, and, after lying in prison at Agra for two years, was poisoned. When they fell, Nîâmân al-Mulk strove hard to restore something like the old order of administration. But he was unwilling to force himself upon Muhammad Shâh as the Sâyids had forced themselves upon Farrukhshâyâr. When the emperor whom he had delivered refused his advice, and the followers of the courtiers made fun of his antiquated dress and the ceremonious manners, he preferred to retire and rule the Dakhan in virtual independence. Ironically enough, Mu-
Nicholas: Sh. believed that Nisam al-Mulk had been plotting his overthrow. With Nisam al-Mulk's departure from Delhi, the last chances of a revival of the empire vanished. Never did a falling state betray greater incapacity for reform. No phoenix could arise from those shameless ashes. Even while Nisam al-Mulk still retained the nominal control of affairs, extraordinary incidents could occur. At Delhi itself, for example, a Hindu clerk in one of the imperial offices turned Muslim, and, when his wife and daughter refused to follow his change of faith, he laid a complaint against them, alleging that, as his daughter had not attained puberty, she was therefore of her father's religion. The case offered certain technical difficulties, but was at last referred to the sadar al-quditah. His treatment of the case displeased the Delhi mob. Riots broke out, the recall of the daftah at the Dhalan-numa Masjid was interrupted, two or three Hindus were seized and circumcised. To pacify the rioters, the girl was imprisoned, and, a few days later, buried with Muslim ceremonial. "To cut a long story," says Kamwar Khan who relates the incident, "she was killed; otherwise it would have been many headaches and much vexation."

Nasam al-Mulk's successors were worthy of the frivolous emperor whom they professed to serve. For twelve years the imperial councils were directed by a man called Shih 4 Abd al-Qasim. Byorigin a cotton-weaver of Tatth, he had lived both as jogi and faqir. Claiming magical powers and popularly believed to consort with djinn and devils, he was summoned to interpret the dreams of the emperor's mother. This led him into the imperial service, and he contrived to accumulate in his own hand a great number of offices, producing a revenue of 5,000 rupees a day, apart from the bribes which he received, said to amount to as much more. This man was pitily described as never having spent money on a good work, never having conferred a favour, and never having done a kindness. He was a miser, and at his downfall (for even at Delhi another Muhammed Shah such qualities at last produced their natural reaction) more than a crore of rupees was found in his private houses. But the unpopularity which his character and habits naturally evoked were as nothing compared with the detestation with which his son and daughter were regarded. No one in Delhi was safe who displeased them or denied them anything that they desired.

Amid such confusion and under such rulers the empire rapidly lost its cohesion. The Mughals [q. v.], whom even Awrangzib sought in vain to subdue, soon became the most formidable power in India. On Awrangzib's death, his successor, Bahdur Sh. had released the Maratha prince, Shih Raja, in the desperate hope of reestablishing through him the form, if not the substance of imperial control. Shih Raja met with influential and talented support. In 1708 he took possession of Satara and by the next year was generally recognized as ruler. A Chipayan Brahman, Bhalaji Waghwhath, became his priesthood or first minister, and began to develop the characteristic Maratha policy, which was to play a part in the enfeeblement of the empire. This was to put forward claims to a share (under the title of Sayad or a quarter part) in the imperial revenues in as many provinces as possible. In 1709 the Mughal governor in the Dakhan admitted this claim, and, although later governors contested it, it was again recognized by the Bahr Sh. Sayyid in 1719. In the next year Halaji Waghwhath was succeeded by his son, Bajji Rao I, and the process was extended further afield. Particular provinces were assigned to particular officers, who were to realize the tax either by collecting the amount from the provincial governor, or by plundering the country. Bajji Rao employed Pailaji Gakekar as his chief leader in raids in Gujrat; Raghuji Bhosale established himself at Nagpur; these and other leaders spread the terror of Maratha devastation in all directions, and it was no longer possible for the provincial governors to make their annual remittances to the capital. At the same time, seeing that their tenure of office was coming to depend more and more upon their own power and resources, the governors tended to become virtually independent rulers.

Ajas Djiq Nisam al-Mulk in the Dakhan continued to profess himself a humble servant of the emperor, but he repelled by force of arms the persons who came with imperial farrunia ordering his supersession, and when he died in 1748 he was succeeded by his son. In Bengal too the succession had become a matter of heredity or war. But the respect which the name of the empire still enjoyed and the degradation into which the empire itself had fallen were exemplified by the large gifts sent by a new viceroy farrunia of investiture and the unhesitating compliance with which they were issued. The troubles breed by this internal dissolusion were enhanced by those of foreign invasion. In 1722 the safawids were overthrown in Persia, and, after a short period of great confusion, the Turkman Nadir Kuli established himself as ruler under the title of Nadir Sh. [q. v.]. With him difficulties arose over the Kandahar frontier. He was engaged in reducing the Ghilzais there to submission. Thrice he sent envoys to the court of Delhi requesting that his enemies should not receive shelter in the Mughal territory. But by this time the Kahl province was falling into a like disorder with the rest. The governor spent his time in prayer and hunting. The money which had been regularly sent from Delhi to bribe the hill-tribes into quietude and pay the troops ceased to be sent, partly because of the growing imperial penury, partly because it was believed that it never reached the governor but was embezzled by his patron at court. Large bodies of Ghilzais therefore were able without the least difficulty to take shelter from Nadir Sh.'s troops in the Mughal province, while the Mughal court foolishly supposed it was evading its difficulties by neglecting to answer Nadir Sh.'s repeated demands. The ineptitude of the court, therefore, rather than (as used to be supposed) any elaborate intrigue of party against party, made Nadir Sh. resolve to invade India. No effective opposition could be offered in either the Kahl province or the Pandjdb. In 1738 Kahl was occupied. In the next year Nadir Sh.'s army appeared before Delhi. The emperor went out, not to strike a blow in his own defence, but to make his humble submission. Conqueror and captive then entered the city. The Delhi mob, grievously mistaking its strength, attempted to massacre the foreigners. As a punishment Nadir Sh. deliberately let loose his troops for five long hours—from 9 o'clock in the morning till 2 in the afternoon—during which some 20,000 of the inhabitants are believed to
to have perished; and beyond this toll of life a
great ransom was exacted, including 50 crores' 
worth of those wonderful jewels which earlier 
Mughal sovereigns had hoarded up for their delight. 
From this time onwards the annals of the Mughal 
empire contain nothing but dishonour. Nadir Shah 
fell; but Ahmed Shâh Durrânî established on the 
frontiers of India another empire and repeatedly 
invaded India between 1748, the year of the 
ignominious Muhammed Shâh's death, and 1764, 
the year in which he inflicted the severest defeat 
in all their history upon the Marâthâs at Panipat. 
Until the decay of the Durrânî empire in the early 
years of the nineteenth century, the provinces of 
Sind, the Pândjab, and Kashmir, were dependen-
cies of the Afghan kingdom.

Europeans in India — Dutch, French, and 
English — had observed these events with great 
care. Early in the eighteenth century the Dutch 
had sent a great embassy to Bahádur Shâh, and 
a little later the English had sent one to Farrukh-
siyar. Both had secured far-reaching firmâns by 
profuse expenditure; both had found that their 
firmâns were waste paper wherever they ran 
counter to the interests of local governors. But it 
was the Frenchman Dupleix who first sought to 
push into practice the conclusions to be drawn from 
this situation. Others were convinced that European 
force could easily establish itself in India; but he 
began experiments, and, in the hope of keeping 
the English motionless while he acted, he pro-
fessed to be acting on behalf and in the name 
of the Mughal emperor. This fiction became the 
traditional basis of French policy in India, and 
down to the end of the century Frenchmen were 
elaborating plans (which their failure to control 
the sea brought to nothing) for establishing them-
seves in India and expelling their rivals under 
cover of imperial grants. With equal consistency 
the English adopted a political realism which 
squared far better with the circumstances of the 
time. They fought and overcame Dupleix in the 
name of their national interests. When they acquired 
Bengal, they carefully avoided all obligation to 
reestablish the imperial authority; and it appears 
that their acceptance of the diwanî of Bengal was 
dictated, not by any desire to mask the reality of 
their power (which no-one in India doubted), 
but by the desire to take on behalf of the East 
India Company something which could not be 
taken over by the English crown as a territorial 
sovereignty certainly would have been. Thus it 
was that Prince 'Ali Gauhar, who proclaimed himself 
as Shah 'Alam II [q.v.] in 1760, on learning of 
of his father 'Alamgîr's murder by his wazir, Châs 
al-Din, first came under the protection of the 
English. He had for some years been attacking 
the province of Bihâr with the aid of the Nawâb 
Wazir of Oudh. But after the battle of Bâkasr 
in 1764 he had given up the struggle, joined the 
English camp, and in the following year on Clive's 
demand bestowed on the East India Company the 
diwanî of the provinces it held in return for an 
annual allowance of 26 lakhs of rupees. At the 
same time the districts of Kora and Allâhâbâd 
were assigned to him and he proceeded to reside 
in the latter city. Soon however, he wearied of 
his position of dependence, and departed to join 
the Marâthâs, who, having recovered from their 
defeat at Panipat, were once more invading northern 
India. On this Warren Hastings decided to hand
Kora and Allâhâbâd over to the Nawâb Wazir 
and refused to continue the payment of the 26 
lakhs. From this time until the close of the century 
he remained under the control of the Marathas, 
except at such times as their internal dissensions 
led to the recall of their forces from the north. 
One of their chief leaders at this time, Mahâmadji 
Sindha, gradually built up a strong principality 
for himself, conquering the provinces of Agra and 
Oudh, and becoming the emperor's real custodian. 
So matters remained till Sindha's defeat by the 
English in 1803 transferred the guardianship of Shâh 
'Alam into the hands of the latter. They carefully 
refrained from entering into engagements with him, 
but they assigned revenues for the maintenance of 
the imperial family, they permitted all orders issued 
in the city of Oudh to run in the emperor's name, 
though the actual administration was conducted 
by an English agent, and they attempted no interfer-
ence with the precincts of the palace. Gradually 
the traditional observances broke down. The Mughal 
emperor and the British governor-general met with 
the ceremonial of equals. The emperor's name 
was removed from the coinage. And it had been 
resolved no longer to recognize the imperial title 
after the death of its holder, Bahadur Shâh II, 
when the Indian Mutiny, in which several of the 
empire princes took an active part although they 
seem to have had little share in bringing it about, 
led to the formal trial and deposition of the 
emperor and the disappearance of the shadowy 
court which for a century had lingered on under 
the toleration of the real powers of India.
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III. MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE IN INDIA.

The Mughal dynasts brought to India strong 
Central Asian predilections and a keen feeling for 
natural beauty. But each in succession obeyed his 
own instincts, education and caprices. Hence they 
patronized no "schools" of art, but came to employ 
an almost cosmopolitan body of artists, Persian, 
Indian, Turk and even European, who one and 
all had to adapt their own canons to the aesthetic 
moods of their employers. In general the Mughals 
forbade any sculpture of the human form, but like 
the Orthodox Greek Church, were usually less 
rigid towards paintings of it and even fostered 
portraiture till it reached a high level. Yet, with 
relatively few exceptions, the Mughal buildings 
were all religious, comprising mosques and tombs 
or shrines. Hence their scope was limited, though 
within their limits they express the religious feelings 
and policies of the dynasty. Even the conqueror 
Bâbur found leisure in his brief reign of five years, 
1526—1532, to build at Panipat the Kâbal Shâh 
mosque, whose name commemorates at once his 
love of Kâbul and his victory at Panipat in 1526. 
His mosque at Sambhal in Rohilkhand is marked 
by an ovoid dome. When he required constructive 
work Bâbur summoned workmen, whether Muslim 
from Constantinople, and avoided Indians; Hindu 
or indigenous standards, though he must have 
employed Indian workmen in spite of his dis-
paragement of Indian skill and knowledge in design or architecture.

Humayun’s longer but still more chequered reign produced many buildings, of which few remain. His mosque at Fatehpur-Sikri near Delhi is massive and well-proportioned, recalling the Tughlaq or Turkish period, with domes rather more than hemispherical. It is decorated with enamelled tiles in the Persian manner, apparently the earliest example of that style now extant. His tomb at Delhi, doubtless begun, as is customary among pious Easterns, during his lifetime, is of red sandstone and also Persian in style, but in it coloured tiles are replaced by white marble, of which the dome is wholly composed, the rest of the masonry being also inlaid with that material. The main dome has a narrow neck, the first of its type to appear in India, the four corner cupolas, also a new feature, support domes of an earlier style.

Akbar (1556–1605) was versatile in his architecture as he was in his religion. In the Fort at Agra he built the palace — one of the few secular buildings of the Mughal period which survive — called the Djahangir Mahal. His other buildings at Agra were demolished by Shah-Djahān. This palace, built of red sandstone which has weathered badly, bears the impress of Akbar’s vigour and originality. Throughout the arches are used sparingly, the horizontal style of construction being the rule. Its forms also are as Hindu as its construction, but the ornamentation, carved on all flat surfaces, is of a type used by Akbar but not found in other buildings. During the early part of his reign an erected at Gwalior the tomb of Muhammad Goharwah, who died in 1562. Closely resembling that of Sher Shāh at Sahasāram, it marks a considerable advance in tomb-building during the brief period that had elapsed between the erection of the two, an advance ascribed by Fergusson to the invigorating touch of Akbar’s genius, but doubtless due in great measure to the skill of the Gwalior school of architects and masons who were probably Hindus. The tomb is a square, 100 ft, each way, exclusive of the hexagonal towers, and its chamber forms a half, 45 ft, square, with the angles cut off by pointed arches so as to form an octagon on which the dome rests. Around this square building is a wide gallery, enclosed on all sides by a screen of pierced tracery in pierced stonework with a projecting porch on each face.

At Fatehpur-Sikri, the new capital founded by Akbar where the court resided from 1569 to 1584, the emperor’s eclectic phase found its fullest expression. Its architecture is admirably illustrated in W. E. Smith’s works 1), but all its significance has not yet been explained. The site was chosen because Akbar’s patron saint, the Kāhlī Salmī Ḍīn, lived in a cave on its summit 2). Akbar’s own residence was the “House of Dreams”, the Kāhlī-gāh, an unpretentious structure standing on the roof of the Mahall-i Khān, which contains paintings attributed by Smith to Chinese artists and apparently depicting Buddha as Yamunatoka 3). However this may be, the design of his throne in the Dīwān-i Khāšā massive pillar symbolizes that he sat there as a Cakravartin or ruler of the four quarters, as Haveli suggests, though it is conceivable that it signified his claim to the supreme headship of his new religion, the Din-i-Ilahi. But it is rash to dogmatize on the symbolism of a builder who seems to have had no settled design for the plan of his new city. The Mahall-i Khān regarded by Fergusson as the original block of building at Fatehpur-Sikri, has two spacious courtyards and is larger than the Red Palace at Agra, but its surrounding structures are inferior in richness of design and ornamentation. From time to time Akbar added courts and pavilions as if to compensate for this inferiority. While the Dīwān-i Khāsh is square, as befits a Hall of Audience, the Daftar-Khāna or Record Office is peristylar like the one erected by Akbar at Allahābād. The Panīr Mahall, a five-storied open pavilion with richly carved pillars, and long colonnades and walls connecting these buildings one with another, complete this group of structures. The most characteristic and beautiful of his designs here are the three small buildings, the Mahall or apartment of Bir Bal’s daughter, the house of Marīam Zamāni, mother of Djahangir, and the palace of the Rūmī Sultan. Kukhāri Begam, a cousin of Akbar and his first consort, Akbar’s greatness however demanded more grandiose monuments. The Dīmān Masjid or cathedral mosque, erected in 1577 (the year in which he proclaimed himself the ma ‘ṣūla (of his age and openly claimed the spiritual headship of Islām) commemorated his victories in the Dakhan (Southern India). It ranks amongst the finest ecclesiastical buildings of India. According to its inscription, it was designed by Sālīm Salmī Ḍīn himself and modelled on the Ka’ba. Though highly ornate it betrays few or no traces of Indian influence 4). The tomb of the Sālīm, in its courtyard, is built wholly of white marble, with windows of pierced tracery of the most exquisite geometrical patterns, and a deep cornice of marble supported by brackets of a design so elaborate as to be almost fantastic. The other tomb in the courtyard, that of Sālīm’s grandson, Shāh Iskār Khān, is of sober and excellent design but eclipsed by its surroundings. The Baland Darwāzah or “lofty gateway”, built in 1602, commemorates Akbar’s conquest of Khāndesh and dwarfs even the Dīmān Masjid. It is the grandest gateway in India and one of the loftiest in the world, its height being enhanced by its position on the brow of the hill on which Fatehpur-Sikri stands. Its architect placed its portals at the back of a semi-dome, which thus became its porch or portico, and its dimensions impress themselves as those of the actual portal. It must be added that Akbar intended his new capital to be a school of all the arts and that he allied architecture to painting. From the fragments of interior mural paintings which survive, it is clear that he employed Persian and Indian artists, who worked independently, and some idea of their technique is doubtless to be gathered from the miniatures of this period, as mural artists were also required to illustrate manuscripts.

1) J. Indian Art, No. 47 (vol. viii., p. 66), 1894.
2) For its wall-paintings see J. Indian Art, No. 66 (vol. viii., p. 55), 1899.
4) 2) The tomb of Salmū Salmī Ḍīn is described and illustrated in Smith’s work cited above and in J. Indian Art, No. 64 (vol. viii., p. 41 and 497), 1898.
At Allāhābād, the city where Akbar was compelled by administrative duties to reside more than at his new but isolated capital, he built the pavilion of the Čalis Mīnār or "Forty Pillars," of which only the hall survives. Its plan is square, supported by eight rows of columns, eight in each row, making sixty-four in all; and it is surrounded by a deep verandah of double columns, with groups of four at the angles, all surmounted by bracket capitals of the richest design.

But perhaps the most characteristic of Akbar's buildings, observes Ferguson, is his tomb at Sīkandera, begun in his lifetime but completed by his successor. Unfortunately Dājhāngīr, in his Tāt̤āb (travels, A. Rogers, i. 1553), asserts that he demolished Akbar's work and reconstructed the tomb. But, seeing that the plan of the building is unique in India and has no Persian or Saracenic parallel, it is more likely that only its exterior is the work of the fastidious orthodox Dājhāngīr. Its original plan was modelled on the Panč Māhall, being composed of five square terraces diminishing in size as they ascend. Thus the outline of the structure is pyramidal, not domical. Standing in an extensive garden it is approached by a single gateway and stands on a raised platform. Exceeding the angle towers the lowest storey measures 340 ft. each way, and on this terrace stand three more, similar in design but more ornate, each about half the height of the lowest storey or terrace. Within and above the highest storey is a white marble enclosure of 157 ft. square, contrasting with the red sandstone of which the rest of the structure is built. The outer wall of this enclosure is entirely composed of beautiful trellis-work; and inside it is a colonnade or cloister, also of white marble, in the centre of which is placed the tomb of Akbar, resting on a platform of exquisite arabesque tracery. This doubtless typifies Akbar's celestial resting-place, for below it lie his remains under a far plainer tombstone in the basement. That Dājhāngīr here departed from the original plan is certain. According to W. Finch, the tomb was to have been covered with a canopy of "curious white and speckled gold richly inwrought". What Akbar planned and what he meant to express by his design must remain a matter of conjecture. Ferguson postulates a Buddhist model, and even sees in the pavilions which adorn the upper storeys reminiscences of the cells which stand on the edge of the great rock-cut bath at Māmmalaparum; but these may have been intended for use as a theological college like the rooms and pavilions in the upper storey of Humāyūn's tomb. He also thought that a domical chamber over the tombstone formed part of the original design, since no such royal tomb remains exposed to the air in any Indian mausoleum — a dangerous generalization. Havell sees in the building an Indian five-storied Assembly-Hall, apparently a meeting-house for the royal order, the Dāhāī, the four lower pavilions (or terraces) corresponding to the four grades of the order. Even Cambodian

1) This view is contested in Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1903—1904, p. 19, but it was certainly the usual custom for a Mughal emperor, like any other good Muslim of means, to build his tomb during his lifetime. The problem is fully discussed in The Tomb of Akbar, by E. W. Smith and W. H. Nicholls, published by the Arch. Survey of India, Allāhābād 1908.

influences have been conjectured). Yet it is not impossible that a Zoroastrian model was kept in view, as Akbar borrowed from that faith among others.

As compared with Akbar Dājhāngīr contributed little to the architectural magnificence of Mughal India. At Lahore, which he made his capital, he added the Barā Klewūm-gāh or greater sleeping apartment to the Fort; and the tomb of Amūskālī was also erected in that city. Near Srinagar in Kashmir he made the Shāhīn Mārs gardens with their summer-houses; and the fine gateway to the Sarāī at Nūrāhān near Dāljandhar is also ascribed to his reign. The quadrangle at Lahore was doubtless executed by Hindu artisans, as the colonnade, which surrounds three sides of its area, is supported by pillars of red sandstone with bracket capitals and carved figures of elephants, peacocks and conventional animals like those found in the Red Palace at Agra. Dājhāngīr's greatest buildings were however erected at Dākkā, in Eastern Bengal, where he made a new provincial capital in supersession of Gāw; but his structures there were principally built of brick, covered with brickwork, only the pillars and brackets being of stone, and they have been almost destroyed by the jungle. In one respect only did Dājhāngīr innovate. In 1600 he built the Motī Masājd or "Pearl Mosque" at Lahore, the first of its kind in India. Between Akbar's style and that of Dājhāngīr little difference exists. The former had used colour ornamentation at Fathpur-Sikri; its later buildings were richly decorated with wall-paintings, and marble mosaic was used in the Dājmī Masājd. Dājhāngīr relied still more on mosaic decoration, e.g. in Akbar's tomb at Sīkandera, but soon after its completion we find variegated marble mosaic supplemented by pīstra dura, as in Fīmūd al-Dawla's tomb, and in the Tādž we still find inlay almost exclusively used. Akbar had continued the use of chamfroned tiles at Fathpur-Sikri for roofing and more sparingly for ornamentation; and they were employed by Dājhāngīr at Sīkandera and by Wāsīr Kāshānī, his wāsīr, on his mosque at Lahore. Indeed the mosaic is only noteworthy on account of this decoration. Akbar had also introduced painting on interior walls.

Dājhāngīr's wife Nūr Māhāl or Nūr Dājhānī erected at Agra the tomb of her father, Fīmūd al-Dawla, completed in 1628. Built almost entirely of white marble, enriched with semi-precious pīstra dura patterns, it foreshadowed the finest work of Shāh-Dājhān's reign. Dājhāngīr's tomb, at Shāhdārā near Lahore, has little architectural merit, consisting of a vast platform 209 ft. square, with a minaret at each corner. The façades are decorated with white marble let into the red sandstone and the flat roof with geometrical mosaics. The emperor's remains are probably buried beneath an opening in the roof so that the rain and dew of heaven might fall on his tomb, as his earliest chronicler says?). In brief the actual grave was hypostyle?;

3) A contrary view, that the tomb had a closed
b) held finds expression in Sura ix. 20, where we read "those who believed and migrated and expended blood and treasure in fighting for the cause of Allah, occupy a higher position (than other believers); they are the fortunate ones". Malhādīr in this way became a title of honour (cf. Sura xxi. 25 where Lot is so called). Individuals who had migrated not to Medina but to Abyssinia also proudly called themselves malhādīr (see Fr. Buhl, Sp. cit., p. 172). But the real "migration" was that to Medina in which the Prophet himself took part. The number of the Malhādīr gradually grew as the increasing power of Muhammad from time to time induced Meccans to leave their heathen city and go to Medina. It is to them that Sura viii. 76 refers, where those who adopted Islam later than the first emigrants who migrated and afterwards fought alongside of the older Malhādīr are acknowledged as belonging to the community ("they are of you"). After the treaty of Hudaybiya (q.v.) in particular, we hear of Meccan women who left their pagan husbands and went to Medina. Where, in accordance with Muhammad's interpretation of the treaty they were not surrendered if they offered the so-called women's pledge (see Sura ix. 11 (22)). Thus the Malhādīr, later and earlier, formed an increasing element in the population of Medina, whom Muhammad often mentions along with other sections of the community as possessing equal rights with them (e.g. Sura xxiii. 6, 49) in which connection it should be noted that Malhādīr is never, as was the case among the Ānār, used in genealogies.

That these emigrants were especially dear to Muhammad is easily intelligible, for they had shared his sufferings in Mecca and made the greatest sacrifices for him and included in their number men who had adopted his teaching out of pure conviction. With the occupation of Mecca, the migration ceased while the Malhādīr remained as a separate highly honoured body. It is natural to suppose that a certain amount of rivalry might easily arise between them and the other elements of the community, and that there was actually a certain amount of friction between the emigrants and the Medinæn is evident from the fact that in the troubles after the Prophet's death the Medinæn endeavoured to set up one of their number, Sa'd b. Ubāda, as successor to the Prophet. The attempt failed through the energetic action of 'Umar, Abū Bakr and Abū 'Ubaida, and the leadership of the community remained in the hands of the Malhādīr until the descendants of Muhammad's old opponents in Mecca seized power for themselves.

b) Bibliography: The biography of Muhammad, especially Ibn Ḥiṣām, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 341 sqq. (Fr. Buhl)

Muhāl [see MANTÝS]

al-Muhāllab b. Abī Ṣufra, Abī Sa'īd al-Azōzī, an Arab general. Al-Muhāllab is said to have been born two years before the death of Muhammad. In the reign of Mu'āwiya he undertook a campaign against India and raised the country between Kābal and Muhāllab (445-664-665). He next distinguished himself in the expedition of the governors of Khurāsān against Samarkand. Then however, he left the Umayyads and joined the anti-Caliph 'Abī Allāh b. al-Zubair who gave him the governorship of Khurāsān. When he was just about to start for there, he was appointed commander-in-chief in the war against the Asrāñ
following the precedent set by Bābur. The sarco-
phagus is of white marble, inlaid with pietra dura,
and it stands in an octagonal chamber 21 ft. high
and 20£ ft. thick on all sides, and access to it is afforded by two oblong
apartments, one on each side, but it does not
open into any of the forty other rooms behind
the arches which surround the structure, each façade
having a central arch with five smaller arches on
each side.

Under Shāh-Djāhān (1627—1658) Mughal archi-
tecture attained its zenith. One of his earliest
buildings was the incomparable Tādi Mahall [q. v.],
beginning the year after the death of the empress,
Arjuna-
mān Bānī Begam, entitled Mumtāz Mahall, or
the "Chosen One of the Palace". For himself Shāh
Djāhān planned a corresponding tomb of equal
magnificence on the opposite bank of the river
Djāmān, but Awrangzēb did not carry out the
scheme, probably because it savoured of paganism 1). Considerable controversy has raged over the question
of its architect. Shāh-Djāhān's style was essentially
Persian, with an indefinable difference of expression,
and it was sharply distinguished from those of Isfahān
and Constantinople by a lavish use of white marble,
sumpuously decorated with pietra dura. Coloured tiles had by now become rare. Spacious grandeur was combined with feminine
elegance, to which inimitable open-work tracery
contribution. In the mosque colour was eschewed,
and the finest art is found in the Pearl Mosques at Agra and Dihli. The former was built in 1646—
1653. Meanwhile Shāh-Djāhān had founded Shāh-
Djāhānābād, the great palace near modern Dihli,
recently restored to something like its pristine

beauty. A Persian engineer, 'Ali Marzūn Khān,
had tapped the Djamān 6 miles above Dihli,
and his canal fed the new capital with many streams.
The most favoured of them was the Nahr-i Bihāsh of
"Stream of Paradise", by which was so named by
Shāh-Djāhān himself. It fell in a cascade down
a marble chute in a pavilion — the Shāh Burj —
and flowing along the terrace which bordered the
Hayāt-Bahāsh ("life-giving") gardens, it traversed the
chain of stately edifices that lined the eastern wall
of the Palace — the Hāmānān, Dīwān-i Khāns and
Khāb-bāsh — silently gliding beneath the Mīrān-
īsūf ("Balance of Justice") across a sun-bathed
court into the cool of the Imitāy Khān or
"Palace of Distinction", styled later the Rang
Mahall Sultan or "Greater Colour Palace", from
its elaborate painted decoration and gilding. Set
on a marble terrace which formerly swept from
end to end of the Fort, it overhung the Djamān
whose course then flowed along the base of the
red sandstone walls. On the West an orchard
separated it from the Dīwān-i Am. Thence, still
on the same level, it passed through the Lesser Rang
Mahall, the Mumtāz Mahall and other buildings of
the imperial sanctuary. Thus Dihli combined the
Mughal love of enclosed gardens, watercourses by
running channels, with their passion for archi-
tectural beauty. It preserved Bābur's love
of nature, and perhaps added to it a sense of land-
scape which also found expression in the Mughal
gardens of Kashmir.

With Awrangzēb (1659—1707) set in the period of
decline, due no doubt largely to that emperor's
orthodox prejudice against art, but partly also to
his conscientious parsimony. He declined to com-
plete Shāh-Djāhān's tomb, ostensibly on the ground
of expense, but also perhaps because he regarded
the scheme as savouring of paganism. Yet he
constructed at Benares the great mosque with its
lofty graceful minarets, built a copy of the Dihli
mosque at Lahore, and at Awrangzēbād imitated,
though on a small scale and with success, the
Tādi in the tomb of his favourite wife. Awrang-
zēb's own tomb, at Khudībād, a hamlet just above
the caves at Eldā, is mean and insignificant. But
some of his buildings, in spite of their ironical
decadence, are the last great examples of the
Mughal style. His Djamān or Bāsh-bāsh mosque at
Lahore is pleasing in form, though the marble
ornamentation of its great central and front façade
is very inferior in detail to its prototype at Dihli.
Its three domes of white marble and the imposing
gateway of red sandstone and marble leading to
it from the Hazūr Bāgh are its finest features.

Near Dihli the tomb (1756) of Nawwāb Sa'dār
Djag, Wazir of Oudh, is a passable copy of a
Humāyūn's mausoleum, but its interior is marred
by indifferent plaster decoration.

At Lucknow, the capital of the Nawwāb Wazirs
of Oudh, the buildings erected by that dynasty
and its nobles hardly deserve to be classed as
Mughal. The one exception is the vast Imāmbara,
built by the fourth Nawwāb, Aziz al-Diwānī, in
1784. Conceived on a grand scale for the cele-
bration of the Muharram according to the Shi'a
rite, its details will not bear close examination,
though its solidity is impressive. The buildings
of the Muhammedi dynasty of Mysore (1760—1777)
have still less claim to be regarded as Mughal.
To conclude, the architecture of the Mughals
was, like all their arts, a resultant of many
forces.
But its essential distinction over Hindu art lay in its balanced use of purely Indian and imported technique; while it recognised the value of symbolism in its structures, it never made its arts merely a vehicle for symbols, as Hindu sculpture tended to do.


MUGHAMMAS according to others MUGHAMMAS, a valley near Mecca on the borders of the sacred area. According to tradition, Abrahah (q.v.) ordered his army to encamp here when he was going to attack Mecca, but was prevented from doing so as birds slew his soldiers by dropping stones on them. In Mughammas is shown the tomb of the Taif Abi Righah who died here after acting as guide to Abrahah. He was so hated by the Meccans for this that the custom grew up of casting stones on his grave [cf. AL-DJAMRA]. Whether this explanation is true or not is unknown, but in any case a verse of Hassan b. Thabit (ed. Hirschfeld, xxii.), shows that in the time of the Prophet the mention of his name was sufficient to insult the Taifis. The antiquity of the custom of stoning his tomb is shown by a verse of Dzarr: "When al-Farazadak dies, stone him as you stone the grave of Abi Righah".


AL-MUGHIRAH b. SHU'BA, of the sept of the Ablaf, a subdivision of the Thaqif, further a member of the clan of the Banu Mu'attib — guardians of the sanctuary of al-Lat — and nephew of 'Urwah b. Mas'ud (q.v.), companion and martyr. For having attacked and plundered some travelling companions during their sleep, he was forced to leave Taif, his native town, and came to Medina to offer his services to Mubahmad. The latter used him to attract the Thaqif to Islam and after the submission of Taif, sent him to this town to superintend the destruction of the national sanctuary and the liquidation of the treasure of al-Lat. In the caliphate of Abak Bakr, although he never succeeded in attaining to one of the great posts which were reserved for the Kuraish, Mughirah was able to keep a position in governing 'Omar, while under no illusions about his morals, appointed him governor of Bagra. A scandalous incident temporarily interrupted his administrative career. He was accused of adultery. The evidence was overwhelming: instead of having him stoned, 'Omar only dismissed him. Mughirah holds in tradition the record for marriages and divorces: the figures of 300, 700 and 1,000 are given. In the year 21 (642), recalled to public life, he was appointed to the important governorship of Kufa. His slave Abi Lutha, who lived in Medina, assassinated the Caliph Omar. Under 'Othman, Mughirah retired to private life. In the reign of 'Ali, he withdrew to Taif to watch the course of events. He went without having been invited to the conference of Ađhira [q.v.]. In 40 (666), taking advantage of the general confusion that followed the assassination of 'Ali, he produced an alleged certificate of appointment from Mu'awiya and took over the control of the annual pilgrimage.

The great Sufyan was able to appreciate at their true value the authorities of the stamp of Mughirah, one of the chief khalifis of his time, the man who could get himself out of the most hopeless difficulty": "if (it was said) he were shut behind seven doors, his cunning would have found a way to burst all the locks". Of shocking morals, free from any attachment to the 'Alid party, equally free from any claims to the caliphate, free from the jealousies of the Kurayish families, as well as from the narrow-mindedness of the Ansar clans, a member of the intelligent and enterprising tribe of Thaqif, everything attracted Mu'awiya's attention to him. In the year 41 (667), this Caliph appointed him governor of Kufa, a region disturbed by the intrigues of the Sh'ite and the continual risings of the Kharidjah. Mughirah succeeded in not compromising himself with the former: he was content to advise them to avoid any too striking outburst. Now nearly sixty, the able Thaqif felt the unusual ambition of remaining where he was and of finishing his troubled career in peace and honour. This opportunist, who had come over to the Side after cool calculation, felt little desire to sacrifice his own peace and leisure for the consolidation of the Omayyad dynasty; he was solely concerned with keeping on the right side of the auspicious Mu'awiya. The sudden rising of the Kharidjah leader Mustawrid failed to disturb his equanimity. With remarkable cleverness he was able to let loose against these rebels their born enemies, "the fine flower of the Sh'ite". Whichever was victorious, it could not fail to lighten his responsibilities. By setting them against one another he rendered harmless the most dangerous elements of disorder in his province. The crushing of the Kharidjah enabled him to breathe freely.

Thanks to this combination of mildness and astuteness, and by knowing when to shut his eyes, Mughirah succeeded in avoiding desperate measures against the people of the 'Irak, who were a continual source of trouble, and succeeded in retaining his position. He was even regretted by his subjects after he was gone. Not quite satisfied, Mu'awiya thought of breaking this lieutenant of his who was always playing at the opportune moment to provoke troubles which required the continuation of his services. In this way he prepared the return to favour of Ziyad b. Abiil [q.v.], destined to be his successor. He is also said to have disarmed the Caliph's suspicions by suggesting the plan of proclaiming Yazid heir-apparent. As the general situation had considerably improved in the 'Irak and order prevailed, on the surface at least, the Caliph left him in office till his death, the date of which is uncertain but which must be placed between 48 and 51 (668-671). Mughirah died on the plague at the age of about 70.
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AL-MUHALLAB, ABD ALMAMUD AL-HASAN B. MUHAMMAD, A vizier of Mu'izz al-Dawla. He belonged to Bajars and was born in Miharram 291 (= Dec. 903). In 334 (945) when Mu’izz al-Dawla was marching on Baghdād, he sent him in advance to negotiate with the Caliph and, on Dju-mmād I, 27, 339 (= Nov. 950) al-Muhallab was appointed vizier. He was given the supreme command in the war with ‘Irān b. Shihāb (cf. 801/2 AL-DAWLA) and had brought him into a very precarious position when he himself fell into an ambush and could only save himself with difficulty, whereupon Mu’izz al-Dawla had to conclude a peace with ‘Irān. In 344 (953–954) the ruler of ‘Oman, Yūsuf b. Wajīh, undertook a campaign against Bajar; al-Muḥallab, however, anticipated him, occupied the town and defeated Yūsuf. In the same year, he fell into disgrace but was able to retain his office and the good relations between Mu’izz al-Dawla and his vizier were restored. A few years later, Mu’izz al-Dawla equipped an expedition against ‘Oman and put al-Muḥallab in command. The latter set out in Dju-mmād II, 352 (= June/July 963), but soon fell ill and decided to return to Baghdād. He died on the way on 26th Shābān of the same year (= 19th Sept. 963) and was buried in Baghdād. On his death Mu’izz al-Dawla confiscated all his property, a measure which aroused general indignation.


K. V. ZETTEBÉRN

MUḤAMMAD, the founder of Islām, was a native of the city of Mecca, out of which the energetic Kurāmah had in the sixth century created a flourishing centre of commerce by exploiting the much visited places of pilgrimage there. In consequence of the unreliability of the sources at our disposal the very first question a biographer has to ask, namely when was his birth after, cannot be answered with certainty. That Muḥammad’s activity in Medina covered ten years (622–632) is certain; but we have no certain data sometimes to Abū Kais b. Abī Anas and sometimes to Hanān b. Taḥāfīt (ed. Hirschfeld, No. 101a) to the effect that his prophetic activity in Mecca lasted ten and some years. The parallelism between the two periods, which might be brought forward as a ground of suspicion, is not complete, and on the other hand, the annual recurrence of the great pilgrimage to Mecca has made it easy for the inhabitants to reckon by them, so that a chronological statement originating there deserves more confidence than others. The Meccan period in any case must not be put too short, for according to ‘Urwa’s story mentioned below (Tahārī, i. 1181), “several years” passed after the migration of his followers to Abyssinia before they returned, after which new difficulties arose which produced the migration to Medina. — For the period before he came forth as a religious reformer we have only the indefinite expression ‘awr (Sīra x. 17). The
Muslim historians make him usually 40, sometimes 43 years old at the time of his call, which, taken with the already mentioned data, would put the date of his birth at about 570 A.D. When however tradition puts the date of his birth in the "year of the Elephant" (see Asmaa and Sura xvii.), this is a result of an unhistorical combination, for Abraham's grandson Ishmael was never in Arabia, the Beduin tribe of Sal b. Bakr, see the article KALMA. The story of the cleansing of his breast (a similar story is related of Umayya b. Abi l-Salt; cf. Goldziher, Arab. x. Arab. Phil. I. 213) is a materialisation of Sura xxv. 1.

In Sura xxiii. 40, we are told that Allah made the poor orphan prosperous. Corresponding to this in tradition is the marriage of Muhammed with a rich merchant's widow, in whose service he had been (cf. AL-MAQADDAs). She bore him four daughters, who play a part in later history, and several sons all of whom died in infancy; one of them at least must be historical as his pagan name 'Abd al-Mal'af (Sprenger, i. 199 sq.; Carlin, i. 173) could not be invented by later writers; such a fiction in any case, as posthumous comfort to alleviate the disgrace of the lack of male heirs (Lammes) would be very inadvisable. If it had to make the baby son of the Beduin tribe of Sal b. Bakr, see the article KALMA. The story of the cleansing of his breast (a similar story is related of Umayya b. Abi l-Salt; cf. Goldziher, Arab. x. Arab. Phil. I. 213) is a materialisation of Sura xxv. 1.
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7; cv. 0 8; ev.; 1 8); he admitted the
acclivities offered there into the true worship (xxvii. 2) and allowed his followers to take part in the
pilgrimage (xvii. 29 sq.) so that it was all the easier
for him later to accept it as one of the main
features of his religion (see below). We shall later
discuss this relapse into paganism, which however
we specifically overcome, as well as the fact that
he was only gradually led to attack on principle
the gods of Mecca. He was also influenced by
the manner of the old Arab inspired soothsayers
(cf. on the modern Kwala: Musul, Die Kultur,
1910, p. 10) to the extent that he adopted their
peculiar form of speech with mysterious oaths and
rhythmic prose (tashâ'ī'; cf. Goldscher, Abhandlungen
s. arab. Philol., l. 9 sq.; Maxmull, Marnef, iii.
358 sq.) when he began to announce his revelations.
All his earlier conceptions were however driven out
except for such trifling residues as these, when a new
world of ideas began to fill him to an ever increasing
extent, until he was finally compelled with irresistible
force to come forth and proclaim them. These new
ideas point mainly to the religion of the "possessors
of a scripture" — Judaism and Christianity — and he
was conscious of this, as much as he repeatedly
emphasised the agreement between his teaching
and these older religions of revelation as irreconcilable
of its truth (cf. the significant passage: "If thou art in doubt about what We have revealed,
ask them who read the scripture before thee",
Sûrâ x. 94). The only question is, in what way
did he become possessed of these new ideas.
Mark only is that he did not get them
from his own reading of the holy scriptures of the
Jews and Christians. The word ummati. (i. 161, 166)
applied to him (Sûrâ xvii. 166) signifies, without
committing us to anything about his ability in reading
or writing — as a merchant he must have had
a certain knowledge of these arts — that he was an
illiterate layman, who was not able to read the
Hebrew or Greek Bible, and that this fact also
the case, the Kûrâr which occurs on every page. For
the formation of the term Wensine, Acta orient.
li. 491 and (citing the Hebrew ummat bâ'âzîm)
Horovitz, Koyernische Untersuchungen, p. 53 would
put "pagan", Nivâîi; but, although this might fit
some passages, it could hardly suit Sûrâ ii. 73
where there is a reference to a difference between
the "possessors of a scripture" and the mowâ'âmim
among the Jews. The usual explanation suits well
enough, as it is certain and it is confirmed by
the Kûrâr everywhere that, while Muhammad had
some notion of the books of the Bible, the Hebrew
and Greek Bibles were closed books to him.
Uterances like the saying that Jesus "received"
the Gospels (iii. 44: v. 50; vii. 27) and that it
should be "observed" like the law (v. 70, 72)
clearly show that he did not know its real content.
Sûrâ xxi. 105 contains a quotation from the Psalms,
but this is quite an isolated instance and he knew
nothing of the Psalms as a part of the Old Testament
(xviiii. 81); the parable of the camel and the eye
of a needle (vii. 28) proves of course no literary
dependence and the alleged description of Mu-
hammad and his followers in the Gospels (xviii.
29) shows what he could build up on a vague re-
version of something he had heard. On the other
hand: the stories reproduced, e.g. the long account
of Joseph (Sûrâ xii.), show that he was indirectly
dependent on the Bible and not only on the
Old but also on the New Testament (cf. what
he relates of Mary, Joseph, Zacharia and John);
the story of the Seven Sleepers (cf. Abuâb Al-
Kahsa and M. Hûber, Die Wunderlegende von den
Siebenknäufen, 1910) also presupposes Christian
authorities. One therefore cannot blame his enemies
when they said that he had foreign teachers (xvii.
153; xxv. 5 sq.; xlvii. 13), which is certainly not
refuted by the reply in xvii. 105. Further it is clear
from the Kûrâr that he did not come into contact
in this indirect way with the books of the Bible in
their simple form, but that his authorities had
drawn on Midrashic and Apocryphical works, which
is easily explained by the varied and most
character of the religious tendencies in Arabia in
particular what he tells of the birth and childhood
of Jesus (xix. 23 sqq.; liii. 411; v. 109 sq.)
comes from Apocryphal sources, and his account
of the death of Jesus (lv. 156) has parallels among
the Manichæans and Basilidians.

To state exactly what religion exercised particular
influence on Muhammad's ideas is hardly possible
in view of the scanty information available about
conditions in these days; especially as many things
indicate that he was influenced from various sides,
primarily by Christian sects, but later also by the
Jews. There was ample opportunity to become
acquainted with both these religions from caravans
passing through to Syria or the lands of the
Euphrates, from communication by sea to Abyssinia,
and from foreign merchants visiting the
great markets; and not only in the more advanced
districts of South Arabia, but also among several
Beduin tribes (e.g. Bakr, Taghibî, Ḥanîfâ, Ḥâjî),
Christianity had established itself, while Jewish
colonies had settled in Medinâ and the oases
north of it. But a citizen of Mecca in particular
had repeated opportunities of coming into contact
with Christians and Jews. The great festivals attracted
people from all districts and it is expressly recorded
that Christians also took part in the pilgrimage
(Snouck Hurgronje, Het Meknaansche Heel, p. 26,
128, 159); in addition there were Christians captured
in war and immigrant Ghasânids living in Mecca
(Ara'î, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 97, 458; 465; cf. the
Christian slave in Tbl'; Ibn Hibân, p. 280 sq.);
and in the Kûrâr alongside of expressions coming
from the Aramaic, several Ethiopic borrowings are
evidence of religious influence from Abyssinia (cf.
Nöldeke, Neue Beitraege zur semitischen Sprach-
mittelstilisierung, p. 47). Recently scholars have
been found of seeking a main source of Muhammad's ideas
and their formulation in the religious development
which is alleged to have taken place in South Arabia.
This is certainly a possibility to be reckoned with,
but so long as we know so little of South Arabian
religious history and in particular so long as no inter-
mediate South Arabian forms are found for the Aby-
sinian loanwords in the Kûrâr we are better to
set it aside. It should also be noted that Muhammad
in his stories of the prophets frequently mentions
the Arab tribes of 'Ad and Thamîn (q.v.) but
only rarely touches on the older history of South
Arabia (Sûrâ xxvii. 20 sqq.; xxviv. 19 sqq.; xlvii.
26; li. 13; on the other hand: harâz, li. xxy. i. 89 sq.;
6; M. Hartmann, Die aramäische Frage, p. 474).
In the utterance ascribed to the Prophet (Bockh, ed.
Kreil, iii. 50) "Belief and wisdom are
Yemeni", Yemeni as the context shows, only
means "of Yemeni fashion" i.e. cultured, human,
in contrast to Beduin coarseness. The main objection
however, is that the hypothesis would only mean
an unnecessarily circuitous route, for Muhammad always appealed directly to his agreement with Christianity, without suggesting any remodelling of these religious views through a South Arabian Mandaeism. And the stronger one endeavour to make Semitic influence on religious matters in Mecca, the more unintelligible becomes the stubborn opposition of the Meccean to Muhammad. Much greater weight should be given to Tor Andræ's treatment of the question of Muhammad's dependence on Christianity. After calling attention to the wide dissemination and dominating position of Nestorianism in the Persian empire, which is of importance as it must have been much more accessible to Muhammad than Monophysitism, he points out the close relationship between Muhammad's ideas and the ecclesiastical writings of the Syrians: the contempt for worldly possessions, the strong condemnation of the arrogance and frivolity of the unbelievers, the warnings against laughing, joking and careless speech, the emphasis on the significance of almsgiving as an atonement for sin, the descriptions of Paradise (we even find the houri in Ephram the Syrian) etc. Alongside of these very instructive similarities, there is however one point to be remembered in which the relationship is somewhat modified, namely Muhammad's Christology. It is, in any case, remarkable in several respects for it is distinguished from his other accounts of prophets and approximates to the teaching of the Church in strict fashion, e.g. in the account of the birth of Jesus and his miraculous gifts and in the undeniable echoes of the doctrine of the Logos (Sura viii. 434; ix. 166). But already in the Meccan period (e.g. xliii. 57 sqq.) Muhammad vigorously rejects the idea of Christ being the Son of God and absolutely denies that he had ever asserted anything of the kind of himself. Here it is not sufficient to point to the Nestorians since they did not deny that Christ was the Son of God. When Muhammad from the first insists on the complete agreement of his teaching with the old revealed religions, i.e. with Christianity also, he seems to have been influenced by a form of Christianity where this dogma occupied a very unimportant position.

What one can deduce in this way from the Koran about Muhammad's development is supplemented in an important way by tradition, according to which he was not alone in his search for a purer religion. Various individuals are named who, disaffected with the old Arab religion, were seeking for a more intellectual faith. As a particular cousin of Khulilija, Waraqa b. Nawfal, even if these traditions cannot be utilized in the form in which we have them, as they have been influenced by later Muslim ideas, yet they certainly have a historical basis, because they are not taken from the Koran and are not intended to show Muhammad in a more favourable light. In addition there are the Hamits [q.v.] of whom the traditions of the Arabs have preserved only a very hazy picture, and Umayya b. Abi 1-Salt [q.v.] whose poems often have points of contact with the Koran, which would be of great importance if they could even in part be regarded as genuine [cf. also the article WEILAM].

While Muhammad was in a state of great spiritual excitement as a result of contact with the religious ideas that had penetrated into Arabia, something happened which suddenly transformed his whole consciousness and filled him with a spiritual strength which decided the whole course of his life: he felt himself called to proclaim to his countrymen as a prophet the revelations which were communicated to him in a mysterious way. When Constantine wishes to see in this the result of a lying devilish plot and continued reflection, this is certainly not correct. We have much rather every reason to trust the tradition which tells of a sudden outburst of conviction that he was called to proclaim the word of God. For this view we have the analogy of prophets in general, from the Old Testament prophets down to Joseph Smith; and no long drawn reflections but only an overwhelming spiritual happening could give him the unshakable conviction of his call. This is also confirmed by several passages in the Koran, which point to a deciding moment, definite in time (Sura ii. 88 sqq.; ii. 118), in which connection it is of minor importance whether it is possible to identify the revelation of the call itself among the Suras of the Koran (according to a common opinion, xci. 1 sqq.) according to some, on the other hand, ( laxlv. 1 sqq.), especially as one must reckon with the possibility that the very earliest revelations were not written down. If this really was the case, however, the reason certainly was not that they were deliberately suppressed, since a revolutionary change of his world of ideas into its diametrical opposite while retaining the earlier apparatus of inspiration would be quite an untenable hypothesis.

The Koran gives only a few hints about the manner of these inspirations; a veil lay over them which the Prophet either could not or would not raise completely. Perhaps the wrapping up (laxlix. 1; Ixiv. 17) refers to a preparation for the reception of the revelations in the manner of the old Arab divination, but we are taken further in an indirect way by the oft recurring accusation of his enemies that Muhammad was possessed (maqurūt), a soothsayer (jāḥin), a magician (jāhij), for they show that in his moments of inspiration he made an impression similar to those figures well known in ancient Arabia. In addition there are several traditions which describe his condition in such moments: more fully and may undoubtedly be regarded as genuine, since they are the last thing later Muhammadanism might be expected to invent, while these mysterious seclusions afforded to those around him the most valid evidence for the superhuman origin of his inspirations. In Byzantine authors we find it stated that the Prophet was an epileptic (e.g. Theophanes, Chronographia, ed. de Boor, i. 334) and modern psychiatrists recognize the correctness of these descriptions of his attacks and we must of course leave it to them to define the exact nature of his condition. From the scientific point of view the fact is the whole described by him only altered what he had from time immemorial from others and which now cropped up out of his subconscious. The scientific student therefore does not see in Muhammad a debtor but fully agrees with the impression of sincerity and truthfulness which his utterances in the older revelations make (e.g. Sura a. 16, 20, 113; xxviii. 85 sqq.; lix. 44; lixv. 16 sqq.; cf. vii. 202; xxi. 15); the cogent imperatives (lixv. 2; xxxvi. 15) the self-denunciation (xxx. 1 sqq.; etc.) along with the fact that he unhappily endured years of hostility and humiliation in Mecca in the unshakable conviction of his lofty task. It is more difficult with the later Medine revelations, in which it is often too easy to
detect the human associations, to avoid the sup-
position that his parasyms (e.g. at the battle of
Bakr: Ibn Hishâm, p. 444; in the slandering of
Abd-Allâh, p. 735 et al.) could sometimes be artificially
rought on, and there is even a tradition which
makes Abâl'aś'î say to the Prophet: "Thy Lord
seems to have been very quick in fulfilling thy
prayers". It must not be forgotten however that
natures like this, without actually being conscious of
it, are able to provoke the same states of excita-
tion, which arise without their assistance; and
so probably not only were his followers in Medîna (cf. Ka'b b. Mâlik in Ibn Hishâm, p. 614 et al.)
but even he himself convinced, that the spirit was continually hovering about him
to communicate the revelations to him. By this
we do not of course mean that in his ecstatic
condition he received the divine communications in externa, as we now have them in the Kur'ân;
only the foundations were given him, which he
afterwards developed into discourses of greater
length. Since in doing this he used the external
forms of the old Arabs soothsayers it is natural
that the Meccans took him for one, but it does
not follow that he was spiritually akin from
the first to these soothsayers who were inspired
by jinn. The indignation with which he objects
to being associated with them is not a proof of
such a relationship of which he wished to rid
himself, simply because he was conscious of the
similarity, but a natural result of the fact that
the enlightened Meccans saw in persons of this
kind luridous familiars of the lowest kind, while
he was firmly convinced that he was filled with
quite a different spirit, one quite unfamiliar to
his enemies.

While it is in no way possible with the help
of the Kur'ân and Tradition, to get an accurate
picture of Muhammad's development and
his condition when prophesying, he himself
gives in the Kur'ân quite a different interpretation of the revelations that came to him, which is based on a peculiar theory which he apparently did not invent himself but adopted from others. The
fundamental idea in it is the conception of
a divine book existing in heaven, al-Kutb , a well
guarded book, which only the pure may touch (lxxv. 76 sqq.), a well guarded tablet (lxxxv. 21 sqq.), the mother of the book (xiii. 2 sqq.), on honourable
leaves, exalted and pure, by the hands of noble
and pious scribes (lxxxv. 13 sqq.). He himself did
not read this book, as E. Meyers erroneously thinks, but it was communicated to him orally piece
by piece, not in its original form but in an Arabic
version intelligible to him and his countrymen
(xiii. 1 sqq.; xiiii. 37 sqq.; xlin. 6 sqq.; xxxii. 12 sqq.; xlix. 192 sqq.; xlii. 8 sqq. ; xliv. 6 sqq. ; and especially xlii. 44 sqq.). If we had
made it a Kur'ân (in a foreign tongue, they would
say: Why is it â€œsignatureâ€‌, from the small
sections of the text (not expounded intelligibly),
a foreign text and an Arab reader!?). In addi-
tion there is the fact that Muhammad was aware
that the complete contents of the book were not
communicated to him, as he expressly states, e.g. of the stories of the prophets, not all of
which were related to him (xl. 78; iv. 162). He
received the communications orally, Allah rehearsing
to him the substance of the separate sections
(lxxxvi. 16 sqq. etc.), while in several passages
it is stated more precisely that the revelations were
communicated through the Spirit (xxxv. 192 sqq.);
is significant for the commercial life of Mecca — from all forms of cheating (xxvi. 183 sqq.; lv. 8 sqq.), banning contact with newborn girls, as the barbarous custom of the time was (unaccordant to Sūra vi. 152; xvii. 33 from poverty, cf. al-Maharrad, Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 277; originally perhaps a kind of magic to procure sons, when only girls had been born, cf. Musil, Kāgraf Aθrya, p. 58; even before Muhammad's time there had been people who fought against this barbarous custom, cf. al-Maharrad, Kāmil, loc. cit.). This is the ideal of the truly pious man who is called by the name of muslim (lviii. 35; xxi. 108 etc.) or hāsh (x. 405; xxx. 291; xviii. 4; cf. vi. 79 and the article). Cf. In this connection the list of Muhammad's precepts in Aθir-a's poem (Ibn Hishām, p. 255; Morgenlandische Forschungen, p. 25 sq.).

From all this, it is quite evident that Muhammad had at this time no thought of founding a new religion. His task was only to be a "warner" (li. 50; lxxiv. 2; lxxix. 45; lxxx. 11; lxxviii. 21 sqq.), in view of the approach of the day of judgment, to his countrymen, to whom no prophet had yet been sent (vi. 157; xviii. 46; xxvii. 2; xxxiv. 43; xxxi. 51; no notice is taken here of HHū and Sāïlīh and as a result of the revelations granted him to give them, in the form of a liquid Arabic būrūn (see above), what the " possessors of a scripture" had in their scriptures, which were not accessible to the Arabs and thereby to save them from the divine wrath. The Jews and Christians also must therefore testify to the truth of his preaching (x. 94; xvi. 45; xxi. 7; xvii. 197; xviii. 53 etc.).

On account of the insufficiency of the sources, it is very difficult to ascertain in detail how Muhammad's relations with the Meccans developed. The būrūn contains only vague references, which permit no chronological arrangement, while the traditions are very full but little reliable. Only one report, which Uthw composed for the caliph Abū Al-Malik (Tabāt, l. 1180 sqq.; 1224 sqq.), the value of which has already been indicated by Spranger, gives a brief but apparently trustworthy glimpse of the main events (cf. also al-Zuhri in Ibn Sa'd, 1/1, 133). At first Muhammad met with no serious opposition and in not a few cases his preaching fell on fruitful soil; indeed the words addressed to Sāïlīh (xii. 64) we may find a hint that he had at first aroused considerable expectations among the Meccans. All traditions agree that Khādira was the first believer, while they differ as to who was his first male adherent. In any case Abū Bakr, the master-slave Zenād b. Hāsa, Zābal b. Aqwa'm, Aṣa' b. Umaid Abū, Abū Rāhman b. 'Awf, Sa'd b. Ali Wāsçāy, and Muhammad's cousin Alī (4 s.) were among his earliest followers. The majority of those who were won over by his preaching were however young and of very little social standing, while the well-to-do and influential held back (xix. 74; xxxiv. 30 sqq.; xxxviii. 62 sqq.; lxii. 11; lxxx. 1 sqq.; cf. the veiled references in vii. 73; xi. 293; xvii. 17; xxi. 111). This became still more the case when the full consequences of his ideas became clear to him and he openly attacked the religion of his native town; for the Meccans, to the majority of whom such devotional matters had been a matter of complete indifference, was discovered that a religious revolution might be dangerous to their faith and their trade. That was this the silent feature of their resistance to Muhammad is evident from the fact that he frequently endeavours to calm the fears of the Kūsa'ish on this point: the Meccan sanctuary, he said, belonged to his god Allāh, from whom the Meccan also recognized the highest god (xxxiv. 23; xxxix. 39; cf. Kās' al-Khālid, ed. Kowalski, v. 14; xii. 12 where Allāh is the lord of the Kūsa'ish and he will protect and bless his sanctuary, if they submit to him (xxviii. 93; xxxvii. 57; xxi. 67; xxi. 1 sqq.),). In addition there was the conservative attitude of these merchants in the field of religion and their animosity to new and fantastic ideas, particularly in that of the resurrection of the dead.

Traditions record at great length the persecution and ill treatment which Muhammad and his followers suffered at the hands of the Meccans. These descriptions are undoubtedly much exaggerated, for the object was to glorify the self-sacrifice of the believers and no doubt also to put the old patrician families of Mecca in an unfavourable light. But it is equally certain that there is some foundation for these stories. It was a case of two persecutions (Āθm) which twice forced the believers to migrate, and in the Kūsa'ish there is mention of "trials" which their opponents inflicted upon the believers, men and women (lxxx. 10), and it is expressly mentioned that the influential wished to prevent Muhammad from praying (xxvii. 9 sqq.; cf. the veiled account vii. 54), while on the other hand, the complaints about what they would have liked to do should not be taken at their face value without more ado (xviii. 17; xxi. 78; cf. xi. 93). The peculiar feature, repeatedly found in stories of the prophets, that their opponents threatened them and their followers with stoning (Sūra xi. 93 and frequently) might suggest the hypothesis that Muhammad was actually threatened in this way by the Meccans, but this would probably only have been in a momentary outburst of passion and in any case the quarrel was mainly conducted in endless wordy disputes in which the spiritual advantage lay with Muhammad. His strength lay in the consciousness that he lived in a higher intellectual world which was closed to the Meccans and that he proclaimed ideas, "the equal of which neither men nor dijuns with combined efforts could produce" (xvii. 90). Very pertinently he often points to the lack of logic in his enemies, when they recognize Allāh as the real true God, but will not draw the logical deductions from this. But even his most crushing arguments rebounded from the impregnable wall of their prejudices which were based on their material interests. This circumstance now began to influence the matter of his preaching in a very remarkable way. When his opponents mocked him because the divine judgment threatened them, he could not come (xxviii. 15; lxx. 5) he began to describe in an increasing degree in his stories how the contemporaries of earlier prophets had met them with incredulity and had therefore brought on their heads dreadful punishments. That he did not use such means at the very beginning of his mission is evident from the fact that his preaching, according to the already mentioned credible tradition, at first gave no offence, and indeed this feature is lacking in the sūras which are certainly the oldest. It was the hardness of heart of his countrymen which made him take to this weapon in order to stir them. At first it proved by no means ineffective, as the Arabs knew of old trading peoples like the
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Thamud [q.v.], whose destruction might well give
cause for reflection. But gradually this line
of attack lost its effect. To Muhammad how-
ever the resistance of the obvious truth was something
so unassailable that he could only find solace in
an idea, which was to be of far-reaching import-
ance in the further development of Muhammadan de-
gmatism. Allah, the innervously excited and al-
mighty, could of course not be impeded by the
resistance of mortals; the unbelief of the Prophets'
opponents was therefore an effect of the divine
will: "Allah makes to err whom he will and gui-
nes whom he will" (xv. 95; xxvii. 127 etc.; xxvii. 34 etc.), a view which his enemies were unsuccessful to turn against himself (xvi. 57; 
xxvii. 47).

Several episodes stand out in the Meccan period
which are unfortunately more or less obscure and
may be interpreted in various equally untenable
ways. It is certain, in spite of the silence main-
tained about it in the Koran (even xvi. 43 is
not to refer to it), that Muhammad's community
was at one time in such great distress that a con-
siderable section of them migrated to Abyssinia.

The later view was that participation in this flight
became a patent of nobility similar to that conferred
by the great Hijja to Medina, which was actually
granted as a titular distinction (Wenhausen, Stu-
zen, iv. 113); but the Prophet gave the advice to
seek protection among the Abyssinian Christians
only to those of his followers, of whom he was afraid
that they had not sufficient strength to maintain
their faith under the difficult conditions in Mecca
(cf. the significant story of the cool reception
which some of the allies later received on their

M. Hartmann's view that the emigrants were to
consider political propaganda in Abyssinia is not
capable of proof. According to 'Urwa, these emi-
grates (i.e. probably the greater number of them)
returned to their native town, when Islam had
become strengthened by the accession to its ranks
of a number of individuals of position. At the
same time there is a different story of their return,
which it would not be difficult to combine with
'Urwa's story if we assume that they gradually
drilled back. We are told that Muhammad pro-
claimed in one of his sermons that the favo-
dities of the Mecca, al-Lâl, al-'Urâz and Manâth
[see these articles], might be regarded as divine
beings whose intercession was effective with Allah.
This led to a general reconciliation, news of which
reached Abyssinia and induced a number of the
Muslims there to return home. Here however they
learned to their horror that the agreement had
been of short duration, as the Prophet had very
soon recognised: these words as interpolations of
Satan and had substituted for them the words which
we now have in Sûrâ iii. 19-23. The credibility
of this story has been doubted, certainly wrongly;
for in view of the absolute impossibility of such
a thing being a later invention, any possible ob-
jections to the reliability of the authorities cited
(Tâhirî, i. 1192, 1195; Ibn Sa'd, t. i. 137 etc.) hardly
deserve consideration and passages like v. 57;
xxvii. 134 (cf. iv. 113) amply show that the
incident was quite possible from the psycholo-

gical point of view.

It is much more difficult to elucidate another
episode of the Meccan period, the story of the
boycott of the Hâshimids. That Muhammad's whole

position during his struggle with the Mecceans was
only made possible by the support given him by
his own family has already been indicated. All
members of the family of Hâshim, with the excep-
tion of 'Abî Lâhab [q.v.], who on this account is
perpetually damned in the Koran and the Prophet
with his wife, chivalrously fulfilled their duty in
this respect, although not a few of them believed in
his call. It would therefore be not unnatural in
itself for the Mecceans in the end to attempt to
make the whole family innocuous without bringing
on themselves the guilt of bloodshed by an open
attack. The story, however, which tells how they
forced the Hâshimids to withdraw into their own
part of the town and pledged themselves to refrain
from intermarriage or commerce with them, is
confirmed neither by the Qur'an nor by 'Urwa,
but sounds in itself somewhat suspicious and is
probably much exaggerated. That the effort finally
failed is conceded by the story itself. On the
other hand, it is quite possible that Khadija's
fortune may have suffered considerably from Mu-
hammad's obligations to his nestorians followers
and from the smiting of the influential merchant
princes.

To the last portion of the Meccan period most
probably belongs Muhammad's nocturnal journey,
later so celebrated, to the "remotest place of prayer,"
which viii. 1 (perhaps also verse 62) briefly refers,
no doubt a vision, which however made upon him
an impression of reality. According to the pre-
valing opinion, the terminus of this journey was
the temple in Jerusalem, and conclusions are
drawn from this about the great significance which
this city then had for him. Schricker (Jrb., vi. 199)
and Herovitz (ibid., ix. 159 sqq.) have however
ever sought to show that maragh al-agâb refers
to the place of prayer of the angels in heaven
(cf. vii. 205; xxvii. 35), for which view several
cogent arguments can be produced, notably that
the nocturnal journey is associated with the journey
to heaven as early as in the tradition given by Ibn
Ishâq and that in the Qur'an there is several
times a reference to an ascent into heaven (vi.
35; xvii. 92 sqq.; xxvii. 14 sqq.).

Of other details we may further recall that
Muhammad, who, as already remarked, was firmly
convincing that his teaching agreed with the
religion of the "possessors of a scripture," nevertheless
had already begun in Mecce to reject the
christological dogmas of the church. This is certain
from the conversation with his pagan opponents
(xxiii. 57 sqq.) which can only have taken place
in Mecce. This however does not affect his idea
of the fundamental identity of his with the older
revelations but only the false doctrine later adopted
in the church, for he makes Jesus vigorously reject
the doctrine of his divinity; but this limitation
of his theory was not without importance and
was able to serve him as a model in his later
criticism of Judaism.

The sources are somewhat fuller for the close
of the Meccan period, although late tendencies
historiography has coloured everything in the
traditions. According to 'Urwa's account, Muhammad
did, it is true, succeed in winning a few
notables in Mecc (inclining probably 'Umrau
his teaching, after the emigration of a number of
his followers to Abyssinia. But on the whole his
attempt at a religious reformation could be regarded
as having failed; and when Khadija and Abî
The migration of the Prophet, the Hijira [q. v.], has been with justice taken by the Muslims as the starting-point of their chronology, for it forms the first stage in a movement which in a short time became of significance in the history of the world. According to the usual calculation, he arrived in Khaybat, a suburb of Medina, on the 12th Rabii' 1 of the first year, i. e. Sept. 24, 622 and shortly after went into his new home. The tasks which awaited him placed the greatest strain on his diplomatic and organizing abilities. He could only rely with absolute certainty on the part which migrated with him (the Muhajirun [q. v.] for their whole future existence depended entirely on him and of course only those had migrated who were firmly convinced of the truth of his mission. In addition, there were those Medina inhabitants who had already adopted Islam or did so soon after his arrival, the so-called Ansar [q. v.], who formed only a portion of the inhabitants of Medina. He only found direct opposition in a few families, like the 'Aws Allab; but at the same time there were a number who while they did not exactly oppose him only reluctantly accepted the new relations, the so called Mundhirun [q. v.], who were to cause
him much anxiety. Fortunately for him, they were led by a man, the Khazzardj b. Abü Unayr, who possessed the nuqādī quality of irresolution to such an extent that he regularly let slip every occasion on which he might have offered successful opposition. A further danger lay in the fact that the old and bitter feud between the two chief parties, the Jews and the Khazzardj, had by no means died down, but which might easily break out again on any occasion. Finally there were the Jews (in the first place aūzal-Akhdarī, i.e. the Nājis and Kumia; cf. Kūs b. aūzal-Kāshānī, ed. Kowalski, xz.; Hassan b. Thālūth, No. 216, 17; Ibn Hīshām, p. 660 and Ibn Sa'd, viii. 86, 91) and the Judaized tribes in Medina, who played an important part because of their wealth and the support they had in the Jewish colonies in Khilār etc. For Muḥammad they were on the whole a plus factor in his calculations for, according to his theory already mentioned, he ought to expect that they would champion the truth of his preaching. His relations with the Christians in Medina (cf. Hassan b. Thālūth, No. 135, 17) were no longer absolutely estranged, since he had begun in Mecca to reject the orthodox ecclesiastical Christology; they were, however, insignificant and could be ignored. He had also a much greater sympathy with them than with the Jews (x. 55; lxi. 27).

Muḥammad had to form a united community out of these heterogeneous elements. The first problem to be tackled was how to procure the necessary means of subsistence for the emigrants, who were for the most part without means or work, which could for the time being only be done through the self-sacrifice of the Anṣār and certainly only very inadequately. To strengthen their claims for protection, he ordered the relationship of brotherhood to be created between each emigrant and a man of Medina. This arrangement, to which was added brotherhood between every two emigrants, was abolished after the battle of Badr by Sūra xxxiii. 6 and left only a few traces (see Ibn Sa'd, iii. xxxiv.). On the other hand, we possess for a somewhat later period, when relations between Muḥammad and the Jews had begun to become more tenuous, a very valuable document in Muḥammad's constitution of the community which has been preserved by Ibn Ishaq. It reveals his great diplomatic gifts, for it allows the ideal which he cherished of an ammañūn definitely religious in outlook to sink temporarily into the background and is shaped essentially by practical considerations. It is true that the highest authority is with Allāh and Muḥammad, before whom all matters of importance are to be laid; but the ammañūn included also Jews and pagans, so that the legal forms of the old Arab tribes are substantially preserved. This scheme had however no considerable practical importance; it is nowhere mentioned in the Kūrān (hardly even in vii. 58), because it was too rapidly obsolete by the rapidly changing conditions.

It is a proof of the Prophet's political wisdom that he endeavoured to attach the Jews to himself by taking over several features of their worship. Thus he made the 10th Muḥarram a fast-day, obviously in imitation of the Jewish fast on the 10th Tisrī, the day of atonement, which is particularly obvious in its name, taken from the Aramaic (šālāt). On Jewish practice are probably also based the introduction of the midday salah, which was now (ii. 239) added to the morning and evening salahs and the easier rule about purification before the salah (iv. 46; v. 97). On the other hand, Friday as the day of the common salah, which probably goes back to the Jewish day of preparation (cf. Becker's correction to Ibn Sa'd, iii. 53, 19, in Thālīth, iii. 579), is said to have been already introduced before the Hijra by Muqā'ab b. Umar (according to others, Amr b. Zūqrā). Whether the choice of Jerusalem as the āqṣā (q. v.) was one of the concessions made to the Medinese Jews is uncertain as the statement about his attitude in Mecca on this point differ. But it is improbable that he should have turned towards the Kūrān there, otherwise it is difficult to understand how the different stories could have arisen. But whether he then used Jerusalem as the āqṣā, which need not necessarily mean a borrowing from the Jews, as this direction of prayer was elsewhere found in the east, e.g. among the Edomites and Elymasites, whether he turned to the east like many Christians, or whether he had a āqṣā at all (the Kūrān is silent on the point), is uncertain, but in any case the balance of probability is in favour of the Jerusalem āqṣā having been one of the alterations made to gratify the Medinese Jews. If some writers have seen in the immediate erection of a place of prayer (Ibn Hīshām, p. 336) a copying of the Jewish synagogues, Čaṣūn b. Husain has with weighty reasons argued that this was not a building definitely assigned to the worship of God, since the alleged masjid was also used for all kinds of secular purposes, because in reality it was simply the court-yard (āür) occupied by Muḥammad and his family, while the assemblies for regular worship were held on the muṣala' (cf. Maqari). But nevertheless the "mosque of opposition" so called by the Prophet with horror (Sūra ix. 108; see below) seems to have been an actual building recalling the Jewish synagogues. In spite of these concessions to the Jews, it soon became obvious that he had seriously miscalculated with regard to them. Although they undoubtedly cherished lively expectations of the coming of the Messiah (Ibn Hīshām, p. 286, 373 sq.) they could not possibly recognise an Arab in the expected Messiah and he had soon reason to lament that only a few among them believed in him (iii. 106). In particular, the misunderstandings in his reproduction of the Old Testament stories or laws aroused the notorious Jewish love of ridicule and thus brought him into an unfortunate position. His conviction of the divine origin of his mission and his position among the believers would not allow him to confess that he had made a mistake and on the other hand he had too often himself appealed to the testimony of the older religions of revelation to be able to ignore this criticism. His reaction to this dilemma by asserting that the Jews had only received a portion of the revelation (iv. 47; cf. iii. 115) and even this included a number of special laws and even adapted to a particular age (iv. 158; vi. 147; xvi. 119) but they had also concealed all sorts of things in their holy scriptures (ii. 39, 141, 154, 169; iii. 64 etc.) and indeed had even falsified their scriptures (ii. 50; iv. 48; v. 16, 45; vii. 162; cf. Hassan b. Thālūth, No. 96, 97; and the article TAQūRūT, in short they obtained hardly more benefit from their scriptures than an ass from the books which he is carrying on his back (Ixxi. 3). The Jews were not able to refute these assertions for, although he challenged them to produce these scriptures
neither he nor his followers could read a word of them. He therefore now poured forth the visions of his wrath upon the Jews in many speeches and awaited the time when he would be able to refute their criticism and malicious writings and contradictions in convincing fashion. (E.g. iii. 177, 9ff.; iv. 48). As he had now already begun to regard the church doctrine of the Christians as a corruption of the true teaching of Jesus, he felt himself called upon to reform the degenerate religion of revelation, which, of which asserted it was the only true one (ii. 107). As a result he now claimed a special place among the prophets: he is seal of the prophets (xxxiii. 40; a metaphorical expression which Maimonides, among others applied to himself and which indicates the conclusion of the series), he is the last prophet, to whom Jesus himself had pointed under the name Ahmad (ix. 67; cf. ii. 75). Still he is not thinking any more than before of introducing a new religion but only of restoring the religion proclaimed by the prophets from the beginning. Nevertheless the early days after the migration were the period when Muhammadanism was born as an independent religion, for parallel with his criticism of the religions of revelation and in particular opposition to Judaism ran a positive shaping of Islam, through which he was emancipating himself in important points from his previous models. He gave his religion a pronounced national character by taking over various elements from the worship of the old Arabs and associating them with his religious ideas. In the second year of the Hijra (July 623—June 624) after some hesitation, he ordered that Jerusalem should no longer be the old temple at prayer: but the new sanctuary of the Black Stone at Mecca (ii. 137—145) for it is "a gathering-place and a safe retreat for men" (ii. 119). His native town was thus made the centre of the true religion. As a substitute for the pilgrimage which he now adopted into his religion as one of the main rites, but from which he and his followers were temporarily cut off, he had an animal sacrificed in this year on the 10th Dhu'il-Hijjah on the mount Arafat in Medina (Tabari, i. 1362; according to Ibn Sa'd, iv/1, 9 he continued this after the occupation of Mecca) and in the following year he calls the Hajj one of the obligations of believers towards Allah (iii. 90, 91). Friday retained its significance but was not to be a day of rest like the Jewish Sabbath (ix. 94, 95), which is connected with his rejection of the Old Testament idea of God resting after the creation (i. 27). In place of the fasting on Ashura, he substituted quite a new particular rite, according to which his followers were to fast throughout Ramazan, the month, in which he himself received the fundamental revelation (ii. 28), as long as the sun was visible in the heavens. The Mussulmans had a similar custom: but whether he took the new revelation from them or from another sect cannot be ascertained (cf. RASDAN). This nationalisation of Islam, which was to have so many results, gave Muhammad a final legitimisation, which brought it into harmony with his earlier appeal to the religions of revelation, as he came forward as the restorer of the religion of Abraham (sūlla of the Hebrews) which had been corrupted by the Jews and Christians. Abraham, whom Jews and Christians alike regarded as the great type of faith and whom he had himself emphatically indi

the great hajj, not only in contrast to the hajj but also to the possessor of a scripture (neither polytheist, nor Jew, nor Christian). [ii. 129; iii. 90, 91], and that, as Shuckburgh has shown, v. 162 and xxxi. 124, must also be much a. In his and his son Ishaq, the ancestor of the Aghzah, founded the Meccan sanatorium and the rites celebrated here, now corrupted by the hajj, which Mu

While his religion was being transformed in this way, Muhammad's personal position was being gradually changed by the altered conditions. According to the already mentioned constitution of the community, all important matters were to be laid before Allah and himself. It now became a fundamental duty of the believers to be obedient to Allah and to himself (iii. 3, 129, 166; iv. 175, 62), where it is added: "and to those among you who have to exercise authority."

While Mecca was the centre of his religion, the Prophet (188, 13, 94, 32, 6, 12, the "women's homage," which is inserted in the account of the second conference at Akaba, Ibn Ishaq, p. 280) and those who are disobedient are threatened with the "torments of hell:" (ix. 64). Alongside of the belief in Allah now appears belief in the Prophet (xviii. 44, 13, 5, 8 etc.), Allah is his protector, as is Gabriel, and the angels are at his disposal (xxi. 4). He claims certain privileges, which suggest a worldly, mortal rather than a spiritual leader (xxx. 62; xlix. 2, 94, 32, 63; xiii. 13, 94, 32, 63) but which however must be described as quite moderate demands.

The elevation of Mecca to the centre of his religion imposed on Muhammad new tasks, which were soon to lead to unexpected results. If visiting the holy places in and around Mecca was a duty of the Muslims, who were excluded from the town (xxii. 25, 27), the result was the inevitable necessity of forcing admission to them. In addition the Prophet had an account to settle with the Meccans, for by his expulsion they had humiliated him in the eyes of the world and the punishment repeatedly threatened them had not materialised, unlike the stereotyped punishments of the godless in the stories of the prophets. This led to a new command, that of the holy war (xviii. 2, 94, 32, 63; xiii. 13, 94, 32, 63) but which however must be described as quite moderate demands.
followers in this connection (ll. 212; xxi. 39 sqq. etc.). He succeeded however in finding a way out of the difficulty, which might be able to pave the way for military enterprises without injuring these feelings too much. After he had sent different men with small armed forces who did not succeed in conquering the enemy, in Kusayr, one of the sacred months in which all fighting was forbidden, he sent some of his followers to Nakha, where a caravan was expected and gave their leader sealed orders in which he left it to their judgment what they should do. They did not disappoint him for they fell upon the caravan which felt secure until the end of the month and one of the Meccans was killed. The rich plunder was sent to Medina, where in the meanwhile a storm of indignation had broken out. Muhammad however gave the people time to recover and finally calmed them, by the revelation ii. 244. The success of the coup had had such an effect in Medina that not only emigrants but also a number of Angar offered their services, when he appealed for followers in Kusayr a. h. in a new raid, which he himself would lead. On this occasion things came to a real aid in unexpected ways. He had learned that the rich caravan was on its way from Syria and he decided to ambush it at Badr [q. v.]. The very cautious Abū Safiyyah [q. v.] who was leading the caravan got wind of his plan however and sent messengers to Mecca for help. But when by a diversion to the coast he had reached safety, he soon afterwards sent other messengers to Mecca to cancel the first message. The angered Meccans had however already collected an army which was three times the size of Muhammad's little handful of men and were unwilling to let the opportunity escape of properly chastising their troublesome enemy. They went to Badr where soon afterwards Muhammad arrived with his men, expecting to meet Abū Safiyyah's helpless caravan. When they discovered their mistake they were filled with terror (viii. 5 sqq.; cf. the continuation of 'Urwa's story: TaBart, l. 1384 sqq.) but the Prophet saw in the encounter the wonderful opportunity of the propagation of Allah who wished to force upon man a battle and his remarkable power of suggestion was able to inspire his men that they completely routed the far superior enemy. A number of the Meccans, including the leader of the aristocrats Abū Lakhš, were slain and several, including Muḥammad's uncle Abū Bakr, were brought prisoners to Medina, where Muhammad had two of them, al-Nadjir and 'Ukba b. Abī Muṣsit, put to death, while the others were held to ransom. This in our eyes very insignificant fracas, which however must be judged in light of the observation of Doughty, who knew the country (Travelers, ii. 378), became of the utmost significance for the history of Islam, for Muhammad saw in the victory a powerful confirmation of his belief in the superiority of Allah (viii. 37, 66; ili. 119; cf. Ka'b b. Mālik, in Ibn Hisām, p. 520 sqq.) and in his own wani and besides the commercial city of Mecca enjoyed such great prestige amongst the Arabs that its conqueror was looked upon to attract all eyes to himself. He therefore displayed even greater energy and was able to utilise the advantages he had won. After he had drawn up the programme given in Sūra vii. 57 sqq. he began to besiege the Jewish tribe of Kūmākḍa in their fort, The Munāfiqūn did not dare to oppose him seriously and the other Jews left their co-religionistes in the arch in shame-ful fashion (cf. ili. 24) so that the latter were forced to migrate to Transjordania.

In order to protect himself while fighting from attacks from another foe, Muhammad at this time adopted a plan which was a further proof of his outstanding political ability. He concluded, as a number of letters that have been preserved show (cf. J. Sprecher, Mitteilungen des Seminars für orient. Sprachen, 1916), as lord of Medina, alliances with a number of Beduin tribes in which the two parties pledged themselves to assist one another.

In the year 3 a. h. (June 624—June 625) Muḥammad continued his attacks on the Meccan caravans so that the Kūsān finally saw the necessity of taking more vigorous measures and revenging themselves for Badr. An army of 5,000 men was equipped and set out with much display for Medina under the leadership of Abū Safiyyah, who was little suited for the task. Although several of his followers advised Muhammad to make his defence within the town, he decided to go out with his forces, which had been much reduced by the departure of the Munāfiqūn, and took up a position at the foot of the hill of Uḥud [q. v.]. In spite of the numerical superiority of the Meccans, the fighting at first went in favour of the Muslims, until a number of archers who had been placed to defend his flank joined against Muhammad's express orders in the battle, which promised to yield rich booty and this at once enabled Khalid b. al-Walīd to fall upon Muhammad's flank. The tables were now turned and many of the Muslims began to flee, especially when the rumour spread that the Prophet had fallen (cf. ili. 138). In reality he was only wounded and escaped with a few faithful followers through a revine on to the west side of the hill. Fortunately for him, the Meccans were quite incompetent to follow up their victory and as they thought that Muhammad had been punished and as they thought that Muhammad had been punished and their honour saved, they turned quietly back to Medina. The Prophet was thus saved from the worst, but he had to lament many fallen friends including Ḥammā [q. v.] and his newly acquired prestige naturally also suffered. With all the eloquence in his power he endeavoured to raise the morale of his followers by exhortation and censure alike (ili. 114 sqq., 133—154, 150—200) but the consequences of his reverse did not fail to materialise. The Jews who had taken no part in the fighting (according to Ibn Hisām, they were observing the Sabbath), made no secret of their delight at his misfortune, and several Beduin tribes next year (4 a. h. = June 625—beginning of June 626; the eclipse of the moon which took place in Eṣṭambūl II of this year was that which in Medina in the night of Nov. 19—20, 625; cf. Rhodeskanis, in W. Z. K. A. M., xxiv. 105; Cantani, l. 958 sqq.) showed how much his prestige with them had sunk [cf. ere MA'UDRA]. It was therefore all the more necessary to make an example and another Jewish tribe in Medina, the Nadjir, seemed a suitable object after Ka'b b. Asfar's [q. v. and cf. Ḥasan b. Thabit, No. 97] murder had served as a prelude. It is made a charge against them in Sūra vii. 4 that they defy Allah and his messenger, on which account Tradition imputes all sorts of crimes to them. After a siege of several weeks (TaBart, l. 1389; cf. Euting, Tagebuch, p. 111) they were forced to emigrate to Khasār or Syria. They left behind them their weapons and their gold and silver as a rich booty, the distribution
of which on this occasion Muhammad reserved for himself (lxix. 6 sqq.).

To this period most probably belongs the prohibition of the drinking of wine which is characteristic of Islam (v. 92 sqq. of the Instructive Gradation in ii. 216; where the word "great" is to be deleted as Schwally proposed).

It has been connected with a number of features of life in the old Semitic east but the main reason should rather be sought in the connection with the "masir" games [q.v.]. Drinking-bouts with feasting on a specially slain camel and games of chance, which were in the eyes of the old Arabs the bright spots in their hard struggle for existence, and in which they endeavoured to display their nobility and hospitality, brought the Muslims into suspicious relations with pagans and with Christian and Jewish wine-sellers, which might easily lead to their faltering in their new religion (cf. Wâkidî, transl. Welhamsen, p. 100; Bukhârî, ed. Krehl, ii. 270 sqq.); and this might explain why he forbade it at the same time, which of course does not exclude the possibility that forms of abstention for other reasons may have been known to (Musallâma's prohibition of wine was obviously intended as asceticism; cf. the article). While Muhammad was endeavouring to restore his weakened authority, a new and threatening storm came upon him and Medina from Mecca. The Quraysh, whose caravans were being continually harassed by him (cf. Hassân b. Thâbit, No. 16, 6 sqq.) and who were urged on by the Jews of Khilânâ, recognised that the victory at Uhâd had only been a blow in the air and realised the necessity of occupying Medina, which they had then neglected to do. Conscious of their slight military skill, they negotiated vigorously with various Beduin tribes and thus raised a large army — said to have been 10,000 men — with which they set out against Medina in the year 5 (June 626—May 627). The various accounts of the season of the year (sometimes a month after the barley harvest, sometimes cold, winter storms, the latter in agreement with Sûra xxxii. 9; cf. Hassân b. Thâbit, No. 14, 3) may be reconciled by the possibility that the siege lasted a considerable time (cf. Doughty's description, Travels, ii. 429 sqq. of the siege of 'Ansa, which in general illustrates this work excellently). The advance of this imposing army produced great consternation in Medina, which was still further increased by the vacillating attitude of the Munîqîn and by the discovery or perhaps only the suspicion that the Jews were conspiring with the enemy (xxxiii. 10 sqq., 26). Muhammad in order to strengthen the defences had a ditch (hâdîluk, a Persian word?) dug in front of the unprotected parts of the town. According to several stories, he did this on the advice of a Persian named Salmân b. J. Horowit (cf. Isr. xii. 178—183) would reject this as a later accretion. Modest as the defences were — about 150 years later 'Abî b. Mûsâ bridged the ditch which had been restored by Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh, by throwing a few doors across it — they seem to have imposed upon the enemy who had little experience in the art of war and the siege gradually dragged on.

The able lord of Medina used the time for secret negotiations with the Ghâfitân and cleverly stirred up enmity among his opponents and when at the same time the weather conditions became unfavourable the besiegers lost heart and gradually began to retire so that the last effort of the Quraysh to destroy their sinister foe came to nothing: For one section of the participants however, the comedy of the "War of the Ditch" was to become a bloody tragedy. Hardly had the besiegers retired than the Prophet declared war on the last Jewish tribe of any size, the Kûraîss, and began to besiege their quarter of the town. The Jews no doubt hoped to escape in the same easy fashion as the Nadrî had, especially as their allies, the 'Awîs, were very actively trying to induce Muhammad to clemency; but this time he was inexorable and carried out seriously a threat that he had previously made (lxix. 3). Tradition has however endeavoured to put the responsibility for the massacre of the Kûraîss on Sa'd b. Mû'âdî (cf. Hassân b. Thâbit, No. 9, clxxii, who asserts Sa'd's innocence). But there are various indications that it was the Prophet himself who made the decision and perhaps induced the Jews to surrender. On this occasion the Jews showed a strength of character and nobility of spirit which throws a redeeming light on their otherwise so ignoble history. By these amputations, which however did not spare all the Jews from Medina (cf. Ibn Hâshîm, p. 855; Wâkidî—Wâlidian, pp. 303, 393; Hassân b. Thâbit, No. 133, 176, the Prophet had come nearer his goal, the organisation of an emira on a purely religious basis, which hitherto he had to keep somewhat in the background for political reasons. For the present he continued his attacks on the Meccan caravans far into the year 6 (May 627—May 628) and his raids, usually punitive expeditions, on Beduin tribes; of these expeditions, which have no particular interest, mention may be made of that against the Bâshî Mu'tâ leggings and the 'Ansa and involved 'Abîs [q.v.] in the celebrated adventure which nearly cost her her position as the wife of the Prophet, until finally a revelation saved her (xiv. 4: 18, 19—20).

Towards the end of the year 6 Muhammad thought that his position in Medina was so firmly established that he could risk a step, which would bring him nearer the desired goal. He and the enigmatisms were still excluded from Mecca and its holy places, but through secret confidential agents, among whom we may certainly include his carefully calculating uncle 'Abûâs, he knew that feeling in the town had been gradually coming round (cf. xvii. 15; ix. 7). An increasing number had become tired of the hopeless war and thought it would be much more advantageous for the commerce of Mecca to make peace with their indefatigable enemy, especially after he had adopted into his programme the pilgrimages to their fairs, the source of the city's wealth. Trusting to this revulsion of feeling he gave his followers in Ibtî-l-`u'd of the year 6, i.e. March 628 (the news of the death of the Persian king Khwarâw Pâwân on the 29th of this year reached him on the way) orders to provide themselves with sacrificial victims and undertake an 'umra [q.v.] with him to Mecca, as Allâh in a vision had promised him a successful fulfilment of the visit (xlviii. 27). He probably chose an 'umra deliberately (Ibn Hâshîm, p. 740; Wâkidî—Wâlidian, p. 249 sqq., 253; cf. Sûra, xx. 30, 34) instead of the great pilgrimage which was soon due, as the consequences of an encounter with all manner of tribes, with whom he might
possibly have been waging war, were too incalculable for him; but perhaps he cherished also the hope that, if all went well, he might remain there in the following month also (cf. ii. 192 which perhaps belongs to this connection). The step was nevertheless a risky one, so that he asked several Beduin tribes to accompany him in case they met with resistance. To his disappointment however, they refused (xlviii. 11 sq.) so that he decided to abandon the military character of the march and make his followers go as harmless pilgrims. In Mecca many were inclined to meet his wishes but the belligerent party was still strong enough to get a body of armed men sent to meet him to prevent him entering the town. He therefore encamped at al-Hudabiya [q. v.] where he began to negotiate with the Meccans, and when this led to no result he sent 'Uthman, who was protected by his family connections, into the town as his representative. But when the latter showed no signs of returning and finally a rumour got about that he had been murdered, the situation became critical and Muhammed dropped all negotiations, collected his followers under a tree, probably one long held sacred, and made them swear to fight for him to the last, which they did with enthusiasm (xlviii. 10 sq.). But soon afterwards a number of Meccans arrived, many of whom no doubt were characteristic of the aimless Meccan policy, by which he was to retire this time but to be allowed to perform an 'umra next year. He agreed to the proposal, concluded a ten years' truce with the Kuraiš and further promised to surrender all Meccans of dependent status who came to him. His followers, whom he had worked up into a state of great excitement by his promises and the taking of the oath, heard these conditions with scarcely concealed anger; but Muhammed calmly ordered the sacrificial animals brought with them to be slain, which was to have been done at an 'umra in the town (see Lane, Lexicon, s. v. asabil), and had his hair cut and by his authority forced his crumbling followers to do the same. Only later did they discover that he had made a brilliant stroke of policy for he had induced the Meccans to recognize the despised fugitive as an opponent of equal rancour and concluded a peace with them which promised well for the future.

He and the participants received ample compensation for the apparently frustrated 'umma at the beginning of the year 7 (May 628—April 629) by the capture of the fertile oasis of Khairar [q. v.], which was inhabited by Jews. It was the first actual conquest by the Prophet and he instituted on this occasion a practice which became regular afterwards, when Jews or Christians capitulated; he did not put the people to death or banish them but let them remain as tenants, as it were, who had to pay dues every year. This expedition which also brought the Jewish colonies of Wadi 'r-Kuraih into his power, made the Muslim rich (xlviii. 18—21).

In this period, although the exact date is variously given, tradition puts the despatch of letters from the Prophet to Muqawki, governor of Alexandria, the ruler of Abyssinia, the Byzantine emperor, the Persian king etc., in which he demanded that they should adopt Islam. The alleged original manuscript of the first of these has however proved not to be genuine (see J. L., 1854, p. 482 sqq.; Zaidi, in Hilal, 1904, p. 103 sqq.; Becker, Fajyari Scholl-Rheinhardt, p. 3). But even what is related about these epistles hardly deserves the faith most people have put in it. Even if we disregard the many apocryphal details, we must surely consider it very unlikely that so sober a politician as Muhammed, who had at this time a very definite object, the conquest of Mecca, before his eyes, should have thought of indulging so fantastic an idea as the conversion of Heraclius or the Persian king, to whom the 'Incid Kuraihi, as no less unintelligible than the Bible to the Prophet and his countrymen, and whom he could neither compel by force nor entice with professed advantages. It is very doubtful if Muhammed ever thought at all of his religion as a universal religion of the world, as for example Nolidke, in W. Z. K. M., xxi. 307, Goldscheider, Vorlesungen über den Islam, p. 25, and T. W. Arnold, The Perishing of Islam, p. 43 sqq. hold (against them, see Snouck Hurgronje, Mohammedanism, p. 48 sqq.; H. Lammens, Étude sur le livre du calif Médina, i. 422). The passages in the Meccan sûras which can be quoted in favour of this theory (vi. 90; xil. 104; xil. 157; xxv. 1; xxiv. 27; xxxiv. 70; xxxiii. 78; lxviii. 32; lxvi. 27; cf. from the latter long passages in lix. 25) are limited by their context or by unambiguous parallels (like vi. 92; xil. 5 [the mother of the city, i. e. Mecca]; cf. xxvi. 214). Besides, in the Medinan period, the place of persuasion and proof ("no compulsion in religion": ii. 257; cf. xvi. 126), was taken by the spread of Islam by force of arms; which, although based on the supremacy of Islam over other religions (iii. 79; ix. 33; lix. 4), was confined to the lands inhabited by Arabs. If after the conquest of Mecca he also declared war on the possessors of a scripture (see below) the campaign undertaken by him prove that he was only thinking of Arabs under Byzantine or Persian rule, and it cannot be proved that he ever went beyond this in his schemes (the gift of Helvon, Baladjari, ed. de Goeje, p. 129 may be confidently asserted to be a forgery; cf. the article UEMMA). The decisive consideration however is that Muhammed at the height of his power never demanded from Jews or Christians that they should adopt Islam but was content with a political subjection and the payment of tribute. The correct conclusion is therefore to reject those stories and to look for the real historical basis in negotiations of a purely political nature, e. g. with the friendly Muqawki (q. v. and cf. Butler, The Arab Conquest of Egypt, 1902) and to assume that the idea of a great missionary enterprise arose later under the influence of Christian traditions, notably of the miracle of Pentecost.

On the other hand, the character of the genuine letters of the Prophet to the Arab tribes changes at this time, for he was no longer content with a purely political agreement but, relying on his now consolidated power, also demanded that they should adhere to his religion, which involved performing the salat and paying "alm"; he even gave the Djahim on the Syrian coast a respite (m叹d) of two months after which they were to decide (see Speyer, op. cit., p. 14 sqq.).

In March 629, Muhammed performed the 'umra stipulated for him by the peace of Hudaidiya (the 'umra of the "contract" or "recovery"). For him who had been driven out of his native city it was undoubtedly a great satisfaction to be able to visit Mecca as the acknowledged lord of Medina;
but otherwise the significance of the occasion was more symbolical and the efforts of the practised diplomat to prolong his stay by his marriage with a sister-in-law of his secret ally 'Abbas (see MADINNA) were politely but firmly resisted by the Meccans. On the other hand, it was of great significance that some of the most important Meccans, like 'Amr b. al-‘Ash and the military genius Khaṭṭīl b. al-Walid, who saw he was the coming man, openly joined him, while his uncle 'Ābās and the very patriotic Ibn Ḥaḍīm, p. 275) but cautious Abī Safyān endeavoured in secret negotiations to prepare in the most favourable way for the inevitable result. In the meanwhile he continued his military expeditions. His forces suffered a serious reverse but the first considerable effort to extend his authority over the Arabs on Byzantine soil, at Muta (q. v.) in Transjordania; this is also recorded by Theophanes (Chronographia, ed. de Boor, p. 335). But several Beduin tribes now began to see what advantages they would procure not only for the next but also for this world: by joining him, and large groups like the Sulaim voluntarily adopted Islam and placed themselves under his flag.

That it was Muhammad's intention to break the truce with the Kuraish at the first opportunity may be taken as certain; for it must have been intolerable for him that the heathen should still have Allāh's sanctuary in their control (ix. 17 sq. cf. iii. 3). The inaccessibility of the Meccans now gave him his opportunity. Very much against the advice of Abī Safyān, the belligerent party in Mecca had supported the Bakk against the Kuraish, who were divided amongst each other, and thus gave him a plausible causa belli (cf. perhaps ix. 12 sq.). In Kausāfa of the year 8 (May 629—April 630) he set out at the head of an army of Muhājirīnūn, Anṣār, and Beduin. The news produced considerable anxiety in Mecca where the number of those who wished to fight shrank daily so that the more prudent now could take control. Abī Safyān, who was sent out with several others (including the Khūṭrib b. Warqa who was a friend of the Prophet) met Muhammad not far from the town, paid homage to him and obtained an amnesty for all the Kuraish who abandoned armed resistance (cf. 'Urwā 'Abdārī, p. 1654 sq.). Except for a few irremediable (cf. Dīwan al-Hudūlūtan, No. 183; Mābarrad, al-Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 395), they acquiesced and thus the Prophet was able to enter his native city practically without a struggle and almost all its inhabitants adopted Islam. He acted with great generosity and endeavoured to win all hearts by rich gifts (lūlīf al-khulīsh, a new use of the slms; cf. ix. 60). Only he demanded ruthlessly the destruction of all idols in and around Mecca. Only Sūrā cx. seems to preserve an echo of the exultation with which this victory filled him; here as in the unusually touching passage alviii. 1 sq., he sees in the success of his plans a sign that Allāh has forgiven him all his sins.

Muhammad did not rest long upon his laurels for not only was Taʾif, which was closely associated with Mecca, still unsubdued but the Hawāzin tribes in Central Arabia were preparing for a decisive fight. A battle was fought with these Beduin at Ḥumayd on the road to Taʾif (q. v.) which at first threatened to be a fatal disaster to the Prophet, mainly because of the unrelatability of a number of the new converts, until some of his followers succeeded in recalling the fugitives and routing the enemy (ix. 25 sq.). On the other hand, his inexperienced troops were unable to take Taʾif with its defences (cf. the description of impregnable fortresses in Dīwan al-Hudūlūtan, No. 66, 80 sq.). The people of Taʾif however afterwards fell in with the spirit of the time and adopted Islam. When Muhammad, after raising the siege, was distributing the booty of Ḥumayd, the Anṣār who as soon as he entered Mecca had expressed the fear that he would take up his residence again in his native town, became very insatiable about the rich gifts that he made to his former opponents in order "to win their hearts", while they themselves went empty-handed (cf. Ḥasan b. Ḥabīb, No. xxix.) but he spoke kindly to them that they burst into tears and declared themselves satisfied. His conduct on this occasion reminds us to some extent of that of David towards the Jews and Ephraimites after Absalom's rebellion.

The characteristic feature of the year 9 (April 630—April 631) in the memory of the Muslims was the many embassies which came from different parts of Arabia to Medina, to submit on behalf of their tribes to the conqueror of Mecca (cf. cx. 3) and the letters which he sent to the tribes, to lay down the conditions of their adoption of Islam. In the autumn of this year, he made up his mind to conduct a campaign against Northern Arabia on a considerable scale, probably because the defeat in Transjordania required to be avenged and because the Ghassānīs king was adopting a hostile attitude (cf. Ibn Ḥaḍīm, p. 94; Maqrīzī, Maghātā, h. 8, 79). But his appeal for followers met with little support. Mūsābnīrūn as well as Beduin held back and even among his devoted followers, there were some who put forward all sorts of objections, out of fear of a campaign so far away in the glowing heat (cf. ix. 43; lxi. 84—91, 98 sqq.). In particular he seems to have had to face at this time a considerable opposition in Medina (ix. 58—73, 125) so that he had to have recourse to his old instrument of intimidation and his words recall in a remarkable way the period of passion in Mecca (ix. 71, 129 sqq.). Matters came to such a pitch that some of the opposition, behind whom is said by one tradition to have been his old inexcusable opponent, the ascetic Abī 'Amir 'Abd "Amīr, furnished a house of prayer of their own "for division among the faithful and support for those who had formerly fought against God and his Prophet" (ix. 108 sqq.). Unfortunately the expressions in the Kūfā and in the traditions are quite insufficient to enable us to get a clear picture of this very remarkable affair. In spite of all opposition however, he carried through his plan, but when after great hardships he had reached Tabuk on the frontier (in the land of the Byzantines; cf. Ibn Ḥaḍīm, p. 956), he stayed there some time and then returned to Medina. The campaign was however not without success. His prestige had now become so great that the petty Christian and Jewish states in the north of Arabia submitted to him during his stay in Tabuk, for example the Christian king Wābānna in Ams (q. v.), the people of Alahār (q. v.) and the Jews in the port of Makkah. Khaṭṭīl also occupied the important centre of Dīwan al-Djandal (cf. for a criticism of the account: Csetani, ii. 261—268; Sperber, cf. cxxx. 44 sqq.; on the alleged letter from Muhammad to the Jews in Makkah, see also Wensineck, in fel. II. 290).
Unfortunately we do not know how the matters which were rapidly coming to a head in Medina actually developed; but we may safely assume that the death of 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy, which took place not long after the expedition to Tabuk, must have contributed to slacken the tension. These years showed a marked increase in the prestige of the lord of Medina abroad. Mecca was in his hands and among the Beduins an inclination was noticeable in several places to submit to the will of the conqueror of this town, to be safe against his attacks and to have a share in his rich booty. This was for example the case with the group of tribes of 'Amir b. Sa'âda, with portions of the great tribe of Tanm and the neighbouring Asad and further north with the Bakr and Taghib. Even in regions so remote as Bajraun and 'Oman within the Persian sphere of influence and among the chiefs of South Arabia, the new teaching and order of things penetrated and found ancient followers in some places. But we must not allow ourselves to be deceived by the representations of the historians, from which it appears as if all the people in these lands adopted Islam. Caetani and Sperber in particular have shown that these accounts are not in keeping with reality and that it was only little groups that submitted, while there was a not inconsiderable number who rejected the Prophet's denunciation. As regards open opposition the question was quite simple; when they were heathen, adhered to their paganism and would not abandon their polytheism, they were to be threatened by Muhammad with the "holy war". He had not only to deal with such as those in Arabia, but there were also in addition to the Jews who had already felt his strength, a considerable number of Christians, and some Persians in the eastern and southern districts. Muhammad was thus faced with a problem which he had to solve. From his words in Suna ix. 29 y.9, where he includes the Christians and even the Jews, the people of such strict monotheism, among the polytheists, who give Allah a son and honour men as lords beside him, one would expect that he would have fought them like the heathen, if they did not adopt Islam (cf. also the attack on the Christians, verse 76 y.).

But in contrast to such utterances we have another (Suna v. 87) where he mentions the Christians very sympathetically because they, unlike the Jews, show themselves kindly towards true believers and are not arrogant, which he ascribes to the fact that they have priests and monks (cf. his judgment on monasticism: Suna vii. 21). These remarkable contradictions may be explained, as pointed out by Tor Andrae, by the difference between the Monophysites and the Nestorians. The former aroused his unqualified displeasure by their Christology, while the latter, who were then predominant in the Persian empire, attracted him much more, and this attitude was shared by his followers after his death, as the letter of the Catholicon Ilyâ'ah, quoted by Tor Andrae, shows. On the other hand, his remarks about the Jews are always very severe. It is therefore all the more remarkable that the distinction between Jews and Christians completely disappears when their position is finally settled. They were included together as "peoples of a scripture" and they were allowed to retain their religion if they recognised the political suzerainty of the Prophet by paying a tax (jizyâ, q.v.); if they did not they were to be fought without mercy.

The memory of the agreement between Muhammad's teaching and that of the "peoples of a scripture", earlier so much emphasised, must have contributed to this rather illogical settlement and in addition there was the fact that treating the Jews as tax-paying tenants, and allowing them to practise their religion, as had been already done at Khaybar, was much more practical for the Muslims than fighting them till they gave in. A further compromise with the "peoples of a scripture" was that believers were allowed to marry the daughters of the "peoples of a scripture" and to eat food prepared by them (v. 7). It is noteworthy that the Persians (Masêhîr: xxii. 17) were included among the "peoples of a scripture" which made a difficulty for later better informed generations (Tabari, i. 1005, 19; Balâdhuri, p. 79); probably Muhammad did not dare for political reasons to demand that they should give up their religion. This extended application of the term "peoples of a scripture" is found not in the Kur'ân but in a letter of Muhammad's to the Persians in Hadjjar (Ibn Sa'd, i/ii. 49) but with the limitation that the Muslims are forbidden to marry their women and eat meat killed by them.

With these exceptions, the Prophet had approached nearer the object which was always before him, although it hitherto eluded him, the formation of an amân on a definitely religious basis, for the inhabitants of a number of parts of Arabia were now actually bound together by religion. The old differences between the tribes with their endless feuds, their blood-vengeance and their lampions which continually stirred up new quarrels, were to disappear at the will of Muhammad and all believers were to feel themselves brethren (lx. 11; xlix. 10 y.). There was to be no distinction among believers except in their degree of piety (xlxi. 13). The Prophet certainly had an ideal before him but it was realised only in a very incomplete way. The very rapid extension of Islam had been accompanied by a considerable diminution in its religious content. Alongside of the older adherents, who were really carried away by his preaching and whose faith had been tried by privations and dangers, there were now the many new converts who had gained mainly by fear (cf. the well-known poem of Ka'b b. Zairah; the poem of the Hudjnulli Uasl b. Abî Iyâs in Kösgarten, Carmine Huitfeld, Nr. 127) or by the prospect of material advantages. In spite of the teachers sent out to them there could be no question of any deep-seated conversion among these Arabs and how the old Arab spirit continued to flourish among them unweakened is shown for example by the boasting and abuse in the poems in Ibn Khîlan, p. 934 y., which is in no way inferior to the old poems. The Prophet himself in Suna xlix. 14 has recorded very definitely how far the Beduins were from the true faith: they cannot say that they believe but only that they have adopted Islam. Commandments relating to religion and worship, which had considerably occupied Muhammad in the early Meccan period, gave way in striking fashion to social and political regulations, a natural result of the fact that the new members were not ripe for the former. Uncertainty on these matters was still great and even at headquarters much seems still to have been in an embryonic state. This is true even of so fundamental a law as the rule for the times of daily prayer, as the five prayers later obligatory are
nowhere laid down in the Qur'an (see above; cf. also the expression “morning and evening” in A'isha’s poem: Morgenland, Forsch., p. 259). That they were introduced by Muhammad himself at the end of his life is possible, but not very probable in view of the silence on the point in the Qur'an, and in any case it is not certainly proved by the mention of the formulas of prayer in a letter of the Prophet’s (Ibn Hisham, p. 1382) as we are not justified in expecting absolutely literal accuracy in the transmission of such documents. Only one or two religious institutions are dealt with at all fully in the Qur’an, the great pilgrimage to the sanctuaries at Mecca and the ‘umra in the town itself, but the hadith was indeed the crown of his endeavours begun in Mecca and carried through with tenacity. The Prophet, although he was now lord of Mecca, did not yet take part in the pilgrimage in the year 8, which was so inexplicable to later generations that they invented an ‘umra unknown to many of his followers (Ibn Hisham, p. 886; Tabari, i. 1670 [Urwa], 1685; Wâkidî, p. 350; Ibn Sa’d, ii/i. i, 123 sq.; Nîlî, 193 sq.; cf. ii/1. 125 sq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Mubazzare Insul, p. 58 sq.). Nor did he come in 9, from Mecca to the ‘umra, until in 10, to Mecca he showed his interest in it however by sending Abû Bakr as his representative and making him read a proclamation which had momentous results (Bukhâri, iii. 165, 249; according to the usual tradition, it was ‘Ali who acted as his deputy; but this is probably a tendentious alteration; cf. Tabari, i. 1760 sq., where Abû Bakr complains about being passed over and is comforted by Muhammad; there is also another tradition, according to which Abû Bakr commissioned Abû Hurairâ to proclaim the exclusion of the heathen from the pilgrimage (Ibn Sa’d, ii/i. 121 sq.). This was what is known as the bârid at (q.v.), in which Muhammad, who had been for so many years excluded from the pilgrimage, forbad all heathen any participation in it and gave them a period of four months, after the excited reception of the letter, to change their religion. The adoption of Islam and merciless warfare (Sûra ix.).

This explains his absence from the celebration in the two preceding years; he wished to wait until he could celebrate it as sole ruler and completely in agreement with his intentions or, as he said, with the ceremonies introduced by Abraham (ii. 119 sq.). Finally all was prepared and at the end of the year 10 (April 631–March 632) he was able to carry through the first reformed pilgrimage (the “Farewell Pilgrimage” or the pilgrimage of ‘Isâm), which became the standard for all time. It is remarkable that the regulations for the ceremonies of the hadith, the object of which was to remove all that was too obviously pagan in the old ceremony (cf. e.g. the anthems in Mina in Faradak, in Z. D. M. G., lix. 604; Arâfah, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 402) and to give it an Islamic colouring, are found mostly in traditions, where later details can of course easily have been inserted, and not in the fragments and more or less incidentally in the Qur’an; but broadly speaking, the later form is undoubtedly based on what the Prophet laid down on this memorable occasion (cf. the article hadith).

The Farewell Pilgrimage, at which an effective address, of which somewhat variant versions have been handed down, is put in the Prophet’s mouth, marks the culminating point in his career. His feelings at this time are probably expressed in Allah’s words in Sûra v. 5: “To-day I have perfected your religion, and completed my favours for you and chosen Islam as a religion for you”. There is therefore a touch of the dramatic in the fact that his career closed a few months later. He himself hardly expected this, for only a month before his death he was preparing an expedition, which was to set out under the leadership of the young ‘Uthma (q.v.) against Trans-ocean (not in some traditions to West of the Jordan, cf. the article umma) in order to avenge the death of his father. The situation was such in other directions also that it required a man in full vigour to deal with it; in several places the appearance of different “prophets” had provoked disturbances [cf. Al Aswad, Tâlimah, and Muzâlimah]. Then Muhammad suddenly fell ill, presumably of the ordinary Medina fever (Faradak, ix. 13); but this was dangerous to a man physically and mentally over-worked. He rallied a little but then died on the 13th Rabi‘ i of the year 9 (i.e. June 632; only this date suits the statement in Hassan b. Thâbil, Nâ, cxxvii, and all traditions that it was a Monday) on the bosom of his favourite wife ‘A’isha, according to the story with the words: “The highest friend” (Tabari, i. 1817; IbnSa’d, ii/i. 57 sq.; 58 sq.; 59 sq.; 71 sq.).

The great difficulty which the biographer of Muhammad feels on every page is this, that the prophet is both complete, the wonderland of his personality and the power of influencing those around him by suggestion, is not recorded in the early sources and indeed could not be recorded. From the Qur’an, it is true, one becomes acquainted with his earliest remarkable inspirations, which even now are not without effect, and with his eminent political gifts later in Medina. We do of course find instances in the battle of Badr or the agreement of Hudâliyya where his intellectual superiority is overwhelmingly evident; but these are only isolated flashes and for the most part we have to read the essentials between the lines and be content with instructive analogies, among which the influence of Joseph Smith on the intellectually far superior Brigham Young is a particularly striking example. The really powerful factor was his unshakable belief from beginning to end that he had been called by Allah, for a conviction such as this, which was not without a slight doubt, expresses an in calculable influence on others; and the certainty with which he came forward as the executor of Allah’s will gave his words and ordinances an authority which proved finally compelling. His real personality was revealed quite openly with its limitations; his strength and his knowledge were limited, the ability to perform miracles was denied him and he speaks quite frankly of his faults (vi, 69; xxxiv,
Apart from the revelation with which he was favoured, he is a man like any other and several times refers to the fact that he will die. (xxxix. 31); xl. 33 [q. iii. 138]; the episode in Ibn Hisham, p. 1072 sq. is not historical but a ten- dentious story directed against the tendency becoming apparent to apostatise the Prophet. This is exactly the field in which later ages have felt dissatisfied, so that they quite early, driven mainly by their disputations with the Christians (see M. Schreiner, in Z. D. M. G., xlii. 594), wove around the person and life of the Prophet a network of superhuman features (see Tor Andræs work quoted below). Apart from the traditions which are clearly confirmed by the Qur'ān we can only have certainty in the strictest sense of the word in cases where the stories place the Prophet in an unfavourable light, not only from our point of view but also from that of the Muslims, e.g. in the story of his temporary recognition of the three goddesses of Mecca before he became a Muslim, one of these goddesses being a form of the 'Urūma and Ḥadhījī on the Farewell Pilgrimage, for it is quite incredible that such features should be later inventions and as a rule in such cases the compromising stories are confirmed by the existence of variant traditions which endeavour to dispose of the offensive features by glossing over or altering them.

If the biographers of Muhammad must for these reasons impose a very considerable restraint upon themselves, there is nevertheless one essential aspect of his activity, which ought to be very strongly emphasised, particularly as justice is not always done to it in modern treatments of his life. There is a tendency in some recent writers not only to emphasise all that is unfavourable but also to neglect his real religious importance. If he had only been an oversexed man, anxious for worldly profit and quite unscrupulous in the choice of his means, Islam, which had been created in him and had died after his death, would have been an effect without a cause. It is impossible for the unbiassed historian to deny that he aroused the religious instinct of his countrymen, and gave expression to a body of religious and moral conceptions which not only satisfied his fellow countrymen but supplied the needs of the people of lands which had old civilizations conquered by the Muslims and served them as foundations for a vigorous and far-reaching intellectual activity. Although as a result of his singular theory of inspiration, his direct dependence on the older religions of revelation remained concealed, he was able in his own way to communicate to his countrymen a part of the spiritual wealth of the "peoples of a scripture" and how he touched the soul of the Arabs is best seen by the efforts of the Wahhābitis at a reformation. In lands of ancient culture, Islam, it is true, was only able to carry out its task by a somewhat radical re- moulding and the intellectual activity already mentioned developed also under the influence of Christianity and mysticism, but yet it was Muḥammad who set the whole process in motion and he could not have gained this influence if he had only been what the writers mentioned profusely to have found in him.
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Of further literature we may mention: Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, iv. (on Medina, Muḥammad’s Constitution of the community and the emmissaries and letters); Sperber, Die Schriften Muḥammad’s an die Stämme Arabiens (in M. S. O. S., xi.); S. Snouck Hurgronne, Het moslimsche feest, 1880; De Islam in de Gids, 1886, 1887; H. Lammens, Mohammed just iliscrivé, 1911; Qoran et Tradition, 1910; Fātimah et les filles de Mahomet, 1912; Wensinck, Mohammed en de joden en de Muslīm, 1908; E. Schenfeld, Études sur l’histoire des Juifs à Medina, in R. E. J., xvi. 26; R. Leszynski, Die Juden in Arabien u. Zeit Mohammed’s, 1910 (in occidental); A. Geiger, Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen?, 1833; Rodelh, Die Abhängigkeit des Qorans v. Judentum und Christentum, 1922; J. Goldziher, Muḥammaschische Studien, 1892; Tor Andræs, Die Person Muḥammad’s in Lehre und Glauben seiner Gemeinde (in Archives d’Études Orientales, xvi. 1918); Mohammed, sein Leben und Glaube, Göttingen 1932.

MUHAMMAD I-I. [See MAIYAD ISLAM.] MUHAMMAD I., according to the current view, the fifth Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, reigned, after the Empire’s restoration in 1413, as sole acknowledged ruler until his death in 1421. Like many details of the first century of Ottoman history, the year of the birth of this Sultan is unknown; Sigillati Oghlan, i. 66 gives 759 or 791 (1379 or 1389). It is commonly agreed that he was the youngest of the sons of Bayazid I, which probably has made von Hammer accept the later date. At the time of Timur’s invasion, Muḥammad resided at Ärin ou Amusia, but he was present at the battle of Angora (end of July 1402). From here he escaped with the help of the vizier Bayazid.
Muhammad had the surname Aḥḥaṭ, or, more popularly, Ṣāḥib, seventh ruler of the Ottoman Empire, reigned from 1451 until his death in 1461. He succeeded his father Murād II’s lifetime as governor in Mağnissia; after the death of his brother Ali al-Din in 1444 he became heir to the throne. Before his final enthronement Muhammad had twice resided in Adrianople as sulṭan, on account of the abdication of Murād II; the first time in June 1444, after a ten years’ peace had been concluded with Hungary. When, notwithstanding this treaty, Hungary and her Christian allies again took the offensive in July, Murād came back from Mağnissia, to which he had retired, and won the battle of Varna (Nov. 10, 1444). Then Murād abdicated a second time, but a menacing revolt of the Janissaries in Adrianople made the grand vizier Khālid Paša call him back again, a matter which Muhammad was relegated once more to his Anatolian governorship until his father’s death.

On Febr. 9, 1451 this new sultan of Adrianople and seemed at first peacefully inclined. In reality his reign was to become a period of untiring and continual conquest under the personal leadership of Muhammad himself, who, especially in the beginning of his reign, took part in nearly all the important campaigns. His conquests did not very much enlarge the boundaries already reached at Murād II’s death, but consisted more in a bringing under immediate Turkish rule of a large number of countries, regions and towns that were still held by local rulers under the Ottoman suzerainty. In this way Muhammad’s conquests made possible the enormous expansion of the Ottoman empire in the xvith century.

The first, and at the same time most conspicuous military achievement of his reign was the conquest of Constantinople, where, by the grace of Murād II, the Palæologue Constantine was still reigning. The preparations for this memorable siege had begun in 1452 with the construction of the castle of Rüstem Hisar (in which an inscription by Zaghazan Paša, one of the builders, of 856 [1452], is found; cf. Khalīf Edhem, in T. O. E. M., ii. 484-497) and other military preparations, e. g. the casting of an enormous siege gun. Constantinople was taken on May 29, 1453, and Galata surrendered soon afterwards (cf. Constantinople). In the next
again from the grand vizirate and executed in
August 1474; Gedik Ahmed Pasha took his place.
In the following years, until 1480, the sultan's
chief attention was given to conquests in Europe.
He built in 1471 the fortress of Sabacz (Bögürdeden)
in Syria, near Belgrad, while his troops in these
and the following years made incursions into Hungary
and far into Austrian territory. The war with Venice
continued and in 1474 the Albanian Skutari
(Skodra) was in vain besieged. The year 1475
brought the great success of the conquest of Kaffa
from the Genoese and, as a result of the establishing
of the Ottoman power in the Crimea, the
submission of the Tatar Khanate of the Crimea to
Ottoman suzerainty. In 1476 the sultan himself
was successful in Moldavia, but in the next years
the Turkish armies had less success against the
Venetians in Albania and southern Morea; finally
in 1478 Muhammad himself went to Albania and
took Croia; Skutari was besieged a long time,
but surrendered only after an account of the peace
negotiations with Venice, which led to a peace
(treaty (confirmed January 26, 1479) leaving a
considerable number of towns in Albania and Morea
to Venice. The Ionian Islands, however, were con-
quered in 1479 by a fleet under Gedik Ahmed,
also, at the same time, went so far as to take
Otranto in southern Italy. An endeavour to con-
quered the island of Rhodes in the same year was
not successful.

Muhammad's last campaign took place in 1480,
when he intervened in the dynastic disputes of the
dynasty of Üçüncü 'Kadir [q. v.], which intervention
gave rise to the first difficulties with Egypt. In
the next year, 1481, he had already set out for a
new military enterprise in Asia, the aim of which
was yet unknown, but may have been connected
with the same difficulties, when he died; rather suddenly,
in the place called Tekfar Çayrî or Khamîl Çayrî
between Skutari and Gela (May 3, 1481).
His body was transported to Constantinople and
buried in the sărko of the Fatih Mosque.

Besides being a great conqueror, Mahammed II
was the builder of many important edifices, in
the first place of the Fatih Mosque in Constantin-
ople and the mosque of Eiyi (u'dudzat el-bâ-
namâën), i. 8 443; 443 443) and further of the
castles on the Dardanelles and other works of naval
and military importance. In the army administration he
succeeded in restoring discipline among the Janis-
aries by incorporating in them the corps of the
Segban; further his name is connected with the
first Ottoman Rûmân-âlem (printed as an appendix
T.O.E.M., III.). He encouraged scientific studies
and showed an interest in literature and poetry (he
sponsored thirteen Turkish poets); even for the
Renaissance arts in Italy he summoned Gentile Belli-
ti to Constantinople, who made his portrait; cf.
also Tschudi, Vom alten Osmanischen Reich, Tü-
hingen 1930, p. 48.}

Bibliography: Among the early sources, the
Byzantine historians (Phranzes, Ducas, Con-
cydis) are by far the more important. The
Greek description of Muhammad's life by Crito-
boulos was translated into Turkish (appendix to
T.O.E.M., 1. and II). The old Ottoman chronicles
(Nehri and others) often treat the beginning of
Muhammad's reign in their last part; the later
historical sources (Sa'd al-Dûn', Ali, Feridûn)
are far from being reliable for this time. Further:
von Hammer, G. O. K., I, II; Zinckenstein (I) and

MUHAMMAD III, thirteenth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born on May 16, 1567, the son of Murad III and the Venetian lady Baffa, and reigned from January 27, 1593 until his death, December 22, 1603. He was the last sultan who, as crown prince, had resided as governor in Magnesia. During his short reign he does not seem to have exercised any great influence on the policy of the Empire, being mostly under the influence of his mother who, as vâlide sultan, intervened in affairs of state through her protégés within and without the palace. Much against her will but on the insistence of a large part of the troops and of the high dignitaries, Muhammad took part in one campaign, namely that of 1596, in which the Hungarian town of Eger (Egi) was taken by the Turks (September 1596). This campaign was a part of the war against Austria that lasted during all his reign and occasioned every year a military expedition to Hungary or to Wallachia. The grand vizier was changed not less than twelve times under this sultan; the most conspicuous grand vizier was Damiad Ibrahim Paşa [q.v.], his brother-in-law and the protégé of the vâlide. Ibrahim three times held the sultan's seal; three other titularies ended their office by being executed. In the same year as the conquest of Eger, the Turks won the battle of Keresetea between the Austrians and Hungarians; the severity of the then grand vizier Cighala Sinan caused a great number of the troops to desert and to appear some years afterwards as jarrists or gævêîâs, provoking dangerous revolts in Asia Minor which lasted thirty years and began with the taking of Urfa by Kara Yafzâli [q.v.] in 1599. A third memorable fact of the Hungarian war was the conquest of Kâneç in 1600 by Ibrahim Paşa. In other parts of the Empire the situation was relatively quiet; only in the Crimea was there a war between two rivals to the khanate, in which the Ottoman government had to intervene. Relations with the European powers were peaceful. France began already to exercise considerable influence through her ambassador; with Persia there was peace until September 1603, when a war began with the taking of Tabriz and Nakhchewan by 'Abbâs I.

The Empire was still supported by the traditions of Sultan's time, but the lack of strong government had introduced a lot of abuses, notably in the administration of the timars and of the finances. One of the consequences was the dangerous revolt in January 1603 of the sipahis in Constantinople, who demanded the abolition of the harem régime in the capital and the restoration of the authority of the government in Anatolia. Two high harem functionaries fell as victims of this revolt; the grand vizier Venâşîîî Mâs'ûn was able to oppose the sipahîs with the aid of the Janissaries, thus creating an everlasting feud between the two corps, but in October of the same year this nefarious policy caused his own fall and execution. Muhammad III was buried in a türbe of the Aya Sofja, a short time before his death, he had ordered the execution of his eldest son Mahmud. He is said to have made a great show of piety, and had some excellent councillors in his environment, such as the khâlidja Sâ'd al-Dîn (died 1599), who had determined him to accompany

the army in 1596; but on the whole his mother's influence prevailed by keeping him mainly confined to the harem in the palace.

Bibliography: Among the Turkish historians the works of 'Ali (until 1595); Selimâni (until 1600), Pecêwî and Hasan Beg Zâde are valuable as contemporary sources, further Na'ma (I.) and Hûdâji Khâfîa, Von Hammer, G.O.E., iv. and the works of Zinkoens (iii.) and Jorga (iii.)

A contemporary European source is Lass, Sarrasse, Ottomans: sive de rebus turcis liber continuus descriptionem potentiae Mahometi III, 1600.

(J. H. KRAMER)

MUHAMMAD IV, nineteenth Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was born on December 30, 1641 and was placed on the throne on August 8, 1648, after the deposition, soon followed by the execution, of his father Sultan Ishâhîm. The power in the state was at that time divided between the court, where the old vâlide Kosem (q.v.) and Sultan Muhammad's mother, the vâlide Kâsîm, held the reins, and the reçbe, the representatives of the Janissaries and the Sîpahi. The lack of stability in the government at this time is shown by the fact, that, until the nomination of the grand vizier Köprüllâ Müahmed in 1656, there were no less than thirteen grand viziers. In 1651 the old vâlide Kosem was assassinated and at the same time the resistance of the Janissaries was broken; the regime of the court party that followed under the sultan's mother did not improve the situation. The grand vizierate of Ishâhîm Paşa (1654—1655), who at first seemed to be the strong man needed, was brought to an early end by his rival Murad Paşa, and in the meantime the Cretan war against Venice was exhausting the resources of the Empire. In March 1656 a military rebellion forced the sultan to allow the execution of several of his favourite courtiers.

The real strong man proved to be Köprüllâ Muhammed Paşa [q.v.] (Sept. 15, 1634, Oct. 31, 1661) who eliminated immediately the influence of the harem régime and became until his death the real ruler of the Empire. His régime began with a Turkish maritime defeat by the Venetians at the Dardanelles, but already in the following year he obtained as success in Transylvania and succeeded at the same time in establishing firmly the Turkish authority in the Danube principalities; the collaboration with the Crimean Khân was here of great value. In 1658 and 1659 he was able to suppress rebellions in Asia Minor, and in the Venetian war a great fleet of Venetian ships and other Christian allies did not succeed against the Turkish forces on Crete. After his death (Oct. 31, 1661) he was succeeded in his office by his son Köprüllâ Ahmed Paşa, who completed the work of his father by carrying through the final conquest of Crete (surrender of Candia on Sept. 4, 1669) followed by peace with Venice. In 1661 the war with Austria had begun again, where Sultan Muhammed took part in several campaigns, notably that of 1665 in which Üjvár (Neshâhî) was taken. In 1664 took place the famous battle of St. Gotthard, where the Turks were beaten by an allied army, a part of which was formed by French troops; still the peace concluded with Austria in 1665 was favourable for Turkey. In 1672 the sultan took part in the campaign against Poland, after the Ukrainian cossacks had invoked Ottoman aid
against the Polish king; the Polish war, ending in a peace treaty of 1678, brought him still further the Empire's position in the north. Kupriil Ahmet Paşa died Oct. 26, 1676. Though the sultan, who had developed in the meantime a morose and suspicious character, never showed him the same confidence as to his father, Ahmet Paşa had been easily able to maintain himself against enemies in the interior, not least by forming new troops (the beylik and the gumbaz), who were far more reliable than the Janissaries and Sipahis. He had not been able, however, to put an end to the extravagant luxury of the court, which wasted enormous sums. The sultan had an abnormal liking for big hunts, that were organized at enormous cost in the environs of Adrianople, which town he preferred as a residence to Constantinople.

After Ahmet's death the sultan did not himself take the affairs of state in hand; he appointed Kâzım Muşafı Paşa [q. v.] as his grand vizier. The latter continued in an unnecessary way the interior work begun in 1677 and 1678 and obtained successes against the Cossacks, behind whom the Muscovite power now began to gain in importance in Turkish affairs. In 1682 war broke out again with the Austrian monarchy and led to the second Turkish siege of Vienna (July 13—Sept. 12, 1683), ending in a Turkish débâcle, thanks to the intervention of the Polish king Sobieski. This disaster cost Kâzım Muşafı his office and his life and at the same time the influence of the Seraf became again predominant. The grand viziers now following proved unequal to their task and in the years 1683—1687 nearly the whole of Hungary was lost to the Austrian armies (Turkish defeat at Mohács on June 22, 1687). At the same time the hostilities with Venice had been reopened in the Morea and in the Archipelago.

All these disasters caused a revolt of the troops in the field; they marched on the capital in September 1687 under Siyawaş Paşa, commander of the gumbaz. His action fell a victim to them; he was deposed on November 8, 1687 by the sultan's brother Kupriil Muşafı Paşa and lived in seclusion in Adrianople until his death on December 17, 1692. He was buried next to his mother in the Veli Djaımi.

Bibliography: Na'mın (ii.) and Hâddi Khalîfâ, and until 1660 the Tarihi of Râshid are the most important Turkish historical sources. The Sivaştı-nâmüs of Kâlîva Çelebi describes many of the military expeditions of this period and is also otherwise a valuable source of information. Among the European sources of this period is covered by P. Racinet, Histoire des trois derniers empereurs des Turcs depuis 1624 jusqu'à 1677, Paris 1863. Further, von Hammer, G. O. R., v., and the works of Zinkeisen (iv. and v.) and Jorga (iv.). See also the monographs of Ahmet Refik, Kupriil Paşa, Constantinople 1913 (1913), Kâzım Muşafı, Constantinople 1914—1924, and Pelikh Senslerli (1904—1110), Constantinople 1932 (1914).

MUHAMMAD V RÜŞHAD, thirty-fifth Ottoman Sultan, was born on November 2, 1584 as a son of Sultan ʿAbd al-Majîd. During the reign of his brother ʿAbd al-Hamîd II he lived in seclusion; his very existence inspired ʿAbd al-Hamîd with such terror that even the mentioning of persons with the name Râshid had to be avoided in his presence (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verrassende Gedenkstenen, iii. 234). He was a man of mild character, who owed his accession to the throne (April 27, 1699) only to the victory of the Young Turks; moreover: he was the first constitutional ruler of Turkey, but he was unable to give direction to the very disparate political tendencies that manifested themselves within and without the Parliament during the years after the Revolution, and after the final victory of the Unionist party in January 1913, Muhammad V had to submit, much against his will, to their government.

At the very beginning of his reign, Turkey lost her last vestige of authority over Bosnia and Hercegovina by Austria-Hungary's annexation, and over Bulgaria by the declaration of its independence (Oct. 5, 1909). The cabinets under Husein Memiç Paşa (until January 18, 1910) and İsmail III Hağiç Paşa (q. v.; until Sept. 29, 1911) were not able to bring about a peaceful situation in the interior (revolts in Albania). Hağiç Paşa had to resign on account of the declaration of war by Italy. Under the grand vizierate of Sa'id Paşa [q. v.] the Italian war led to the loss of Tripoli, confirmed by the peace treaty of Uşçay (Oct. 15, 1912). The peace was signed under the anti-unionist cabinet of Ahmet Muhîttî Paşa, but in the same month began the so-called Balkan War against the unfederated Balkan States. The reactionary cabinet of Kâmil Paşa soon showed an inclination to conclude a disastrous peace through the intermediacy of the European powers (Conference of London); then on January 23, 1913 the Unionist coup d'état brought again a Unionist government under Mahmûd Shewket Paşa. The result was a reopening of the hostilities and, after the failure of Bulgaria, the recapture of Adrianople (July 22, 1913). In the meantime Mahmûd Shewket had been murdered (June 28) by adherents of the liberal opposition, but this did not bring about a change in the political course; his place was taken by Sa'id Halil Paşa, whose government signed the peace-treaty with Bulgaria (Sept. 29, 1913), Greece (Nov. 14) and Serbia (March 14, 1914). From this time on, the Committee of Union and Progress, which from the beginning of Muhammad Râshid's reign had not ceased to work behind the scenes, became all powerful and its leaders ʿAṭât Bey and Ener Bey came more and more to the front. Afterwards, when at the beginning of the First World War, the Ottoman Government had decided to remain neutral, it was the Unionist sympathies with Germany that brought about a gradual estrangement between Turkey and the Allies (the "Goeben" and "Breslau" incident), culminating in the entrance of Turkey into the war on the side of the Central Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on October 29 and 30, 1914). ʿAṭât Bey himself became grand vizier in February 1917. The Allied endeavour to force a way through the Dardanelles was definitely abandoned in January 1916 and in the meantime Turkish troops fought on the Egyptian front, in Irã and on the Russian and Persian frontiers. Before the end of the war Muhammad V died unexpectedly on July 2, 1918.

Bibliography: de la Jouquières, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, 1914, i., 7. Ahmad Emin, Turkey in the World War, New Haven 1930; besides many other publications on the war and on the general politics of Turkey.

(J. H. Kramer)
MUHAMMAD VI WÂSID AL-DIN, last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was born on January 14, 1581, as son of Sultan 'Abd al-Majid. He was called to the throne on July 3, 1581, after the death of his brother Muhammad V Reşâd, the former heir to the throne Yüsuf 'Esra al-Din, son of 'Abd al-'Azîz, having died in 1576. When on October 30, 1581, nearly four months after his accession, the armistice of Mudros was signed, he was the ruler of an empire that seemed to be at the mercy of its former enemies, whose military forces occupied the capital and other hitherto unconquered parts of Turkey. On the other hand, the power of the Committee of Union and Progress was broken, but, since in the beginning of 1919 there began in Anatolia an increasing opposition against the foreign occupation, joined with an aversion to obey the Constantinople government, Muhammad VI seemed to have no other choice than to throw in his lot with the Allies and, together with his grand vizier Dânimâ Ferîd Pasha, he collaborated with the Allies in the endeavours to suppress the nationalist forces (beginning of 1920); this anti-nationalist action was even sanctioned by a fatwa of the Shî'îh al-İslâm. As the nationalist movement grew ever stronger, the Sultan's authority could only be upheld in Constantinople by the support of the Allies. His government had to sign the Treaty of Sévres (August 10, 1920) and the Tewfîk Pasha cabinet (since October 21, 1920) tried to summon the Parliament for its ratification. But in 1921 things had already gone so far that Tewfîk Pasha recognized the powerlessness of his government to represent Turkey. The final success of the nationalists against the Turks was expected by the Cossacks of Smyrna, September 9 (1922). But it was brought about the armistice of Mudania (October 11, 1922), to which the Sultan's government was not a party. It was still invited to represent Turkey in lausanne, together with the Angora government. This was not accepted by the Great National Assembly, which, on November 1, 1922, declared the Ottoman sułtanate abolished from March 16, 1920 (occupation of Constantinople); Tewfîk Pasha's cabinet resigned accordingly (November 4) and Muhammad VI remained as Khâlifa in Constantinople, where, on November 10, he appeared at his first ıntâmî. When, however, the National Assembly decided some days afterwards to try Wahid al-Din on a charge of high treason, this last Ottoman Sultan left Constantinople as a fugitive on a British ship (November 17, 1922) and the very next day the Angora government declared him deposed, the ex-sułtan proceeded to Mecca as the guest of King Hasaan. From here he launched a proclamation to the Islamic world, in which he maintained that the separation of the caliphate from the sułtanate was contrary to the shî'a (text in Orientis Modernis, ii. 702–705). This appeal found hardly any response in the Islamic world. The last Ottoman Sultan left Mecca again and went to live in San Remo, where he died on May 16, 1926. In 1924 he had even recognized King Hasaan's claim to the caliphate.

Bibliography: Jäschke and Pritsch, Die Türkei seit dem Weltkrieg, in W.F.L., vol. xx., 1927–1929, and vol. xli, Heft 1–2, 1930, where in the Introduction all available Turkish and Western sources are indicated. (J. H. KRAMER)
by his nephew Mahmūd, son of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, but the viceroy of the provinces, Alḥaḡ in Dīhī, Khaṭṭā in Mullān, Tādż al-Dīn Vildīs in Kirmān, and Ḫūdīz in Ghaznī, became independent. 

Bibliography: Ṣabāḥ-ī Nāẓim, and translation by Major H. G. Kayvert (Bibl. Ind.); Tūrāḵān Gūsida, by Ḥāmid Allāh Mūṣafī and translation by Professor E. G. Browne (G. M. S.); The Cambridge History of India, vol. iii.

(T. W. Hato)

MUḤAMMAD, Tughlūk, the second king of the Tughlūk dynasty of Dīhī, was the eldest son of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughlūk, its founder. During the short reign of the usurper, Naṣīr al-Dīn Khaṭṭār, he was in some peril, but escaped and joined his father, who was marching on Dīhī. He was known at first as Dāwūrān Khān, but received the title of Ulagh Khān and was sent in 1321 to Warangal, to reduce to obedience the rajā of Pratap Rādḍārā II. In this distant region he attempted to rebel, but his army refused to believe his story of his father's death at Dīhī and to accept him as their king, and he was obliged to return in haste to the capital, where he either persuaded his father of his innocence or gained a pardon, for, though he accomplished no further than to be again sent, in 1322, to Nīnār, and on this occasion compelled the rajah to surrender and sent him to Dīhī. In the following year he acted as regent during his father's absence on an expedition into Bengal, but his conduct aroused suspicion, and his father rebuked him in letters sent from Bengal. He received the king, on his return, in a temporary kiosk of wood, so constructed that the dislocation of a beam would bring the whole structure down; and by this device crushed the old men to death, and ascended the throne in February 1325. The delineation of a character so complex and capricious as that of Muḥammad Tughlūk is no easy task. He was one of the most extraordinary monarchs who ever sat upon a throne. To the most lavish generosity he united revolting and indiscriminate cruelty; to scrupulous observance of the ritual and ceremonial prescribed by the Islamic law an utter disregard of that law in all public affairs; to a debasing and superstitious veneration for all whose descent or whose pious command were set a claim to a hereditary dignity, when roused respected neither the blood of the Prophet nor personal sanctity. Some of his administrative and military measures give evidence of abilities of the highest order; others are the acts of a madman.

The chronicle of his reign is largely a record of rebellions punished with gross barbarity. In the second year his cousin Gūrḫāpī rebelled in the Dakan and was slayed alive. In 1326, a second revolt of Wasfūr, named it Dāwātābād, made it his capital, and two years later drove the whole population of Dīhī thither. In 1328 Khāṣa Khān rebelled in Mullān and was defeated and slain, and in 1329 India was invaded by the Muḥṣilīs of Aḥḥ al-Dīn Tarmāštīnī, who, however, was driven from the country. In the same year the enhancement of the land-tax in the Gangetic Dothb drove the inhabitants into rebellion, and the measures taken to suppress the rising depopulated the country. At about the same time Muḥammad issued his famous fictitious currency, decreeing that his brass tokens should be accepted as equivalent to silver.

In 1331 a rebellion in Bengal was crushed by Bahānār Khān, but in 1338 he died, and a second rebellion separated the province from the kingdom of Dīhī, and in 1334 Sayyid Djalāl al-Dīn Aḥsan established his independence in Madura. Muḥammad marched to punish him, but a pestilence in his army compelled him to retreat, and on his return he established in the Dakan the pernicious system of farming out the revenue for cash. Under this system, the result of which was to drive both the impoverished cultivator and the defaulting farmer into rebellion. Ḫūsni of Dāwātābād, believing a report of the king's death, rebelled, but was captured and pardoned, a rare instance of clemency, but a rebellion in the Pāndābāt was crushed with great severity.

An enormous army raised for the conquest of Persia melted away for want of funds to maintain it, and in 1337 a heavy calamity fell on northern India, a famine of unusual severity which lasted for seven years. The king's measures to combat the famine were, on the whole, well conceived and well executed. Grain was plentiful in Awadh, which proved that the famine was largely due to artificial causes, and he built a temporary city, Sargā-dvār (Sargā dvār, Sanskrit: "the Gate of Paradise"), on the western bank of the Ganges, transferred thither the citizens of Dīhī, and with the assistance of Aʿīn al-Mulk, governor of Awadh, fed them from the granaries of that province. In the following year he committed one of the greatest of his many follies in assembling an army of 100,000 horse for the invasion of Tibet and sending it into the Himālaya, where it perished.

In 1339 a rebellion in the Dakan was crushed and even the faithful Aʿīn al-Mulk was goaded into rebellion, but, in consideration of his services, was imprisoned instead of being put to death. Almost immediately afterwards Shāhī the Afghan rebelled in Mullān, but died before the king's army arrived into Afghanistan. The famine was now at its height, and the people were eating human flesh. Muḥammad set himself to the framing of regulations which should improve and extend agriculture and obviate future famines. By their means, says the contemporaneous historian, with conscious or unconscious irony, agriculture would have been so promoted that plenty would have reigned throughout the earth, had they been practicable. They included the extension of the system of farming the revenues, and bred confusion and rebellion, which reacted on the king until he regarded his subjects as his natural enemies and waged war against them with all the weapons of despotic power. The tale of executions is recorded, with sickening details, by Ibn Buṭṭābī. Rebellions in Sūrīn, Samānā, Kāthī, Gāhān, Kārā, and the Dakan were all traceable to the king's revenue system, but he attributed the discontent in the Dakan to the dissatisfaction of his officers and sent to that province a wretch who slew ninety of his officers in cold blood, and was himself slain in the rising which his barbarity provoked. Muḥammad marched into Gūrḫāpī and personally undertook the collection of arrears due to the treasury, so alarming the officials in the Dakan that they seized the fort of Dāwātābād.
and proclaimed an Afghan, Tamīl Mukh, as their king. The king marched to Dawlatabād, captured the city, and besieged the rebels in the citadel, but was recalled to Gędarāt by a serious rebellion headed by a man named 'Uqīt. He pursued the rebel in Gędarāt and Kāthākwar for three years, drove him into Sind, and followed him thither, and on March 20, 1351, died within a few miles of Thātha, where the rebel had taken refuge. "The king," as a historian says, "was freed from his people, and they from their king".

His empire, at its greatest extent, included the whole of India except the small kingdoms of the Colas and the Pandyas, in the neighbourhood of Cape Comorin, and the principality of Girnar in Kāthākwar. Before his death he lost Bengal, the Dakkan, the Peninsula, and Sind, and left the remnant of his dominions seething with discontent.


(T. W. Haag)

MUHAMMAD III, the sixth king of the Tuglak dynasty of Dihlī, was the son of Firdawsī, at whose death the son of Fath Khān, his eldest son, was raised to the throne on Sept. 20, 1388, as Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tuglak II, but was slain on Feb. 19, 1389, and was succeeded by his cousin Abū Bakr, son of Zafar Khān, the second son of Firdawsī. Muhammad, the third son, contested the succession and, after suffering more than one defeat, occupied Dihlī and ascended the throne on Aug. 31, 1390. Abū Bakr took refuge with Bahādur Khān in Mewāt but was pursued and defeated, and was imprisoned in Mirāb, where he shortly afterwards died. The old servants of Firdawsī, men of Eastern Hindūdūstān, who had been the principal factors in all the troubles of the kingdom, were put to the sword, after being tested by a shibboleth which distinguished them from the natives of Dihlī.

A rebellion in Gędarāt was suppressed in the same year by Zafar Khān, who in 1396 became independent in that province, and in 1392 Muhammad crushed a serious rebellion in the Dothāb, captured Ḳāhva, ravaged the districts of Ḳāhva and Dalman, and built near Dжалas a fort, which he named Muhammadābād. In the same year, he put to death his minister, Ḳān Khān, who was meditating rebellion, and appointed in his place Ḳhādījā Djalās. Another rebellion was crushed in the southern Dothāb, and in August 1393, Muhammad invaded and plundered Mewāt and returned to Djalās, where he fell sick. Bahādur Khān took advantage of his illness to plunder some villages in the neighbourhood of Dihlī and Muhammad marched into Mewāt, defeated him, and put him to flight, but on his return to Muhammadābād his disorder increased, and on Jan. 20, 1394, just as he had ordered his son Ḳhādījā Djalās to march against the Khojars, who had captured Lāhore and were ravaging the Pindārī, he died.


(T. W. Haag)

MUHAMMAD I, the second king of the Bahmanī dynasty of the Dakkan, was the eldest son of Ḥasan, 'Abī al-Dīn Bahman Shah, usually, but incorrectly, styled Ḥasan Ganga. On succeeding his father, on Feb. 11, 1335, he carefully organized the government of the four provinces of the kingdom and the administration of the army. The pertinacity of the Hindū bankers and money-changers in melting down the gold coinage which he introduced led to a general massacre of the community and the measure involved him in hostilities with the Hindū states of Warangal and Vīḍyaṇagara. He invaded the dominions of Kānchāya of Warangal three times, put his son Venyek Deva to death, and compelled him to pay heavy indemnities and to surrender the town and district of Golkonda. After this success he grossly insulted Bubba I of Vīḍyaṇagara by paying some dancing girls with a draft drawn by him on Bubba's treasury. Bubba invaded the Rājārī Dothāb, captured Mūḍāga, and massacred its garrison. Muhammad marched against him, attacked him with great impetuosity, defeated him, and recovered Mūḍāga, where he rested during the rainy season. In 1365 he met Bubba at Katical, again defeated him, and carried out an indiscriminate massacre of his subjects. The Hindūs were cowed by the slaughter of 400,000 of their race, and Bubba was compelled to sue for peace. He honoured the draft and paid an indemnity, and received in return a guarantee that non-combatants should be spared in future wars, and the agreement, though sometimes violated, mitigated to some extent the horrors of the long period of intermittent warfare between the two states. On returning from Vīḍyaṇagara he completed, in 1367, the great mosque at Gulparga, and then turned against his cousin Bahānān Khān Mānaḍarīnlī, who had for some years been in rebellion at Divalatābād, defeated his army, and drove its leaders into Gędarāt. He died in 1377 and was succeeded by his elder son, Muhammad II, the fifth king of the Bahmanī dynasty of the Dakkan, was the son of Mahmad Khān, the youngest son of 'Abī al-Dīn Bahman Shah, the founder of the dynasty, and was raised to the throne on May 20, 1378, after the assassination of his uncle, Ḥusain Shah. Fiṭḥāyat's statement that this king's name was Mahmad has misled all European historians, but is refuted by inscriptions, legends on coins, and other historians.

Muhammad II was a man of peace, devoted to literature and poetry, and his reign was undisturbed by foreign wars. He invited Ḥafiz to visit his court, and the great poet set out from Shīrāz in response to the invitation, but was so terrified by a storm in the Persian Gulf that he disembarked and returned to Shīrāz, whence he sent to Muhammad his excuses in a well-known ode.

Between 1387 and 1395 the Dakkan was visited by a severe famine, and the king's measures of relief included the free importation of grain, the establishment of schools at which children were taught, fed, and lodged at the public expense,
special allowances to readers of the Qur’an and the blind, but only those of his own faith profited by his benefactions. He died of a fever on April 29, 1328, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Ghulam al-Din.


(T. W. HAMO)

MUHAMMAD III, LASHKARI, the thirteenth king of the Bahman dynasty of the Dakan, was the younger son of Humayun Shih, and succeeded his elder brother, Nizam Shih, on July 30, 1463, at the age of nine. His minister was the famous Mahmud Gawan, Malik al-Tujjimag, Khwaja Djanah. A campaign against Malwa in 1467 was unsuccessful, but between 1469 and 1471 Mahmud Gawan conquered the southern Kankan. In 1477 Malik Hasan Bahri, Nizam al-Mulk, a Bahman who had been captured in Vidjeyamag and educated as a Muslim, led a successful expedition into southern Urtia and was rewarded with the governorship of Telingana. Fath Allah ‘Imad al-Mulk, another Bahman with a similar history, was made governor of Barar, and ‘Umar ‘Adil Khatt, a Turk, was appointed to Daulatboud. In 1474 the Dakan suffered severely from a famine which lasted for two years, and in 1476 a rebellion in Koundawir led the king into Telingana. He relieved Malik Hasan, who had been besieged in Raddjamahendri, invaded Urtia and punished the raudja, who had supported the rebels, and on his return in 1478, captured Koundawir and assumed the title of ‘Alahsid.

He then set out to invade the eastern Karsat, but first divided the great province of Telingana into two governments, mortally offending Malik Hasan, the governor. The partition was part of his scheme, devised by Mahmud Gawan, to be applied to the provinces of the kingdom. Muhammad made Koundawir, in the Karsat, his headquarters, and returned thither after carrying out a daring raid to Kondjaweram. From Koundawir he issued an edict dividing the other three provinces of his kingdom, Barar, Daulatboud, and Gullisgur into two governments. The measure was intensely unpopular, but it was only the vindictive Malik Hasan that actively resisted it. He regarded Mahmud Gawan as the author of all the unpopular reforms, and by means of a forged letter persuaded the young king that his minister was in league with the foreign enemies of the state. Muhammad, when under the influence of drink, summoned his faithful minister, and on April 5, 1451, without any inquiry into the circumstances of the case, caused his head to be struck off. Mahmud’s innocence was established immediately after his death, and from the day of his unjust execution may be dated the collapse of the authority of the Bahman kings. Of the two parties in the state, all the foreigners, led by ‘Abd al-Khaliq, who established himself in Buljapur, and the respectful portion of the Dakanis, led by Fath Allah ‘Imad al-Mulk of Barat, avoided intercourse with the king, who was thrown into the arms of the assassins, led by Malik Hasan. The latter accompanied Muhammad to Bidar and subsequently on an expedition to Buljapur, but encamped apart from the royal troops, and always saluted the king from a distance, refusing to enter his presence. Muhammad attempted to drown his grief and humiliation in drink, from the effects of which he died at Bidar on March 22, 1452, crying out in his last moments that Mahmud Gawan was slaying him. He was succeeded by his son Mahmund, who was never a king but in name.

Bibliography: See art. MUHAMMAD I.

(T. W. HAMO)

MUHAMMAD II, ABBAS [See KAABAR.]

MUHAMMAD II, ‘ABBAS ALALL, great-grandson of Hasan, the eldest son of Ali and Fatima, was one of the ‘Alids who did not spend their time passively awaiting the fulfillment of their aspirations, but endeavored to realise them by personal effort. He and his brother Ibrahim had, according to Wajih, been brought up as future rulers and Muhammad was called al-Madbi by his father. As early as the reign of the Umayyad caliph Hisham, the two sectarians al-Maghira [q.v.] and Bayan [q.v.] who did not recognise Muhammad as ‘Ali al-Baqir [q.v.] endeavoured to make propaganda for him. When signs of the imminent collapse of Umayyad rule became apparent after Walid’s death, ‘Abbads Allah’s family by his command paid homage to Muhammad with the exception of al-Baqir’s son Dju’far. Wider circles also recognised him as the legitimate heir, including the Mu‘tazili, who in those days had a distinctly ascetic character. Abul Dju’far, later the ‘Abbadsid caliph, was at this time attached to this school and it is several times recorded that he was among those who paid homage to Muhammad. This is in itself by no means improbable and well explains his hostile attitude to him, although it remains remarkable that Muhammad later nowhere, even in his polemical letters to him, refers to this important fact: The Umayyad governor Ibn Hulaila also thought of joining him when he was besieged in Wasi in 132 (759) but dropped the matter when he received no answer to his letter.

When finally the ‘Abbadsid Abu l’Abbasi in the same year won the caliphate and ousted the ‘Alids, the two brothers disappeared and showed thereby that they would not recognise him. There now began for them a period full of adventure and danger, especially after Abu Dju’far became caliph in 136 (754). They went secretly from place to place to gain adherents; nowhere could they feel safe from the caliph but the people were on the whole favourably disposed to them and at least would not betray them. In this way they reached, not only Basra and Kufa but even went as far as al-Sind via ‘Aden; as a rule however, they stayed in Arabia most securely among the DJu’hamin, in whose territory lay the hill of Ralja, which so often appears in the history of the ‘Alids. The caliph was very uneasy at the continued lack of success of his search for them; more and more angrily he demanded of his governors in Medina that they should be produced and he dismissed several in rapid succession, when they appeared, perhaps without reason, ineffective and lukewarm in their efforts. He himself took very active steps but with little result. On his pilgrimage in 140 (758) he had Muhammad and Ibrahim’s father thrown into prison because they would not betray their place of concealment, and on a later pilgrimage (144 = 762) the same fate met the sons and grandsons of Hasan, ‘Abbads Allah’s brother. They and ‘Abbads Allah were taken to Kufa, treated most
brutally and 'thrown into prison, where most of them died.' The same thing happened to Thāhir’s father-in-law Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, a descendant of ʿUṯmān, whose head the caliph sent to Ǧafrun with a certificate on oath that it was the head of the ʿAbd Muḥammad in order to intimidate his followers there. Shortly before (Dec. 761), he finally found a governor after his own heart, Riqāḥ b. ʿUṯmān, who conducted the search with the necessary vigour. But he was soon able to save himself the trouble for in Ǧadīd 745 (Nov. 762) Muḥammad appeared in Medina and began the revolution while his brother Ǧahfl went to Bāṣra to do the same. It is not clear whether they did this because in Muḥammad’s opinion the time was ripe or whether they were forced by circumstances to hasten their plans. In any case, the enterprise was not sufficiently prepared, for although they had a large number of followers in Ǧafrun, Bāṣra, Egypt, where however Muḥammad’s son ʿAli was arrested by the ʿAbbasids, governor in Khurāsān and even in Sind, to which another son ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAlṭar was sent, there was no question of any organisation, and, as so frequently, the enthusiasm for the ʿAlids was like a fire of straw which blazes up quickly but dies down as soon. In Medina where Riqāḥ was completely taken by surprise, Muḥammad in keeping with his character acted with great mildness; he opened the prison, forbade all bloodshed and was content with arresting Riqāḥ. The best element in the town came over to him after the jurist Ǧalīl b. Anas declared invalid his oath taken to the ʿAbbasids; Mecca also surrendered to the new ruler. The outbreak of the revolt was really a relief to Abu ʿUṯmān for he had now, as he said, enticed the fox out of his hole. He hurriedly left Bagdad, with the building of which he was busy, and went to Ǧafrun, the point of danger. With keen instinct he saw that the weak point of the rebellion lay in Medina which must be attacked first, for in this remote spot there was a lack of materials of war and the roads thither could easily be barred. But he first of all offered a complete amnesty to Muḥammad, which however only led to a characteristic exchange of letters, in which one reproached the other with the weaknesses of his family. He then sent his relative ʿĀṣa b. ʿAṣaḥ against him with 4,000 men, with instructions however to settle the matter peacefully if possible. His arrival had a sobering effect upon the Medinae, of whom a number seized the opportunity to get out of their difficult position. Muḥammad however remained undismayed. He rejected the well meant advice of several men to abandon Medina as an insult to the town but left his people free to stay with him or not. He trusted in Allāh "from whom victory comes and in whose hand the matter lies", and imitated all that the Prophet had done in his time in romantic fashion. For example he revetted the ditch which the Prophet had dug round Medina when it was besieged by the Kūraish; he used Muḥammad’s sword and his battle-cry was the same as that at the battle of Ḥunain; even the old single combat before the battle proper was revived. The result in these circumstances was easily foreseen. ʿĀṣa, after offering a free pardon in vain for a few days, laid a few days over the ditch, entered the town and began a battle in which Muḥammad’s supporters became less and less in numbers until their leader finally fell

(Monday, 14th RAMADĀN 145 = Dec. 6, 762). Muḥammad’s head was cut off and sent to the caliph. For the further course of the rebellion see the article ḤIRĀTH 1. 'ABD ALLĀH.

Muḥammad is described as tall and strong with a very dark skin, on which account the caliph surmisedly called him al-Muḥammad, the “Blackened.” He was rightly called “the pure soul” (Ṭabar, iii. 100) for he was an ideal character, gentle in spite of his personal bravery, but he lacked those qualities which are required of a pretender in times like his.


(FA. BRILL)

MUḤAMMAD b. ‘ABD ALLĀH, a Tāhirīd, governor of Bagdad. Born in 209 (824—825). Muḥammad in 237 (851) was summoned by the Caliph to Bagdad and appointed military governor in order to restore order in the chaos then prevailing, in spite of the great power of the Tāhirīds, who ruled Khurāsān as independent sovereigns in practice, although they nominally recognised the suzerainty of the Caliph, its task was by no means a light one. After al-Mustak‘ī ma had ascended the throne (242 = 856), he confirmed Muḥammad in his office and also gave him the governorship of the ʿIrāq along with the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina. In the following year troubles broke out in Bagdad and Sāmarrā. The Arabs were defeated by the Byzantines and the rage of the people was turned against the Caliph. The vizier Uṯmānī also succeeded in restoring order with the help of the two Turkish generals Ṭawfīq and Bughrā the Younger. The ʿAlids also gave the government trouble on several occasions. A descendant of ʿAli named ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUṯmān rebelled in Ǧafrun and drove out the governor of the town. After he had routed an army sent against him by Muḥammad, he was attacked by the ʿAbūṣāfī governor al-Ḥasan b. Isma‘īl while another division took him in the rear and he finally fell in the battle (Ǧadīd 250 = Aug. 864). Another ʿAlī, al-Ḥasan b. Zaid, had more success. Two prominent men in Ǧabarstān, who were discontented with the rule of the Tāhirīd, appealed to him in 250 and very soon he was acknowledged as lord of the whole of Ǧabarstān. The Tāhirīd governors of al-Ra‘ay and Ǧazwī were driven out and replaced by ʿAlids; Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, governor of Khurāsān, a nephew of the governor of Bagdad, was sent an army against al-Ra‘ay. The ʿAlīd governor was defeated and captured and the town had to surrender but again fell into the hands of the ʿAlids. When the former governor of Ǧabarstān, Sulaimān b. ʿAbd Allāh, invaded this province and conquered it completely, al-Ḥasan b. Zaid had to flee to Ǧalīmān where he was defeated by Muḥammad b. Ǧāhir (351 = 865—866); after some years (257 = 870—871) however, he inflicted a defeat on the latter’s troops in Ǧarādūn and in 259 (872—873) he again became lord of Khurāsān, where he founded an ʿAlid dynasty which lasted about sixty years. Arabia
also did not escape the ‘Aliid plots. A descendant of ‘Ali named Jum‘a b. Yūsuf raised trouble there in 853, plundered Mecca and Medina and killed so many pilgrims that he received the epithet of al-Safābi, ‘the Bloodshedder’. There was also continual trouble in the capital. In Muharram of the same year (ye Feb. 866), al-Mu‘ta‘īn left Sūmra and went to Baghdad. Al-Mu‘ata‘īn [q.v.] was then taken by force from his prison in Sūmra and proclaimed Caliph; he then appointed his brother Abū Ahmad, later co-regent with the Caliph al-Mu‘amid, commander-in-chief in the war against al-Mu‘ta‘īn and his governor. When all negotiations failed, the latter had to take arms but was several times defeated. Fighting took place in and around Baghdad with varying success during almost the whole year, while anarchy in the provinces increased and when Muhammad finally began negotiations with Abū Ahmad, he was accused of treason, so that the Caliph had to protect him against the troops who were furious with him. But when Muhammad’s friends had the Mu‘ata‘īn intended to sacrifice himself, he made peace with Abū Ahmad. The Caliph had reluctantly to confirm the treesty and alidicate in favour of his rival al-Mu‘ta‘īn (Dhu l-Hijja 251 = Jan. 866) and the latter thereupon ascended the throne. Muhammad died in Dhu l-Ka‘dah 253 (Nov. 867).


(K. V. Zettersten)

MUHAMMAD b. ‘ABD ALLAH HASSAN AL-MAHDI, the well known Somali Mahdi called by the British ‘the Mad Mahdi’. He was a Somali belonging to the Ogaden Bah Geri tribe, section Rāh Ham. He was born about 1860 and had been from his youth devoted to religions and mystic stahis; in 1885 a.d. he performed the pilgrimage and during his stay in Mecca became acquainted with Sa‘īd Muhammad Sa‘īd [cf. SOMALIAND] of whom he became an eager follower. After his return to Somaliand he first settled in the Dālibahata tribe’s territory and began a vigorous propaganda on behalf of the Sa‘īliya parīṣa and to call Somali Muslims to a more strict rule of life. As he was a learned, eloquent man and a skillful impromptu composer of poems (the ancient and best way to propagate one’s ideas among the Somali Beduins), he was easily able to attain a great popularity among the Dālibahata in British Somaliand and his Ogaden countrymen in Abyssinia. His influence brought him to the knowledge of the government of Berbera, and British officials had sometimes recourse to him to settle through his mediation disputes arising between Beduin groups. In March 1899 however, the Mahdi suddenly changed his former attitude to an openly hostile one toward the British Government. In August 1899 he assembled his followers in Berbera and declared himself to be the Mahdi and proclaimed the holy war against the infidels. A first expedition was sent against him by the Abyssinians to prevent a further exten-
Government, and further they organised the Sultan's forces to employ them against the Mullah, thus assuring the defence of the northern frontier of their colony. There then began a series of raids led by Somali auxiliary bands, especially against the Mullah's followers in the northern valley of the Shabelle and towards Nugal, where Djirirkan and Garad were occupied by the Sultan of Hoby. These energetic actions which took place even during the Great European war, besides wear down the Mullah's army, caused him to lose political control of a very large zone where the population concluded peaceful agreements with Italy and forced him to be continually ready to defend his position from the north also. However, after the end of the Great War, the British Government decided to attack the Mullah from Berbera and to finally overthrow him. In January-March 1920 after violent bombardments of the Mullah's defences by the British airmen, a British force advanced to Taleh, the Mullah's last camp; he, rapidly pursued by the Camel Corps and Somali auxiliaries, fled to Ogaden and then into the Karanli tribe's territory, where he died on November 23, 1920.

The Mullah's career is a very typical one for the study of the Somali mind. He had begun his movement as an agent of the Siddiya 'parisa, then his increasing popularity tempted him to a more ambitious sphere and, accordingly, after placing his propaganda on a severely religious basis, he tried to become the leader of all the Somalis by making the ties of the common faith prevail over the tribal bonds. This is really the only way to lead such a movement in Somaliland where Islām may be regarded as a tie of brotherhood among tribes otherwise deeply divided by their secular history of wars and revenge. Therefore Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh Ḥassān said in a famous poem: "I have not put my prayers on this sea to join together the Muslims who were not brothers?" alluding also to his relations with the Siddiya in Arabia. He desired for the same reason that his followers should call themselves 'Darawish', forgetting even the name of their original tribe. Therefore he attempted to become angry when he was referred to in official correspondence as "Muhammad 'Abd Allāh, the Ogaden Bah Geri" while he used to add to his signature only the name: al-Hišami (alluding to the origin of the Somali from 'Aqil b. Abī Tīlib) [see the art., SOMALILAND].

Further, instead of the tribal forces he raised special armed corps, often with a new name, like the Haggattu ("the scratchers") recruited among the Habar Gidir, the Dugad recruited among the Makkāli ("Dugad" means "shooter"), the Karrayl recruited among the Dhulabsana. But he did not pursue this policy to the end; the hostility of the greater part of the Isāk tribes, which was a strong appeal to the old rivalry between Isāk and Dirrā; Muhammad Siddā's letter, which was undoubtedly a severe blow to him, since he had had already provoked the hostility of the Kādiriya and so had to rely entirely on Siddiya support; the necessity of getting booty for his soldiers who otherwise would have hardly remained with him; all these things and his very nature caused the religious prestige of the Mullah as the Mahdi of Somaliland to decline and he generally became merely the chief of a tribe; a powerful chief indeed of a large tribe like the Darawish were, formed from various elements and therefore very similar to the federations well known in the Somali customary law. It was obvious that, when he began to regard himself in this light (that is regarding himself as a chief of a Somali tribe rather than "the brother born from the same father and the same mother of all the Muslims"), it was very difficult for him to restrain himself and his followers from exaggerating those tendencies so familiar to their own national character; and therefore they came back gradually to the ancient Somali custom of guerrilla warfare conducted in the traditional way, even to defying the tribes of the enemy in insulting or scornful poems or designating them with typical ironical nicknames or giving to every razzia a special name ("the razzia smashing the bones") was the name given to the fight at Duhmadhob; of the Ayyūb al-'Arab).

It may therefore be concluded that the Mullah's attempt to avail himself of Islam to conquer the old rivalries between the tribes and combine the Somalis to drive the Europeans out of the country, failed both on account of the strength of the European armies and the fierce Somalis, often unconscious, opposed by the Somali on the basis of their ancient tribal organisation and customary law.


(ENRICO CERULLI)

MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD ALLAH [See Ibn ALAAR, IBN AL-KHATIR, IBN MALIK.]

MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD AL-MALIK, ABU DAA'AF, called Ibn al-Zayyāt, vizier to several 'Abbasid d. Ibn al-Zayyāt began his career as secretary in the chancellery in Bagdad and when the caliph al-Mu'tāsir noticed his abilities and having appointed him his vizier (819-820) (KH 25). He also filled this office in the reign of al-Walid; but as he treated the latter's brother Dī'afar, the future caliph al-Muttawakkil, with a lack of respect he earned his hatred. After the death of al-Walid in Dhu l-Hijjah 252 (Aug. 847), Ibn al-Zayyāt wished homage to be paid to his son Muhammad; the latter, however, was thought to be too young by the Turkish general Waṣf and in his stead Dī'afar was proclaimed caliph under the name al-Muttawakkil. The vizier was at first allowed to remain in office but in 'Athār of the following year (Sept. 847), he was arrested, deprived of his possessions and subjected to a cruel form of torture which himself had invented. After enduring the most horrible cruelty he died in Rabī' 1 253 (Nov. 847).


(K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD AL-MALIK [See Ibn TUFAIL, IBN ZUHR.]
MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD AL-RAHİM [See Ibn AL-FURAY].
MUHAMMAD b. 'ABD AL-WAHHĀB [See WU'TANWA].
MUHAMMAD b. ABD 'AMIR [See AL-MANṣūR R. ABD 'AMIR].
MUHAMMAD, a són of ABD Bakr and one of the wives, Aṣmah of the tribe of Khaṭṭām. He was born in the last year of Muhammad's life so that his father could not have exercised any influence on him, while the memories of ABD Bakr's great friend which were kept alive in his family must have had all the more influence on the passionate nature of the boy, which receives important confirmation from the fact that Ibn Kūtayb describes him as one of the "pious" (mursal) among the Kuraish. When in the reign of Uthman the bitterness at the preference of the Umayyads in combination with a reaction against the strong secularisation of 'Abd al-Malik provoked a movement which grew in strength, he took part in it with great vigour and began along with ABD Bakr's ungrateful foster-son, Muhammad, b. ABD Hārith, the people of Egypt against the Caliph. He later went with other revolutionaries to Medina where his equally ardent but much wiser half-sister 'A'isha in vain advised him to go with her to Mecca and leave others to carry through the crime; but he was one of those who broke into the Caliph's room where he ill-treated the helpless old man although it was Kūtayb b. Bahr who dealt the death-blow. He was one of the few Kuraish who joined 'Ali and the latter apparently cherished a real affection for the young man, whose enemies of course interpreted as further evidence of his friendship with the murderers of Uthman. Muhammad took part in the battle of the Camel, at the conclusion of which the chivalrous 'Ali commissioned him to escort his half-sister to Basra. The sources give somewhat different accounts of the last phase of his life in Egypt. According to Waṣālīdi in Balādhūrī, ABD Al-mu'min (Tabari, i. 3392 sq.) and Yaḥyā b. ABD al-Mu'min (ibid., p. 475) recall 'Abd al-Malik's appointment of his governor of Egypt and we unwisely interpreting these accounts as meaning that 'Abd al-Malik appointed him governor of Egypt. On the contrary, 'Abd al-Malik was at this time still in power, and it was to appoint a youth inexperienced in war to this difficult post, that he sent for his eldest follower al-Ashārī (q.v.) and gave him command in Egypt while he appeased Muhammad's rightly injured feelings by a kind letter. The attempt to make good the mistake failed, however, for al-Ashārī was poisoned on the way in al-Kalbān at the instigation of Muḥammad. Al-Zahīlī's account (Tabari, i. 3242) shows 'Ali in a somewhat more favourable light. After the recall of Kais he sent al-Ashārī as governor to Egypt and only after he was poisoned did he send Muhammad. Finally there is a third story (Ibn al-Kalbī and Mas'ūdī) according to which al-Ashārī was sent to Egypt only after the death of Muhammad, but this must be due to some misunderstanding of the first version. In any case, the choice of Muhammad was an unfortunate one, for the inexperienced youth, who had no authority and was besides insufficiently supported by 'Ali, was not fit to meet experienced opponents like Muḥammad and 'Aun b. al-Asy, and al-Qays came with an army and a battle was fought at al-Musannāt (the dam). When the actual murderer of 'Uthman, Kānān b. Bahr, had fallen after a brave resistance, the Egyptians lost heart and Muhammad, abandoned by all, was captured and killed while trying to escape (258 = 659).

Bibliography: Balādhūrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 228; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 2869 = 3414 passion (s. Index); ii. 2470; Dinawari, ed. Guirguis, p. 160 sq.; Ibn Kūtayb, Kitāb al-Ma'ārif, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 85, 97; Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, ed. Barbiere de Meynard, iv. 277, 279 = 281, 421 sq.; Yaḥyā b. ABD al-Mu'min, ed. Sunan, ii. 203 sq., 226 sq.; Wellhausen, Das arabischen Reich, p. 59-62. (Franz Buhl.)

MUHAMMAD b. ABD BAKR [See Ibn Khayyim AL-DIANTUDYA, IBN SATISH AL-NASR].
MUHAMMAD b. ABD 'UL-ẒAMIN [See Ibn AL-ZAFAR].
MUHAMMAD b. ABD MUḤammad [See Ibn AL-ZAFAR].
MUHAMMAD b. 'UL-ẒĀDI Abū 'Umaid ALLAH, son of Abu 'Umaid Dīwadhād, an Eastern Iranian (not Turkish) noble from Ushān al-Mas'ūd's al-Nahr (see Barthold, Türkistan, G. M.S., p. 169). For his early career see the article SūHMA. After his rupture with al-Ma'ālikī he returned to Baghādād (276 = 889) and appears to have remained there (cf. Tabari, iii. 2112) until his appointment as governor of Aḍḥār al-Dījān in 279 (892). Though on his arrival he had entertained friendly relations with the Bagrātids of Armenia, Sembât (acc. 891), after seizing Maker in 280 (893) he made a first incursion into Armenia, but without success. At the same time he had strengthened his position at Baghādād by giving his daughter in marriage to al-Ma'ālikī's confidant, the general Bakr al-Ma'ālikī. Having been rejoined by his shāhīd, the general Wast, who had defeated the al-Darūjī 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz in al-Dījān in 281 (989-985) but did not succeed in annexing his territory, he made a second expedition into Armenia in 282-285 (985-986) and captured Kars, Erzurum and Vanpurak. Subsequently he came to terms with Sembât, but his son Dīvadhād remained as governor of Dīvān until Muhammad's death. In 284 (987-988) Muhammad declared his independence, but finding himself unable to withstand al-Ma'ālikī made prompt submission, was pardoned, and in the following year officially recognized as governor of Armenia in addition to Aḍḥār al-Dījān. About the same time he appears to have adopted the title of al-Aṣhhī, which appears on his coinage, and which was evidently intended as a claim to descent from the old princely family of Ushān, (see the article AFGHAN and casti, Iran. Namensbuch, s. v. Piša). In 287 (992) he made a further indirect attempt to extend his rule over the territories which were slipping from the grasp of the Umayyads by encouraging Wast to seize Malāya and to apply to the caliph for investiture with the government of Cilicia. Al-Ma'ālikī, however, learning that this was only a preliminary step towards the seizure of Diyar Muhār, gave Wast and al-Aṣhhī, put an end to their design by a swift and unexpected campaign against Wast, who was himself captured. Al-Aṣhhī died a few months later (Rabi' 1, 288 = March 901) at Barūdān. 

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited above and under the article SūHMA see Mas'ūdī, Murūdī al-Dhahab, viii. 144-145, 196-200; al-Kindī, Wulīt Majr (ed. Guest), p. 235; Ibn Khallikān, tr. of al-Safarīnī, i. 500; Histories de l'Arménie par le patriarche Jean VII, tr.
MUHAMMAD b. ABDZINAB [See Abu 'l-KHAFFAH]

MUHAMMAD b. ACHLAB [See AGHLABIS]

MUHAMMAD b. AHMAD [See IBN AL-ALAMI, IBN IYAN, IBN KIRGI]

MUHAMMAD b. 'ALI, a grandson of Husain the son of 'Ali; his kunya was Abi Dжа'far. On account of his learning he was given the honorific name of al-Bakir (the inventor), who goes deeply into things). He was a recognized authority on Tradition and a number of pious utterances are also recorded of him; he had at the same time the characteristic fondness of his family for embroidered silk garments and colours. That did not escape the usual fate of his family of being celebrated by a section of the Shi'ah as an imam is shown by a poem of the 'Ijli Ati' Haiara; but he lived contentedly in Medina and apparently played no part in politics although he was treated, for example by Umar II, with respect. He was expressly disowned by extreme Shi'i like al-Mughira and Bayan. When the party which had hitherto paid homage to his brother Zaid, abandoned the latter, they transferred their privileges to him, or rather, since he was dead, to his son Dжа'far [cf. IYAN b. MUHAMMAD]. The reason of the breach is said to have been that Zaid would not insult the memory of the two first Caliphs as his followers demanded but this does not agree very well with the fact that Muhammad b. Iyan's obviously much rhetoured account emphatically declares his fondness for Abi Bakr and Umar. The date of his death is variously given as 114, 115 or 118 AH.


MUHAMMAD b. 'ALI [See AL-DJAWAD AL-ISHAAB, IBN AL-ARABI, IBN ASKAR, IBN KIRGI, IBN AL-TASSEK, IBN WAJHIBYA]

MUHAMMAD b. 'ALI AL-RIDA', first Imam of the Twelve Shi'a, was born in Ramdan 115 (June 821) in Medina. As, according to Abi 'l-Faraq al-Ishahibi, Maqshid al-Talibisin (Teheran 1307), p. 195 sq., he was of negroid appearance, it may be true that his mother, a slave-woman, variously called Salma, Dura and Khaiziur, was a Nubian; to give her an honourable pedigree it was added "of the family of Maria the Copt". When al-Mamun attacked 'Ali al-Rida' to his court, he married the boy to one of his daughters, Umm al-Fadl, who was taken to him in 215 (830). Al-Mu'tasim on his accession summoned him to Baghdad. He arrived there at the beginning of 220, but was dead already by Dhu'l-Ka'da (Nov. 835). According to the Shi'a and in keeping with their scheme of martyrdom, he was poisoned on the instigation of al-Mu'tasim by Umm al-Fadl who remained childless; but even the already mentioned Maqshid, which record every murder of an 'Ali, know nothing of this. This Muhammad is generally speaking, only occasionally mentioned inside the Shi'a, along with his father, e.g. in Ibn Walji al-Ya'ish, Tawdih, ed. Houtsma (Leyden 1883), ii. 552 and in Tabari, Annals, iii. 1092, 1093; according to al-Ma'mun, Munshi al-Zahabs (Paris 1861 sqq.), iii. 117, Muhammad died in 219, according to vii. 171 not till the reign of al-Walid, i.e. after 227. Even within the Shi'a, his role is quite a passive one. After his father's tragic end, those with Za'id views who had hoped some day with him as Caliph to put into force their activist 'Ali political programme, went their own ways again, while those who held Imam views, one group, as usual in such a case, became "スタミファ" Waqiyifaya and another chose Abruad, a brother of al-Ka'da, as Imam; for Muhammad was only seven at the time. For those who remained faithful to him, there arose in the Sihurut al-Imama the question of the child Imam's knowledge. The case was repeated with the following three Imams. But the authority to teach and to act, in the hands of men whose activity extended through several Imamates; with Ma'mun (p. Bibi), xi. 125 infra cf. Mires Muhammad al-Astabirab, Manhaji al-Ma'mul (Teheran 1306), p. 217; Abi 'Amir al-Kasbah, Manajat Aghlab, Khilafat al-Ka'da (Isfahan, 1317), p. 352 sq., 374 sqq.; Tafrih al-Zahab (Bibl. Bibl. III., No. 60), No. 124, 150, p. 289, note 1. The gradual development of the dogma in this question, is associated with the child Jesus; teaching in Sura xix. 30 sqq., is not quite clear, as regards its apportionment to the various Imamis. Hereologers including al-Nawahi, Firaq al-Sa'id (Bibl. Bibl. III., No. 4), p. 74 sqq., quote the doctrines anonymously. Besides, there is the confusion of names (which has also entered European indices); for Muhammad b. 'Ali was also the name of one of his grandchildren, who died before his father, the 10th Imam Al-Najat, but left issue; his adherents continued the imamate further than the Twelve through these children, while they deny the existence of the twelfth Imam Muhammad al-Mahdi as successor of his brother, the eleventh Imam Hasan al-Ashur. They work avoid confusion by giving the ninth Imam, the Abu Dжа'far al-Thani; his official title is al-Taqi, "the God-fearing"; a common epithet is al-Dжа'if, "the liberal"; he is said to have paid his father's debts. As mac'ar al-bad, he had, like al-Ka'da before him, Utma'n b. Sa'id al-Amri, called Salamun or Zaibat. Among the usual miracles of the Imamis, Abu Dжа'far al-Saffar (d. 290) in Bayqur al-Daraghtin (in Ma'mun, xii. 108) relates that the ninth Imam carried a warshipper at night from Syria to the holy sites of Kerbelah, Kufa and Medina as well as to Mecca. The fact that his memory has been kept so green to the present day is due to the fact that he was buried beside the tomb of his grandfather, the seventh Imam, Minah al-Ka'im [q.v.]; thus arose the double Maqshid al-Ka'imman.

Biography: A full account with exact references to the sources is given in Muhammad Bakir b. Muhammad Taqi al-MadjJlis, Ridair al-Armar, xii. (Teheran 1302), p. 99-126; of earlier works we may specially mention al-Ma'mid (q.v.), al-Frzyadi (Teheran n.d.), with the addition of a solution, arranged in the order of the Imamis.

(R. STROTHMANN)

MUHAMMAD b. 'AMMAR [See IBN 'AMMAR]
MUHAMMAD b. ANUSHTEGIN [See KHWA-
SIMPIN].

MUHAMMAD B. BAKIYA B. 'ALI [See Ibn
BAKIYA].

MUHAMMAD b. DAWUD [See Ibn ABDURREHM,
AL-IFARABI].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-DAJAZARI [See Ibn AL-
DAJAZARI].

MUHAMMAD b. DUŞMANZIYAR [See KIK-
KOVID].

MUHAMMAD b. FARĀMARZ [See KHOSROW
MOLLE].

MUHAMMAD b. ḤABBĪ [See Ibn ḤABBĪ].

MUHAMMAD b. AL-HANAFIYA, a son of
'Ali and Khawla, a woman of the tribe of
Bani Ḥanifa, who had been brought a prisoner to
Medina after the battle of 'Arafat [q. v.] and came
into 'Ali's possession (cf. Suyūtī's poem Kīthā al-
'Agāmūt, vii. 4: "she was a servant in the house"); he was born in 61 A.H. Although he did not, like Ḥasan and Husain, have the blood of the
Prophet in his veins, he became involved not only in
the political turmoil but also in the schemes
which the bloodless families of the extreme Shi'īs
built up around the family of 'Ali. He was not
blame for this, for he was of a retiring
position and acted very cautiously. But when Ḥasan
had sold his rights and Husain had fallen at Kerbelā
in 680, many turned their eyes to him as the
natural head of the family. This aroused the
suspicion of 'Abd Allah b. Zubair who, after the death of
Ḥusain, appeared more and more openly as a
preacher; the fact that Muhammad had no
sympathy with the efforts of the opposition in the
Ḥijaz is evident from the interesting statement of
Balādī that he definitely declared the
assurances brought against the Caliph Yazīd I by the
Medinese to be false. The matter only became
serious when the adventurer Mughārīr [q. v.] after
seven vain efforts to get others to join him stirred
up a movement on a large scale in the Ṭūlāk in
66 (685), as champion of Muhammad's rights.
Even now Muhammad acted with great restraint
and declared the significant title "al-Mahdi" with
which they wished to greet him (cf. Tabari, ii.
510 and Ibn Sa'd, v. 68, which has certainly been
misinterpreted by Lammens). He obviously did
care for Mughārīr at all, and he had every
reason to doubt the genuineness of his enthusiasm
for him; but in view of the many dangers which
surrounded him and probably also from a want of
decision he did not wish to break with him openly.
Therefore when some people came to him from
Ṭūlā to clear up his attitude to Mughārīr, he only
gave them a diplomatic answer which was
noncommittal (cf. the somewhat different versions:
Ibn Sa'd, v. 72; Ya'qūbī, ii. 308; Tabari, ii. 607
and thereon Kīmi, p. 595) but which they inter-
cepted as a kind of approval, as it did not definitely
disown him. As a result the revolution-movement
spread in extent and much blood was shed to
avert the Ḥusain and with it the 'Alīs. Muhammad
was against this also (cf. Ibn Sa'd, v. 72 sq.; 77);
but when Ibn Zubair's attitude became more
and more hostile he finally imprisoned Muhammad
and several relatives, including 'Abd Allah b.
'Abbās, at Mecca near the Zemzem well, he saw
nothing else for it but to appeal for help to Mughārīr.
This was what the latter wanted and he sent a
body of cavalry at once to Mecca and released
Muhammad and the other prisoners in the nick of
time but by the latter's express orders avoided
conflict with Ibn Zubair's troops, as the town was
not to be desecrated by bloodshed. Muhammad
then sought shelter with his family at Minā (cf.
Kūmāt, p. 554, 597; Kīthā al-'Agāmūt, viii. 33:
Kumāt, ed. Horovitz, i. 78) and later went to
Ṭūlā. He made no further use of Mughārīr and
was therefore not compromised when the revolution
failed and his champion fell in 67 (686-687).
In spite of the threats of Ibn Zubair and the
demands couched in more friendly language of
'Abd al-Malik and although a safe place of
residence was granted him neither in Ḥijaz nor in
Syria, he defined his attitude by paying homage to
neither of the two pretenders and adhered to
the principle that he would only recognize a ruler
around whom the Muslim community were united.
He therefore appeared in the noteworthy pilgrimage
of the year 688 along with the Zubairids, Umayyads
and Khālidūs, as an independent head of a party,
although only under an armed neutrality. Only
when, after the fall of Ibn Zubair (73 = 692), the
anonymity of the vox populi which he had demanded,
became a reality, did he finally recognize the
Marwanī as the legitimate ruler and visited him
in 78 (697-698) at Damascus. He returned how-
er to Medina, where he died in 81 (700-701).
His strict passivity in the political field is always
attributed to purely religious motives as in the
traditions; not human force but Allah's help alone
should assist 'Ali's family to their rights; but there
is no doubt that a further reason was his lack of
enterprise and self-confidence, a trait common
to a number of 'Alīids. That, like his whole family,
he at the same time liked the good things of this
world is evident from the heavy demands which
he sent to 'Abd al-Malik for the payment of his
debts and annual pensions for his children,
and relatives; there is also evidence that he
had the family fondness for fine clothes and
manners. It is all the more remarkable then that
the more fanciful and extravagant school of Shi'īs
was seized upon him at once after his death and spread
the belief that he was not dealt but lived in a
kind of fairy kingdom on the hill of Radwān west
of Medina, whence he would return as the victorious
leader of an army (cf. Kīthā al-'Agāmūt, viii.
476 sq.; Kīmi, p. 347; ibid. 9 sq.; viii. 32). This was the idea of raqī's which
'Abd Allah b. Sā'b [q. v.] had associated with
'Ali (cf. Firdausī, in Z. 241, xxiii. 309 sqq.) and
which was now transferred to him; and in fact it
was now easier to bring him into the forefront than
it had been while he maintained his attitude of
stoutly passive resistance in his lifetime.

Biography: Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i.
1126-ii. 783: passim (s. indices); iii. 2337,
2476, 2510; Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, v. 66-86;
Balahārī, Amāh al-Aḥrāf, in Z. D. M. G.,
xxxvii. 394; Mas'ūdī, Murūjū, ed. Barbier de
Maynard, v. 176 sqq., 267 sq.; Ya'qūbī, ed.
Houtsma, ii. 267, 308, 311-314, 320; Muḥarrār,
Kūmāt, ed. Wright, p. 296 sq., 554, 580
sqq., 597 sq.; Nawawi, Biographicae
Dictionum, ed. Wietersen, p. 113-115; Dinawarī,
ed. Güstafson, p. 156 sqq., 166 sqq., 242,
274, 279, 287: passim, 303-315; T. W. Arnold,
Meccanische, p. 10 sq.; W. Vleto, Recherches sur
la Domination arabe etc., 1894; H. Banning,
Muḥammad ibn al-Hanafiya (dissert.), 1909;

**MUHAMMAD b. HANI** [See Ibn Hani']

**MUHAMMAD b. AL-HASAN** [See Ibn Duraid, Ibn ‘Abdullâh, bin ‘Abd al-Salîm]

**MUHAMMAD b. AL-HUDHAIl** [See Abu l-Hudhail]

**MUHAMMAD b. HUSAIN**, an Ottoman dignitary and historian, who at the request of the first Wali of Baghdad, Derważ Mehemed Pasha (Durriayi, *Safli li-‘l-‘almâni*, ii. 33), translated into Turkish the history of ‘Abî. Shîhâb Hamâghûhâ, written in 1036 in Persian; he added two letters to it and gave it the title *Tuhfat al-Mu’mûn*. The work only exists in manuscript.

**Bibliography**: Bursaft Mehemed Tahir, *‘Otmâni Mülûkîlîr*, ill. xiii.; cf. also Ṣafî al-Khalîfa, *Kashf al-Zawâ‘in*, Hulâq 1274, i. 404, where Mustafa Shâhânlî is named as the Turkish translator.

The **MUHAMMAD KHALIFA** (‘Abbâd ‘Abd al-‘Azîz, 1587-1637), who was a dignitary of the court and flourished under three sultans (Mūsâ IV, 1033-1049 = 1623-1640; İbrahim, 1049-1058 = 1640-1648, and Mehemed IV, 1058-1069 = 1648-1687), was not identical with him. He wrote a chronicle of his time entitled *Twoelâd al-Qilâmat*, which covered the years 1060-1075 = 1650-1665. The work which consists of 3 volumes and a Khalima (of which the second letter contains two and the third 12 lines) was published by Alîdâ Fârid as supplement 11 to *T.C.A.M.* parts 78-83, Istanbul 1340 (1924).

A certain Muhammad Khalifa b. Husain is perhaps the same person: he also was a dignitary of the court of the same three sultans and wrote a history of his time which covered the years 1043-1070 (1636-1659). The only known manuscript is in Vienna.

**Bibliography**: Alîdâ Fârid, biographical introduction to the *Twoelâd al-Qilâmat*; Flügel, *Katalog*, ii. 271; Babinger, G. O. W. p. 409, № 179 (text wrongly 170) and 180. (T. Mikrêl)

**MUHAMMAD b. AL-HUSAIN** [See Abu l-Hasän, Abu Sa‘îd, Ibn Miqâla, Al-Sâ‘îr al-Râîî, Abu]n]

**MUHAMMAD b. IBRAHÎM** [See Abu l-Hašan]

**MUHAMMAD b. İBRAHÎM ‘ADîl SHAH** (1035-1070 = 1626-1660) succeeded to the throne of Bijdipur after the death of his father. In the year 1064 (1654), the armies of the emperor Shah Djihâân invaded the Deccan and laid waste the country of Bijdipur. After the subjugation of Davlattâbâd and other forts, Muhammad b. İbrahîm ‘Adîl Shah agreed to pay a considerable tribute to the emperor of Delhi. He was the last king of Bijdipur who struck coins in his own name. In the latter part of his reign, his vassal Swâdîj, son of Sâhî Bhambî, by stratagem and treachery obtained great power, and the foundation of the Bijâdipur monarchy became weakened. He died in 1660 and was buried in Bijdipur where his tomb is called *Gill Gumbâs* (circular dome).

**Bibliography**: Fuqati Asma’aâ, *Fsahîh∗ ‘Adîl Shah*, hol. 344; *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. xii. 159. (M. Hidayet Hosain)

**MUHAMMAD b. İLYAS** [See Abu ‘Ali]

**MUHAMMAD b. İSÄ** [See Ilkâniya]

**MUHAMMAD b. İSâHâK** [See Ibn İsâ, Al-Nâzîr]

**MUHAMMAD b. AL-KASIM** [See Abu l-Alî’, Abu al-‘Abbas]

**MUHAMMAD b. KASIM**, a cousin of Walî II (86–96 = 705–715) and son-in-law of al-Hâijdîlî b. Yûsuf, was the governor of Bâsra; in 91 (711), he was sent to conquer Sind. Having defeated and killed the Râdî of the place called Dîhîr, he took possession of that country in 93 (712) and finally penetrated as far as Multân about 500 miles from the sea and even reached the foot of the Himalayas. Various accounts are given of the death of this general. The common story is that Muhammad b. Kasim was falsely accused by the two daughters of the Râdî of Dîhîr, whom he had sent to the harem of Sulaiman (96–99 = 715–717), the brother and successor of Walî, of having violated their chastity, and that he was therefore sewn up alive in a raw cowhide, by order of the enraged caliph. Others say that Muhammad b. Kasim, with other members of his family, was tortured and put to death by Śâlih b. ‘Abîd al-Alâm, governor of Istak, in revenge for the murder of his brother by Hâijdîlî.


**MUHAMMAD b. MAHMÚD** [See Abu ‘Umar]}
he against Muhammad. He was also able to win Malikshah over and to collect an army, which was however scattered in the following year by Muhammad with the help of Mawdūd, lord of al-Mawṣil, and Salmān was again made prisoner. Muhammad now thought himself strong enough to attack the Caliph himself and to besiege him in Baghdad. Imād al-Din, who was in the town, gives a full account of the siege (Rc. Hist. Crois., ii. 246 sqq.). Muhammad hurriedly raised the siege when news reached him that ʿAbd al-Malik had encamped Hamadān with Malikshāh and Arānān (552 = 1157). By the time the sultan arrived there they had retired, but he was at war with them till his death in 554 (1159).

**Bibliography:** see the article **SELJUQS**.

(M. TH. HOUTSMA)

MUHAMMAD b. MALIKSHĀH ABU SHUQAIʿA GHAYTHI b. DUNYĀ ḫAṢIM AMIR AL-MUʾMÆNA, a SALTJIB b. SALTJINA (498-511 = 1005-1118), was born on the 18th Shabān 474 (Jan. 20, 1082) of a slave, who was also the mother of Sanadjar, and was given the Turkish name of Tapar. After his father’s death, he stayed at first with Turkan Khatun but then joined his brother Barkiyārūk who granted him the town of Gansā, Arrived there, he also seized Arrān and allowed himself to be seduced by Muʿayyad al-Muluk b. Nūṣrat al-Mulk into dropping his brother’s name out of ʿ.market. The two brothers fought one another with varying success in the following years until finally in 497 (1104) Barkiyārūk withdrew from the western provinces of the empire to Isfahān and left Muhammad to enforce recognition as sultān from the governors in these lands. When Barkiyārūk died soon after, at the end of 1104, Muhammad turned first to Baghdaḍ because he was sure of the homage of the Caliph, who had already received him and his brother a few years before in ceremonial audience (cf. the account in Ibn Khallikān, Bītākk 1299, ii. 444, had the emir Ayār, who had at first had the ʿattāṣa read for Malikshāh b. Barkiyārūk, treacherously put to death and sent the king of the Arabs Šadāqa back to his capital al-Hilla with orders to restore peace in Baṣra and among the Arab tribes of the neighbourhood. He then hurried to Isfahān, where the Būṭaynīya had achieved great successes in the troubled reign of Barkiyārūk and had established themselves in several hill-fortresses in the neighbourhood. One of their leaders, Ibn ʿAtāq, had by a ruse secured possession of the fortress of Dir-Kaḥ of ʿAlī-Dir built by Malikshāh. The sultān regarded it as his first duty to subdue and root out if possible these unbelievers; he sent his troops to besiege the fortress and, when it was taken, rased it to the ground and had the captured Būṭaynīya executed in cruel fashion (500 = 1107; cf. the text of the report sent by him to the Caliph’s vizier in Ibn al-Kalānī, ed. Amedroz, p. 152 ff.). Nor did he hesitate to have his own vizier, Saʿd al-Mulk Abu Tāḥamīn Abū al-Muluk Abu Ṭāhir al-ʿAttājī, executed at the gate of Isfahān; he was suspected, according to Anshahwān wrongly, (cf. Rsc. Hist. Crois., ii. 91) of having dealings with the Būṭaynīya.

While Muhammad was still in Isfahān, the emir Ğawāl Saḵawu, who ruled between Fāra and Khurāsān, made his submission to him; the sultān had previously tried in vain to bring him to obedience through the emir Mawdūd. The sultān was so pleased that he granted him the town of al-Mawṣil where Ḏjeκermanī, who had only paid homage to him under compulsion, was in command. The latter was not inclined to submit to the arrangement, but was taken prisoner in an encounter with Cawālī. The latter however was not yet lord of al-Mawṣil, for the followers of ʿAzṣunkor al-ʿAbūsulku, the governor of Baghdaḍ, to Šadāqa and to ʿAbd al-ʿAtā, the Salmānī of al-Raʾīm. The last-named sloshed answered the appeal and came with his troops to al-Mawṣil where he had homage paid to himself as sultān, but soon afterwards, after an unsuccessful encounter, he was drowned in the Ḳhāṭibūr on his retreat. Cawālī now had little difficulty in taking the town and going on to his further task, the war against the Crusaders. It would take us too far here to sketch the course of this war, and the reader may therefore be referred to Weil, Gesch. der Chl., iii. 191 sqq. During his absence he again fell into disgrace with the Caliph, who had in the meanwhile returned to Baghdaḍ and sent his troops to attack Šadāqa, by whom he was also dissatisfied. Šadāqa fell in battle in 501 (beg. of 1101). The sultān sent Mawdūd to al-Mawṣil and granted him the same dignity as he had previously given Cawālī. The latter on the same day made his peace with the sultān and was appointed as Emir of Fāra, where he fought the unruly elements in the population with great energy (cf. Ibn al-ʿAdīr, ed. Tārīkh, x. 561 sqq.). The Būṭaynīya however gave Muhammad no peace, so long as they were able to hold their strong mountain citadel of Alamāt; Abū Nashr ʿAḥmad, a son of Nūṣrat al-Mulk, who after Saʿd al-Mulk acted as the sultān’s vizier, was therefore given orders to take this fortress and when he did not succeed, he was dismissed in 504 (1109-10). In the meanwhile the sultān was being urged more and more from different sides to prosecute the war with the Crusaders seriously, and to succeed in persuading the various governors the of western provinces to combine and attack the Christians under the leadership of Mawdūd accompanied by the young prince Masʿūd. After Mawdūd’s assassination (507 = 1113) ʿAzṣunkor al-ʿAbūsulku took command and after him ʿAbūsulku assumed the supreme command but on account of the strife among the Turkish emirs, the value of the Crusaders and the complicated situation in Syria, decisive successes could not be attained. For the course of the campaign we again refer the reader to Weil, op. cit., p. 194 sqq., and the historians of the Crusaders. In the last years of his life, the sultān sent the emir Anṣahwān Shīrī against the Būṭaynīya In Alamāt, but he died on the 24th Dhuʾ al-Hijārā 511 (Apr. 18, 1118) before the fortress was taken. He was only 36 years old and this is why Weil suggests that the Būṭaynīya had a hand in his death, but does not go so far as to support this hypothesis in the oriental chronicles. On the contrary, individuals in his immediate entourage, notably the Great Ḥājjī ʿAlī Bār, seem to have been not quite innocent, because they, apparently to avert suspicion from themselves, accused the sultān Guhar Khatun and the famous poet al-Ṭehrābī of having caused the sultān’s illness by magic arts. The former was blinded and strangled on the day Muhammad died. The reason given by Matthias of Edessa for this (Docum. Arm., i. 120) is wrong. The sultān deserves credit for having, with the assistance of his brother Sanadjar who ruled in Khorāsān and the adjoining lands, restored the fortunes of the Salmānī kingdom, which had declined since the death of Malikshāh.
and for having vigorously fought insulds and sectarians in his seal for Sunni Islam and the 'Abbasid caliphate. He was, as Rec. Hist. Cr. ii. 118 has it, the perfect man of the Sultãns and their strong heart-camel.

Bibliography: given in the article Seljouks.

(M. Th. Houtsma)

MUHAMMAD, ABU AHMAD, İLĐAD-DAWLA WA-DJAMÅ, AL-MALLA, ABU AHMAD MUHAMMAD, second son of Sultan Muhammed of Ghazna, was born about 387 (997). He was married to a daughter of Abû Nasr Muhammed b. Abu'l-Habib Ahmad b. Muhammad, the Faríghan ruler of Džâlân. After the death of Abû Nasr Muhammed in 401 (1010-1011), Sultan Muhammad assigned to his son Muhammed the government of the province of Džâlân. In 411 (1020), at the instance of Sultan Muhammed, the 'Abbasí Caliph al-Kázîr b. Tâhî the Confessor conferred on him the titles of Jálân al-Dawla wa-Djámâl al-Milla. Towards the close of his life, Sultan Muhammed divided his empire between his sons, giving Ghazna, Khurásân and India to Muhammad and Rayî, Džâlân and Ifsânân to Mas’ûd, and took solemn vows from both to respect this division. When Muhammed died in Rabî‘ II, 421 (April 1030), Muhammad ascended the throne at Ghazna, but Mas’ûd, disregarding his vow, marched on Ifsânân to take possession of Ghazna. In the meantime, the holders at Ghazna deposed Muhammad on 3rd Shawwal, 421 (October 2, 1030) and read the Mu’âta in the name of Mas’ûd. Muhammed was then deprived of his sight by orders of Mas’ûd and imprisoned in a fort. His reign had lasted only 6 months.

In 431 Sultan Mas’ûd suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Sultâns, and resolved to settle in India. In the beginning of 432 (September 1040), leaving Ghazna in the hands of his son Mawdûd and his wazîr, he marched into India with all his treasures, but on 13th Rabî‘ II, 432 (December 24, 1040) his slaves deposed him and raised Muhammed to the throne. Shortly after this, Mas’ûd was put to death. Hearing this, Mawdûd advanced with a large army to avenge the death of his father, defeated Muhammad near Dünpûr on 3rd Sha‘bân, 432 (April 1041), and put him to death. The second reign of Muhammad lasted only 4 months. Muhammad was obedient to his father and was a man of amiable temperance. He resembled his father in appearance.


MUHAMMAD b. MARWAN, an Umayyad governor. In 65 (684-685) he was sent by his father, the caliph Marwan I, to Mesopotamia, and in the battle of Dâir al-Dâjihân in 72 (689) in which his brother, the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, defeated Mu‘izz al-Dîn al-Zubair, he commanded the advanced guard of the Syrian army. In the following year ‘Abd al-Malik gave him the governorship of Mesopotamia and Armenia, which carried with it the command in the war with the Byzantines. On account of climatic conditions the Arab expeditions always took place in summer. In 73 (692), the emperor Justinian II was defeated at Sebaste or Sebastopolis in Cilicia. In 75 (694) Muhammad again took the field against the Byzantines and was successful against them at Marûtsh, and in the following year he invaded Armenia. Along with his nephew ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Abd al-Malik he was sent to al-Halîkhânî the year 82 (701), to support him against the rebel ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad b. al-Asfâfî, and in the negotiations with the ‘Irâqîs before the battle at Dâir al-Dâjihân the caliph was represented by Muhammad and ‘Abd Allâh. In the same year, Muhammad led an expedition against Armenia, and again in 84 (703) and 85 (704). After the accession of al-Walid (Shawwal 86 = Oct. 705) Muhammad fell gradually into the background while Maslama, the caliph’s brother, was the actual commander; but the former retained his governorship for some time until in 91 (709-710) he was replaced by Maslama here also. Muhammad died in 101 (719-720).

Muhammad b. Sa‘ūd — Muhammad b. Tūghdīj

The full source is the Khalīl al-Ghazzawi (vol. ii. of Rawdat al-A‘shār) of Husain b. Qādān (d. 1225 H.), MS. British Museum Add. 23, 345, fol. 39–50; the Boulain lithograph (1332 H.) is very inaccurate; summarized by H. St. J. Philby, Arabia, London 1930, p. 12–22.— See also A. Masul, Northern Night, New York 1928, p. 258–259, and Amin al-Ra‘i‘ī, Tādi‘īq Qādān al-Halāl, Beirut 1928, p. 50–53, and for general works the Bibliography to the article Ibn Sa‘ūd. (H. A. R. Gru.)

Muhammad b. Sirīn (See Ibn al-Salām).

Muhammad b. Tāhir, governor of Khurāsān. After the death of his father, Muhammad received the governorship of Khurāsān (Radjab 248 = Sept. 862). In 250 (864–5) the ‘Alid al-‘Imām b. Zaid rebelled, which led to a long and serious struggle (see Muhammad b. Nā‘īr). When ‘Abd al-Malik al-Sidqi rebelled against Ya‘qūb b. al-Layth al-Shāfi‘ī and appealed for help to Muhammad, who appointed him governor of al-Tabarzan and Kuhistān, Ya‘qūb found a welcome pretext to invade Khurāsān. Muhammad sent an embassy to him; but as Ya‘qūb had already found a following among discontented Khurāsānians, all negotiations were in vain. In Shawwāl 259 (Aug. 873), or according to another statement in 258, he entered Nisanbūr without striking a blow, put an end to the ‘Abd al-Malikid dynasty and took Muhammad prisoner. But when he rebelled against the Caliph al-Mu’tamid, he was defeated in Radjab 262 (April 876) by the latter’s brother al-Mu‘awwad and Muhammad, whom he had with him in chains, escaped. The Caliph restored the latter to his former office in Khurāsān; the exiled Tāhirī however never found an opportunity to exercise his functions. He was further appointed — probably not till 270 (884–5) — vizier of Nāsibid and Khaibād as his deputy as military governor of Baghdaḍ. He held this office until the accession of al-Mu‘taḍidīd (279 = 892). He died in 296 (908–9).


Muhammad b. Tāhir (See Ibn al-Khaṣṣāb).

Muhammad b. Takah (See Khawārijmīn).

Muhammad b. Tughdīj (or Dioph) b. Vaktan b. Fūrūk b. Khāṣā b. Bakr, known as al-Ikhshīdī, from the title granted to him by the Caliph al-Ra‘ī‘ī in 327 (939), was the founder of the Egyptian dynasty of the Ikhtsīdīdīs (q.v.).

He was born in 268 (882) at Baghdaḍ and must have spent his youth in Syria, as his father, who joined the service of the ‘Abbasid at about the same date, was appointed governor of Damascus and Tabaryya c. 276, a post which he held for some fifteen years, and he himself acted for a time as his father’s deputy for Tabaryya. In consequence of the overthrow of the ‘Abbasid dynasty in 292 (904), he was imprisoned at Baghdaḍ. He was released in 294 (907), according to the inscription of ‘Abbās b. al-Husayn, and being implicated in his murder, had to fly when the conspiracy of Ibn al-Mu‘ta‘is (q.v.) failed. He escaped to Syria and found himself reduced to a humble station. Next year he passed on to Egypt, where his government, took him into favour, so that he kept him with himself, both in Egypt and in Syria when he was transferred thither to act as governor at intervals (302–307 and 309–311), and promoted him to appointments of importance.

At this period Muhammad came into contact with the powerful Mādarā‘i family, and also attended Murūsīh (q.v.) when he was brought to Egypt by the Fāṭimid invasions. He had already attracted some attention at Baghdaḍ by an exploit in 306. In 316 (928), through influence at the capital, he became governor of Ramla, quitting Takīn abruptly. In 319 he obtained a transfer to Damascus, where he became powerful, and in consequence of his defeat of Baghār in 321 extended his rule over the whole of Syria. In the same year (March 933) Takīn died, and Muhammad b. Tughdīj succeeded in obtaining the appointment as governor of Egypt in his place, but only nominally and for one month (Sept. 933). Two years later, by means of a large army and fleet, he entered Fustā‘ī and took possession of the country, overcoming the resistance of al-Mardā‘ārī (Muhammad b. ‘Ali), who by appointment from Baghdaḍ was then in control of Egypt, the governor being under his direction (taşık tūdīrīhī), Superior to al-Mardā‘ārī, however, was al-Fadl b. Dā‘ūr b. al-Fadlī (for whom see the article Ibn al-Fadlī; the inspektor minister (wā‘ir khudhīf) of Egypt and Syria, who had been specially granted full executive powers. Muhammad b. Tughdīj had acted with the authorization of al-Fadl and later (324) obtained the confimation of al-Ra‘ī‘ī to the addition of Egypt to the province of Syria already held by him. Probably at the same time he was granted the suzerainty over al-Yaman and the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina, in honour of the following year to the Emperor Romanus he boasted of those places as part of his kingdom. Until the death of al-Fadl in 337 (March 939), he seems to have been subject, at least in theory, to some control by him. In 342 a decisive victory by the troops of Muhammad b. Tughdīj near Alexandria (battle of Albuq; March 31, 936) crushed the third Fāṭimid invasion and led to overtures from the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Kā‘īn, which in the end came to nothing. Muhammad did indeed decide three years later to recognize the Fāṭimid, and had given the order that al-Kā‘īn should be proclaimed in Egypt, out of indignation at the ‘Abbāsid government at Baghdaḍ, but was induced to reconsider his decision.

Only a month after he had received his title al-Ikhshīdī from al-Ra‘ī‘ī (Ramadan 327 = June–July 939), he found himself threatened from Ra‘ī‘ī by Ibn Rā‘ī‘ī (q.v.) and learnt that his provinces had been granted to this rival. Bad‘kam (q.v.), as amir al-amara‘ at Baghār, gave no answer to his appeal but that the question must be decided by the sword; the powerless Caliph could say nothing. Ibn Rā‘ī‘ī rapidly possessed himself of Syria, driving back the forces sent to oppose him,
and had soon captured Ramla (Oct. 939). Muhammad b. Ṭūḥāḏyj himself confronted him with an army at Yarramū, and with no fighting beyond some skirmishing entered into negotiations, ending in an agreement to cede Syria from Tabariya to north on condition that Ramla and the rest were restored to him. Ibn Raʾšāf soon broke this treaty and again advanced. This time Muhammad b. Ṭūḥāḏyj encountered him at al-ʿArish and routed him (15th Ramaḍān 324 = June 24, 940), but as he followed him into Syria, met with a reverse in his turn, one of his detachments being surprised and badly defeated at Laddāḏūn (18th August). Peace was then renewed on the same terms as before, and Muhammad b. Ṭūḥāḏyj undertook to pay an annual subsidy of 140,000 dinārs. He was back in Egypt in October.

The death of Bāḏjkam in 339 (April 941) drew Ibn Raʾšāf back to Baghdāḍ, and Muhammad b. Ṭūḥāḏyj was soon relieved of him completely, for he was murdered a year later by the Ḥamdānīs. Muhammad lost no time in recovering Syria, marching thither himself (June 942) and remaining in the country about six months before coming back to Egypt. It must have been at about this period that he succeeded in dispersing some minor encroachments on Syria from the direction of Raʾṣā, that are alluded to without details, those of Adl (al-Bāḏjkam) and Badr al-Khārjāhānī. He had to meet more serious attacks from the Ḥamdānīs. One of them, al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd, took Ḥalāḥ from him in 332 (March 944), and in May he set out to recover it. The Caliph al-Muttaḏi, moreover, insecure under the protection of the Ḥamdānīs from Tūṣān, the amir al-ʿaṣ̱rār, had appealed to him for help. His enemy retired at his approach and having regained the town he proceeded to Raʾṣā, where he met the Caliph (Sept. 7, 944). At this time he had thoughts of becoming amir al-ʿaṣ̱rār himself. He urged al-Muttaḏi to come with him to Syria and Egypt, and even offered to go with him to Baghdāḍ. He begged him not to trust himself to Tūṣān, but could not dissuade him. After receiving flattering marks of honour he departed. Before he reached Fustāṭ on his return the Ḥamdānī Saif al-Dawla [q.v.] had taken Ḥalāḥ (Oct. 944). The Egyptian army sent to meet this new aggression was severely defeated at Rastān near Himṣ, and Saif al-Dawla advanced to Damascus and entered it (April–May 945). Muhammad b. Ṭūḥāḏyj, coming from Egypt with his army, obliged him to retreat, pursued him, brought him to battle at Kinnārūn (May–June 945), and defeated him. Again Muhammad made easy terms when victor; Saif al-Dawla retained Syria north of Damascus and was also given a subsidy. The treaty was concluded in Raḥib 1 334 (Oct.–Nov. 945), and Muhammad then went back to Damascus, remaining there until he died a few months later (21st Dhu Ṭaʿrīh 334 = June 24, 946), just after the arrival of a Byzantine envoy concerning an exchange of prisoners for which he had opened negotiations.

Next to nothing is recorded of the internal events of Egypt during his reign; the country was doubtful quiet. Its revenue, said to have amounted to two million dinārs annually, was no longer accounted for to Baghdāḍ, and no regular payments were made from it to the central treasury. But he sent large occasional gifts to the Caliphs, so that al-Rāfiʿī considered him an exemplary vassal.

He left seven million dinārs at his death besides considerable other property. No constructional works of much importance are credited to him. At Fustāṭ he rebuilt the shipyard on the mainland, and on its site he built a garden called al-Makätārū; he enlarged the government house in which he resided, a Tūṭūnīd building that was situated near the still existing tomb of al-Kaṣīr Bakkār, and added a masāʾūd̤ān; he also made another garden known later as Rāfiʿī, afterwards the site of the western Fīṣṭānī in the face of Cairo. His armies at times seem to have been large. At the battle of Ablīf the Egyptians are said to have had 15,000 horsemen, at that of Kinnārūn 50,000 men. Such numbers would have been reached by means of levies for particular emergencies, which he is known to have raised more than once. On one occasion his personal retainers (qāʿārām), on whom he more especially depended, numbered 500. The constantly repeated and universally accepted figures of 400,000 for his army and 8,000 for his bodyguard can be dismissed as ridiculous, notwithstanding that they rest on the early authority of al-Fakhūri (d. 354), and with them the accompanying myth as to his habit of concealing his sleeping places when on campaign.

The most renowned of his followers was Kāfūr [q.v.]. Another of his qāʿārām, Fāṭik, rose to some eminence. Ali b. Muhammad b. Kāfūr was his secretary both at Damascus and in Egypt. Muhammad b. Ali al-Madaraṭī was his wazīr for a few months (328–329), Muhammad b. Ali b. Mukāṭī, previously secretary to Ibn Raʾšāf, was his wazīr at his death. His four brothers were all younger than himself; al-Ḥasan was in command at the battle of Ablīf, and represented him in Egypt during all his absences, al-Ḥusayn was in command at Laddāḏūn and killed there, [Ubayd Allāh acted for him in Syria, Ali disappears early.

Notable Egyptian authors who flourished during his reign were the historian Ibn al-Dāyā (d. 334), al-Kindī (d. 350), and Abd Allāh al-Farghānī (d. 362), who came to Egypt in 329 and was in his residence at Raʾṣā in 333. Al-ʿAlī, moreover visited Egypt in 330. Al-Mutanabbi, just rising to fame, recited once in his presence in Syria and addressed a verse or two to him and to his brother [Ubayd Allāh (d. 333 at Ramla)].

Muhammad b. Ṭūḥāḏyj was strong physically, but subject to occasional fits of melancholia. His character is illustrated by a number of incidents that have every appearance of being authentic. He was strict, but in no way vindictive or cruel. He often brought his officers to account, and then after punishing them by arrest or fine would restore them to favour. Hardly any executions are heard of in his reign. He would not allow torture and the "maltraitement of accused persons, so common in his time. His tact and sagacity were conspicuous. He was decent in his life and liked by his men and the people. On the other hand, he was certainly oppressive and unfair in some of his money exactions, and though at times not ungenerous was inclined to be mean and miserly in minor matters. The two great faults attributed to him, even to his face in his lifetime, parsimony and timidity, are not altogether without foundation. As to the latter, his own defence in a particular instance looks valid.

His career was closely parallel to that of Ahmad b. Ṭūṭūn [q.v.], even as regards several fortuitous
occurrences. It leaves no doubt of his capacity, and if admitting of occasional overcaution, will not allow of anything like cowardice. He did not make the same mark as his predecessor, but was a milder and perhaps a better ruler.

Bibliography: Ibn Sādāl, al-Muqarrī (ed. Ta'liqārī, Teheran, 1890) contains the text of the principal authorities, a list including subsidiary authorities, and a full bibliography in German carefully worked out from both sources. By far the most important authority is the long and detailed biography of Muhammad b. Tughdī which forms part of Ibn Sādāl's work, and appears to consist of the life composed by Ibn Zālīq between 350 and 355, reproduced almost but not quite verbatim. The other principal authority is the Kīṭāb al-Walīfah of al-Kindī, ed. Guest. Little, if anything, can be added from books published after al-Muqarrī.

(R. Guest)

MUHAMMAD II. TUGHLUQ [See Muhammad Tughrul.

MUHAMMAD II. TÜMART [See Ibn Tumbart.

MUHAMMAD II. UBAID ALLĀH [See Abu Ma'sāf al-Ma'sāf.

MUHAMMAD II. AL-WALĪD [See Ibn Aḥmad Razzāḵ.

MUHAMMAD II. YAHYA [See Ibn Bāḍurād.

MUHAMMAD II. YĀKIT [Abū Bakr, a chief of police in Baghād. In 318 (930) Muhammad, whose father was chief chamberlain to the Caliph al-Mukṭadr, was appointed chief of police. The maintenance of order in the capital at this time was much neglected and the praetorians conducted a regular reign of terror. In a fracas between infantry and cavalry Muhammad intervened on behalf of the latter; their opponents were cut down, some driven from the city and only a small contingent of negroes, who at once surrendered, remained unscathed (Muḥarr mak 318 = Feb. 930). Some months later these mutinied and demanded more pay; but they were driven out of the town by Muhammad and then routed by the chief emir Mu'nīs (q.v.) with ease. The confusion was increased by the breach between Mu'nīs and Muhammad. At the instigation of Mu'nīs, Muhammad was dismissed in Dīnār Hādī 239 (June–July 931). Mu'nīs was nevertheless not satisfied but demanded that his hated rival should be banished. The Caliph at first refused to grant his request; but when Mu'nīs threatened him with force, he had to yield, whereupon Muhammad went to Sidjīnāt (Radjāb 319 = July 931). Soon afterwards the Caliph quarrelled with Mu'nīs and recalled Muhammad. In Muḥarrak 320 (Jan. 932) the latter returned to Baghād; the Caliph then sent him with an army to al-Muḥājīl in the region of Takrit. But when Mu'nīs advanced from Mūṣil, the Caliph's troops under Muhammad and Sa'd b. ʿAḥmad retired to Baghād without striking a blow. After the victory of Mu'nīs and the murder of al-Mukṭadr in Šawwāl of the same year (Oct. 932) the latter's son ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd fled with Muhammad and his other supporters to al-Muḥājīl and then to Ṣawī, where a number of his generals abandoned him. When the forces of the new Caliph al-Kāhir approached under the command of Yalābī, ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd and Muhammad fled to Tuṣāt. Muhammad was not popular on account of his arrogance and selfishness, so that one after the other laid down his arms and finally ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd surrendered. Muhammad entered into negotiations with Yalābī and the Caliph pardoned him. He then returned to Baghād where he gained a great influence over al-Kāhir. On the accession of al-Rāšīd in Dīnār Hādī 1, 332 (April 934), Muhammad became the real ruler in a short time; the Caliph appointed him chief chamberlain and also made him his commander-in-chief while the vizier Ibn Muḳṭar played a more subordinate part. When al-Muḥājīl's cousin Hārūn b. Ṣibrāt, whom al-Kāhir had appointed governor of Māl al-Kūfah, al-Dīnār and Māṣāḥah, rebelled, Muhammad was sent with an army against him. In the resulting battle, Muhammad suffered a defeat (Dīnār Hādī II 332 = May 934); soon afterwards however, Hārūn fell from his horse and was killed by one of Muhammad's slaves. With the death of their commander the resistance of Hārūn's followers collapsed; Muhammad was nevertheless unable long to retain his position of power. On the advice of Ibn Muḳṭar who feared his ever increasing power, al-Rāšīd had him arrested along with his brother al-Muṣṭafīr and the secretary Abū ʿIṣāḥ b. Ṣarūrī on the 37th Dīnār Hādī 1, 333 (April 12, 935). Muhammad died in prison in the same year.


MUHAMMAD II. YAZID [See Ibn Muṣṭafīr, al-Muṣṭafīr.

MUHAMMAD II. YUSUF [See Ibn Aḥmad Hanīn.

MUHAMMAD 'ABD AL-KARĪM [Alawi, better known as ʿAbd al-Karim Mansūr, a Persian historian of the middle of the 13th century. His best known work is the Taʾrīkh-ī Ahmad or Ahmadīkhā bānī composed for ʿAbd al-Raṣūm b. Hādījī Muhammad Rawḥān-Khān, a history of the founder of the Durrāt dynasty in Afghanistan, Ahmad Shāh. After ʿAbd al-Karim had finished a history of Shūdjaʾ al-Mulk Durrāt and the conquest of Khurasān in 1225 (1820), he decided to write a complete history of the Durrātins and began his Taʾrīkh-ī Ahmad. The work is based on the Taʾrīkh-ī Husainī Khānī of ʿAbd al-Dīn Hūsain (Rīvī, Cat. Pers. MSS. Brit. Mus., iii. 904?) and is really only a paraphrase of it. It begins with the story of Ahmad Shāh which he continued to the year 1212. Then he follows a description of the Pandjāb and the roads between Ḍābul, Harāt, Panjāb and Kandahār and a chapter on Turkestān under Nariśka Bay. The work concludes with the accession of Shahbūz al-Mulk. In addition to this book, ʿAbd al-Karim in 1620 (1847) wrote the Muḥādjīnāt, a history of the Persian emperors with the English down to General Pollock's expedition (Sept.–Oct. 1842). It again is not original but based on the poem Abbār-nāma of Kāšīn Dīnār. According to Beale, Oriental Biographical Dictionary (London 1859, p. 5) he also wrote a history of the Sikh war entitled Taʾrīkh-ī Pandjīb Tukhsam H-i ʿAbdābī, but there is no mention of a manuscript or lithograph of any such work in any of the European catalogues. It is possible that there is some confusion with the Pandjāb section of the Taʾrīkh-ī Ahmad in the Catalogue of the Persian printed Books in the British Museum (London 1922, p. 19). E. Edwards ascribes to the author a dictionary of English and Persian synonyms.
entitled *A Dictionary of Anglo-Persian homogenous words in a... Collection of... Words having nearly the same Sound and the same Meaning*, Bombay 1859; it is however unfortunately not possible to be certain that the author of the book is the same 'Abd al-Karim Munzah.


(E. Brehier)

**MUHAMMAD 'ABDUH, a Muslim theologian, founder of the Egyptian modernist school.**

Muhammad 'Abduh belonged to an Egyptian peasant family and was born in 1849 in Lower Egypt. He spent his childhood in the little v illage of Maḥallat Nasr in the maktûbiya of Buḥairân. When Muhammad 'Abduh had learned the Kur'ânh by heart, he was sent in 1862 to the theological school of Taḥâ la but he left this after a year and a half discouraged and was only induced to resume his studies through the influence of a grand n eccle who assured him an interest in mysticism. In 1865 he returned to Taḥâ but the next year proceeded to Cairo to the Azhar mosque. There at this moment the first movements of a new spirit were becoming apparent in the beginning of a return to the classics and an awakening interest in natural science and history, which agreed with mysticism in a lower estimation of the old traditional studies. In this milieu Muhammad 'Abduh at once devoted himself entirely to mysticism, practised asceticism and retired from the world. It was again his grand uncle who persuaded him to give this up. About the same time, 1872, Muhammad 'Abduh came into contact with Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din al-Afghânî [q. v.] who had just arrived in Egypt and was destined to exercise a profound influence upon him. It was he who revealed traditional learning to Muhammad 'Abduh in a new light, called his attention to European works accessible in translations and attracted his interest finally to Egyptian and Muslim problems of the day. Muhammad 'Abduh soon became his most ardent disciple and in his very first work of a mystic nature (Risâlat al-Wâdirât, 290 = 1874) enthusiastically described Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din as his spiritual guide. The influence of Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din is still more marked on the matters of Muhammad 'Abduh's second work, notes on dogmatics entitled *Hâjîyya 'alâ Sharh al-Dawâlî" al-Adâlî al-Afghânî* [1292 = 1876]. The influence of Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din and the development of affairs in Egypt towards the end of the reign of the Khâlid Isâ'î caused Muhammad 'Abduh in 1876 to take to journalism, which he practised henceforth. After concluding his studies at the Azhar mosque and acquiring the certificate of an 'Allm (scholar), he first of all gave private tuition; in 1883 he was appointed as teacher in the Dar al-Ülím, which had been founded a few years before to modernise instruction in religious learning. In the same year, shortly after the accession of the Khâlid Tawfiq, Muhammad 'Abduh was dismissed for reasons that have not been clearly explained and sent to his native village, while Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din was banished from Egypt; but a liberal ministry very soon recalled Muhammad 'Abduh (1880) and appointed him chief editor of the official gazette *al-Wâqîya al-Mihrîya*, which not only contained official announcements but also endeavoured to influence public opinion; under Muhammad 'Abduh's control it became the mouth-piece of the liberal party. In spite of a common ultimate goal: the liberation of the Muslim peoples and a renaissance of Islam by its own strength, there was an essential difference between Muhammad 'Abduh's programme and that of Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din; the latter was a revolutionary who aimed at a complete upheaval; Muhammad 'Abduh, on the other hand, held that only gradual reform could be successful, thought that no political revolution could take the place of a gradual transformation of mentality and regarded a reform of education, especially moral and religious, as the first preliminary to progress. His interest was more to become concentrated on Islam and its position in the modern world. *'Arâbî Pâ'îb* his rebellion put an end to Muhammad 'Abduh's activity on these lines. His part in this movement has not yet been sufficiently elucidated; although it is certain that he neither shared the optimism of military circles nor approved their use of force, he put himself on the side of the nationalist opponents of absolutism and endeavoured to exert a moderating influence on its leaders. After the suppression of the rebellion he was condemned to banishment from Egypt at the end of 1882. He first went to Bairût and then to Paris where in the beginning of 1884 he met Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din. The two founded a society called *al-Urwâ al-muntâji* and published a work of the same name, which had to cease publication after eight months but exercised a very profound influence on the development of nationalism in the Muslim east. In Tunis Muhammad 'Abduh continued propaganda for the society, but he cut himself off from it and settled in Bairût at the beginning of 1885. The *Urwâ* expressed the views of Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din entirely. In Bairût he taught at a theological school and engaged in Muslim and Arabic studies. In this period he produced his translation from the Persian of the *Risâlat al-Rashîd al-ahâd-dâhîya*, the only considerable work of Sayyid Dâjjal al-Din (1302 = 1886), and two valuable philological treatises (*Sharh Nâ'âsî al-Balâqî* [1302 = 1885] and *Sharh Maḥâmil al-Fâîf* al-šâdâmi *al-Hamâbâdî* [1306 = 1889]). When in 1889 he was allowed to return, he at once went to Cairo. His wish to resume teaching again was not at once granted; instead he entered the judiciary and was immediately appointed a judge on the Tribunals Indigènes, two years later Conseiller at the Cour d'Appel; in 1899 he attained the highest clerical post in Egypt, that of state mufti, an office he held till his death. One result of his work at the courts was the publication of his verdicts in *Tasâfi' i'tibâr al-Mu'âlâhâ Barhîya* (1318 = 1900) which gave the stimulus to important reforms in the admini-
station of the *shari'a*, and the foundation of the College for *Kulla* goes back primarily to his efforts. In the same year, 1899, he became a member of the Consell Légalatif, which marked the first stage in the representation of the Egyptian people. Finally he was allowed to resume his interest in education; in 1894 he became a member of the governing body of the Ashtar, which had been constituted at his suggestion, and in this capacity not only acquired great renown by his reforms in the university but himself took an active part in the teaching. In addition to this many-sided activity in the fifteen years after his return he found time to publish a number of works, including his most important: the *Risalat al-Tawhid* (1315 = 1897), his principal theological work based on his lectures in Bairut; the publication of a work on logic (*Sharh Kitab al-Baq'ir al-Naqiriyah, Tafsil al-Kaifi Zain al-Din* (1316 = 1898)); a defence of Islam against Christianity in the field of knowledge and civilization entitled *al-Islam wa *'An-Na'ir, mu' a 'l-Iltim wa 'l-Madaniya* (1320 = 1903; first published in *al-Ma'mur*). Muhammad ʿAbduh was not able to finish his commentary on the Kurʾān, on which he laid such importance and of which he had published portions in *al-Ma'mur*; it was revised by his disciple and friend Shaikh Muhammad Rashid Ridā and published first of all in *al-Ma'mur*. Of Muhammad ʿAbduh's numerous articles by which, along with his lectures, he most influenced public opinion, two (of 1900) were published in a French translation entitled *L'Europe et l'Islam* by Muhammad Ta'lat Harb Bey (1905). The advanced ideas put forward by Muhammad ʿAbduh provoked the most vigorous hostility in orthodox and conservative circles which manifested itself not only in serious refutations but also in attacks on and intrigues against him, as we see from a whole literature of lampoons. But his teaching met with remarkable support among all seriously minded Muslims. The principal organ of his views was the monthly *al-Ma'mur*, which had appeared since 1897 under the editorship of Sheikh Muhammad Rashid Ridā, who has also produced an extensive literary and political commitment to his master (but his views and the tendencies of his periodical must not be identified offhand with those of Muhammad ʿAbduh). Muhammad ʿAbduh died in 1905; but his teaching has retained its influence steadily to the present day.

Muhammad ʿAbduh's programme according to his own statement was: 1. the reform of the Muslim religion by bringing it back to its original condition, 2. the renovation of the Arabic language, 3. the recognition of the rights of the people in relation to the government. His political activity was dominated by the idea of patriotism, which was the first to champion enthusiasm in a religiously in Egypt. As an opponent equally of the political control by Europe and of Oriental despotism in Muslim lands he favoured an inner assimilation of western civilization, without abandoning the fundamental Muslim ideas and a synthesis of the two factors. From this programme, which assures Muhammad ʿAbduh an important place among the founders of modern Egypt, must be distinguished his effort to carry it through in the field of theology. Muhammad ʿAbduh is in the first place a theologian; his life was devoted to the attempt to establish and maintain Islam, at least as a religion, against the onslaught of the west, while he abandoned without a struggle those aspects of Muslim-Oriental life in which religion was of less moment. However great a stimulus he may have received from progressive western thought, the actual foundations of his teaching came primarily from the school of Ibn Taimiya and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ghanī al-Danjawiya, who favoured reform on conservative lines, and from al-Ghazālī's ethical conception of religion. Deeply convinced of the superiority of true Islam, unaffected by the vicissitudes of time, Muhammad ʿAbduh wished to get rid of the abuses which falsified the Muslim religion and made it out of keeping with the times, and to adapt Islam to every real advance by going back to its true principles. Muhammad ʿAbduh was thus brought to attack the *maṣbūḥah* and *istiʿṣāl* [q. v.], to demand freedom for *idīlīn* [q. v.] and a new *idīlīn* [q. v.]. In keeping with modern conditions, based on the Kurʾān and the true sunna, for the establishment of which he laid down strict criteria; he was also brought to reject the hairsplitting of the *fuḥūd* and the worship of saints and all *bidʿa*, and to the endeavour to create a more ethical and deeper religion instead of a mechanical formalism. The antiquated system of Fiqh, against which Muhammad ʿAbduh claimed full freedom, was to be replaced by new laws capable of development, in which consideration for the common good (*maslahah*) and the times should, in keeping with the true spirit of Islam, have if necessary preference to the literal text (*masāʾil*) of revelation, just as in any conflict between reason and tradition in settling what is laid down by religion, the verdict of reason should be followed. Alongside of the belief in the sublimity of revelation there was in Muhammad ʿAbduh the conviction that knowledge and religion, properly understood, could not come into conflict at all, so that reason need not recognise a logical impossibility as a religious truth; religion was given to man as a thread to guide him against the aberrations of reason; reason must therefore, after it has tested the proofs of the truth of religion, which it is qualified to do, accept its dogmas; Muhammad ʿAbduh's object was a cooperation between religion and science. In dogmatics he adopts essentially the most rational conception that could still be reconciled with orthodoxy. At the same time he interiorises the conception of revelation (to him it is intuitive knowledge caused by God and provided with the consciousness of this origin), but his kind of religious experience is limited to the prophets and deficts that of religion (to him it is an intuitive feeling for the paths to happiness in this and the next world, which cannot be clearly grasped by the reason). The task of prophecy for him is the moral education of the masses. Religious teaching and commandments are therefore intended for the masses and not for the elite. Muhammad ʿAbduh regards the Kurʾān as created and endeavours to weaken the rigidly opposed point of view of orthodoxy. The saints he does take into his system but is sceptical regarding belief in miracles. In spite of the denial of causality and laws of nature by orthodoxy, he finds a basis for explaining nature by causal laws but by quite scholastically formal reasoning. As regards the duties of religion, Muhammad ʿAbduh adheres to the four main duties of ritual prayer, the almsgiving, fasting and pilgrimage; only he shifts them, as usual in mysticism, from the sphere of worship to that of religion and morals. On the old question of free will Muhammad ʿAbduh
decides for indeterminism; he thereby opens the way to build up a moral system for society, which, excluding all fatalism, preaches vigorous activity by every one and, following the ethics of the mystics, mutual support. His view of the substance of Muslim teaching Muhammad 'Abduh defends not only against traditional orthodoxy but against Christianity also by a kind of philosophy of history of religion; the sending of prophets was a gradual process of education of step by step, the last and highest stage, that of absolute religion, is the sending of Muhammad; if the Muslim peoples of the present do not correspond to the Muslim ideal, this is only the result of the fact that they have lost the old purity of the teaching; an improvement is possible by return to it. This primitive Islam of Muhammad 'Abduh is however not the historical Islam but a very much idealized one. The superiority of Islam over Christianity in substance lies, according to Muhammad 'Abduh, in its rationalism and its closeness to reality and its avoidance of unattainable ideals of life.

In this theology, the religious content consists of humility before God, reverence for the Prophet, enthusiasm for the Qur'an. The basis of this Islam is the recognition of a not too regressive system of dogmatics; its object is the observance of an ethical system which is favourable to progress, and both are influenced by a strongly marked rationalism, which is genuine old Muslim but for Muhammad 'Abduh is no indifferent inheritance but the main weapon of defence of Islam and actually takes the place of a deepening of religion so that his theology has the character of a polemical compromise.


MUHAMMAD AHMAD b. `ABD ALLAH, the Mahdi of the Sūdān, was born about 1258 (1835) on the island of Darār in Dongola among the Argil islands north of el-Orfe. A member of the Kunii family of the Nubian Arab Berbers, in later life when Mahdi to prove his kinship and mystical relationship with 'Ali and the Prophet, he traced his genealogy on his father's side to Hasan and on the mother's side to Hassan and 'Abbas. He was the second son of a shop's carpenter and had an older sister and three brothers. His tendencies early revealed themselves in him; after the usual early education he therefore in 1277 (1861) entered the order of the Sammātāya with Shaikh Muhammad Sharif; after a seven years' noviciate Muhammad Sharif appointed him a shalih of the order. After a short stay in Kharṭūm where he married, he went to the island of 'Abba (in the White Nile, north of Kosti), built a šāhāt there and a šābūna and collected pupils around him.

His master Muhammad Sharif, with whom he maintained a constant connection, settled near him in 1288 (1872), which seems to have been unwelcome to Muhammad. Shortly after this event there arose in Khorfato al-munṣafar, under the influence of the traditional ideas of the Mahdi, which brought about a breach between him and his master. He now joined the enemy of his former leader, the Shaikh al-Kurāshī, and in 1297 (1880) became his successor. In his wanderings (ṣiyāḥa) from Dongola to Sennar, from the Blue Nile to Kordofān, he convinced himself of the discontent of the people, who were oppressed by the Egyptian government; the turbulent, mixed population of the Sudan, the religious fanaticism, the dissension between Turks and Arabs, the old opposition of the Shi'a to the Turkish ruling official classes, all formed a fruitful soil for his claims to be the Mahdi; the movement begun by Muhammad Ahmad which, as its letters and proclamations show, was based on a religious experience in which he earnestly believed, came from the first mixed up with political and social ideas, in which the east cannot be separated from religion, and in which finally deception and cunning played an evil part. According to the traditional formula, Muhammad Ahmad felt himself called "to purify the world from wantonness and corruption." For this purpose he summoned the people to fight in the first place against "the infidel Turks". He had previously bound a number of chiefs in Kordofān and Darfur to him by his oath of fealty, after the model of the Prophet; for the text see Dietrich, in Islam 1925, p. 39. He had been cleverly able to attach men of action like the unscrupulous `Abd Allāh al-Tayyib, later his Khalīfa, to him; at the same time he practised a shameless nepotism. He further incited the people by numerous pamphlets and edicts, which contained his visions of the Prophet, who had appointed him Mahdi, of al-Khidjr, Gabriel, the angel, summons to "purify religion", to "emigrate", to "show fealty, to imitate the Mahdi, to the ḍālīn," etc. The hill of Gadd in Dar Nūba became the centre of this secret propaganda; in Shabān 1298 (July 1881) he made his first public appearance as Mahdi. Negotiations begun by the government in Kharṭūm with Muhammad Ahmad proved fruitless. Two companies sent against him under `Abu ʿIlā-Ṣaʿādī were destroyed; this secured further victories for him. The Egyptian government was moreover prevented by the rebellion of `Arabī Pāshā from taking vigorous action. The expeditions of the governors of Fashoda, Rashīd Pāshā, Yūsuf Pāshā al-Makhlīfī (at Gadh, May 1882) and of Hicks Pāshā (at Shākām or Khargollī), all ended unsuccessfully. The Mahdīya thus spread unhindered from Kordofān via Bahīr al-Gawshī to the eastern Sūdān; there in Sawākin, `Othmān Dījna, a former slave dealer, soon to be the ablest Mahdīist general, entered Muhammad Ahmad's service. Attempts by the Mahdi to extend his power to the west with this object to conclude alliances with Muhammad al-Sanṣūfī in Djaghībat and with Morocco came to nothing. At the height of his power the campaign of 1301 (1884) took him to Kharṭūm, which after a heroic defence by Gordon fell into the Mahdi's hands on Jan. 30, 1885. Gordon was killed. Muhammad Ahmad did not however long survive his victory; he died, probably of typhus, on 9th Ramadān 1302 (June 22, 1885) at Omdurman near Kharṭūm.
where a kahfa was erected by him to his successor, the Khalifa 'Abd Allâh; it was henceforth the Mahdi's capital until Kitchener put an end to 'Abd Allâh's rule and to the Mahdiya in 1898. The organization of the Mahdiya under Muhammad Ahmad, which was primarily to follow the laws of the Prophet, was early developed; it was quite military in character, for the 'ishâh was considered more important than the khalifâ. He had four khilafas beside himself, of whom al-Tâ'îyish was the most intimate and undoubtedly had the most pernicious influence on him. Particular attention was devoted to the distribution of booty and to the administration of the treasury (hai al-mâl).

Muhammad Ahmad's teaching shows some of the features of the extreme popular Sufism and some of those of an idealized primitive Islam. His asceticism was hostile to progress; the contempt for learning in the Mahdiya and the order to burn all books on uma and tafsîr alienated the educated classes from him. The only things that had validity in addition to the Kur'an were the proclamations of the Mahdi, the Rûhî (a collection of ghûlî expressions), a work attributed to Maintained Muhammad Ahmad's own uma as a substitute for the previous one but remained incomplete. In the abolition of the four mahdhabs we see the 'ishâh tendencies frequent among the Sufis. Washâbî influences are very probable in a number of regulations, for example in the prohibition of adornment, music, extravagance at weddings, tabacco and wine; particularly however in the zeal against the worship of saints and sorcery; as a matter of fact Muhammad Ahmad himself became an object of worship among his followers even before his death.

The only really new thing in Muhammad Ahmad is the addition to the shâhidah: "...wa-uma Muhammâdun Ahmad'un 'abd 'l-'llah khaib Mahdiya-li takhassus wa-khishâfa râ'î, wrkâ. Where the traditions of the Mahdi did not suit him, he did not hesitate to alter them. He laid down the following 6 asbûn instead of the 6 of the su: 1. qadîr, on the courage; 2. sifâ, performance of the work; 3. kâtâb, stress was laid on the sîrat, in express opposition to the sîrât practice and in place of the kâfî; 4. obedience to God's commandments; 5. the extended shâhidah; 6. recitation of the Kur'an and of the Rûhî.

A few extremist ideas, like that of equality between rich and poor, come partly from the revolutionary character of the old Sîfâ, partly from the political and social conditions of the time; the social ideas were however not his central ones but only incidentally used cunningly to attract the masses. In practice the Mahdiya had an exceedingly unitifying and equalizing effect: slaves and slave-dealers fought under one banner, the humblest often rose in a short time to the highest offices.

Muhammad Ahmad's eschatology centres round the world domination of the Mahdi. The conquest of the Sudân was to be followed by that of Egypt, Macedonia, Syria and Constantinople. The formation of a Pan-Islamic movement. Muhammad Ahmad's personality began very early, sometimes deliberately encouraged by him and his immediate followers and sometimes actually believed by them. Under pressure from his court chronicler Isâmî 'Abd al-Kâdir, composed a highly coloured sîra entitled Kitâb al-Mustahkâm ila Sîrat al-Imâm al-Mahdi. It covered the years 1298 to 1302 A.H. but was burned in the time of the Khalifa 'Abd Allâh. The Egyptian writer Shukriy (see below) claims to have had in his hands a copy that was said to have survived.

Bibliography: Na'im Shukriy Bey, Turji't al-Sûdân, Cairo 1903 (in the third part Shukriy, utilising the edicts of Muhammad Ahmad and the Khalifa 'Abd Allâh, which were collected and printed under the Khalifs, as also the above-mentioned Sira and his own experiences in the Anglo-Egyptian army, gives a very full account of the Mahdiya under Muhammad Ahmad and 'Abd Allâh); Djurdji Zaidân, Rûhîyat xristî al-Mahdi, Cairo 1892.—On two fatâwâ of the Egyptian government against the Mahdiya s. Dietrich, in Ibl., 1925, p. 53.—F. R. Win- gate, Mahdism in the Egyptian Sudan, London 1891; do., The Rise and Wane of the Mahdi Religion, London 1893; Jos. Othowerl, Aufsamm n. Rîch des Mahdi, Innsbruck 1892; Shukriy Pasha, in the article Sudan in the Encyclopaedia Britannica 1896; Hasenclauer, Geschichte Egyptons im 19. Jahrhundert, Halle 1917; Ernst L. Dietrich, Der Mahdi Mohammed Ahmad nach arabischem Quellen, in Ibl., 1925, p. 1—90 (with further literature); J. Darmesteter, Thā Mahdi, London 1885.

MUHAMMAD 'ALI PASHA (in European sources often Mehemet Ali or Mehemet Ali) was the well-known powerful viceroy of Egypt during the years 1805—1849 (which period comprises the entire reign of Sulân Mahmed II q.v.); and the founder of the khedivial, later royal dynasty of Egypt. Seen in the light of history his life-work fully entitles him to the epithet of "the Founder of Modern Egypt".

Muhammad 'Ali was born in 1769, possibly of Albanian extraction, in the town of Kàwâla [q.v.] in Macedonia; he was engaged in the tobacco trade until he joined, as his hâshi in a corps of Albanian troops, the Turkish army that landed in Egypt in 1799 and was beaten by Bonaparte at Abî Kir (July 25). In 1800 he was one of the two chiefs of the Albanian troops in Turkish service who were left behind in Egypt; this secured him an influential military position when, after the final departure of the French in 1801, Turkey began to try to recover her authority over Egypt. At the end of 1801 he fought as a general against the Mamlûks, but in the troubled years that followed he was alternatively on the side of the Mamlûk Beys (headed by al-Bardisol) and of the Turkish governors sent from Constantinople. He intrigued against Khassaw Pasha [q.v.] whom he had to leave Egypt in May 1803, and who was already in the same year appointed titular governor of Dîdûs. Under the following governorship of Káshîf Pasha, Muhammad 'Ali succeeded in winning the favour of the inhabitants of Cairo and their spiritual leaders, and used them with success in his intrigues against Kâshîf, whose Turkish troops — composed of delis — were a scourge to the population, while his own Albanians were ordered to behave well. The result was that Kâshîf had to withdraw in August 1803, leaving the citadel of Cairo to Muhammad 'Ali. The Turkish government, though sending several emis- saries and trying to remove the Albanian troops, failed to keep Egyptian affairs under control and ended by recognizing Muhammad 'Ali's self-assumed
position (November 2, 1805); he was solemnly
installed in April 1806.

The internal and external difficulties of the
Sultamic Porte did not allow her to interfere any
further for the moment and the new governor had
soon occasion to show himself a loyal vassal
when the English — then at war with Turkey
[cf. SELIM III] — landed in Alexandria in March
1807. At that time Muhammad 'Ali had already
undertaken the struggle against the Mamluk Beys
al-Bardusi and al-Alfi, the latter of whom was
strongly supported by the English. He came back
hastily from Upper Egypt, fortified Cairo, and
claimed a victory over the English army at Rashid
(Razezat) in April. Soon after the departure of the
British fleet in September the viceroy began the
execution of his far-reaching administrative and
economic measures, which were to restore Egypt's
economic strength and consequently to assure for
himself a more powerful position than any Turkish
governor had had for the last two centuries [cf.
MAMLUKS]. In the meantime the Beys (whose two
leaders had died in 1807) continued their
position (no doubt increased by the viceroy's land
policy), which was finally broken by the massacre
of about 300 Mamluks in the citadel of Cairo on
March 1, 1811, on the occasion of a festival. "The
persecution of the Mamluks was at the same time
to extended to the other parts of the country. Mu-
hammad 'Ali now could send, without danger to
his own position, his Albanian troops in the cam-
paign against the Wahhâbi in Arabia, to comply
with a request of the Porte. The Wahhâbi war
began in September 1811 and was conducted,
until 1816, by Muhammad 'Ali's son Œsoum; after
the latter's death the command was taken over by
his elder brother Ibrahim Pasha [q.v.]. Muhammad
'Ali himself took part in an expedition to Yemen,
but had to return before the end of the war, be-
cause his position as governor seemed to be in
danger.

The military successes of the Egyptian troops
against the Wahhâbi power immensely increased
Muhammad 'Ali's authority all over Arabia and in
a larger sense in the entire Near East; European
policy began to look for the first time on Egypt
as a factor of political importance. This import-
ance was further increased by the expeditions to
the south that followed immediately on the Arabian
campaign; Egyptian power was established for
the first time in the Sudan [q.v.], where Muhammad
'Ali's third son Isma'il found his death in 1822,
the year in which the town of Kharjim [q.v.]
was founded. At this time Egyptian power was
also extended in the direction of the Red Sea,
which made an end to the hitherto continuous
plague of the incursions of nomadic Arabs into the
Nile valley; the ports of Sawâkin and Massawa
(Maşwâ) came under the Egyptian sphere of
influence, although the direct authority of the Porte
was maintained.

A new phase in the development of Muhammad
'Ali's power began by his participation in the
military repression of the Greek revolt by the Turks.
Only through Egyptian aid was the submission of
the whole of Greece with the exception of Nafplio
obtained; first by the conquest of Crete by Ibrahim
Pasha (1823) and then by the Egyptian army that
landed in 1825 in Mossa. When in 1827 England,
Russia and France intervened in the Greek question,
the combined Turkish-Egyptian fleet was destroyed
in the bay of Navarino (October 20, 1827); in the
following year the Egyptian troops evacuated the
peninsula, after a convention had been concluded
between Muhammad 'Ali and the British admiral
Codrington (August 6, 1828). Crete remained under
Egyptian administration until 1844.

Muhammad 'Ali's power was now such that he
could conclude international agreements without
the sultân's cognizance; at the same time the two
Mediterranean naval powers, France and England,
were endeavouring to win him over as an independent
political factor. In 1829 France had almost induced
Muhammad 'Ali to undertake the conquest of the
Barbaresque states of Algiers and Tunis; the viceroy,
however, was more inclined to seek territorial ex-
pansion in the east, the more so as the four
governorships of Syria had been promised him
by the Porte as reward for his participation in the
Greek war, a promise that had never been
fulfilled. At the end of 1831 there arose difficulties
between Muhammad 'Ali and the Porte on account
of the governorship of Akkâ, which he claimed
for himself. The conflict soon brought about the
abandoning of an Egyptian army under Ibrahim Pasha
in Syria. On May 27, 1832 Akkâ was taken.
In the following month the army that was sent
by the sultân was repeatedly defeated and finally
beaten near Könya (December 21, 1832). The
Egyptian army, continuing in the direction of
Constantinople, reached Kutsahla. Here at last an
armistice was concluded between the Porte and
Ibrahim as representative of his father, thanks
to the intervention of the European powers,
who Russia had already sent military aid to
Constantinople. Muhammad 'Ali was granted the
appointment of governorship of Syria and Adana by the definite
peace of April 6, 1833.

During the following six years the viceroy's power
was at its height. While Ibrahim administered
Syria, severely but on the whole to the prosperity
of the country, Muhammad 'Ali continued his
administrative programme in Egypt and inaugurated
a pan-Arabian policy, the aim of which was to be
the union of all Arab-speaking peoples under
his leadership. In Arabia his influence was still
considerable since the Wahhâbi war; he now
tried to extend Egyptian influence as far as the
'îrak. This policy, while at the same time constituting
a threat to the ambitions of the European powers
in the Near East, was to bring him again into
conflict with the sultân, who, having succeeded
at last in subduing too independent vassals in other
parts of his empire, was waiting for an opportunity
to crush his most powerful vassal in Egypt. The
latter, in 1838, had even made known his intention
of declaring himself independent of the Turkish
government.

Not long after the outbreak of hostilities the
Turkish army under Hafiz Pasha was completely
defeated at Naşib in North Syria (June 24, 1839),
while the Turkish fleet under the Kapudan Pasha
Ahmad sailed to Alexandria and went over to
Muhammad 'Ali's side. In this desperate situation
the authority of the Porte was saved by the inter-
vention of the five European powers, in defence
of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The
Egyptian question had thus produced an interna-
tional political crisis, which was aggravated by
the opposition of France, which had long been
best intentioned towards Muhammad 'Ali among
the European governments. By the convention of
London (July 5, 1840) England, Russia, Austria and Prussia agreed with the Porte upon the terms to be imposed upon Muhammad 'Ali. When the latter did not accept, there followed military demonstrations against the coastal towns in Syria (Akkâ taken on November 4, 1840). Soon afterwards a British fleet appeared in Alexandria, where Admiral Napier on November 27 concluded an agreement with Muhammad 'Ali. The viceroy consented to the return of the Turkish fleet and renounced his governorship of Syria, Adana and Cetie, while on the other hand he was to keep the hereditary governorship of Egypt as a part of the Turkish Empire. These terms were confirmed by an imperial firman of February 13, 1841, completed by another of May 25, in which the mutual relations of sultan and viceroy were definitely regulated. The chief points were the right of succession according to seniority in Muhammad 'Ali's family, the payment of a tribute and the permission to maintain an Egyptian army of 18,000 men, the higher officers of which were to be appointed by the sultan.

Muhammad 'Ali's last years were passed in peace. In 1846 he visited Constantinople and Konstânia; in 1848 he lost his son 'Abdâl 'Ali to whom his military successes were due. On August 2, 1849 he himself died in Alexandria, to be succeeded by 'Ammâr's son 'Abdâl Pasha [q.v.]. He was buried in the new mosque which he had had erected in the citadel of Cairo.

Still more amusing than the career of this once obscure Turkish officer are the enormous changes brought about by his work in the condition and the international position of Egypt; they have made him a hero in the history of the Near East. His reign is an era by itself in Egyptian history. Muhammad 'Ali's latest biographer says: "He began by seeking only to raise money. He ended by seeking, however mistakenly, to develop and civilise the country" (Dodwell, p. 220). His work indeed did not at all mean a break with the government traditions prevailing in the Turkish Empire, but the political aim that Muhammad 'Ali had set himself, seconded by his personality and the continuous supervision of his Kerrâle individually, led him last to result where, had similar conditions, would otherwise have been difficult to attain, as is shown by the state of things prevailing at the same time in other provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

As the measures taken by Muhammad 'Ali in the field of administration, land policy and the industrial and commercial mobilisation of the country have been briefly sketched in the art. KHELÎW, it is unnecessary to enter here into the same details. It is sufficient to point to the fact that all these measures had as their first object to make the paisha himself the sole proprietor and administrator of the riches of Egypt. He certainly listened to the advice of European and other councillors and valued European institutions as examples to follow to a certain extent. But he followed oriental methods and made as good a use of Europeans as officials in the home administration.

This was not the case in Muhammad 'Ali's newly-created army. The paisha himself had not been entirely able to keep his mercenary troops under control (mutiny in Cairo in 1816). So he decided to form a new army, moved by the same motives that had led Sultan Selim III to create new regular troops (müfti-i ğredî). From 1819 this enterprise was confirmed and brought to a successful end by the French captain Sève, who, after having embraced Islam, served Muhammad 'Ali as Sulaimân Paşa. A first attempt to use negro slaves from the Sûlûmân-as soldiers having failed, the failliîs of Egypt itself were recruited; the officers were mainly taken from among the young Mamluks, besides whom there were not a few Europeans. With this army were won the military successes in Morea and Syria. The recruitment met with exceedingly strong opposition among the people of Egypt and later in Syria, and the methods used to get the required number were sometimes cruel, but the paisha's energy prevailed. At length this military organisation proved to be a means of education for the people and prepared the growth of national feeling among the generations to come. As has been said already, the final Imperial firman of 1841 limited the Egyptian army to 18,000 men in time of peace.

Muhammad 'Ali's attempts to create an Egyptian fleet go back as far as 1815. At first he had ships built in France and Italy and in Bombay, but soon Alexandria itself got its yards. After the destruction of the Egyptian fleet at Navarino ship-building began again and quite a number of French and Italian officers were employed in the Egyptian navy after 1831. The Egyptian fleet, however, did not long survive its founder.

On the whole, Muhammad 'Ali's rule wore a Turkish character. Most of the responsible posts in the administration and in the army were held by Turks and by descendants of the Mamluks. Thus the Ottoman ruling system, with some modifications applied after the European model, was imposed on Egypt most completely at the time when the country itself was politically loosened from the empire. It may be called an exception that the Armenian Boghos Bey, who was for a long time Muhammad 'Ali's minister of finance and of foreign affairs, came to this exalted position, although the use of Christians (Armenians and Copts) in more subordinate offices had always been government practice in Turkey as well as in Egypt. The viceroy himself is said never to have spoken well any language other than Turkish.

Muhammad 'Ali was not a great builder of magnificent architectural monuments. He erected a mosque after the Turkish fashion in the citadel of Cairo, but he never built costly palaces for himself. Most of his works were of public utility, such as the improvement and the enlargement of the irrigation system in the Delta, including the Nile Barrage below Cairo. This last work was undertaken in 1847, but failed.

The judgments on Muhammad 'Ali's personality were very divergent even during his life-time. Most of his admirers were found amongst the French; in view of the on the whole friendly attitude of the French government this is of course not strange. British opinion was less favourable, but all those who came into contact with the viceroy were impressed by his personal charm. Now that his era belongs to the past, the impression remains of a great man in many respects, possessed of considerable personal courage and trustworthy and loyal in a high degree. His methods were sometimes cruel and in the begin-
ning of his career he often had recourse to
ingenious, but in the circumstances it is hard to
understand how it could have been otherwise. As
years passed by and the prosperity of the country
increased, his methods of government grew more
lenient, so that, at the end of his reign, he had
become decidedly popular with his subjects. An
equestrian statue of Muhammad 'Ali now com-
mands the chief square of Alexandria; and one
of the largest thoroughfares in Cairo is called
after him.
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MUHAMMAD 'ALI B. MUZAFFAR AL-DIN.

[See KALURJ.]

MUHAMMAD BAIRAM (MUHAMMAD B. MU-
STAFâ B. MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. MU-
HASSÎN B. ABDÂD B. MUHAMMAD B. MU-
HASSÎN B. BAIKAM), a Tunisian patriot and
man of letters, born in Tunis in Muharram 1256
(March 5—April 3, 1840) and died on Wednesday,
25th Rabi' II, 1307 (Dec. 18, 1849) in Egypt, at
Hulwân, and was buried in Cairo near the tomb of
the Imam al-Shafi'i.

Belonging to the family of the Bairams whose
Muhammad Baimam, at the head of a body of soldiers, took part in the capture of Tunis by Sinan Pâshâ on 25th Djamâdi 981 (Sept. 24, 1753) and of which several members had held the office of grand mufti of Tunis, Muhammad Baimam studied at the Djami' al-Zâliûna and had as teachers al-Tahir b. Sâîdî, al-Şâhâbî b. Sâîdî, Aymân Baimam, Mustafâ Baimam, the Shâhî b. İsmâîl Muhammad Baimam, Mu'âwîya and others. At the age of 17, he compiled a manuscript in which he recorded the ordinances, decrees and administrative regulations which the emir Muhammad Pâshâ ordered the authorities to enforce.

On the death of his paternal uncle Baimam IV, he was given charge of the Madrasat al-Imanîyya on 1st Djamâdi 1, 1378 (Nov. 10, 1861) and on the 9th of the following month (Dec. 13) of that of the Djami' al-Zâliûna. Soon after this, troubles provoked by the despotic régime began to disturb Tunisia and resulted in the closing of the representative assemblies in which Baimam was interested. He published in the Ni'âdî, the official gazette, the two first political articles that ever appeared in Tunisia and in them he condemned the tyranny of the authorities, preached the love of liberty and begged the government to be liberal and to grant its subjects representative assemblies.

On Safar 17, 1291 (April 6, 1874) he was appointed to administer the empty which he hastened to reorganise. The hard work ruined his health and forced him to take a journey in Europe to recuperate; this caused him to begin his Safwat al-Fikih. He left on Shawwâl 1292 (Oct. 31–Nov. 28, 1875) and visited Paris. In the same year the Sâidi College was founded; Baimam shared in the preparation of the regulations and programme of studies, modelled on those of European institutions, and was one of the first to enrol his son so as to encourage his compatriots to take advantage of such innovations.

On 1st Djamâdi II, 1292 (May 7, 1875) he was put in charge of the government printing works which he at once reorganised, and securing eminent assistants: Muhammad al-Sâhih Tailor, Hüsnû Fath Allîh of Cairo, a prodigy of the Ni'âdî regularly. It was at this time also that he reorganised the Maktubat al-Sâhihîya alongside of the Djami' al-Zâliûna.

In 1293 (1895) he assisted Turkey in the war with Bulgaria and Montenegro by sending money, horses and camels, political considerations preventing the dispatch of help in men.

In the summer of 1295 (1898) he went a second time to Paris, visited the Exhibition and was received with great consideration by President MacMahon. He took the opportunity to visit London and England and, on his way back, Algiers. He took a very prominent part in the reorganisation of the Savîcî Hospital which was opened on Safar 18, 1296 (Feb. 1879). At the same time he was one of the two arbitrators appointed by the Tunisian government in the case of Hâshîr Safiyyîth Tâshîth and the French government. In the middle of the same year, he was appointed by the vicier to go to Paris, to receive medical attention, but was paid, but in reality to ask Gambetta to remove the French consul, who was interfering in the domestic affairs of the country and even managing them. The consul thwarted the plans of Baimam and the vizier. On his return he told the vizier that France intended to annex Tunisia. Tired of the vexations preexisting of the vicier Mustafâ b. İsmâîl he obtained, after many attempts, permission to make the pilgrimage to Mecca and left Tunis, never to return. On Shawwâl 16, 1297 (Oct. 4, 1879) he went via Malta, Alexandria and Cairo, where he was received by the Khedive Tewfîk Pâshâ, and thence to the Hijaz, visiting Mecca and Medina. Then he went to the Vambû and the Suez Canal to Bairût, where he was much honoured by the people and by Midhat Pâshâ, the governor of Syria, and on to Constantinople. He wrote a Bâdîa in honour of Sultan 'Abd al-Ḥamîd. The Tunisian government at the instigation of the French consul, who feared the establishment of closer relations between Turkey and Tunisia, demanded his return but the Sublime Porte diplomatically did not receive the request.

It was in Constantinople that he began to prepare the Safwat for publication and finished the first two volumes. The penetration of France into Tunisia was a rude shock to Baimam, who in collaboration with the former vizier of Tunisia, Khârî al-Dîmî, was appointed by the Sublime Porte to prepare a report on the situation created by the Franciscan. Disparing of returning to his native town he went to Leghorn and was joined by his family; he then went to Geneva, where he left his son to finish his education, and to Vienna and Bucharest and then settled in Constantinople. The Sultan, wishing to send some horses as a present to the Emperor Frederick III of Germany, Baimam was appointed to write the letter conveying the gift. During the eighteen months which he spent in the Turkish capital, Baimam drew a pension of £ 25 per month. It was during this stay that he prepared the third volume of the Safwat.

His health being undermined by an illness which grew worse daily and being unable to meet his expenses and fearing the machinations of his detractors, who saw in him a man to be removed, he left Constantinople on 1st Muharram 1302 (Oct. 21, 1884) to go to Egypt, where his letters of recommendation secured him the esteem of the Khedive Tewfîk Pâshâ, who gave him a pension.

On the 25th Rabî' of the same year (Jan. 13, 1885) he produced al-'Um, a political and scientific journal.

Two years later, he went to London to attend the Jubilee celebrations of Queen Victoria, had medical attention in Paris and returned to Egypt via Berlin and Vienna. He then completed a work which he had begun in Constantinople entitled Tadżdîr al-Sâniyya, which was published on March 29, 1885, on Islamisme et la Science (Paris 1853), in which he alleged that religion was an obstacle to the diffusion of science among Muslims. He also published a Qaidâ in which he declared that it was permitted to purchase bonds or shares in a Muslim government loan so that Muslim money should not leave the country, and that this had no character of usury. He wrote a report on the compulsory use of the Arabic language in the teaching even of modern sciences. He finished the fourth volume of the Safwat and had begun the fifth which death prevented him from finishing.

On 12th Djamâdi 1, 1306 (Jan. 14, 1889) Baimam was appointed a judge in the Tribunal de 1re Instance in Cairo. Going to Huwilân for a change of air, he took pleurisy and died after 25 days' illness.
He had a vast knowledge of Hadith, law, history, ancient and modern, and historical and political geography. In addition to the works already mentioned and numerous risālas which it would take too long to enumerate, we may mention the following: 1. Ṭabḥat al-Khamīsī fi Hillād Ḫalīfah al-Rāshīd, printed at Cairo in 1303 in which he claims that the law regards as permitted the flesh of game killed with fire-arms; 2. a treatise on prosody; 3. a risāla in which he says that it is permissible for men to let their hair hang down and float in the air, contrary to the opinion of several ḥanafis; 4. al-Taḏkhir fi Maḥṣul al-Raḥīaq, a study in which he shows what slavery among Muslims is according to the law, points out the motives of slavery and the rules regulating it, and concludes by saying that slaves who are sold on the present day are free men and that Muslim governments which forbid the sale of slaves are acting in accordance with the law; 5. Ṣafwat al-Fihār al-Mustawadā’ al-ʿAmīrī, published in 6 vols. in Cairo in 1302—1303, 1303, 1304, 1311, the sixth volume being devoted to the biography of Muḥammad Bārīm and edited by his son of the same name; it is perhaps the best treatise yet written in Arabic on political geography.

**Bibliography:** The biography written by his son and published at the end of the Ṣafwat; E. Van Dyck, ʿIstīqa’ al-Kawāthīr, Cairo 1906, p. 414; G. Zaidān, Turāth Abū al-Luḥqāt al-ʿArābiyya, Cairo 1911—1914, iv. 289.

(MOH. BENICHÉE)

**MUḤAMMAD BĀRĪM,** son of Shaikh Ghułam Muḥammad, born in 1347 (1647), was first taught by his father and then by Shaikh ʿAbd Allāh, called Mīyān Ḥanṣar, and Shaikh ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī. After a few years he himself began teaching in his native country. He first became a muhaddith or disciple of his father, and after the latter's death attached himself to the famous saint, Muḥammad Muḥāsin Sarhīmī. He was pursued by ʿAbū ʿAṣhim Khāṣf, Muḥāsin Sarhīmī, to come to the court of Āwānghaš and accepted the duties of Bakhshaṭ (pay master) and Wāliʿahānine (writer of the official diary), but by special favour he enjoyed much leisure, which he devoted to literary work. He died in 1694 (1683) at Sahāraūpī. He is the author of 1. Miḥāl al-Ḥādīth al-Muṣālim (a general history compiled under Āwānghaš); 2. Rīwāyah al-Awārīḥ (life of saints), 3. Tadhkira al-Ṣawār (biographies of the poets).

**Bibliography:** Bakhtīār Khān, Miḥāl al-Ḥālām, fol. 4782; Elliott-Dowson, History of India, viii. 145—165; Rieu, Cat. Pers., MSS. Br. Mus., iii. 900; Ethé, Cat. of Persian MSS., India Office, p. 49. (H. H. HADDAD)

**MUḤAMMAD BĀKHTĪYĀR KHALDĪ,** an inhabitant of Ghur, was of a very mean appearance and amongst other deformities of his person it is said that when he stood upright the mean of his fingers extended considerably below his knees. When he reached the age of manhood he went to Ghazna, and offered himself as a volunteer to the officers of Muḥammad Ghurī, but they refused to enrol him. He, therefore, repaired to Dihlawī, and was appointed by Ḳāṭṭ al-Dīn Allāb (q.v.) to command an army destined for the conquest of Bihār about 596 (1199). Here he was very successful. He was next ordered to invade Bengal. In 600—601 (1203—1204) he proceeded to Nāyān, the capital of Bengal, and captured it without any bloodshed. His last attempt was directed towards the invasion of Bihār and Tibet, but he met with reverses which compelled him to retreat. He succeeded in reaching Dīrkhūt in Bihār where he died, but his body was carried to Bihār and buried there in 602 (1206).


**MUḤAMMAD BEY ABU DHAAHAB** [See 'Abd Bey.]

**MUḤAMMAD BEY 'OTHMĀN AL-DJALĀL,** was born in Egypt in 1829, the son of a judge in the Court of Appeal, named Yūnīs al-Ḥasanī. When a boy he learned English, French and Turkish at the school of languages (Madrassat al-Ālamūn) and when only 16 was given an appointment in the government translation bureau. His patron, the engineer Clot Bey, had him appointed to the Conseil de Médecine. In 1863 he entered the War Ministry and five years later (the Ministry of the Interior. In 1879 the Khedive Tewfīq Pāshā appointed him to his civil cabinet and several times took him to accompany him on journeys. After the death of the Khedive he was appointed a judge in Cairo. In 1895 he was pensioned and he devoted himself to literary work till his death at the end of 1898.

In collaboration with Clot Bey, he published a sketch of the history of Muḥammad 'Ali and an elementary grammar of the Arabic and French languages and also a description in rhyme of his journey with the Khedive Tewfīq. He then devoted himself to the translation of poetry: first of the fables of La Fontaine, the novel Paulet Virginie, and of Racine's tragedies Alexandre et Grand. Esther and Iphigenie. All these he translated into classical Arabic. But his real importance lies in his endeavour to translate Molière's comedies into the modern Arabic vernacular of Egypt, freely adapting them to Arabic conditions.


The Egyptians were not much attracted by these comedies translated into the vernacular. The language did not appear cultured enough to the Egyptian public. They were hardly ever produced and the rich vocabulary which the comedies contain has not been noticed or utilised by students of modern Arabic.

**Bibliography:** On metre and language see Socin, Sobermann and Kern, loc. cit.; and see also Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 175 sqq. the poet's autobiography in al-Ḥaqq al-Adham of 'Ali Pasha Muḥāsin, xvii. 62; al-ʿAbāb al-ʿarabīya fi ʿI-Kurn al-ʿāṣir, ii. 91 sqq.; J. E. Sarkis, Dictionnaire encyclopédique de bibliographie arabe, ii., col. 1306. (M. SOBERMANN)
MUHAMMAD CEBELI. [See GHAZIHL.] MUHAMMAD DAMAD PASHA, grand-vizier, also called Oktuz Muhammad Paša, was the son of afarrier of Constantinople and was educated (rather unusual at that time for a boy from Constantinople) in the imperial palace for a military career. He left the palace as silahdar, but we do not know his career until he was appointed, in 1516 (1607–1608), governor of Egypt. Here he was successful in the energetic suppression of a Mamluk revolt and when he returned in 1610 to the capital with two years’ tribute, he was appointed Kapudan Paša, being at the same time married to Sulhahn Ahmed’s seven-year-old daughter Gawhar Khan (married afterwards to Radijeh Paša and Syuywush Paša; cf. Sigilli’s ‘Anişmi, l. 147), which assured him the qualification damad. As Kapudan Paša he was made responsible for a defeat inflicted in 1613 on a part of his fleet, off the island of Chios, by a small Spanish-Sicilian fleet; this blow prevented the landing of Turkish ships in Syria on an expedition against the Deuces. Damad Muhammad was dismissed from the post of Kapudan, became, however, second vizier and, after Naşib Paša’s execution (October 17, 1614) he was appointed grand-vizier. In this office he commanded in 1615 as vez‘ed-i nevâr in a new campaign against Persia, the peace negotiations having ended unsuccessfully a short time before. Nothing was undertaken, however, that year, partly owing to astrological calculations. The grand vizier remained that winter in Aleppo. The next year the Persians were attacked in Armenia, where they had made some progress; Eriwan was beleaguered and capitulated beginning of July 1616 after a 25 days’ siege. The Turkish army was obliged, however, to withdraw with heavy losses occasioned by the rude climate and the insufficient food supplies. Damad Muhammad was dismissed in January 1617 to be succeeded by Khalil Paša [q.v.], in the Venetian Rellandini Khalil Paša and Muhammad Paša are described as the only members of the Imperial Dîwan that really count. The next year, after the ascension of Óﬀûnî II, he became Khalil’s vezir-malâm during that year’s Persian campaign and, after Khalil’s disgrace (January 18, 1619), this dignity he held only a year, in which peace was concluded with Persia; the reason of his dismissal was a dispute with the Kapudan Gâzîeddin Ali Paša [q.v.], a favourite of the sultan (January 1620). Damad Muhammad went as governor to Aleppo, after having been deprived of all his wealth by the extortion of his successor. He died soon after his arrival in Aleppo and was buried in the tekke of Şahîh Abî Baki, where he had a mausoleum made for himself.

Bibliography: The principal Turkish sources are Na’mû I, Peçenî and Hadsî Khalîfî (Peckî-beke: and Tukfî at-Khîlî). Further von Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 447, 468, 475 sqq.; 597 sqq. of where some contemporaneous western sources are indicated; Óthmûn Zâile, ‘Hadîf al-Wusûrî, p. 61; Sigilli’s ‘Anişmi, l. 147.

(J. H. KRAMER)

MUHAMMAD DJÀFAR KARADJA-DIGHI, Mânhî of the kâdîr prince Djâal al-Din, Mirâs and translator into Persian of the famous comedies of the Alharbîdînî, playwright Mirâs Feth ‘Ali Aklundâzâ. After they had been published (1859). Mirâs Feth ‘Ali sent a copy of his plays to the above-mentioned Kâdîr prince in the hope that he would take notice of it. But the book lay unheeded for years in the prince’s library until Muhammad Djaftar opened it by chance. The unhealed, delighted with the plays, at once decided to translate them into Persian. As no one would help him, he was forced to print the translation at his own expense, which brought him into considerable financial difficulties. The translation appeared in lithography in Teherân in 1874 under the title Tozmîlû. When the work was finished, Muhammad Djaftar corresponded with the author and found out that they were related. The Persian translation is of the greatest importance for the history of Persian theatre as it gave the stimulus to the composition of original works. The influence of Aklundâzâ on the work of Malikû Khan and even on more recent dramatists, such as Aşkûmî, is quite apparent. From the artistic point of view, however, Muhammad Djaftar’s translations cannot be called successful as their language is very clumsy and filled with countless Alharbîdînîisms. It is remarkable that European orientalists, first became acquainted with Aklundâzâ’s works in their Persian dress and published a considerable number of these translations (see Bibliography) as textbooks for the study of spoken Persian, although, in view of their linguistic defects, the translations cannot by any means be regarded as models of the living Persian language.


(E. BRYKHEVS)

MUHAMMAD ESSAD. [See GHÂDIB DREJ.] MUHAMMAD ESSAD. [See Essad Efeeni.] MUHAMMAD GAWTH GAWALÎYĂR, an Indian saint. He was a descendant of the famous saïnt Shaikh Farid al-Din ‘Attar [q.v.], his full name being Abu ’l-Mu’azzam Muhammad b. Kâfûr al-Din b. Lâjj b. Mu’in al-Din Kâtîl come to India and died at Djanpur. One of his brothers, Shaikh Bahîlî, who was attached to the service of Humâyûn, fell in battle and lies buried at the gate of the fort in Bâyána. According to his own statement, Muhammad Gawthi was born in 906 (1500). He was a pupil of Shaikh Šâhîd al-Din Hâdîdd Hâdîr, and belonged to the Shafī’îya sect of şâfîî. He and his eight brothers were disciples of Shaikh Šâhîd Hamîd, khalîfa of Shah Ḫâdan, the disciple and khalîfa of Shaikh ‘Abd Allîtâ Shâṣṭa. After leading a solitary life
for more than thirteen years in the mountains of Čuńār, he came to Gujārāt, where he became acquainted with the popular saint and scholar Shāh Wadhī al-Dīn Gujārātī. He went to Āgra in 1563 where he was received with high regard by Akbar. Subsequently he returned to Gujārāt where he died in 820 (1562). Humāyūn is also said to have been a faithful follower of Muḥammad Ghaẕwī.

He was the author of several Sūfī works, the most popular of which is Iswā'h-i Akhbar, in Arabic, which he completed in 956 (1549), and which he subsequently rendered into Persian with additional improvements. His other works are Kullāt al-Maḥāsin, Bahā al-Hayātī, and Mīrāḏī Nāma. It is related that his ecstatic sayings in the Mīrāḏī Nāma were condemned by the ulamā' of Gujārāt, who passed orders for his execution, but that he was saved by the timely intervention of the above-mentioned Shāh Wadhī al-Dīn.

**Bibliography:** Bankipore Lib., Cat., vol. 16, p. 281; Alā' al-Dīn Khān, I., p. 165; Ghulam al-Maṭbū'a, p. 57; Thalāṭrī, J. J., Ta'rīḵ al-'Ulamā' al-Hind, p. 266; see also Ḥājjī Kāshānī, 4, 643; Erhl, India Office Lib., Cat., Nos. 1875–1876; Loth, Arab. Cat., No. 671–672.

(Abdul Muṣṭafā)

MUHAMMAD GURDĪ PASHA. Two Turkish Grand Viziers are known under this name.

1. The one who is also called Ḥādīm Muḥammad Pasha began his political career after having been a eunuch in the imperial palace; in 1604 he became aṣhīr in Egypt, where he was able to establish some order; after that he was twice kalim-muḥāli of the grand vizierate in the capital, in 1611 and in 1615; in the meantime he had held governorships in Erzerūn, Bosnia and Belgrad. He was called to the grand vizierate in the days of Sultan Mustafā I's second reign, when the Janissaries and the Sipahis were dictating their will at Constantinople (September 1622). Kādīm Muḥammad owed his nomination to the Sipahis — who had obtained the dismissal of Mir Ḥusain Pascha, the leader of the Janissaries — also to the confidence of the wāli, and to his well-earned reputation of a wise and experienced politician. He succeeded indeed in the abolition of abūjana — the army administration — by convoking a large council of dignitaries, where the reinforcement of the šālik was decided. When, however, in several parts of the empire, there arose opposition against the Janissary regime, especially the action of Akbar Pascha [q.v.] in Erzerūn, the grand vizier was unable to oppose the Janissaries in Constantinople. Their leader Mir Ḥusain was luring them again, while at the same time the sultān was crying for revenge for Sultan 'Othāmān II, who had prevented the former grand vizier Dāwūd Pascha was killed in January 1623. On February 9 of the same year the rebellious Janissaries, declaring that a eunuch could not be their grand vizier, obtained his dismissal in favour of Mir Ḥusain. Gurdī Muḥammad went into exile, but after the enthronement of Murād IV he came back to the capital as vizier, and acted for the third time as kalim-muḥāli in May 1624 when the then grand vizier went on an expedition against Alba. He died on March 26 and was buried in a mausoleum in Eṣṭahbāt. His age is not given in the sources. In the opinion of the English resident Roe, Gurdī Muḥammad was one of the few persons that were able to load the affairs of the empire.


(T. H. C. MM.)

MUHAMMAD HASAN PASHA, a Persian man of letters, who died on 19th Shawwāl 1313 (April 3, 1596). His honorific titles were Šāh al-Dawla and later Šāhān-i Suļā′mānī.

Through his mother he was related to the Khatārs [q.v.] and through his father he claimed descent from the Mongol rulers. His father, Ḥādījī 'Alī Ḥān of Marāgha, was a faithful servant of Naṣīr al-Dīn Šāh (1558–1652) — discovered the conspiracy of Sulaimān Ḥān and the son from his youth upwards was in the service of the court.

Muḥammad Ḥasan Pasha was one of the first students at the Dār al-Funūn founded in 1268 (1851) and spent 12 years there. Later he went with his father when he was appointed governor of Ṭarābah. In 1286 (1869) he was appointed secretary to the Paris Legation and spent two and a half years there. On his return to Fesrūn he was appointed interpreter to the Shah and in this capacity accompanied him on his travels. In 1288 (1871) he was appointed head of the dragōnāvān (dar al-taḏḏama) and of the press bureau (dar al-ṣawt) as well as director of the official Rāḥem-tiyawān. In 1290 (1873) he was appointed superintendent of the palaces and assistant to the minister of justice and henceforth continued in rank.

E. G. Browne criticises severely the work of
MUHAMMAD HASAN KHAN — MUHAMMAD ISMAIL

Muhammad Hasan Khan and his books have been written for him by his own scholarly works. On the other hand, Javakhovsky speaks with much respect of his works and shows that he is a great many literary undertakings (e.g. the printing of the Kur'an with an inter-linear Persian translation, concordance and index, the foundation of a press for printing in Persian characters, the establishment of the Maghribiy school, encouragement of the daily press etc.) although after the appearance at Bombay of satirical broadsides against the British Himalayan Shariat the censorship was established on the suggestion of Muhammad Hasan Khan.

The fact is that the number of works — often very useful — bearing the name of Muhammad Hasan Khan, is very large. Without the help of "secretaries" some of these books could not have been undertaken. To Muhammad Hasan Khan is in any case due the honour of having suggested them. His principal works deal with the history and geography of Persia and are often in the form of annals. They are: Mir'at al-Buldun, 1, 2 editions (1293, 1294), a dictionary of geography: letters 1—2, 2, 1295 (history of the years 1—xxi. of the reign of Nasir al-Din and calendar); iii, (years xvi—xxvii. of the reign of Nasir al-Din and calendar); iv, 1296 (geography: letters 1—2 and history of 1296). In the geographical parts we find quotations from Vakht and European travellers along with notes specially prepared by the local authorities (an extract from the Mir'at al-Buldun: Two books usb-nasimi was published at Bombay in 1311); Tur'ish-ka-manap-im Niyat, 3 parts, 1298—1300 (history of the time of the Haji) vol. iii, history of the Kajjar 1194—1300; Ma'al-ka-shah, 3 vols., 1301—1305 (description of the journey to Kerman with important archaeological data); 1, 105—213 contains the autobiography of Shah Tahmasp, and ii, 469—500 a list of books in the library of the sanctuary of Mazar-i, Khudchi, Hujjat al-Saltana fi Hudud al-Shahada, Tehran 1304, Tabriz 1310 (history of the martyrs of Karbala); Azadaran hikmat [cf. Sura l. 76], 3 vols., 1304—1307 (biographies of famous women of the Islam); Khudchi, Hujjat al-Tawajjub, a handbook of the arts, 1310; Khudch-i, Marji'a, 1309 (historical annals for the reign of the Nasir al-Din Shah); Khudchi, Hujjat al-Tawajjub, fi azhali Djaradi Shahwah, 1311 (history and geography of Sawad-khan in Masandaran).

In the field of literature Muhammad Hasan Khan was only a translator (Swazi Family Robinson, romances of Jules Verne, discovery of America, Tur'ish-ka-khahiji, Yangi Dusun, Tehran 1288, Memoirs on the Indian Mutiny of 1857). He also wrote a number of text-books on geography and on the French language.


MUHAMMAD HUSAIN TABRIZI, a famous Persian calligrapher, pupil of the celebrated Mir Saiyid Ahmad Moghadda and teacher of the no less famous Mir'at al-Shahid. His remarkable command of the art of calligraphy, so popular in Persia, brought him the title of honour Mihin Urud (greatest master). His father Mirzâ Shkurrallâh was Mihin at-Mashahâr to the Shahwâd Tahmâsp I (1291—1297), the master himself, according to the Oriental sources, was vizier to Shah Ismail II (1278—1288) but lost the favour of the sovereign and was forced to fly to India where he remained to his death. Rieu says he died about 1350 (1345), but this does not agree with other biographical details and is indeed improbable. That he spent the remainder of his life in India is evident from the fact that most of the manuscripts known to have been written by him were handed in India. The inscriptions on the mausoleums of Tabriz are said to have been his masterpieces but unfortunately they have been almost entirely destroyed by earthquakes. After completing these inscriptions he made the obligatory pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return devoted himself exclusively to copying the masterpieces of Persian poetry. A Dwâdah of the Persian poet Amir Shirî from his pen is in the Cambridge University Library, Bibliography: C. R. Huart, Les calligraphes des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du Mir'at al-Mawalân, Paris 1905, p. 327; E. Browne, A Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the Library of the University of Cambridge, 1899, NV, p. 255, p. 353; Mirzâ Halîh, Khâsh o Khattâfân, Constantinople 1296, Tur'ish-ka-khahiji, Abâb, Tehran 1314, p. 102; Ch. Rieu, Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum. . ., p. 785, 786, 788.

MUHAMMAD ISMAIL II, or Abd al-Qâhin al-Mahdî was born on the 22nd Shawwâl 1196 (1781), of a Dhilli family that traces its origin to the Caliph 'Umar. He was a nephew of the famous Mawâlân Shah 'Abd al-Qâhir (1332—1383). Having lost his father early, he was brought up by his uncle Mawâlân 'Abd al-Qâhir (1342—1383). In childhood he was insensible to his studies and fond of swimming in the Djamun, but thanks to a retentive memory and keen intellect he later on became a learned man.

Being shocked at the harsh or intolerable tendencies, then prevailing among Indian Muslims, he zealously preached the doctrines of Islam, impressed by the religious sanctity of Saiyid Ahmad al-Majduddin, he became his disciple and his constant companion. In 1256 (1828) they went to Mecca and then to Constantinople, where they were received with marked consideration. Six years later, on their return to Dhilli, they gained many followers. In 1255 (1827) they with many disciples went to Peghâwar and declared a jihad against the Sikhs. But owing to some innovations upon the mazes of the Afghans, their power declined and during a retreat they perished in a skirmish with the Sikhs in 1257 (1830). He is the author of the following works:

1. Khudchi, Lutfi al-Fikr, a treatise on the principles of Muhammadan law according to the Hanafî school;
2. Muhadda, a Persian treatise on the Imamats;
3. Taqwiyât al-Imam, an Urdu treatise on theology (printed 1293, translated into English by Mir Saiyid al-Mohâdî, ed. T. R. A. S., iii, 316);
4. Shirî at-Mustafà, a treatise in Persian on the doctrines of Islam.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
Bibliography: Şiddik Hasan, İlahi al-Nabul, p. 416; Saffiy Ahmed Khan, Akbar al-Sanadid, ii. 97; and J. A. S. X., xii. 310. (M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD KAZIM B. MUHAMMAD AMIN was a mufti or secretary to Awrangzeb. He was entrusted with the compilation, from official records, of the history of the emperor's reign and was ordered to submit it to him for correction. He accompanied the emperor on his journey to Adjumur where he fell ill and was consequently sent back to Dilli and died there shortly after his return in 1692 (1681).

The history which he composed is known as 'Alamgir Numa'; it begins with the departure of Awrangzeb from Awrangabad in 1668 (1657) and is brought down to 1678 (1667). It has been printed in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1865-1868.

Bibliography: Khafi Khan, Murshidah al-Lubab, ii. 210; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, vii. 174-180; N. Lee, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, N.S., iii. 454; and Rieu, Cat. of the Persian MSS. Br. Mus., ii. 267a. (M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD KHALIFA. [See Muhammad B. Husain.]

MUHAMMAD KHAN BANGASH. Nawab styled Qasimdar Djang, was a Ruliwa chief of the tribe of Bangash. The city of Farrukhhabad was founded by him in the name of his patron the emperor Farrukhshah. When Muhammad Shafi became emperor of Dilli, he appointed him governor of Malwa in 1143 (1730), and as he could not stop the repeated attacks of the Mahrattas he was removed in 1145 (1732) and appointed governor of Allahabad. Muhammad Khan intended to reduce the Hindustani of whom Radja Chaturzala was chief. He captured several places but as he did not know the roads, Chaturzala with the help of Pahwa Radji Rao, surrounded him suddenly with an army. The Nawab took refuge in the fortress of Djanggar; whereupon his son, Kasim Djang, having collected an army of Afghans marched to Djanggar and escorted his father in safety to Allahabad. The imperial ministers then removed him from the governorship. He died in 1156 (1743).

Bibliography: Mawdhir al-Umar, ii. 771-774; Treich-Farrukhabad (Asiatic Society's copy), fol. 9, 13, 18, 20, 26 and 46-48; and Imperial Gazetteer of India, xii. 64-65. (M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD KOPURUL. [See Kopurul.]

MUHAMMAD LALI PASHA. [See Muhammad Pascha Lah.]

MUHAMMAD LALEZARI SHAIRI, author of a work on tulips, Mawin al-Ashlar, "Balance of Flowers". This treatise on the cultivation of tulips was composed in the reign of Sultan Ahmad III (1115-1143 = 1703-1730), who had given the author the title Shahrisperverd, on the suggestion of the grand vizier Ibrahim Pascha between 1718 and 1730.

Bibliography: H. Fr. von Ditz, Denkwürdigkeiten aus Asien, Halle and Berlin 1815, ii. 199, reprinted as: Vom Tulpen- und Narcissen-Bau in der Türkei aus dem Turkevisen der Schich Muhammad Lala-Ishvar, Halle and Berlin 1835; Pertzsch, Katalog der türk. Hsc. Berlin, P. 305, № 252. (Th. Meznel)

MUHAMMAD LALEZARI, Tahir, the name of a Kady who died in 1204 (1789) in Constantinople, who wrote a series of theological treatises and commentaries, which are still accessible in ms.: Musul al-Musulim fi Musul al-Kifl fi al-Musulmi, Daf' Sirha Raghbi fi Nahr al-Fismat; commentary on the Kiflis-Nameri, and the commentaries in a collected volume in the 'Agir Efendi-Library in Constantinople (Difters Kutub-i-Kutub-i-Aghir Efendi, Constantinople 1500, p. 188, № 243 [3rd Waki-foundation]; commentary: Laymanur al-qubra (on Qasrwa); Ya'zamat al-amrun (on Biruni); Amurat al-Ajam (on Abd al-Kadir al-Ghan); al-Durrat al-sabka (on Al-Ashkar) and Kawkub al-dawra (on Ibn Majshug). The name Lalezari comes from Lalezir, a quarter of Constantinople near the Fatih Mosque.

Bibliography: Brussel Mahmud Tahir, 'Otmahal Maviylifleri, i. 349, to which may be added Tharij, Siyaj-i 'otmahl, iii. 245; Tahir Lalezir-zade, who in 1201 (1786-1787) was Molla of Eidyub. (Th. Meznel)

MUHAMMAD MUHSIN AL-HADDJI, son of Haddji Fadl Allah, son of Ahmed Fadl Allah, a rich merchant of Iran who came to India in the early part of the xviii century, was born at Hagi in 1143 (1730). For a time the Agha resided at Murshidabad and carried on there an extensive mercantile business, but finding the rising port of Hagi a more convenient centre, he finally settled there with his son Haddji Fadl Allah.

Already settled at Hagi was one Agha Muftahwar, who, coming originally from Persia like Ahmed Fadl Allah, had won his way at the court of Awrangzeb [q. v.]. That monarch had conferred upon him extensive jagirs in Djsur and other places in Bengal, and Agha Muftahwar, eager to take possession, finally himself set out from Dilli for the Eastern province. So well did he manage his newly acquired lands that he soon became one of the wealthiest men in the province. He selected Hagi as his headquarters. Agha Muftahwar for many years remained childless and it was only in very old age that a daughter was born to him. Round this only child, named Must Djan Khaan, all his affections centred, and dying when she was only seven years old he left her all his property. The widow of Agha Muftahwar was displeased with the conduct of her husband and subsequently married Haddji Fadl Allah, the son of Agha Fadl Allah, her late husband's friend. The fruit of this marriage was Haddji Muhammad Muhsein. He was eight years younger than his half-sister, Must Djan Khaan. Muhammad Muhsein was first brought up at Hagi, afterwards he completed his education at Murshidabad. After finishing his studies at Murshidabad, he returned to his sister's home at Hagi. Later, he started on a long journey and for twenty-seven years he continued his travels in India, Arabia, Persia and Central Asia. It was not until he had reached his sixtieth year that he finally decided to terminate his travels and return home. Making his way slowly across Northern India he came at last to Lucknow. Thence he came to Murshidabad in 1216 (1801), with the intention of settling there. But during his long absence his sister, Must Djan Khaan, had married her cousin, Saiyid al-Din Muhammad Khan, nephew of Agha Muftahwar; her husband died in the prime of life and she was anxiously waiting for the
arrival of her step-brother. At last at the solicitation of his sister, Muhammad Muḥsin came to Ḥājdī, and when she died at the age of eighty-one in 1218 (1803), she left a will bequeathing to Muhammad Muḥsin the whole of her property.

It was thus not until Ḥājdī Muhammad Muḥsin had reached the age of seventy-three that he became possessed of the great wealth which greatly helped his co-religionists in Bengal in the pursuit of education. He had never married and the death of his half-sister left him without near relatives. He was anxious that his great wealth should be put to good use, and, consequentially, on the April 26, 1806 (1221 212), he signed a Deed of Trust, setting apart the whole of his income for charitable purposes in perpetuity.

Michael Muhammad Muḥsin lived for six years after making this noble disposition of his property. For his own personal use he had reserved only so much property as would bring him in about one hundred rupees a month. In 1227 (1812) he died at the age of about eighty-two and was buried in the garden adorning the ImamātRa which he had so splendidly endowed.


MUHAMMAD MURTADA B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD AL-RAZZAK ABU 'L-FAID AL-HUSAINI AL-ZARQULI AL-HANAFI, an Arabi scholar, born in 1145 (1732) in Bilgārān in Kamārāt in N.W. India, settled, after travelling for many years in pursuit of knowledge, in Cairo on 9th Safar 1167 (Dec. 7, 1753). There he succeeded in realizing an interest in the study of Tradition by giving lectures to specially invited companions. In Upper Egypt also he was always a welcome guest with the Arab Shi'ahumān and in the Egyptian country towns, and his fame spread to the Sudan and even to India. From the year 1191 (1777) he drew a pension from the government. He died in Ṣahābān 1205 (April 1791) in Cairo of the plague.

His principal works are two great commentaries. He wrote the *Ṭabi' al-Arūs* on Fīrāzābādī's Kāmiū, finishing it in 1183 (1767) after 14 years' work; although in the preface he quotes over a hundred sources used by him, he takes most of the additions to the Kāmiū bodily from the Liṣān al-'Arab of Ibn Manṣūr. It was printed incompletely in 5 vols. in Cairo 1286–1287, and in 10 vols. in Cairo 1307. He wrote a commentary, also very extensive, on Ghazālī's Ḥīyā 'Ulūm al-Dīn, entitled Ḥīyā al-Silāh al-muttaṣafin, in which, in addition to explaining words he devotes special attention to establishing traditions quoted by Ghazālī; it was printed at Fās in 1301–1304 in 15 vols., in Cairo in 1311 in 10 vols. He also composed a number of smaller works on lexicography and Tafsīr, as well as in the commentary on 'Adī's: 1. No'ūṣ al-ṣiṣṣa fī Bayān Raḥīf al-Maṣlah wa-1-ʿIṣāṣ, ed. by Landberg, *Principes arabes*, 1, 40–55; 2. al-Fawa'īl al-mukarrar fī Taḥlíf Lašīf-al-Tābah, Cairo, Fīrīḥ, l. 96; 3. Taḥlíf al-Wadā'ī al-Maqrīzī al-Muḥātār bi-'l-Kaṣīfī, Muṣāf, Dāwūd, Muḥṣīṣ al-Dīn, p. 140; 4. al-Amāli al-Shaikjūnyan, lectures on traditions, which he gave in the Dāmājī Shāikjī, Berlin, Alwardt, No. 10253; 5. Kitāb al-Fadhilah Yamūn al-Āakhirūn, Cairo, Fīrīḥ, vi. 209; 6. Taḥlíf al-Kaṣīfī al-Maṣlah fī Madā'ī Shāikjī al-ʿArāfī Ṣamīlī in the form of a maqāma, Cairo, Fīrīḥ, iii. 47; 7. ʿĪdāf al-Maṣlah fī ʿl-Īdāf wa-ʿl-Awalidī, finished on 4th Rabbī 1194 (April 10, 1780), ibid., v. 51; 8. Dāshghūra: al-Bīkār fī Nuzūl Bani 'l-ʿAlī, finished on 26th Dhu 'l-Hijja 1182 (May 2, 1769), ibid., v. 150; 9. Fīrīḥ al-Fawā'īl. The history of the Arabic script and of famous calligraphers, finished on 12th Dhu 'l-Hijja 1184 (March 30, 1777), ibid., p. 163; 10. al-Ḥawāf al-miṣīrī fī Nuzūl al-Sāda Al Qurṭub al-Tamīrī, ibid., p. 205; 11. Muṣāf al-Ṣaḥīfī fī Nuzūl Bani 'l-ʿAlā, finished on 16th Ramaḍān 1187 (Nov. 21, 1774), ibid., p. 343; 12. Niṣābat al-Ṣaṭrīl Muhammad Efendi Ibn Ḥawām al-Bānī, ibid., p. 346, b. 8.


MUHAMMAD PASA. [See MUHAMMAD DAMAD PASA, MUHAMMAD GURĐI PASA, KARADA MUKHED PASA, SOKOLL]

MUHAMMAD PASA, BALTADI, grand vizier, was born about 1660 in the town of 'Othmānji, and, after an education in the imperial palace, entered the corps of the halqāf. On account of his beautiful voice he acted for a time as muʿāqelān; later on he became a scribe and rose rapidly in this career. In 1703, at Ahmad III's accession, he became muʿāqel and was made Kapudan Paşa in November 1704. In December of the same year he obtained the grand vizierate as successor of Kalayi Alı̄m Paşa, against whom, although he had been at one time his fellow halqāfī, he had used with such power of intrigue, for which he was especially notorious, according to the historian Rāḍīh. On May 3, 1706 he was dismissed — on account of his lack of capacity, as Rāžīd says — and sailed to Lemnos, but his friends obtained for him the nomination to the government of Erzurūm. In January 1709 he became governor of Aleppo and from here he was called, in August 1710, a second time to the grand vizierate, after Köprülü Nūmān Paşa had proved unable to restore stability in the way that had been expected from him. At that time the first great conflict with Russia was drawing near; Charles XII of Sweden, after the battle of Poltawa, remained in Turkey. The beginning of Baltādī Muhammad's second grand vizierate was therefore filled with preparations for the war with Russia, which had been decided upon at a great state council in November 1710, and approved of by a fatwā of the Shāikjī al-Isāmī. The grand vizier was made commander of this memorable campaign, which quickly was ended by the battle near Fahlī (Falksen, Turk. Fahlī) on the Pruth (July 21–22, 1711). Peter the Great's army was left in a desperate position, but his generals succeeded in concluding a truce with the
grand vizier, by the terms of which the Russian army was allowed to withdraw, while Azoł was restored to the Turks. The general feeling in the Ottoman historical tradition is that Balthadji Muhammad had been bribed; his enemies at any case intrigued against him in Constantinople so that, even before his return to the capital, he was informed of his dismissal at Adrianople (Nov. 1717). The conclusion of the armistice of the 12th was also much against the wishes of Charles XII who, on his remonstrances to the grand vizier, is said to have got the insulting reply that, in case Peter had been taken prisoner, there would have been no moderates left in his country and that, in general, it was not good that sovereigns should leave their country (Voltaire, Histoire de Charles XII et de Pierre V). Balthadji was exiled to Losbos and then to Lemnos, where he died in 1712, aged over fifty.

The reputation which this grand vizier has in Turkish history, and which is also given him by von Hammer, does not seem to be confirmed by western sources (Jorga, iv. 308).

Bibliography: The chief Turkish authority is Râghi's Tarikh, the campaign against Russia has been described in a Tarikh-i Muhâfiz, contained in the work of Hasan of Crete and in a Munich manuscript (Babinger, G. O. W., p. 307, 310); Dâhver-Zade, Dâni to the Hadîkat ul-Wussûrâ, p. 369; Siâliî-î Sherî for, iv. 208 307; von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 111 307, 148 307; Jorga, Geschichte des Osman. Reiches, iv. where other western sources are indicated; Ahmad Rejîk, Manâlükî Ahlûnûn vîye Denîr Bâzî Şahvî, Constantinople 1910; Ahmad Mûkhîr, Rûm ocnûdên gire Bâltadji Mûhammad Pashâmân vezifârî, T.O.E.M., vol. 8, p. 166 338 307.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, ELMAS, grand vizier, was born about 1660 in a village near Sinûh as son of a ship's captain. After having been attached to the service of the pasha of Tripolit, he was educated in the hâch of the palace and became in 1687 slâyh: 12th; soon afterwards he became nişâhî and obtained the rank of vizier. In Ahmûd II's reign he was pasha in Bosnia but did not yet play a prominent part, though he is said to have been one of that sultan's favourites. After Mustafa II's accession he was appointed efîmânmî of the imperial chancellery and, when a revolt of the Janissaries had cost the grand vizier Sûrtmî Ali Pasha's life, he was appointed in his stead (April 1695). He accompanied the new sultan during the campaign against Austria of the years 1695, 1696 and 1697. On September 11, 1697 the Turkish army was attacked by the Austrians under prince Eugène, while it was passing the Theiss near Zenta in order to march on Szegedin. The sultan had already reached the left bank, but the grand vizier, together with a number of high military chiefs, was killed that day in the battle, which meant a heavy loss for the Turkish troops. Elmas Mûhammad had been against this military enterprise, but the other members of the council had persuaded the sultan to the contrary. He is said to have disliked the surname Elmas "diamond" to his accomplishments and handsome physique.

Bibliography: The Tarikh of Râghi is the chief Turkish source, further 00mân Zade Ta'bî, Hadîkat ul-Wussûrâ, p. 122 sqq. Siâliî-î Sherî, i. 395; von Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 1.


(J. H. KRAMERS)

MUHAMMAD PASHA KARAMANI. [See KARAMAN MEHMET PASHA.]

MUHAMMAD PASHA, LALA, grand vizier under Ahmad I. He was a Bosnian by origin and a relation of Muhammad Sokollî Pasha. The year of his birth is not given. After having had his education in the palace, he was mer-i-zâker and became in 1595 agha of the Janissaries. Two years later he took part in the Austrian wars as beylerbey of Rum-ili and was commander of Eastergem (Grão; Turkish: Östergem) when this town capitulated to the Austrian army in September 1595. During the following years Lala Muhammad was several times mer-i-zâker in Hungary and when, in July 1604, the grand vizier Yavuz 'Ali had died in Belgrade, on his way to the Hungarian theatre of war, the sultan sent the imperial seal to Lala Muhammad. Although peace negotiations were continually being resumed, the new grand vizier took in that year Waitzen (Turk. Wât) but besieged in vain Eastergem. During next year's campaign Eastergem was taken by Lala Muhammad (Sept. 29, 1605) and in November he crowned the Hungarian Bocskay as king of Hungary (without the regions occupied directly by the Turks) and Transylvania. In that same year the Turkish eastern army under Çigalâ Pasha was beaten by the Persians, while the troops sent to subdue the revolt in Anatolia were routed at Balawadin. After his return it was decided that the grand vizier should remain next year in the capital and lead the war on the two fronts and, if possible, bring to a successful and the long-drawn peace negotiations with Austria. The young sultan, however, changed his mind in keeping with the wishes of the Kapudan Pasha Derwisch, who was intriguing against Lala Muhammad. Accordingly the latter was ordered to take command of the army against Persia. He had already put up his tent in Uskudâr, when overcome by sorrow because of the frustration of his plans, he was seized with an apoplexy and died three days afterwards (May 23, 1606). He was buried near the niche of Sokollî Pasha.

Bibliography: The Tarikh of Peclevi, who, as scribe, had served Lala Muhammad on several occasions (cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 192), Na'mân and Hasan Beyzade; 'Olmân Zade Ta'bî, Hadîkat ul-Wussûrâ, p. 52 sqq.; Siâliî-î Sherî, i. 395; von Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 140.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, RUM, vizier and, according to some sources, grand vizier under Sultan Muhammad II. As his surname indicates, he was a Greek renegade. After having had an education in the palace he was destined for a military career and became at one time beylerbey. The dates of his birth and of his military advancements are not recorded. He had taken part in the final campaign of Muhammad II against Karâmân in 1466 and was charged by the sultan with the transfer of parts of the population of the conquered regions to Constantinople, instead of the grand vizier Mahmut Pasha (q.v.) who executed these measures in too lenient a way, as the sources say. On the way back to Constantinople Mahmut was dispossessed of his dignity in favour of Rûm Muhammad. The latter remained grand-vizier until
commander of the expedition against Azof [q. v.], which town he seized after it had been burned by the Cossacks before he arrived. On his previous march he had been with the sultan’s favourite Djindji Kâğıtja a triumphant supporter of the sultan, Kosem [q. v.]; they intrigued against the grand vizier Kara Mustafa Pasha, who sought to remove the danger by sending Sultan Zâde Muhammad in 1643 to Damascus as Vâdi. After Kara Mustafa had been executed on January 1, 1644, Sultan Zâde Muhammad was made grand vizier. One of his most conspicuous characteristics in this office seems to have been his ability to flatter the sultan and to satisfy his very extravagant wishes by obtaining money from all possible sources and by giving sandjakas to many of Isâtâm’s favourites. At this time the Empire was at peace with Austria (which sent in August 1644 an extraordinary embassy to confirm the peace) and with Persia, although Rahoccy, the prince of Transylvania, did his best to involve Turkey in a war with Austria. There was, however, a strong desire to go to war with Venice and to conquer Crete. The vâdi undertook this undertaking, but his former confederates drew the sultan to their side. Accordingly Yûsuf Pasha sailed as sâdir to Crete in the spring of 1645 and took Canera (August 17). The good feelings that arose after Yûsuf Pasha’s return led to Sultan Zâde’s dismissal from the post of grand vizier (December 1645). After Yûsuf Pasha in January 1646 had fallen a victim to Sultan Isâtâm’s cruel capriciousness, Sultan Zâde himself was made sâdir against Crete. He departed in April 1646, drove the Venetians from Tenos, which they had taken by surprise, and died shortly after his arrival in Canera (July 1646). He was buried in the teke of Hadîtî in Üskûdar.

Bibliography: Na’im’s Türâk is the chief Turkish authority; valuable contemporary information is given in the Siyâhat-nâme of Ewliya Celubi, who himself went with the expedition against Azof. Further the Doiîl Tawârid-i Âltı ‘Othîmân of ‘Îsâ Pasha Zade (cf. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 211) and an anonymous Necât-nâme (G.O.W., p. 152, 161) by ‘Othîman Zade Tâlût, Hadîtî el-‘âlî, 8, p. 84, p. 161: Siyâhat-nâme, iv. 161; von Hammer, G. O. W. (J. H. KRAMERS)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, SOKOLLÎ (See Sokollî)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, SULTÂN ZÂDE, grand vizier under Mahmut I, was born about 1660 at Constantinople. His father was a Janissary. He began his career as a scapegoat and rose to important posts; in 1739 he played a role in the peace negotiations at Belgrad with Austria. He had been beyaz of the grand vizierate, viz. minister of the interior, when the sultan, under influence of his new beyaz agha, the so-called Behsithe Younger, dismissed his predecessor Has'an Pasha and called him to the grand vizierate (August 1740). The twelve months of his period of office were not filled with war, but with important diplomatic negotiations, in which he was supported by the new beyaz Muhammed Safî, later grand vizier, and the red efendi Mustafa, both of whom equally well versed in European diplomacy. During Tiryâkî Muhammed’s grand vizierate peace was concluded with Na’dîr Shah of Persia (September 1746) and the peace treaties with Austria and Russia were renewed. As the reason for his dismissal (August 24, 1747) is given his addiction to the use of drugs.
(hence the surname "Tiryaki") and his quarelsome, vindictive character, by which he had made enemies, especially in the ranks of the "elmek." After his fall he was governor in different eyalets, as İli, Məşəf, Bəğəddə, Dəžəda, and he died in July 1751 at Rətməno in Cretə, where he lived, probably in involuntary retirement. According to the Sədədəbə, he was a capable official before coming to the grand vizierate; afterwards he was a failure in every office.

**Bibliography:** The Turkish of "Izzə; Dələwər Zəde "Omar, Dələwə "Hadətə al-Wərəmə," p. 73 sqq.; Sədədəbə "Bərəxə," v. 237 (where the dates are wrong); von Hammer, G.O., vi.

**MUHİMMAD PASHA, YEŞENCE, grand vizier under Muhammed II.** He was called Yegen "the Nephew" because he stood in that relationship to Kəl Yənda Efeşini, a high official in the financial administration (Sədədəbə "Bərəxə," v. 650); he also began his career by holding different financial offices, and was also əbəsəbəqə of the grand vizier Təpə "Təxəbə Pasha (1732). In 1737 he became bəshən-vəsəzən in Constantinople during the absence of the grand vizier Əbdəl Ələxə Pasha. He was successful that year against the Muslims on the Dənəcə frontier (taking of Fətəş əIəssəm), but was nevertheless dismissed, after his return, through the influence of the əzəxbər aghətə Bəxər. Yegen Muhammed was appointed in his place (December 1737) and had to continue the peace negotiations with Austria and Russia, which were made especially complicated by the rivalry between France (represented by de Villeneuve) and the Sea Powers in offering their good services as mediators. The grand vizier himself was rather in favour of continuing the war, and, being of a proud and arrogant character, made the negotiations still more difficult. In June 1737 he went zədədə to the Austrian front and was successful in recapturing Səmənədərə and Ozwə (August). He was back in the capital in November. At the end of the year the Russians retired from Əokətə and Kələrmə, which placed Turkey in a favourable position in the never ceasing peace negotiations, in which Poland also had become involved. But not even this grand vizier was able to bring the war to an end; the same influence that had disposed of his predecessor obtained his dismissal in March 1739. After that Yegen Muhammed was governor of Crete, Bosnə, Əldən, and Anadolu. When in this last office he was called to the post of zədədə on the front of Kərə (March 1745) against the Persians. He received large reinforcements from different quarters and thought himself strong enough to attack Nə dib Şəkər in his encampment near Ərivan. This battle resulted in a disaster for the Turks, owing mainly to a mutiny among the irregular təxəbəsən. Yegen Muhammed was killed, probably by the mutineers, in August 1745.


**MUHİMMAD (Mesrəp) RAUF, an important Ottoman author and poet who plays a very prominent part in the development of the Turkish modern and of the written language. Born on Aug. 12, 1291 (1875) in Constantinople, the son of an Anatolian, who came from Kurşaya, and a Circassian mother, he received a good education. He studied the Naval School and became a naval officer, but he only spent eighteen months in the navy, mainly in Crete. When quite a boy, he displayed an irrepressible love for the theatre, literature, and began to write at the age of 16, taking as his models the novels of Ahmed Midhat and the translations of French romances of adventure. This first production was a drama, Dəvət yəkəbə Gəsəbə Kəsəlmə ("Baseness or the Corroser of Gascoigne"). As his knowledge of English, and later of French, increased, he extended the scope of his reading and of his interests, so that at school he received the nick-name Roman əxəyən Efeşini (the novel-reader) and later Romandəh (the novel-writer). His literary activity proper only began in the Naval School where he became acquainted with Georges Ohnet, Əokətə Feşə electrodes, Alphonse Daudet, Əmələ əIəsə, Ələxə, the French realists and naturalists and endeavored to imitate them. His story Dələwə is the most notable of his efforts at this period.

When he became acquainted with the works of the modernist Əokətə-Zəde Ələxə, əIəsə, (q.v.), he came completely under his influence, especially after entering into correspondence with him and having his story Dələwə published by him in the periodical Kənəs. Through əIəsə who remained his model and Əxəyə, with whom he made a friendship he made soon afterwards, he adopted the career of letters completely and became an author. When Dənəbə Şəkər al-Din had to go to the ƏIəsə as medical officer, he left the editorship of his periodical Məkəbə in the hands of əIəsə. In 1312 (1896) RAUF at the suggestion of əIəsə published his novel Gərməxə-Shêkəi ("Youthful Passion") in İdələm, but it did not meet with any special success. He only began to be famous as an author with his cooperation in the periodical Sərəzətə Fətənə in 1312 (1896), which was of great influence in the development of modern Turkish literature. Here he worked with əIəsə and the poet ƏIəsə Əfətə (q.v.), to whom he had become related by his marriage. In 1501 the Sərəzətə Fətənə came to an end and with it his literary activity till the Revolution of 1908.

His first contributions to the Sərəzət were Nətxəs ("In Convalescence") and Ünbəxəs. In the 10th volume was published in serial form his most celebrated novel: Eyfəl ("September") which then appeared in book form like most of his works in the collection, so important for the development of Turkish literature: Edəbəyətə dəxətə Kəaəxəbə, vol. vi., 1517 (1901). This novel, which was reprinted several times and which remained unique of its kind and represents a height of achievement never again reached by RAUF, had great influence and won general approval. In vivid, moving, although unequal language he describes in impressively realistic fashion the development and tragic end of a noble, innocent love. The astounding verbosity in which RAUF revels here was aptly compared by əIəsə to a gemlet which always turns at the same spot.

Of his novels we may also mention Fordəbə ("The Morning of Passion"), Edəbəyətə dəxətə, N. 28; Gəndəf xə Kəalə ("A Young Girl's Heart"); Mənəxə ("Violet") and Kəalə ("Nightmare").

More important are his collections in the pre-
MUHAMMAD RAUF - MUHAMMAD SHAH

writing fashion of short sketches, tales and long stories. Among these is his second most famous work: Siyah Indjiler ("Black Pearls"), a collection of poems in prose, modeled on Ziya's Manzar Sihirler and Beaudelaire's Fleurs du mal (Andeyby, No. 11, 1317); also the collection of long stories "Ahbibi" ("Enamoured") (Andeyby, No. 16, 1325 = 1910); Titir ("Death Agony") (Andeyby, No. 12, 1325); Son Emel ("The last Hope") (Andeyby, No. 29, 1329 = 1913); and Bir "Asghar Tale" ("H-quality of a Love Affair") (1330 = 1914); further Ul Usbiiye ("Three Tales"); Echar ("Flowers"); Perinbentzibeli ("As butterflys").

Rauf was no less successful as a dramatist. He wrote the following pieces: Pek ("The Talon"), a drama (oyun) in four acts (Andeyby, No. 14, 1325 = 1909); Ferdi ve Siyasi Ders ("Ferdi and Co") in 3 acts, a dramatisation of the novel of the same name by Ziya (Andeyby, No. 17); and Lijiyat ("Battle") in 5 acts (Andeyby, No. 30, 1327 = 1911); also Bk Kusme ("Two Powers"); Yaghmuran doluya.

Rauf died on Dec. 23, 1931 at Constantinople.

Numerous contributions by him are in the Sorvet-i Fuyuân; the finely produced woman's periodical Mebâra of which he edited the only volume that appeared. Contributions by him, some his own work, especially poems (Rauf possessed not inconsiderable poetic talent and was regarded as the Turkish Baudelaire), also essays and criticisms, of which his analyses of the contemporary novel are valuable, were published in different collections, periodicals and newspapers in vast numbers. His Zemsah ("Lily") brought him trouble. It was confiscated on account of its sensuality and the author was imprisoned. He wrote other things in the same style which were not printed.

In his works he appears as a very artistic, rather sentimental nature; even what he writes in prose is pure poetry. His prose is as good as that of Ziya, the leader of the Sorvet-i Fuyuân movement. He is one of the most important personalities in this group of men of letters, although his marked merits in form and style are counter-balanced by equal defects, which became worse as he paid no attention to the cultivation of his style; in him we find a reversed process, from the more particular to the less. He would have been held in higher repute generally, if he had ceased to write after his first works. — Owing to the identity of the name and the parallel literary activity Muhammad Rauf was often taken for M. Rauf, the son of Faruk 'Atif Pasha, who died on Feb. 23, 1918 and was buried at Hai Dar Pasha. M. Rauf was editor of the Rasîmi Kütâb. He was a dramatist and wrote: Fermine, Niğûha Keremeti ("Wonder in sight"); a comedy Istek le Bûrû arânishia ("Between Fire and Powder") and a piece entitled Tûr ki written jointly with Rauf Nedjet, one of his most intimate friends. The following dramas were never printed: Zâfik Al-Dîn-i Elyâb, Nermiyan and a number of adaptations. From the English he translated Saiyed All's The Life and Teachings of Muhammad the Spirit of Islam in 2 vols. entitled Mevpowerg Tel'dcile, 1918.

Besides being an author, M. Rauf was also a teacher, a task for which his extensive knowledge of languages qualified him (in addition to French and English, he knew Arabic, Persian, German, Italian, Greek and others). He lectured at the University on mythology and Greek and Italian literature, on which he wrote two text-books: Yûnâni Fuyuân, Tûrki Fuyuân and Italya Fuyuân. He was also for a time teacher of western literatures, Turkish literature and French at various schools.


MUHAMMAD SADÎ [Mir Dżuma], minister of 'Abd Allah Karb Shah of Haiderabad during the xviith century, was originally a diamond merchant, and was famous in the Deccan for his wealth before he became minister. After the defeat of his master 'Abd Allah by Awnarâzî, Mir Dżuma took service under the latter, and was made Governor of Bengal from 1071—1075 (1660—1664). He defeated Shah Shâjadî when the latter fought against his brother Awnarâzî. Mir Dżuma was afterwards employed in the conquest of Cochîlîhûr and Assâm in 1072—1073 (1661—1662). He overran both these countries but owing to the rainy season and the spread of disease among his troops, he was compelled to return, only to die of dysentery contracted during his campaign, shortly after his arrival at Dacco in 1073 (1663).

Bibliography: Muftâr al-Umûrî, iii. 530; Blochmann, A. S. E., xli. 91; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, viii. 199; Imperial Gazetteer of India, ii. 402; vii. 214; Elphinstone, History of India, 1839, p. 583—613.

MUHAMMAD SADÎ. [See KHALIL EFKENI ZÕĐUK.

MUHAMMAD SHAH (1131—1161 = 1729—1748), emporor of Dîhî, surnamed Muhammad Rawshun Akbar (or, the Brilliant Star), was the son of prince Dhiabîn Shâh, one of the three brothers who perished in disputing the crown with their eldest brother, Dhiabînâlar Shâh, son of Bahadir Shâh. He was born on Friday the 24th Râbî' I 1114 (August 7, 1702), and was crowned by the two Saiyid brothers, Saiyid 'Abd Allah and Saiyid Husain, after the death of Râfî al-Dawlah on the 25th Dhu 'l-Ka'âd 1131 (September 29, 1719). Muhammad Shah reigned for about 30 years and died one month after the battle of Sârîlund, which his son fought against Ahmad Shâh Abdâli [q. v.]. His death took place on Thursday the 27th Râbî' II 1161 (April 16, 1748). He was buried in the court before the Mausoleum of
Muhammad Shah — Muhammad Zaim

Ni'üm al-Din Awliya at Dhihli. This emperor may be called the last of the Timurid line, who reigned in Dhihli and enjoyed any power. The few princes of that sovereign's family who were raised to the throne after Muhammad Shāh were mere puppets in the hands of the nobles of the court.

Bibliography: Muhammad Hājjī Khatīb Khān, Manāhī al-Lubāb, iii. 840; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, vii. 485; Eliphinesme, History of India, 1889, p. 692.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD SHAH I, ALI AL-DIN KHALID (695—715 = 1395—1415) was the nephew and son-in-law of Sultan Qalau al-Din Firuz Shah II Khajdu, whom he murdered by treachery at Karī Mānpūr, in the province of Ilahābād, in 695 (1295), and ascended the throne of Dhihli in the same year. He re-conquered Gujrat (697 = 1297), took Citor and temporarily subdued the Rādpūtīs (703 = 1303). His eunuch general, Malik Kāfūr, seized Duqgūr and Warangal, and founded a Deccan province of the Dhihli kingdom. The empire is said to have flourished during his reign. Among contemporary poets Amir Khurram and Khawāja Ḥasan āl Bārī, the first ranks, Shāhīs Niṣām al-Dīn Awliya, one of the greatest saints of India, flourished at the same time. He died in 715 (1315) and was buried in the tomb which he had constructed in his life-time in Old Dhihli.


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD SHAH BAHMANI. [See Muhammad I—III, above, p. 664 sqq.]

MUHAMMAD SHARIF AL-NADAVI was born in the Deccan where he spent the first twenty-five years of his life. He afterwards visited in an official capacity Gujrat, Malwa, Adjmir, Dhihli, Agra, the Punjab, Sind and Kashmir. He went to the last country in the train of Dīgīrīgīrī and under the command of Kāsīm Khān (1617 = 1621). He is the author of Magdīlī al-Saltānī, a short history of the kings of Dhihli and of the Deccan dynasties from the Muhammadan conquest to the accession of Shah Dijān, completed in 1038 (1628).


(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD Tahir al-Fatani al-Gujraṭī, was born at Fatan in Gujraṭ in 914 (1508), after completing his education in his native land, he proceeded to Mecca, where he studied traditions with eminent scholars such as Ibn Ḥadjar al-Haitami al-Maκtūm and others. He acquired much learning from ‘Ali b. Ḥāṣīn al-Dīn al-Muttaqi (d. 975 = 1567) and also became his disciple in the Kādirī and Shāhītī orders. After his return to his native country he tried his utmost to spread learning and to uproot the doctrines of Muhammad al-Djamalpurī who had claimed to be the Maktī of his time and had a considerable following among the Bohora [q. v.], a community to which Muhammad Tahir himself belonged.

In 980 (1572) Akbar went to conquer Gujraṭ, and after his conquest he conferred honour on Muhammad Tahir by tying with his own hand a turban on his head, saying that it was incumbent on him (Akbar) to spread the true principles of Islam. Khān ‘Azīz Muhammad Kākhānī was appointed governor of Gujraṭ and he helped Muhammad Tahir in uprooting the new doctrines of Mahdīism. But when ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khān Kākhānī succeeded him as governor, Muhammad Tahir suffered much at the hands of the followers of the Mahdī and proceeded to the court of Akbar in Akbarshāh for redress. On his way at Ujai in he was murdered by some followers of the pretended Mahdī in 986 (1578).

Among his various compositions the following may be mentioned:

1. Manāhī al-Qādirī al-‘Aṣir al-Amārī fi Qawālīt Ṭarīq al-Qādirī, a copious dictionary of the Kurān and the Traditions, lithographed, Lucknow 1248, 1284 and 1314;

2. al-Mughūl, a dictionary of proper names of Muhammadan traditionists, lithographed on the margin of Tāḥrit al-Tahābīd by Ibn Ḥadjar al-Aṣqālānī (Dhihli 1290);

3. Tujjīhīr al-Majūdīhī, a treatise on traditions that have been incorrectly attributed to the Prophet.


MUHAMMAD ZAIM, a Turkish historian. All that we know of his life is gleaned from his works. He was born in 950 (1552) for he tells us that at the accession of Sultan Murūd III, i.e. in 982 (1574), he was 43. At the early age of eleven he took part in the campaign of 950 (1543) along with his elder brother Perwa′n Agha, who at that time was Kapudān Bāshā to the Sandjak Beg of Lepanto, Yahyā Pascha Oghlu Ahmad Beg. When the latter, after the capture of Stuhlweissenburg, was appointed Sandjak Beg there, the brothers seemed to have remained in his service, probably till 952 (1545) when Ahmad Beg was summoned to Stambul, in connection with the plundering of the Stuhlweissenburg churches. In 967 (1554) when Sultan Sulaimān took the field against Shah Tahmāp of Persia, Muhammad Zaim was a secret agent in the service of the governor of Syria, Teki Oghlu Mohammmed, and a year later he was secretary to the powerful grand vizier Mohammed Sokollī and in this capacity compiled the official report of the death of Selim II and the accession of Murūd III which was sent to the governors of Diyarbakir, Aleppo and Baghdad. This office, to which he perhaps succeeded on the promotion (1578—1580) of the famous Fertćālu Ahmad Beg [q. v.], he must have filled till the death of Mohammed Sokollī in 987 (1579); we hear nothing further about it. He held a great fakīr (wakzan) and his epithet Zaim; him he himself says: wakzan-i atbedat asliyyat-i insānīyeyen Mohammed i munāfeg u-mādehsīr. Friends requested him to write a history and he finished it within a year. He began the work in Muharram 985 (beg. March 21, 1577) and had completed it in Jumāt-i-Hijriyya of the same year (beg. Feb. 9, 1578). The date of his death and
disposition of Aḥū Mānsūr and compared the following order of succession to that of the Husainid Muhammad Bākır for Aḥū Mānsūr and of the latter for the Husainid Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, with the Jewish line: first Moses, then Joshua, son of Nun, then the sons of Aaron (the later priesthood is meant). This arrangement was chosen in both cases so that conflict might not arise between the two lines of brothers (bāyātīn). — We cannot be certain that the Muḥammadīya formed a definite sect. The name rather records the fact that the rising of al-Naf ʿal-Ẓakīya, which was of great extent, attracted all circles of the Shīʿa to its ranks, even those who belonged to the Husainid camp; and members of the Muḥammadīya, the followers of Muḥṣīl b. Saʿdī, killed in the year 119 (737) by Yūsuf b. ʿOmar's predecessor ʿAṭīlī b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAṣūrī, probably, under the leadership of Dāhir b. Yānī al-Dīūrī, supported al-Naf ʿal-Ẓakīya with their good wishes at least.

Quite a different group is the ultra-Islāmīc Mūḥammadīya or ʿAlīmīya. It took its name from the belief in the divinity of the third ʿAlī Mahdī in reply to an ʿAlīyīa or ʿAʿlīyīa, which regarded ʿAllā as God. Its principal representative Al-Fāyūkī b. ʿAlī was executed between 279 (892) and 280 (893).

The Khāridjī Mūḥammadīya was a separate party within the strictly Khāridjī sub-group of the Adārīdī; it is called after a certain Muḥammad b. Zūrak.


(2. STRÖTHMANN.)

Mūḥammad a town and port on the head of the Persian Gulf and in the Persian province of ʿArabštī. It lies on the right bank of the Ḥaffār channel (formerly called Nahār Bayān) which connects the Ḥafṣūn river with the Shah ʿal-ʿArab. The original village from which the town grew appears to have lain on the left bank of the channel, on the island of ʿAbshādān [q. v.], and Muḥammad a is probably therefore not to be identified with the town of Bayān, though it now lies on the same site. Further, Bayān was included in ʿIrāq. Arabī by the geographers, whereas Muḥammad a, lying on ʿAbshādān island, was a part of Persia until the shifting of a channel threw the possession of the town into dispute between that country and Turkey. By the treaty of Erzerum (1847) it was assigned to Persia, but though the government was nominally directed from Shahrāb, it remained in reality in the hands of the Arab shaikhs of the Ḥabb (or Ḫab) tribe, who were Shīʿa. From the fact that the Arab geographers ignore the town, at any rate under its present name (for references to Bayān see ꦭ. Le Strange, below), it may be inferred that the change (Muḥfrīt) was either of minor importance or of comparatively recent origin. At the present time the port is of some importance for the trade of Persia, its principal article of commerce being dates.
though it is also connected with the oil trade.


(R. LEVY)

MUḤARIB, the name of several Arab tribes (Wustenfeld, *Register zu dem general Tabellen*, p. 320 gives five of this name) of which the most important is that of the Muḥārib b. Khaṣṣafa b. Kāis Ālān (Wustenfeld, *Register zu den general Tabellen*, D, 8). They do not however seem to have been of very great importance either in the Ḫulayfah or in Islama; Ibn al-Kalubi only gives these two pages of his *Dhawqarat al-Anībah* (Brit. Mus. MS., Add. 23,297, fol. 163b—165b) but these add considerably to the very meagre information in the Tabellen especially as regards the lines of 'All b. Ǧasr b. Muḥārib and of Badḥa'wā (sic) b. Ḍhūhī b. Ǧarīf b. Khālaṣ b. Muḥārib. A typical Bedouin tribe, the Muḥārib lived in the mountainous region of southern Najd between Medina and al-Yamāmāt (Wustenfeld, *Register*, p. 320 following Ibn Kātabi, *Kithāl al-Maṣā'īf*, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 41); several places in their territory are recorded in Yāḥūt's geographical dictionary (cf. the index of tribes, s. v.). We know very little about their history before Islama; they were closely connected with other tribes of the general group of the Kāis 'Allān, like the Hawāshīn, with whom they are said to have shared the worship of the idol Ḥulūl b. Ǧarīf (Yāḥūt, *Mağ'ūl*, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 167; 1, 1 = Wellhausen, *Recht*, p. 65; cf. *Ṭağī al-Anībah*, iii. 415, l. 7; from below), and especially the Ghaṭafānīn (inheritors of their clan Thālab b. Sa'd b. Ḍhūhībān) alongside of whom the clan of the al-Khūḍr b. Ǧarīf b. Khālaṣ b. Muḥārib (the genealogy of the Tabellen is to be rectified in as much as al-Millik is the name of al-Khūḍr and not that of his father) fought the war known as the *yawm al-ḥurāfa* or yawm Dūrat Mağ🇪II alluded to by the poet of the Ḫulayfah Usbān b. al-Ḥumān in some of his poems (cf. al-Muṣaffaṭdīyāt, ed. Lyall, Ns. ii. and xii. and the commentary of Ibn al-Anbar), with the passages quoted in the notes).

The Muḥārib at the beginning of Islama were hostile to Muhammad; this hostility was perhaps only the continuation of that which prevailed between the nomad tribes of the 'Āliya of al-Najd and the citizens of Medina. Thus we find, in the early years of the Ḫulayfah, that Muhammad sent against them (and against the Ghafarān) a series of expeditions, of the nature of raids and counter-raids rather than regular military enterprises (our sources give 30 or 40 men as the total of Muslim forces); the details of their fighting are given in Caetani, *Annali dell' Islama*, i. p. 527—538. (3 A. H. § 6), 596—597 (5 A. H. § 3), 689—

*AL-MUḤARRAM* (A.), the first month of the Muḥammādian year. The name is originally not a proper name but an adjective, as the article shows, qualifying Ṣafar. In the pre-Muḥammādian period the first two months of the old Meccan year were Ṣafar [q. v.] and Ǧīd, which is reflected in the dual *a-potiori* al-Ṣafārīnī for al-Muḥarram and Ṣafar; in the old Arab year the first half year consisted of *three months of two months each* (Wellhausen), as the two Ṣafār were followed by two Ḥaṭās and two Ḥumādās. The first of the two Ṣafār, as the one that belonged to the sacred months, was given the adjectival epithet al-muḥarram which gradually became the name of the month itself. As Ǧa ḫu ʾḥ-i-Hiḍja also belonged to the sacred months, three of the four sacred months came together except in leap year. The month intercalated to equate the year to the solar year was inserted after Ǧa ḫuʾ ḫ-i-Hiḍja and was not sacred. It thus came about that learned Muslims described the intercalation as remounting the Muḥarram concerned; Ṣafar, i.e. as making Muḥarram not sacred; they mean that the month after the pilgrimage, which they consider as al-Muḥarram, following the custom, is not sacred i.e. is Ṣafar and the second month i.e. in their view Ṣafar, is "al-Muḥarram". In doing this they of course overlook the fact that Ṣafar proper now only comes third; but when the intercalary month was abolished in Islama, the proper conception of the state of affairs was lost [cf. NAF].

In the early period when an attempt was made
to equate with the solar year by inserting intercalary months, — which was not successful on account of the ignorance of the old Arabs in astronomical matters — al-Muharram introduced the winter half year as the name of the first of the intercalary months. The Arab year began, like the Jewish, in autumn. After Muhammad had forbidden the insertion of the intercalary months in Sūra iv. 2. Muharram, the beginning of the year, went through all the seasons as the year, which now consisted of 12 lunar months, had always only 355 or 356 days, as it still has. Whether the first month of the year was originally marked by a festival we do not know. Wellhausen has endeavoured to show that the ḍahīf originally fell in the first month of the year, so that Muhammad was ḍarīm in its quality as “Dhu-l-Ḥijjah.” This also suggests that there was originally only one sacred month, but it was observed at different times in different parts of Arabia. Muhammad in the Kūrān always speaks only of the sacred month (ii. 942, 217; v. 2, 97); only in Sūra ix. 36: in laying down the method of reckoning time does he speak of four sacred months, in which it was thought to be of greater value if the year was divided into four parts, and, according to Sūra vii. 217, the defence of the faith takes preference over the sacred month. What the sacred month referred to in the Kūrān is, we do not know; in Sūra v. 2, at any rate, the month of the pilgrimage must be meant, which fits Wellhausen’s theory excellently. The commentators think Ṛadīj or Ḍhū ’l-Ḥa’līn is meant, at any rate not al-Muharram.

Al-Muharram has 30 days of which, in addition to the 1st as the beginning of the year, the following are specially noted: the 9th as the fast-day of the Shi’ite ascetics; the 10th as the anniversary of Kerbela (60 = 680), on which al-Husain b. A’īb b. Abī Tālib [q. v.] fell fighting against the Caliph Yazid b. Mu’awiyah and therefore the great day of mourning of the Shi’a (on the significance of the 10th Muharram for the Sunnis see “Āqīdah’), celebrated by pilgrimages to the sacred places of the Shi’a, especially to Kerbela [see MUGHEER HUSAIN], in which the passion play, representing the death of A’īb’s son [see TA’ZIYAH], plays the most important part; also the 16th as the day of the selection of Jerusalem as the Kibla [q. v.], and the 17th as the day of the arrival of the “people of the elephant” (Sūra cxiv).


MUḤĀSĪBĪ ABU ‘ABD ALLĀH ḤARIBĪ B. ḤARIB AL-ANṢĀRĪ, called Muḥāsibī, i.e. “he who examined his conscience,” was born in Baṣra; he died in Baghdad in 243 (857). A legist of the Ḥanbali school, a theologian who advocated the theory of the principle of reason (sarf), using the dialectic vocabulary of the Muṭarrīfīn, which he was the first to turn against them, he finally adopted a life of ascetic renunciation after a moral conversion prolonged which is described at the beginning of his Masāḥa. Involved with the Muṭarrīfīn in a general persecution as a result of Ibn Ḥanbal’s attack on the dialecticians, he had to give up all teaching in 232 (846) and died in retirement.

His principal works are: Rūya al-Ḥanbaḍ Allāh, Masāḥa (more accurately: Naṣṣ), Kitāb al-Taṣwīkh, Mā’yaṭ al-ʿAṣīr wa-Muṭāna, Risāla: al-ʿAṣāma, Fāḥim al-Sulāfī; none of them is yet printed. The Dāwā’ al-ʾArṣaṣ, which Sprenger attributes to him, is of an earlier date; it was arranged by his chief teacher ʿAṣāma b. Aṣim ʿAshqi.

Muḥāsibī is the first Sunnite mystic, whose works reveal a complete theological education; they combine in a very original way a keen concern for exact philosophical definitions, and a fervent reverence for the most naive traditions with the rigorous search for an increasing moral purification.

In his Rūya he discards the foundations of the concept of introspection which ʿAshqi had envisaged; he shows that a correlation is possible between two series of human happenings, the external actions of the members and the intentions of the hearts (against this: Allāh and the majority of contemporary muḥāṣibīn); he proves in detail that the enactment of the states of conscience (nashīd) can be guided progressively towards a perfect purity, provided an ascetic and moral rule of life is observed, the true ṭabāṣṣīma mentioned in Sūra iv. 27.

His adversaries (muḥāṣibīn), especially Ḥanbalis, attacked him for having differentiated the concepts of "līfān" and "ṣafī" (parallel of the "sower", "sīma" and waṣwafīa (like Ibn Karrām); admitted the created character of the ʿalāfū (our pronunciation of Kurʿānic verses); held that the elect, in Paradise, would be summoned to enjoy directly familiarity with the divine being; chosen his references from authors not by following the formal text and literal translations of their sūrahs, but on account of their intrinsic significance, from their moral weight (līfā), for the reader.

The Rūya is his main work; it forms in 61 chapters, in the shape of advices given to a pupil, a complete manual of the inner life. Ghazālī used it before writing his Ṭūḥā; and in spite of periodical attacks, its reputation among Arabic-speaking Muslim mystics lasted for a long time, and may be compared with that of the Sūrāt Ḥamin Christi among Christian mystics using Latin; the Shinābīya brotherhood, with Mursi, Ibn Ḥabīb Rundi, and Zarath Burski, have always recommended its use; and one of them, ʿArṣ al-ʿArṣ al-Muḥāsib, has made a summary of it.

The Ashʿari theologians also esteem Muḥāṣibī as a precursor.

signon, Essai sur les origines... de la mystique mulsiman, Paris 1922, p. 210—225 and 126—137; do., Passion d’al-Hallâ, index, s. v.; do., Textes indiscrets... la mystique mulsiman, Paris 1929, p. 16—23, and add. (L. Massinon)

MUHIBB AL-DIN. [See al-Tâbarî]  
AL-MUHIBB, a family of scholars in Damascus of the 11th—11th (xvth—xviiith) centuries of which three members distinguished themselves in literature:

1. Muḥibb al-Din Abu ʿAmr Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Tāhir al-Dīn al-Ḥasan al-Dimashqī al-Muḥiyyī b. al-Ḥasan, born in the middle of Kamādi? 949 (Dec. 23, 1542) in Hama, studied there, in Halab and Hims and after a journey to Constantinople obtained a post as teacher in the Madrasa al-Κuḍayrīya in Damascus. In 978 (1571) he accompanied the Shâsh al-Islâm and Chief Kālid Četvâže to Cairo, was for a period a kādi and there after a second journey to Constantinople was appointed kādi in Hims, Maʿarrat al-넘ān and several other towns of northern Syria. In 993 (1585) the post of a chief naṣib (al-miṣrāq al-kuṣūr) was given to him; at the same time he was military judge, judge of the Syrian caravans, taught in several madrasas and gave fatwas at the Sultan’s request. He died on the 23rd Shawwal 1016 (Feb. 18, 1608). Of his numerous writings only three have survived: his commentary written in 969 (1561) (according to al-Muhibb, iii. 322, on the other hand, prepared at the age of 16) on Muḥammad b. al-Shâsh’s (d. 815 H.) Uṣūl al-Bayānîya (Muṣ̄lima ṭaḥiyya (Uṣūl al-Bayānîya) in the Berlin, Ahwaiz, Ver., No. 7457—7557, and Gotha, Perach., No. 2780 MSS.; his Travel, al-Riḥûla or Ḫāliṭ al-Riḥûlah al-Ngâdiyya wa l-Diṣār al-Miṣriyya, in the Paris, Cat. de Sâne, No. 2293; Cairo, Fihrist, vii. 646; Stambl, ʿAiṭh Efendi, No. 2030 (s. Rescher, in M.K.O.B., v. 496) MSS., which he wrote when kādi in Maʿarrat al-نعمān, and his commentary written in 1011 (1603) on the authoritative verses in Zamakhshari’s Kaḥfahî entitled Tamīs al-Aṣya, See. Bukhārī 1281, Cairo 1307—1308, and on the margin of Kaḥfahî, ibid., 1318.


2. His grandson Ṣuḥayl Allâh b. Muḥibb Allâh b. Muḥibb al-Din was born on the 17th Muharram 1031 (Dec. 2, 1621) in Damascus, at an early age showed great linguistic ability, received in 1048 (1638) from Naǧm al-ṣul al-Ghazâlî (d. 1051 = 1641), (see Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 292) the iṣâqûs for Ḥadîth, and after failing to secure something in Hims through the Shâsh al-Islâm Muḥammad b. Zakârîya, was given by his father the latter’s post at the Derwâshîya. In 1051 (1641) he accompanied Muḥammad Ḥasan to Constantiopole, was appointed to the Madrasa Arba in there, but dismissed a year later, when he returned home. In 1059 (1649) he accompanied the kâdi Muḥammad b. Abâl al-Halûn al-Buṣrâwi to Egypt and became his deputy. After a quarrel with him, he resumed his studies in al-Asâr and came home next year. In 1073 (1662) he again went to Constantinople and four years later was appointed kādi of Barišt and returned to Damascus in 1079 where he died on 23rd Džumâddul-Ilī, 1082 (Oct. 27, 1671). While his own Džumâdû and his description of his journeys to Constantinople have not been preserved, his edition of the poems of his friend Manṣur al-Ḥasan (d. 1080—1069 in Damascus) are still in existence. He first of all arranged them chronologically, beginning with a poem on Sultan Ibrahim I of the year 1055 (1646) (in addition to the MSS. mentioned in Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 277 there are now Kuprili, ii. 1245 and Mösûl, Daʿûd, Manṣûr, No. 153, 20), then alphabetically, including poems of a later period down to 1071 (1660); this edition was printed at Damascus in 1301. In 1078 (1667) he edited the biographical work of Abû al-Ḥasan al-Bûrûnî (d. 1024 = 1615) Taʾrif al-ṣawād min Abû al-ʿAzîm and published it with a supplement; we may add to the MSS. mentioned by Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 290: Muḥammad Kurd al-All, in R.A.A.P., iii., 1923, p. 193—202.


3. His son Muḥammad al-Amin b. Ṣuḥayl Allâh b. Muḥibb Allâh b. Muḥibb al-Din Muḥibb al-Din, born in 1059 (1649) in Damascus, went with his father in 1065 (1655) to Egypt but returned home several times from there. A friend of his father’s, Muḥammad b. Luṭf Allâh b. Bârûn al-Iṣârî, who had been kâdi in Damascus in 1065 (1655) and was military judge in Anatolia in 1078 (1668), provided him with funds to study in Brusa. He returned home after a brief stay there on 8th Safar 1086 (May 4, 1675) in company with the mufti Muḥammad b. Abî al-Ḥalîm al-Iṣârî had in the meanwhile been appointed military judge in Adrianople and was able to procure him a post there. But his patron fell ill soon after wards and had to resign. Muḥammad accompanied him to Siambal and looked after him till his death on 10th Shawwal 1092 (Oct. 24, 1681). He then returned to Damascus and began to write. When in 1101 (1690) he had made the pilgrimage to Mecca, he was appointed a deputy kâdi and then a teacher in the Amnīya in Damascus. He died there on the 18th Džumâdd al-Ilāh, 1111 (Nov. 11, 1699).

His principal work is a collection of about 120 biographies of scholars, poets etc. of his time and the period immediately preceding it arranged in alphabetical order, entitled Khustain al-Alfar fi Ḥāna al-Karn al-kâdî al-suhûr, the first fair copy of which he finished in 1096 (1685) (printed Cairo 1684, 4 vols.). The draft of a number of biographies from the Hijâz and Yemen, which is preserved in the Brill-Houtmans MS., No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is, No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection;
like the crown and throne. It is the same when sovereignty is delegated to governors (vi., p. 5; v. 1; cf. i., p. 499; v. 163; iii., p. 421; v. 111; vi., p. 459; v. 3745; v. 463; v. 418). There is a reference in the same poem to seals of amber (i., p. 545, v. 692) such as actually existed (cf. Reinaud, Mon., i. 129). They were sometimes steeled in Chinese musk (vi., p. 351, v. 2288).

In Turkey the seal was again the emblem of power. The imperial seal (mukhär-šāhīnīšāhī) was handed to the grand vizier, hence also called mukhär-šāhī (cf. 8āzām-Šāhī), with great solemnity. Cf. M. d'Ohsson, vii. 120, and Na'īm (iv. 430). In speaking of ambition to become grand vizier the phrase mukhär-šāhīnīshāhīnī ("desire for the seal")

We may mention here that according to d'Ohsson (8āzām), the sultan had four seals with a tughrā set in rings; one was square and remained in his possession; he entrusted the others which were round, to the Grand Mistress or Lady Treasurers of the Harem (khāmān-tā?) and to the khāmān-tā, a white eunuch who at one time held the office of first chamberlain.

The seal was changed at each accession of a new monarch (cf. Na'īm, i. 117) as was the tughrā itself. Ewīlī Čelebi's statement, which implies the contrary, is therefore rather strange (vii. 300, v. 4 from below). In Persia the seal was retained but the name was changed (cf. Čaitam).

The grand vizier produced the imperial seal on the ašarbān days for the bolt or seal and for the registers of the rūsānāh and the archives of the Finance Department and melāyī defter-khānā, the Treasury (khānāt) and the general Archives (defter-khānā) (M. T. M., 499). The grand vizier also had, like all the viziers or governors of provinces, two other seals, one, a large one, impressed at the top of bayurūtān or "ordnances," and the other, a small and modest one, placed at the foot of the letters from the vizier, including official ones (cf. Ahmad Rūsūm, 8īmīn. Tarīkhā, iii. 1514).

The use of seals in Turkey (we know very little of those of the Sālājūls; cf. Reinaud, Mon., i. 121 note) was exceedingly widespread. They were used for impressions in wax (mukhār-mawān) and for stamping in a particular kind of ink to which saliva was added, as in Persia (cf. l.e Père Raphaël du Mans, p. 129). In more modern times the seal was carried in the purse (cf. a verse by Mejmīd 8ākīf in his poem Sīrīl Rāhī). It is only recently that under the influence of the West the mukhār has been dispensed with by the signature. It must have received its coup de grace with the recent adoption of the Roman alphabet and of rubber seals.

The industry of seal-engraving has thus been gradually disappearing. It had at one time reached a high degree of perfection and the artists used to sign their work. These signatures were usually very brief, Mīḥlī, Sīh, Ahmad etc. They were written in characters so minute that they could only be distinguished with a lens and only when very clearly engraved. Quite a study could be written on these artists.

Ewīlī Čelebi gives the following information about the seal engravers of Istanbul (i. 575). He distinguishes:

1. Engravers on stone, Ḥabbākūṭ, 105 workmen in 30 shops. They engraved on stones such as
THE MUHRADAK (MOHURDAR), Turk. MÜHÜRDAH [cf. the article ŞEHAT], keeper of the seals or better, "private secretary" (cf. below), was therefore a very important personality. Mir 'Ali Shīr Nava'i was the muhradak of Ḥusain Baiktara before becoming Ḥusain b. Reza and first minister (cf. Belin, Notice sur Mir..., 1863, p. 13; cf. de Saëcy, N.E., iv. 284, 261). He was succeeded in these offices by another poet, Mo'vestān (ibid.). On the muhradak in Persia, cf. Le Père Raphael du Mans, p. 21. In Central Asia the title of muhradak seems to have replaced that of tāmbūk which is now early as the Orkhoz inscriptions. In Turkey, each vizier had his muhradak (Ahmad Râsim, "Othman. Türk. li. 455). Cf. the account of the career of a muhradak in the Süklü'evâni, ii. 33 below (Behroj Eshuha [the same as is mentioned in the Manuel de Saint Pâsha, i. 4].)

The vāhnāmāgī had also their own muhradaks (J. Deny, Sémaine des archeves turques du Caire, p. 136). At Kâfi Koy there existed a quarter called Mühradak. For the work bearing the title Mürhuradak Türkî, cf. Babinger, G.O. W., p. 216 sq.

With the viceroys of Egypt the muhradak was a "private secretary" of the Khedive. The title of muhrdar was abolished in 1884 but the office has remained. His salary was the same as that of the chief of the cabinet (cf. ibid., p. 92 and 476).

Bibliography: Cf. the article ŞEHAT. We may now add: Babinger, Das Archiv der Byzantischen Osman Pacha, Berlin, 1931, p. 23 and note 5, where reference is made to a little known article by Rina Efiomi Madesroef. Cf. also von Hammer, Hist. de l'Empire Ottoman, xi. 445, 450, 464 (J. Deny).

MUḤSIN ALI, son of Shah Ḥusain Ḥājīkhan, was an inhabitant of Lucknow. In poetry he was the pupil of Ḥājan Wasi'. He flourished in the latter part of the sixteenth century. He is the author of a Dīwān, a collection of lyrical poems, and a biography of Urdu poets called Nasabî Sama'īn. Bibliography: Nasabî, Tīmcīd-

al-Muhtadī, Abu Abū Allām, Muḥammad, an Aḥbāb al-maṣbūl. After al-Wâlîk's death, a number of officials wished to pay homage to the young Muhammad, son of the deceased caliph and a Greek slave; instead however, al-Wâlîk's brother was proclaimed his successor and only after the deposition and murder of the unfortunate al-Mu'tazz (end of Ṛaddāb 255 = July 693) Muḥammad ascended the throne with the name al-Muhtadī. His ideal was the Umayyad Caliphate. People al-Aris. Like the latter, he also distinguished for the strictness with which he conducted his life; with piety and simplicity however, he combined strength and ability and during his brief reign he did his best to raise the caliphate from its degradation and to restore the power of the Commander of the Faithful. In several provinces there were risings by 'Alids, real or alleged; but the most dangerous enemy of the caliph was the Turkish general Miṣr b. Baghā. When the latter, who was fighting against the 'Alids in Persia, heard of the accession of al-Muhtadī, he returned home. Reaching Sāmarrā in Muharram 256 (Dec. 869), he forced the caliph to take an oath to bring to justice the Turkish chief Sālih b. Wāṣfī, who had robbed the mother of the caliph al-Mu'tazz of all her priceless treasures. When Sālih concealed himself, the Turkish mercenaries mutinied and were intending to depose al-Muhtadī but were suppressed by the minister of the latter. Al-Muhtadī then promised Sālih's followers that he would pardon him; but as the latter did not appear, they went to Sāmarrā and began to pillage it until they were scattered by Miṣr. Sālih was soon afterwards discovered and killed by one of Miṣr's men. When Miṣr had taken the field against the Kārāgārī, al-Muhtadī began to incite the people against him and his brother Muḥammad b. Baghā and accused them of embroilment. Muḥammad was brought to trial and put to death although al-Muhtadī had expressly guaranteed his pardon. The only course left for the caliph was to dispose of Miṣr if he was to keep his throne. But his plan was betrayed; Miṣr advanced with superior forces and the caliph suffered a disastrous defeat. As he declined to abdicate, he was murdered in Radjab 256 (June 870) in horrible fashion.


MUḤTASIB (Ar.), "censor," an officer appointed by the caliph or his warī to see that the religious precepts of Islam are obeyed, to detect offences and punish offenders. His office was the jihâd, and to it only men of good standing could, in theory, be appointed. Like al
Group of 29 seals accompanying the address to Muhammad 'Ali Pasha by the principal religious authorities in Mecca: the governor at the time, the imāms, khāffas, mujtahids of the four schools etc. The text dated at the end of the month of Muḥarram 1226 (Feb. 27/1813) contains congratulations on the occasion of the victory over the Wahhabs and expressions of gratitude for the restoration of freedom of pilgrimage.

Art. MUHR
Seals of various individuals, Ottoman, Algerian and Hijjari (beginning of the sixteenth century).


2. Esma Sultan, sister of Mahmud II. 11 Ram. 1222 (November 12, 1807).

3. Musa Pasha, șehînêçi or grand vizier interim. 8 Shaw. 1222 (December 9, 1807).


5. Kasim Agha, chief eunuch. 19 Rab. II 1225 (May 24, 1810).


8. Mehmud 'Arif Efendi, former șehîğ-êli-islâm. 9 Saf. 1227 (Feb. 21, 1812).

9. Mehmud Sadl Khatîb, Minister of the Interior. 23 Ijam. II 1227 (July 4, 1812).

10. Shâkir Ahmed, șehînêçi. 28 Ijam. II 1227 (July 8, 1812).

11. Mehmud Khurshad Pasha, șâbu-d-şâba (at this date). 15 Saf. 1228 (Feb. 17, 1813).


17. Sarl Ahmad, wa'dl al-haramain al-harfâm at Mecca. 3 Shaw. 1241 (May 11, 1826).

18. Selim Thabit, wa'dl of Algiers at Constantinople. 7 Shaw. 1242 (May 4, 1827). Cf. No. 4: same seal, but on this impression the signature of the zugraver 'Omer appears clearly under the fleuron on the left.

19. al-Saiyid Khalil, wa'dl of Algiers at Smyrna. End of Ram. 1243 (April 15, 1828).


22. Sulaimân Ismail, șâmîç and wa'dl of Algiers at Durazzo. 7 Ram. 1244 (March 15, 1829). To left under the fleuron: signature
holders of public office, he had to be a Muslim and free. Generally he was a fakih, and in addition to his police functions he performed those of a magistrate. In some respects his duties were parallel with those of the šafi‘i, but the mufti’s jurisdiction was limited to matters connected with commercial transactions, defective weights and measures, fraudulent sales and non-payment of debts. Even in these matters he could hear only those cases in which the truth was not in doubt. As soon as evidence had to be sifted and oaths administered the mufti’s jurisdiction ceased. As a consequence he had power to enforce the law without first requiring complaint from an injured party, and had to see that in a place where Muslims lived they did not neglect to hold a Friday service in the mosque and that if they numbered forty or more they formed themselves into an organised community. But if the number was large and there were differences of opinion on the question of worshipping the individual Muslim at the mosque unless he was a persistent defaulter. Even then the officer could do no more than admonish the delinquent. So far as the mosque was concerned the mufti could insist on the qibla and he could examine the mu‘allafat in the subject of the times lawful for the ablution. If a public mosque fell into disrepair, the mufti was charged with the duty of calling the attention of the authorities to the matter.

An important part of the mufti’s duties was to see that the laws of the šafi‘i were maintained. Persons breaking the fast of Ramadan, widows and divorced women who did not observe the ḥudūd [q.v.] before remarriage, and other transgressors, were liable to have to make explanations before him. Public morals further, came under his jurisdiction. He had to prevent men from consorting with women in public and from indulging openly in wine; also the playing of forbidden musical instruments came under his ban and he had to see that games and toys did not lead to offences against the šafi‘i. However, he could not act on suspicion alone nor had he the right to go behind closed doors to pursue his investigations. His powers would appear to have been wider where the spiritual welfare of Muslims was concerned. Thus if a fakih propounded views contrary to idjma‘ [q.v.] it was the mufti’s duty to admonish him and to report him to the sovereign if he persisted in preaching heterodox doctrines. Also, if a person not a fakih suddenly turned to the study of the šafi‘i, the mufti had to make investigation in order to discover his motive and to prevent his misleading persons who might apply to him. Schools also had to be visited by the mufti, though not so much for the purpose of inspecting the character of the teaching as to ensure that teachers did not beat their pupils too severely (Ma‘ṣūṣ, Ḳaṣaf, i. 464). Other matters which came within his jurisdiction were connected with public amenities rather than with morals or religious institutions. Thus, in towns where the source of drinking water was coiled or the provision made for poor wayfarers he could order the townsmen to rectify matters. He had to see to it that no house overlooked the women’s quarters of another belonging to a Muslim and that no house had projecting rainspouts or drains leading on to the street to the inconvenience of wayfarers, and finally that the šafi‘i was kept clean and clear of obstacles to traffic.


AL-MUḤÝL. [See ʿAlîn, b. 2.]

MUḤÝL b. ʿALI (al-Arâbî). MUḤÝL b. ʿALI MUḤÂMÂD (Mehmed) b. ʿALI b. AL-DIN ‘ALI al-DÎJÂLÎ, a Turkish theologian and historian of the time of Selim I (1512–1520) and Sulaimân I (1520–1566). His father was the famous mufti Zanibî ‘Alî al-Dîjâlî, a grandson of Dijâlî al-Dîn Mehemd of Ak Serai (hence the epithet Dijâlî). He received his theological training first from his maternal grandfather, Hüsân Zâde Feândî, then from his father ‘Alî al-Dîn and later from Mu‘ayyad Zâde Feândî. He worked as mûdates in several medreses, in Constantinople at the Murad medresse and at the eight schools of the Fatih mosque and in Adrianople where he was also a mufti for a period. He died in retirement and was buried at Adrianople in 957 (1550); according to some, however, in 956 (1549).

His main importance lies in the fact that he edited the anonymous Ottoman chronicles, the Târîkh-i ‘Alî ʻOthmânî, and under the title Târîkh-i ‘Alî ʻOthmânî, These chronicles which run from the beginning of the Ottoman empire were continued by him down to 936 (1539) i.e. till shortly before his death.

Two versions of his Chronicle exist, both of which go back to him: 1. a shorter one to which corresponds the translation of the Beck manuscript by Gaudier-Spiegel: Chronica ac Acta (in der Türkischen Sprache vorn geführte Krüge, aus Türkischer Sprache verdeutsch. Vorhm niss in Druck ausgesehen, Frankfurt a/O. 1567; it was also published in Latin and German by Leunclavius: Analea Sultaniearum Ottomanarum a Turcicisenna scripta, Frankfurt 1588; 2nd edition with index and German transl. Neues Chronika Türckischer Nation von Türken selbs beschrieben, Frankfurt a/Main 1590; 2. a longer version: the so-called Veronan Chronicle (Codex Veraniatanus), edited in Latin and German by Leunclavius: Historia Musulmanum Turcorum de monumentis inscriptis in libro XVIII, Frankfurt 1591. These were 18 books instead of the 30 planned. As early as 1590 the first three books were published in German at Frankfurt: Neuerer Musulmanischer Histori, Türkische Nation, von ihrem Herkomen, Geschichte und Taten; beyß Bücher, die ersten unter derregischen, followed by the complete German translation of the Analee: Neuerer Musulmanischer Histori Türkischer Nation, Frankfurt a/M. 1595.

In addition to his chronicle, which exists only in manuscript (MSS. in Vienna, Munich, Berlin, Gotha, London, Constantinople etc.), Muhyî al-Dîn is also credited with poems in Turkish, Arabic and Persian (also extant in a manuscript) and a theological work.
MUHYI 'L-DIN MUHAMMAD — MU'IN AL-DIN SULAIMAN PARWANA


MUIHYI LĀRĪ (d. 933 = 1526—1527), a Persian writer, author of the famous Fatḥi al-Haramain, a poetical description of the two holy cities, Mecca and Medina, which also contains a full account of all the rites of the obligatory pilgrimage (hajj).

This book, written in 911 (1500) and dedicated to Mu'āṣar b. Mahmūd Shāh of Gūḍḫāst (197—932 = 1511—1526), was a long time wrongly attributed to the celebrated poet 'Abd al-Rahmān Kāšānī. Muḥyī Lārī was a pupil of the great philosopher Muhammad al-Sha'rānī (d. 907 = 1501) and made use of his extensive philosophical knowledge in a commentary on the great Kāfāh of Ibn al-Fārūḍ, which is known as al-Tārīkh al-kubrā. In this work he endeavoured, following in the footsteps of his teacher, to reconcile the principles of orthodox Muhammadian mysticism with the teachings of Aristotle in the form in which they were disseminated in the east.


(E. BERTHELS)

AL-MU'TID. [See 'Allah, b. 1, 113.]

MU'IN AL-DIN SULAIMAN PARWANA, vice-regent of the Sālidūq empire in Asia Minor after the Mongol invasion of that territory. His father Mahdihībād al-Dīn 'Alī al-Dāhlī, some sources, such as the Taqīrī-bi Gū啸e, Mu'īn al-Dīn is called "al-Kāshī," which implies origin from Kāshān) had been a minister during the reign of Kākhkūshār II and had been able, after the battle of Kūse Dagh (1243), to secure for a time the continuation of the Sālidūq dynasty in Asia Minor, by his intercession with the Mongol general Bāqūlī (Bin Bībi, p. 243). His son Mu'īn al-Dīn Sulaimān soon rose to hold important offices and had been commander of Tōkjāt and Erzinjān, when, in 1256, he was promoted, by the favor of Bāqūlī, to the rank of pārwarān. The title pārwarān denoted a high administrative office (high chancellor) in the Sālidūq empire and is erroneously explained by the Persian dictionaries as a synonym of fāwārān (the word is fully discussed in the foot-note in p. 46 of Khalīl Edhem's article in T.O.E.M., vol. viii; cf. also Huettl, Z. Isl. Staats, i, 86). At the time indicated the three sons of Kākhkūshār were nominally reigning, but Mu'īn al-Dīn was already the real director of affairs. After Bāqūlī had appeared on the scene in 1250, the empire was divided into two parts, of which Kukan al-Dīn Kājīlī Arslān got the eastern part with Parwana as visier at his side. The latter had also a family connection with the dynasty, for he was married to a daughter of Kākhkūshār II, while one of his own daughters became the wife of the Sālidūq Ghiyāth al-Dīn Mas'ūd II. As visier of Kukan al-Dīn he conquered Sinope (Stabul) from the Greek emperor of Trebizond; the town was given to himself, and after his death some of his descendants continued to reign there (cf. 1250 and 1287, Schödel, Parwanier-Zaithlen, in T.O.E.M., 1st year, p. 703). In February 1265 Parwana, warned that his sulṭān wanted to get rid of him, had him imprisoned and afterwards strangled at Aş-Serīt. The two and a half years' old son of Kukan al-Dīn, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kākhkūshār, was set up as puppet-king. During the following years, when Parwana was, under the supervision of the Mongols, the real master in Eastern Anatolia, the wretched situation of the country induced many notable Turks to emigrate to Egypt, where they incited Sulṭān Baibars to a military expedition against the Mongol dominion in their country. It is highly probable that Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwana himself was secretly at the head of these negotiations. Baibars invaded Asia Minor, defeated a Mongol army at Alibārba and occupied the town of Kaşārīye in April 1277. Here he waited for Parwana to join him, but the latter had lost his confidence in the enterprise and fled to Tōkjāt with the young sulṭān. Baibars returned again to Syria and soon a Mongol army appeared under the Ilkhan Abaqa to inflict drastic punishment on the Muslim population; he is said to have killed over 200,000 people. At the same time suspicion fell on Parwana. He was accused of having fled with his army at the battle of Alibārba, of having not appeared before the Ilkhan after the defeat, and of having neglected to inform the Mongols of Baibars' approach. At first Abaqa was willing to spare him, but on the insistence of the relatives of those killed in the battle of Alibārba, he ordered him to be executed at Ala Dagh, together with his retainers, probably on the 1st of Rabī‘ I 676 (August 2, 1277). Ala Dagh is, according to Khalīl Edhem, probably the same as Köse Dagh, to the east of Siwā. His burial place is not known. A foundation inscription on a mosque built by Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwana in 663 (1264—1265) is still extant at Marzūf. His death inspired several poets to make elegies on him (Manādījīm Bīshī). From the tradition of the Mawlawī order it appears that Parwana was on intimate terms with Khalīl al-Dīn Rūsūm; the latter's work Fatḥi al-Mu'īn was dedicated to him (cf. Kūripūlālī, Zāhil M. Fāsil, I, Mu'tawālīm, p. 258).

Bibliography: The Sālidūq-nāmā of Ibn Bībi (Houtsma, Reiset, iv.) and of Aṣkārīyāt (used in manuscript by modern authors); Rašīd al-Dīn, Qanāt al-Tawārīkh, ed. Blochet, Paris 1911, p. 548; Hayton, in Historiens arménien des Croisades, ii, 179; al-Makritis, al-Sulāhī bi-Muṣāfr al-Mu'tāb, translated by Quaternaire (1837—1844) and by Blochet, 1906; al-Nuwarī, Nikihat al-Abār (used by Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, iv.) Abu l-Fida', Ta'rīkh, Constantinople 1285, iv. 80; Mastawī, Ta'rīkh-i-Gū啸e, in G.M.S., 1910, p. 484; Munadāddīm Bīshī, Siyāsāt al-Akhbār, ii, 577—573; J. von Hammer, Geschichte der Ikhana, Darmstadt 1842, i, 299; Nejīb 'Aṣīm, Turā' Ta'rīkhī, Constantinople 1316,
Additions and Corrections

P. 530, L. 33, p. 5437, L. 39; instead of 375, read 275.


P. 671, L. 22, instead of 1105, read 1100, L. 64; instead of Ghezar, read Gobur.

P. 674, L. 54; instead of 10079, read 835.

P. 682, L. 45; instead of Wali'sshur, read Wali's sigh.

P. 688, L. 43, 55, 63; instead of Mir, read Mirz; L. 66; instead of in May 1624, read, in

Mir 1624.
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MU'IN AL-MISKIN whose full name was MU'IN AL-DIN MUSLIM MUHAMMAD IBN NASIR AL-DAWLA who led the Seljuk state in Persia and the border regions for around 31 years, from 1200-1241. He is known for his efforts to maintain the Seljuk traditions and his role in Persian culture.
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mid writers claim, he privately declared his adhesion to al-Mu'izz. His death on 21st Djamād al-Aswād (24th May 968) gave the signal for the advance of the Fātimid army, said to have been over 100,000 strong, which set off under the command of Dījawar on 14th Rabi‘ I, 358 (6th Feb. 969), with the support of a naval squadron. The disorganization which prevailed in Egypt and the terror inspired by the Greek armies (who in 968 had swept over the whole of northern Syria without meeting opposition and had taken immense numbers of prisoners), contributed greatly to the prospects of its success; moreover, many of the Egyptian notables and even of the troops had sent letters to al-Mu'izz inviting his intervention. On Dījawar's approach the population made their submission by an embassy of notables, but the Ikhwānid and Tūlūnī regiments rejected the conditions laid down in the agreement, and had to be forcibly dislodged from their positions at Dījrāz and on the islands. The retreating Manuli people split up into bands, some of which continued to give Dījawar much trouble as local centres of disaffection, ending only with the arrest and deportation to Africa of their commanders, and the disarmament or imprisonment of the remainder.

Dījawar, having entered Fustān on 17th Shawwāl 358 (7th July 969) and laid the foundations of the new city of al-Khīrā, immediately took in hand the reform of the administration. Complete religious toleration was promised, and confirmed by the reinstatement of the existing officials, weekly sessions for the hearing of mājālim were instituted, several vast taxes were abolished and property which had been illegally appropriated to the Treasury was restored to its owners and regular salaries were assigned to the officers of the mosques. Another of his reforms, however, caused great resentment, as the levying of a new coinage to replace the existing debased coinage, and the order to levy all taxes in the new currency. His difficulties were increased by a prolonged famine and by the turbulence of the Berber soldiers, and it was not until the arrival in Egypt of al-Mu'izz himself in Ramadān 362 (June 973) that the task of reorganization was completed by centralizing the financial administration under Ya'qūb b. Kifrī (q.v.) and 'Amīr b. al-Ḥasan, and by the removal of the Berber troops to a new camp near Heliopolis.

The course of events in Syria after the occupation of Egypt is differently related and obscure in detail. Dījawar's lieutenant Laj'far b. Fadhāl defeated the joint forces of the Ikhwānīs and Karmānijas under al-Ḥasan (in some versions al-Ḫāshām) b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Taghādī at Ramla in the early months of 359 (970), but the general disorganization and the licence of the Arab tribesmen preventing him from entering Damascus until Dhu 'l-Ḥijjah of the same year. Shortly afterwards he detached some contingents against the Greeks, but the troops sent to recover Antioch were defeated near Iskandarīn, or, according to Yahyā b. Sa‘īd (ed. Chekhlo, p. 139), were recalled before besieging the city for five months. Meanwhile the Karmānij general al-Ḥasan b. Ahmad al-ʿAṣām (in some versions al-Aghabāh), in revenge, it is said (but see de Goeje, Les Cérémonies du Bahrām, p. 181-190), for the stoppage of the subsidy he had received from the Ikhwānid al-Ḥasan, opened negotiations with the Buwālīd 'Īzā al-Dīn and
the Hamdānī idrīs of al-Mu‘izz, and with the aid of subsidies from the sultans and some Ikhshihīd contingents, defeated and killed Dayfīr and recaptured Damascus in 1721 (A.H. 365). Having set up the remaining Egyptian forces in Yūsf, he marched on Cairo, but was defeated by Dzhawar in Rābi‘ I 361 (Dec. 971), and his fleet was destroyed at Tinall. The Karmātians retained their hold on Damascus, however, repulsed a strong Mamluk force despatched to Palestine by Dzhawar in Ramaḍān 361, and with an army of Arab auxiliaries and Ikhshihīd (some sources also add Daylami) made a second descent upon Egypt after the arrival of al-Mu‘izz. By bribing the Arabs, the Caliph succeeded in dividing and defeating the Karmātian army outside Cairo in Ramaḍān 365 (May–June 646), but not before the Karmātian forces had overrun both the Delta and Egypt itself. On al-Hasan’s return to al-Ahṭīr the ‘Uṯlīlī Zā‘īm b. Mawshīb occupied Damascus on behalf of al-Mu‘izz, but came into conflict with the Mamluk troops, whose indiscipline and excesses at length led the citizens to appeal to the Turkish general al-Aṣfāḥīn, who remained in possession of the city until he was captured by al-‘Azīz [q.v.]. Meanwhile in northern Syria the Fāṭimid forces gained a series of striking successes against the Greeks. Tripoli and Bahrīt were captured in 394 (975), and John Zimiskes suffered a crushing defeat both on land and sea at the hands of Rāyšān, governor of Tripoli, on his attempt to recover the city.

The empire which al-Mu‘izz bequeathed to his successor, though it fell short of his ambitions, was still of imposing extent. The viceroy to whom he had committed the western provinces, Balasik b. Zīrī [q.v.], proved both loyal and capable; when, on the departure of the Caliph, the Zenātīs again rose in revolt, he scattered their forces and captured Tāḥāt and Tilīmān. The holy cities of Mecca and Madīna acknowledged the suzerainty of the Fāṭimidās, and they had a powerful following in Sīnā. Only in Syria had the Karmātians, on whose cooperation al-Mu‘izz had confidently relied (though the letter reproduced by al-Makhrīzī, Ḥakīmah, ed. Bn LX, p. 333 sqq. is of doubtful genuineness), brought him to a halt, but by this action they had placed a fatal obstacle in his way. This appointment preyed on his mind and, worn out by ill-health and by grief at the loss of his eldest son ‘Abd Allāh (died 364), he died at Cairo on 12th Rābi‘ II, 365 (Dec. 19, 975), having nominated as his successor his second son Nūẓẓar al-‘Azīz.

The personal character of al-Mu‘izz was singularly noble; frank, accessible, simple in his habits, endowed with brilliant gifts, and endowed with all the traditional qualities of šī‘a, he was at the same time a capable administrator and just towards his subjects, though the financial exigencies of his last years left a bitter memory. No instance of cruelty is recorded of him, except the execution of his Karmātian captives, and he was completely devoid of religious fanaticism.


(H. A. R. Gibb)
difference in longitude between the two heavenly bodies is 180°, while the modern use is to take account of the deviations of latitude from the ecliptic, al-Battâni’s expression, emphasis (Opus astronomicum, ed. Nallino, ii. 196) that we can only have the true Mukabala when both bodies are either in the ecliptic itself or are in equal ecliptical latitudes when opposed; in other words when they are diametrically opposite one another in the heavens (cf. *kibur al-musulmān*). Opposition with the sun can only occur for the moon and the outer planets (in ancient astronomy only for Mars, Jupiter and Saturn), not for the two inner ones, Mercury and Venus. When an outer planet is in opposition to the sun, its conditions of visibility are at their best; at midnight it passes through the meridian and is above the horizon the whole night. When the moon is in opposition to the sun, when the sun has set, the usual technical expression for this in Arabic astronomy is *al-taṣālíkh*, which is derived from the same root as *mukabala* (Greek *μεταβολή* or *μεταξομεταβολή*) and is rendered by Plato Thebanaeus and other mediæval translators by *transmutation*, but we do not commonly apply the general term *mukabala* applied to the opposition of sun and moon, while on the other hand we never find *al-taṣālíkh* used in the general sense of opposition of the planets (cf. al-Battâni, iii. 349, s. v. *kibur al-musulmān*).

Al-mukabala, opposition, forms along with *tābat*ī, quadrature (Gr. τετράγωνον, Lat. quadratum, quadratum), *tābâṭāk*ī, trigon (Gr. τριγώνον, Lat. trigonum, triangulum, trigonum, *astra* tricornia), and *tākta*sī, hexagon (Gr. ἕξ γωνία, Lat. hexagonum, sexangulum, *astra* sexticia), the four astrological aspects (ābdāl, ṣāhīl, ḥaṣāl, ḥaṭlat), which are applied to the ecliptical difference in longitude of two planets to the amount of 180°, 90°, 120° or 60° respectively. The *aḥkāl* also play a part in the astrological arrangement of the signs of the zodiac (tawāgi) (cf. the article *miqāra* and al-Battâni, iii. 194). It should be noted that the conjunction of planets (mukabara, Greek *συνάφεια*; for moon with sun [new moon] always *idgīn*) is not included among the *aḥkāl*, nor the position when the difference of latitude is 30° or 150° (cf. al-Battâni, s. v. *aḥkāl*).

In horoscopes mukabala and *taṣālīkh* are ruled as unfavourable in principle, *taḥkīk* and *tāصلا* on the other hand as favourable.


(Wilf Hartner)

MUKADAM (m. a. *placed in front*). Applied to persons the word means the chief, the one in command, e.g. of a body of troops or of a ship (captain). Dozy, *Spieg.* s. v., gives number of police appointments which have this name. In the devshir orders the word is used for the head of the order or the head of a monastery.

As a neuter noun the word is a technical term in logic and arithmetic. In logic it means the protasis in a premise in the form of a conditional sentence, e.g. *"If the sun rises (it becomes day)\*", where this whole sentence is to be regarded as a syllogism. But as every sentence can be a premise, *mukaddam* is really identical with the condition in the conditional sentence. In arithmetic *mukaddam* means the first of two numbers in a proportion, i.e. 3 (1-5) or in other words the divided in a simple division.

In logic and in arithmetic the portion following the *mukaddam* (in brackets above) is called *taṣālīkh*.


(M. Flogner)

AL-MUKADDASĪ, SHAMS AL-DIN AḤĀB AL-‘ABBĀS MUḤAMMAD B. AḤMAD B. AḤĀB AL-BANNA’A AL-SHĀMĪ AL-MUKADDASĪ AL-MAṬ‘Ī B. ‘ĪSĪ AL-BASHSĪRĪ as he is called on the first page of the Berlin manuscript (Cat. Ahlwardt, No. 6034), is the author of the most original and at the same time one of the most valuable geographical treatises in Arabic literature. The name-form al-Mukaddasi, denoting his origin from Jerusalem, goes back to Sprenger, who brought the Berlin manuscript from India and made this author first known in Europe (A. Sprenger, *Die Post- und Reisezüge des Ortes*, Leipzig 1844, p. xviii), but the form *Maṭ‘ī* is probably more correct, as Jerusalem is commonly spelt in Arabic al-Madīa (Yāḥyā, *Al-Madīa*, iv. 550). Yāḥyā always quotes him as al-Bashshārī.

Biographical dates on the life of this author are only to be found in the text of his treatise. In 356 (966), when he was at Mecca, he was about twenty years of age; it is probable that he lived at least as late as 1000, as the last datable information in the treatise belongs to the end of the 10th (xth) century. His grandfather Abu Bakr al-Banna’ā was an architect in Palestine and had made for Ibn Ṭulun the gates of the town of ‘Akkih. His mother’s family was originally from Bīyar in Kūmis, from where his grandfather Abu I-Tayib b. al-Shāwī (in B.G.A., iv., p. viii, l. 12, *paterna* is to be corrected into materonas) emigrated to Jerusalem. Muḥammad b. Ahmad himself shows also a good knowledge of architecture, besides a good literary and general erudition.

The geographical treatise is known from two old manuscripts, which form the basis of de Goeje’s edition in the B.G.A., iv. 1877 and of his revised edition of 1906. The Berlin manuscript has the title Aḥsan al-Tawāqi’ fī Murūṣat al-Aḥfūl, while the Constantinople manuscript (Aya Sofia, No. 2977 kēr; cf. Ritter, in *Lit. xix.* 43), written in 658 (1260), is only indicated as Kitāb al-Aḥfūl. The Leyden manuscript (Cat. v. 191) is a modern copy of the Constantinople one, while another Berlin manuscript (Cat. Ahlwardt, No. 6033) is a bad copy of the other Berlin manuscript. The date of composition is not certain. The text itself states that it was completed in 375 (985) (B. G. A., iv. 9), but as has been said, information of a later date has been added, while Yāḥyā (i. 653) gives the year 378 (988). The manuscript (Constantinople) is somewhat less extensive than Berlin) and de Goeje, hesitatingly, considers the composition of C as the older one. It is dedicated to a certain Abu I-Ḥasan ‘Aḥī b. ʿIṣā and mentions the Samaras as the most important dynasty; B, on the contrary, does not contain the dedication and is more orientated towards the Fatimids.

The general scope of the work proves beyond doubt that it is based on the same geographical tradition as the treatises connected with the names of the latter, but affords a wealth of information on a vast number of regions hitherto unknown to Europeans. The author’s undoubted aim is to describe the land of God with his own eyes, in contrast with the material from which the earlier geographers drew as fully as possible. The work has a very unequal value. The first part dealing with Syria, Egypt and Africa is the best and most trustworthy. The descriptions of the different regions in Arabia are for the most part compiled from older sources. The author’s real merit lies in the fact that he assembled so much material and collated it with so much care and knowledge. He describes all kinds of wild beasts, birds, flowers, fruit and corn, and gives also a number of meteorological and astronomical data. He has drawn up a list of castles and fortresses, the names of which are found in other sources nowhere else, as well as a list of inscriptions which are not found in any other manuscript. He does not give any indication of the sources from which he took his information, and is therefore of little value as a bibliographical authority. (D. de Goeje, *Die Post- und Reisezüge des Ortes*, Leipzig 1844, p. xix).
where the native sailing-boats are built. The country around is not fertile; a mile to the west however is an oasis belonging to the ruler, which is watered by a stream which also provides the town's water supply. The climate of Mukallā is very dry, the coast hot; only from October to April and in June and July do fresh breezes and showers temper the heat. The population varies between 6,000 and 12,000.

Mukallā is the only place between 'Aden and Maskat that deserves the name of harbour. It cannot however be used as an anchorage during the southwest monsoon; in this period its place is taken by Burām, 16 miles southwest. The trade with India, Somalia, the Red Sea and Maskat is considerable. The exports are mainly gum arabic, skins, henna from the Veshbou valley, senna and some coffee; the imports are cotton goods, metals, pottery from Bombay, dates and dried fruits from Maskat, coffee from 'Aden, sheep, aloes and frankincense from the African coast. The fisheries also give a considerable yield while amber is obtained in considerable quantities. Parais and bananas from Bombay play a leading part in the trade and Hindustān is spoken almost as much as Arabic. Since 1884 Mukallā has been under the rule of the 'Alā'ī dynasty with which England concluded a treaty granting a protectorate on May 1, 1888. According to Ibn al-Majdūsir, the old name of the town was 'Al-Mukannā, and the natives also called al-Mukallā, like al-Shīrī, Bender al-Abkāf or Sīk al-Abkāf. The port has steamship communication with 'Aden; most of the traffic is borne by native sailing-boats of 100—300 tons, which are busiest at the time of the date harvest.


(Adolf Gehrmann)

AL-MUKALLĀ. The capital of the province of Mukallā, and situated on the southern coast of Arabia, 142 miles N.W. of the cape of the same name. The town lies between two bays at the foot of a reddish limestone cliff, which rises to a height of 300 feet behind the town; four towers for the defence of the town are built upon it. On the west side a wall runs from the cliff to the shore with only one gate in it. The only buildings of any size are the great mosque on the coast with a minaret which can be seen from a great distance, and the sultan's palace; the other buildings are mainly huts with a few houses of stone. The palace is a great six-storey building with decorated windows which stands on a kind of peninsula. In the centre of the town is a large cemetery with the tomb of Wall Yaʿqūb; in the modern western part of the town is the bazaar which is provided with all kinds of goods and has some modest industries which provide the native population with baskets, pipes of a kind of limestone, silver powder-horns and muskets without stocks. There is a yard in the harbour I. G. W. de Goede, in the introduction to vol. iv. of the B.G.A., p. vi.—viii.; further cf. Brockelmann, G.A.A., i.

[J. H. Kramer]

MUKALLĀ (Makalla), a seaport on the south coast of Arabia, 142 miles N.W. of the cape of the same name. The town lies between two bays at the foot of a reddish limestone cliff, which rises to a height of 300 feet behind the town; four towers for the defence of the town are built upon it. On the west side a wall runs from the cliff to the shore with only one gate in it. The only buildings of any size are the great mosque on the coast with a minaret which can be seen from a great distance, and the sultan's palace; the other buildings are mainly huts with a few houses of stone. The palace is a great six-storey building with decorated windows which stands on a kind of peninsula. In the centre of the town is a large cemetery with the tomb of Wall Yaʿqūb; in the modern western part of the town is the bazaar which is provided with all kinds of goods and has some modest industries which provide the native population with baskets, pipes of a kind of limestone, silver powder-horns and muskets without stocks. There is a yard in the harbour

AL-MUKALLĀ, a seaport on the south coast of Arabia, 142 miles N.W. of the cape of the same name. The town lies between two bays at the foot of a reddish limestone cliff, which rises to a height of 300 feet behind the town; four towers for the defence of the town are built upon it. On the west side a wall runs from the cliff to the shore with only one gate in it. The only buildings of any size are the great mosque on the coast with a minaret which can be seen from a great distance, and the sultan's palace; the other buildings are mainly huts with a few houses of stone. The palace is a great six-storey building with decorated windows which stands on a kind of peninsula. In the centre of the town is a large cemetery with the tomb of Wall Yaʿqūb; in the modern western part of the town is the bazaar which is provided with all kinds of goods and has some modest industries which provide the native population with baskets, pipes of a kind of limestone, silver powder-horns and muskets without stocks. There is a yard in the harbour

where the native sailing-boats are built. The country around is not fertile; a mile to the west however is an oasis belonging to the ruler, which is watered by a stream which also provides the town's water supply. The climate of Mukallā is very dry, the coast hot; only from October to April and in June and July do fresh breezes and showers temper the heat. The population varies between 6,000 and 12,000.

Mukallā is the only place between 'Aden and Maskat that deserves the name of harbour. It cannot however be used as an anchorage during the southwest monsoon; in this period its place is taken by Burām, 16 miles southwest. The trade with India, Somalia, the Red Sea and Maskat is considerable. The exports are mainly gum arabic, skins, henna from the Veshbou valley, senna and some coffee; the imports are cotton goods, metals, pottery from Bombay, dates and dried fruits from Maskat, coffee from 'Aden, sheep, aloes and frankincense from the African coast. The fisheries also give a considerable yield while amber is obtained in considerable quantities. Parais and bananas from Bombay play a leading part in the trade and Hindustān is spoken almost as much as Arabic. Since 1884 Mukallā has been under the rule of the 'Alā'ī dynasty with which England concluded a treaty granting a protectorate on May 1, 1888. According to Ibn al-Majdūsir, the old name of the town was 'Al-Mukannā, and the natives also called al-Mukallā, like al-Shīrī, Bender al-Abkāf or Sīk al-Abkāf. The port has steamship communication with 'Aden; most of the traffic is borne by native sailing-boats of 100—300 tons, which are busiest at the time of the date harvest.


(Adolf Gehrmann)
MUKAN (Mughan), a steppe lying to the south of the lower course of the Araxes, one part of which (about 10,000 square kilometres) belongs to Russia (U.S.S.R.) and the other (50–70 x 60 kilometres) to Persia. The steppe which covers what was once the bottom of the sea has been formed by the alluvial deposits from the Kur (in Russian Kura) and its tributary the Araxes. The latter has several times changed its course and one of its arms flows directly into the gulf of Kaff-Aghaj. In the interior the only water in Mughan is from a number of springs, and it is covered with tells and shows traces of the old system of irrigation. Mughan has a very mild climate in winter (Kazvinis calls it kshirun Aghar-khahan) and in the spring it is covered with a rich carpet of verdure but in summer the heat makes it a regular hell and it is infested with snakes (Monteith says: in June the snakes literally covered the ground?); cf. Abi Hamid al-Gharna on Kazvin, p. 372.

The name. The old Arabic transcription (Balaghurt, Tashirt) is Mukhan (without article) but quite early in certain manuscripts of the Arab geographers we find Mughan (probably a popular etymology mughan “magi”) which became general in the Mongol period. Markwart, Z.D.M.G., 1895, p. 633 connects the name of Mughan with that of the people mentioned by classical writers as inhabiting this region: Hecataeus, fragment 170: le Mavan al’Aptaw; Pomponius Mela, book III, ch. v.c. *Mochi (“al Hyrcanian front Albani et Mussi et Hyrcani”). This tribe is to be connected with the Caspians who lived in this region; cf. Hübchmann, Die alten Orientvölker, 1904, p. 269, cf. in Yakhut, iv, 676 the genealogy in

rented by Ibn al-Kahl, according to which Mughan and Djilam — both inhabitants of Tabistan — were the sons of Kamsahih (I) b. Yakh b. Nūh; cf. Genesis x.). The Chronicle of Theophanes, p. 363, has Bessarab (var. Bessara), the Armenian geography Mukan, the Georgian chronicle Mowakan (another Mowakan lay near the confines of the Alazan with the Iora).

History. The Byzantine general Léoninus in 678 subdued Iberia, Albania, Bukhara (cf. above) and Media. The district of Mukan was conquered in 21 (642) by an officer of Sargon Bukair who addressed a letter guaranteeing peace to the people of Mukan of the mountains of al-Kahh” (Caucasus; Tashirt, l. 6666). According to Balaghurt, p. 337–339, in 25 (654) Wall b. Uqba undertook a campaign against the people of Mukan (abd Mukan), of al-Bahr (cf. Tashirt) and al-Taisham (= Tajish). Another campaign of Salih b. ‘Aj in the people of Mukan and Djilam, although successful, entailed severe losses. According to Yakhut, ed. Houtsma, ii. 395, 12 in 123 the future Caliph Marwan II b. ‘Abd Allah undertook a campaign in Mukan and Mukan figures several times as a stronghold of Biskak (Tah, iii. 1174, 1178). In the third (ninth) century Ibn Khuradadhbih, p. 119, mentions one Sikha (I as chef of Mukan. According to Ibn al-Mas’udi, Muradi, ii. 5, in his time the Shurwan (cf. Shurwān) had conquered the states (manakia) of Yeyrin (several variants) and al-Mukanānyas. It appears from Ibn Miskawaw (ed. Margoliouth, l. 399) who mentions the isphahab of Mukan b. Dālī as ally of the Ghil chief Qašqar b. Mardi, who rebelled against the Dālam in 336 (937), that Mukan enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy. In 359 (950) the Kurd Daiman sent his vizier “into the mountains (sic) of Mukan to entrench himself.” In 349 Mukan appears as a centre of rebellion (Ibn Miskawaw, ii. 136, 178–179. The poet Khāżī mentions the rising of the isphahab of Mukan against the Rawwādī Wehānād (1278, cf. Kiwan, Futūhān-i gumān, Tashirt 1299, ii. 94). Later we hear of Mukan mainly as an excellent area for the winter pasturage of the conquering nomads. In Yakhut’s (iv. 676) time the majority of the people of Mukan were still Turkomans. In the history of the Khurasmāh Djalal al-Din, Mukan is constantly mentioned. The sultān sends his booty there, keeps his baggage and mobilises his troops there (Naşvāt, Sūr, p. 210, 280, 366 etc.). But in 617 (1220–1221) the Mongol general Līje and Subutay sent the winter in Mukan (Djewvān, l. 116), and Kazvin, p. 379 says that Mongols took Mughān for their winter pastures and drove out the Turkomans. In the time of Timur, Mukan must have been included in the region of Kadsābāgh where this conqueror liked so much to pass the winter. During the winter of 804 (1401) Timur repaired an old canal which was given the name of his tribe of Timurids. The canal lies from the Kshā-kuš Kurgān and at a distance of 10 farsangs ended at Sarjā-pil (i.e.?). Since, in order to give the necessary instructions, Timur (who was to the north of the Araxes) had to cross the river (Zafaranām, ii. 395), we may suppose that the canal lay to the south of the Araxes, i.e. in the steppe of Mughān. It must correspond to the Vīn G’aus arskh of which traces can still be seen for a length of about 23 miles. Sarjā-pil may correspond to Castell on the Russian map (according
to the involved description by Monteith, the Barlas canal issued in the neighbourhood of Karasu?). The canal is in any case quite distinct from another canal which Timur traced in 806 to the north of the Araxes towards the town of Balaqan (Zafar-nama, ii. 543).

In the Safavid period (and perhaps already under the Karavanserai) Mughân became the possession of the Safi Turkmans tribe who forms the principal support of the dynasty and became known as the Mughans (q.v.). By article ii. of the treaty of Gulistana of 1723 the steppe of Mughân was divided between Russia and Persia. The boundary line was more precisely defined in article ii. of the treaty of Turkmenâbâd (q.v.). In 1884 Russia forbade Persian nomads to cross into Russian territory. Towards the end of the sixteenth century the project of irrigating the land of Mughân was conceived and realised between 1902 and 1907. The four systems of canals were to make 200,000 hectares cultivable, particularly for cotton. From 1884 the steppe was occupied solely by nomads who were Russian subjects. But in 1917 there were already 46 Russian villages with 17,000 inhabitants while the Turkish nomads who had become settled on the banks of the Kuras and of the Araxes numbered 30,000 souls. As a result of the tragic events of 1918, the whole Russian population had to leave Mughân and the canals became silted up. Between 1920 and 1924 the work of restoration was carried out and the ingettis were renewed to return. The total area of irrigated land in Mughân is estimated at 355,000 hectares, while immediately to the north of Mughân the steppe of Mil (from Mil-Balaqan, "oasis of Balaqan", cf. Khandkow, Mem. sur inscriptions musulm. au Caucase, 137. Aug. 1852, p. 72) has another 165,000 irrigated hectares.

Historical geography. The Arab geographers are fairly well acquainted with Mughân (cf. the Bibliography). In the Mongol period, Mughân must have comprised all the lands to the north of the Saltaw ridge (which is a western outlier of Russian Tâlik and forms the watershed between the middle course of the Kuras and the Bolgarn), to the east of the lower course of the Kuras (where it follows the northern direction) and to the south of the Araxes. Towards the east the Mughân stretched to the Caspian Sea and included the coastal region of Russian Tâlik. The mountainous part of the latter, held as a vassal, must also have belonged to Mughân. The same condition must have existed in the Arab period for the curious expression of Ibn Miskawayh (136 referring to the Djiilik Mughân can only refer to the mountainous part of Russian Tâlik).

We may note Mughadzâ's remark (p. 380) who among other wonders mentions, one marhâ (7-8 faraks = 20-25 miles) distant from Mughân, an imposing fortress called al-Harâ (?] below which are houses and palaces in which there are large quantities of gold (guldâ 'asim) in the form of birds and wild beasts and "many kings made plans to seize it but never succeeded in reaching it". Mughadzâ does not definitely say that the fortress belongs to Mughân and evidently speaks of it by hearsay. Is this a reference to Shishil-kala (which is about 50 miles = 2 marhâ to the south of the presumed site of the Sâmchirân of Mughân)? On this imposing mountain (6,000 feet high) can still be seen ruins of important fortifications (Raddû, p. 355; "ruins of a strong castle...many ruins of brick buildings"). Finally, in a Persian translation of Ispâhân, 186, 187, we read: "The Gils and the Mughân are tribes on foot who rarely go on horseback" which can only refer to a few remnants of the old population settled in upper Tâlik (where the highlanders are very distinct from the lowlanders).

Bibliography: cf. the article Shârsân; Djiilik-nama, p. 152 (of little originality); Olearsius (1853), Voyages, book iv., ch. 21 (ed. 1656, p. 447-451); Shamshâda-Djwâd Balharu river Bedjirwân-Dizî-Ağhâ Sâmîyân Ardashir; J. Struys, Lee voyages, Amsterdam 1720, ch. 27 (il., p. 235); it is exactly identical with that of Olearsius J. J. Lorch, Nachrichten von d. wissenschaftlichen Reisen nach Persien (1747), in Büschings Magazin, part s., p. 367-476; Shamshâda-Djwâd-Bolgarn-Lankurî-Astârî-Rashî; Monteith, Journal of a tour through Aserbajjen (etc), in T.R.G.S. 1834, iii., p. 28-31; Ardashir-Barasî-Kirî-kâlîs (at the confluence of the four rivers which form Balakoo = Balaqan) Kuyrar-taps Agha-masa Vedi-bulûk-Altan Altan-takht-Aslanbur-Bayat (wrongly taken for the old Balaqan) -Barahâ; Toropov, Mughanska steppe, Krasn. kalendar, 1864, p. 243-298; Toropov, in Krasn., 1864, No. 28; Ogranovîc, Oifestyles Belusaroa, in Kahan, 1871, No. 32; Durm, Carpath. St. Petersburg 1875, index; Ogranovîc, Proeniitst Prii-d Ardehlabikha i Scrabalhaya, in Zap. Kowt. Oddl. Imp. Russ. Geogr. Obshch., x/1, 1876, p. 244; Udjarûd; Raddî, Reisen un d. persien-mas rec. Lebens, Tafelz u. einige Beobacht., Leipzig 1886; passim Belusaroa etc. On the flora and fauna of Mughân and the plans for irrigating it there is a whole literature in Russian. The most recent references are in W. S. Kliip, Zakonoskaya, Moscow 1929, p. 50.

AL-MUKANTÂRÂT. [See ASFURLÂK.]

MUKÂTIL B. SULAIMÂN B. BÂSHîR AL-ARAB AL-KHRÂQÂQI AL-BÂSHI (ABU 'L-HASân), traditionist and commentator on the Kur'an, was born in Balkh and lived in Marw, Baghâd and Bâsha, where he died in 150 (767); there is also a reference to a stay in Hairût. Of his life we know almost nothing apart from a few details for his judgment as a traditionist. The name of his wife Umm Abî 'Uma Nûb b. Abî Mâryam has been preserved. According to Ibn Durajd, he was one of the mawalî of the Benî Asad. He is sometimes quoted as Mukâtîl b. Dâwi-âl-dîs or Dâwi-âl-dîs. Ibn Hadjaj, Lâbîn al-Mûsâr, expressly states in contradiction of wrong ideas that this is our Mukâtîl and that Dâwi-âl-dîs is not a lašûd of Mukâtîl himself but of his father.

Mukâtîl's prestige as a traditionist is not very great; he is reproached with not being accurate with the isâm. His lexicon enjoys even less confidence. The biographers write with one another in telling stories which illustrate his mendacity and particularly his professing to know everything. Contempt is poured on his memory by stories of ludicrous questions which were put to him about the most impossible things and to which he either gave fantastic answers or could make no reply. It is in keeping with this profession of universal knowledge that the sources are unanimous in talking of his extreme anthropomorphism (tâjallî).
It did little to help his fame also that he is said to have told pious stories [cf. H. A. R. Gibb] in the mosque, at a time when this was strictly forbidden. In politics he is said to have belonged to the Zaidiya, in theology to the Murjidiyya [q.v.].

Mu'attil's literary activity was somewhat comprehensive, yet until quite recently nothing was known of his works. Only since 1912 has a Qur'ani commentary by him been known in the MS. Or. 5533 of the British Museum. The genuineness of which however Goldschmidt did not think beyond doubt. The Fikrist gives a list of his works; Hujjatul Khalifa also gives some of them. They deal mainly with the language and exegesis of the Qur'an; but a pamphlet against the Kadartiya is also mentioned. This is however hardly in keeping with another story, according to which he wrote a pamphlet against Dajmah [q.v.] and the latter wrote against him.


(M. Pleissner)

MU'AKHAMAT, the part of the range of hills west of the Nile, which lies immediately to the east of Cairo and from which the mountains take a northerly direction, borders to the Nile delta to the south-east. It reaches a height of about 600 feet and consists, as does the greatest part of the north African mountains, of limestone (cf. Description de l'Egypte, Etat moderne, Paris 1822, t.1/ii. 751).

The name Mu'akhamat (the Tauji al-Arur records also the popular form al-Mu'akhamah) does not go back to a pre-Muhammadan nomenclature, nor is it considered, in spite of its correct Arabic formation, as a true Arabic word, for the geographers (cf. Yaqut, iv. 607 sqq.) give, hesitatingly, different explanations of its meaning. The name occurs for the first time in the historical tradition of the Egyptian Arabs, as found in the Fatih Miṣr of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (cf. Torrey's edition, New Haven 1899, p. 156 sqq.), in half legendary tales in which also al-Mu'akhamah [q.v.] plays a part. Some of these traditions give it an eponymous hero, Mu'akham b. Miṣr b. Baisar b. Hām, or lay stress on the special sanctity of the mountain, declaring that, in some way, it is connected with the mountain of Jerusalem. As in the last mentioned traditions Ka'b al-Azhār [q.v.] is named as final authority, it seems probable that the origin of the name must be sought in Jewish legendary traditions (for Jewish traditions about mountains, cf. the Midrash Thallim on Psalm lxi. 17) and that the name has been fixed only in course of time on the ill-defined mountainous region to which it is attached, since the flourishing times of al-Faṣṭ and al-Kairawān. The vagueness of the geographical definition has survived in the Arabic geographical sources, which either call Mu'akhamat the entire eastern mountain range as far as Wuswān (Wuswan) or even represent under the name Mu'akhamat the whole of the mountain system that runs over the inhabited world from China to the Atlantic Ocean (Ibn Hawqal and others). Moreover several geographers give the legendary statement that in the Mu'akhamah are mines of emerald and other precious stones, while in reality it contains only stone quarries, but these were used already in very ancient times. Mu'akhamat, Kāfir, ed. Bilsāni, i. 123 gives a fairly complete survey of the different traditions and opinions.

It may be thus assumed that the Mu'akhamah acquired a real geographical identity only after the foundation of al-Faṣṭā. Its geographical situation, viz. its proximity to the bank of the Nile, has deeply influenced the territorial expansion of this town and later of Cairo [q.v.]. Parts of the town and famous sites are situated on the western spur of al-Mu'akhamah, such as the mosque of Ibn Tulun and the citadel of Saladin. The elevation of Ibn Tulun's mosque bears, however, the special name of Dajmah Yaḥkūr. The cemetery of al-Kairawān belongs likewise to the Mu'akhamah and it is with this cemetery that are connected the ancient traditions already mentioned. This Mu'akhamah plays a part; al-Mu'akhamah informs 'Amr b. al-'As that the mountain, instead of earthly vegetation, is destined to bear the plants of Paradise and the caliph 'Umar, informed by 'Amr, decides that by these plants of Paradise can only be meant Muslims who have died. Accordingly, tradition records a number of Sāhibān who are buried in al-Kairawān. On the summit of al-Mu'akhamah was built in the Fatimid period the mosque of al-Diyānah, by Badr al-Diyanālī in 1748 (1085); for this reason the mountain is also called Dajmah al-Diyānah. On the southern slopes, towards Hulwān, lay the Christian monastery Deir al-Kāfsar (description by al-Shabābī towards 1000; cf. Saban in Abb. Pr. Ab. Wiss., 1905). A historic or perhaps legendary feature, connected with al-Mu'akhamah is that the Fatimid caliph al-Hakim is said to have disappeared mysteriously, in the night of 27th Shawwal 411 (Feb. 23, 1021), when he had gone for a ride in the Mu'akhamah. Finally it may be mentioned that the Mu'akhamah has given its name to one of the large modern Arabic newspapers published at Cairo.

(J. H. Klamms)

MU'AKHWĀS, MU'AKHWĪS, the individual who in Arab tradition plays the leading part on the side of the Copts and Greeks at the conquest of Egypt. The Prophet is said to have sent a letter to him in the year 6 a.h. In the address on this letter, the text of which is given in Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (cf. Torrey, p. 46), al-Maqrīzī (Almajir, i. 29), al-Suyūṭī (Ham al-Maṣāra, i. 58) and al-Manṣūrī (p. 29), as well as in an entirely different version in Pseudo-Wākidī (p. 10), and also in the accounts of the incidents in the Arab historians, the position of Mu'akhwās is described in the following phrases: 1. Sāhib al-Ishārāt (Naawat, p. 577); Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 45; 32; Abū Sa'īd, iii, p. 38 [100]; Ibn Khāṭir, iii, fol. 159 b; Ibn Sa'd in Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, iii, p. [99]; 2. Maṭlib al-Ishārāt (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 49; al-Suyūṭī, i. 60; Pseudo-Wākidī, p. 75; Ibn Ḥakam, p. 971); 3. Sāhib Miṣr (Abu 'l-Fida, i. 149); 4. Mālik Miṣr (al-Manṣūrī, p. 7: cf. al-Maqrīzī, Almajir, i. 163, v. 78); 5. Mālik Miṣr wa 'l-Ishārāt (Pseudo-Wākidī, p. 10); 6. Sāhib Miṣr wa 'l-Ishārāt (Pseudo-Wākidī).
All these epithets, though devoid of much meaning, simply the actual ruling authority in Egypt, whose true title was not known to the Arabs. If we remember that in the year 6 (628) the Persians were masters of Egypt, we can hardly give much credence to the story of the Arab historians. This is evident from the statement recorded by Manufi (p. 50) that Egypt was under the rule of Maukawis continuously from the lifetime of the Prophet, through the caliphate of Abu Bakr to the beginning of the caliphate of Omar. Muhammad’s letter to Maukawis was long ago declared not to be genuine by E. Amelinus (Registrum cap. 392) and Wellhausen (Studien und Vorarbeiten, iv. 90) although they did not doubt the fact of the embassy to him; later Butler (Conquest, p. 522) and Th. Noldeke (Zeit.M.G., 118.160) still believed in the embassy although the latter granted the possibility that tradition might have transferred the name from the time of the conquest to the man to whom Mahommed sent gifts, while for example Samuel (Egyp. in the Middle Ages, p. 6, note 2) supposes that the Maukawis of 628 and the Maukawis of the conquest are two different people. This suggestion however is disposed of by the fact that the name of the letter is called in Ibn Kathir (in Abi l-Fida) in genuine; Nawaw only gives Djuwaidj, i.e. the same as the Maukawis of the conquest; for we need not heed the patronymic of Maukawis given by Pseudo-Wakidi (p. 10) (in genuine), while the epithet al-Farshab al-Nafs, which al-Ma’si, Tanaki, p. 261, has taken in an obviously corrupt form from an old source, is the Ibn Karkab al-Vinani of the Maukawis of the conquest. In view of the many serious contradictions, which the transmission of Maukawis into the period of Persian rule in Egypt offers, there is no alternative but to regard with Cantini, Anni dell’Italia, iv. 90 the story of Mahommed’s embassy to Maukawis as legendary and devoid of any historical value (cf. also G. Rouillard, p. 187 and note 2). The genuineness of the parchment found in a monastery at Akhtma by the French ethnologist E. Barthélemy in 1852, which was thought to be the original of Mahommed’s letter to Maukawis and was actually put among the relics of the Prophet in the old Scroll, thus disappears (cf. the publication by Helin, in J.A., 1854, p. 483–482 and Djuwaidj Zaidan, in Hülüt, xii.2, 1904, p. 103 sqq.). Its falsity had already been recognised by J. Karabacek (Beiträge zur Geschichte des Maukawis. Leipzig 1874, p. 33, note 35 and Mitteilungen der K. Königl. österreichischen Classe, 1874, p. 182) (cf. also Noldecke-Schwell, Geschichte der Qurins, i., Leipzig, 1909, p. 106). As a matter of fact palaeographical grounds are clearly against any assumption of a date in the first century for this document.

The same discrepancies, which we find in the transmission of the name and title of the Maukawis of Mahommed’s letter are found in the Maukawis of the conquest. In the historians we find the following names:

1. Djurjaji b. Münz (Abi Sallâh, p. 30 [84]), 101 [230]; 2. Djuwaidj b. Münz b. Kurjak (Ibn Abi l-Hakam, p. 64, note 9; Ibn Hadjar, Itâba, ill. 1090); 3. Ibn Kurjak or Ibn Kurjak (Abi l-Khâlidi, i. 259, sq); Ibn Taghribird; l. 9; Yâkût, Maríajum, ill. 894, 14).

Taking first of all the name of his grandfather, J. v. Karabacek’s endeavour (p. 3) to dispose of apparent contradictions in the statements about the patronymic by assuming a double name Münz Farshab proves unnecessary, when we see the name unequivocally given in No. 3. When Karabacek (p. 3) preferred the reading Farshab for Kurjak, he was at least able to quote the form in the Codex Parisinus of Ibn Taghribirdi, but I cannot agree with Amelineau in supporting Karabacek’s proposal (Registrum cap. 394 sq) to equate this name with Maukawis, especially if we remember the variant of the Farshab, and Noldeke must be right when he (Zeit.M.G., 118.160) restores this to the Tadhwar rejected by Karabacek. The form unpointed however has however so far been found in only one papyrus, the more usual form being Maukawis (Zeit.M.G., l. 138). Butler’s conjecture (p. 523) on the name seems to me as improbable as Karabacek’s identification. He calls attention to Abi Sallâh’s observation (p. 67 [156]) that Maukawis is a corruption of Gregorios and supposes that Kurjak is a corruption of Kurjar so that Ibn Kurjar would be an error for Ibn Karkab and mean “son of Gregory”. Camaan’s proposal (in Butler, p. 523) must be dismissed as still more improbable, viz. that Ibn Kurjak is a corruption of Abi Kurka. The office filled by Maukawis is described by the sources in the following terms:

1. Shâhi Misr (al-Baladkhani, p. 226); 2. Malik ‘alî Misr (al-Ma’uri, Khâbat, l. 163, sq); Ibn Duqamä, v. 118); 3. Amir al-Khâlidi bi-Misr (Ibn Hadjar, ill. 1090); 4. ‘Amir ‘alî Misr (Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, p. 64, note 9; Al-Makkin, i. 39); 5. ‘Amir ‘alî ‘l-Khârâjî bi-Misr (Eutychius, ii. 302). If the three first terms only mean the ruler of Egypt in general, the two last names limit the sphere of activity of Maukawis to the administration of taxation and the expression given in 4 may be taken as synonymous with ‘amir “governor”. In this connection we have the very clear evidence of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, p. 37 and Ibn Duqamä, v. 119 who preserve the statement that Maukawis was appointed by the emperor Heraclius as governor of Egypt and entrusted with the wrapping of war and the levying of taxation. Abi Sallâh’s statement (p. 30 [84 sq]) that Maukawis Djurjaji b. Münz had rented the taxes of Egypt from Heraclius for 18,000,000 dinars fits in with this. This makes intelligible the statement of Eutychius (ii. 302) who calls Maukawis controller of the land taxes (‘amir al-khârâjî) and traces his attitude to the Arabs to his extorting the taxes raised, and further explains the description of Maukawis (Maukawis) as Tadrâjî in the Vita of Apa Samuil published by Amelineau (p. 367), to which we may add the statement of the Ethiopic Synaxar that Maukawis had been Patriarch and financial controller of Egypt.
M. J. de Goeje and J. v. Karabacek have laid special stress on this side of the activity of Mu\cker\wak\xattr\' in identifying the prefect George mentioned in John of Nikia (p. 359), whom de Goeje regards as prefect of Lower Egypt and Karabacek (p. 8) as pagarch of Babylon, with Mukawak\xattr\' who is called in the sources George son of Menas. A. J. Butler (note 4 to Abi\xatr\' Salib, p. 81), Milne, and Lane-Poole have followed de Goeje while Amelina\xatr\'(Fragmenta coptica, p. 404; Samuel de Qalamoun, p. 24 and Résumé de l'histoire de l'Egypte, p. 243) wished to identify Mukawak\xattr\' with the Patriarch George who was appointed by the emperor Heraclius as successor or deputy to Cyrus during the period of the latter's stay in Constantinople (cf. John of Nikia, p. 574).

In contrast to these attempts at identification, which are in more one respect in contradiction to the sources, the most probable solution of the Mukawak\xattr\' problem is the identification of Mukawak\xattr\' with the Patriarch and governor Cyrus of Phaia, who was sent in the year 631 a.d. by Heraclius to Alexandria where he died on March 21, 642. While Zonenberg (in his edition of John of Nikia, p. 576, note 3) has already pointed out that the main features of the activity of Cyrus are found in the Arabic stories of Mukawak\xattr\', although no doubt the legend mixes up the activities of several individuals under this name, F. M. Esteves Pereira, (Vita de Abba Samuel, P. 41-53) completely proved the identity of the two. Independently J. Kral in an unpublished article for the Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung des Papyrus Erhard Rainer, on the authority of three new fragments of the Vita of Apa Samuel, had come to the same conclusion. The full story of the entire problem by A. J. Butter, the main result of which, the identity of Mukawak\xattr\' with the Patriarch Cyrus, has been adopted by B. Evette (Patrologia Orientalis, ii. 491, note 1), by M. Guidi in his doctoral thesis, C. H. Becker and O. Braun in his article Cyrus in the Kirchliche Handlexicon, ii. col. 530 and others, has been critically examined by L. Caetani (Annali dell'Istituto, ii. 86 sqq.). The decisive evidence for the identity of the two individuals is found in the History of the Patriarchs of Severus of Assamniae (ed. Evette, p. 490 sqq.; ed. Seybold, p. 166 sqq.) in which there are references to the Patriarch and governor of Heraclius in connection with the flight of the Patriarch Benjamin once as Cyrus (بكرس), then a few lines later as al-Mukawak\xattr\' or al-Mukawak\xatr\'; the synecdoche in this connection also give the name al-Mukawak\xattr\' (cf. F. Amelina, Fragmenta coptica, S. 397, note 1; p. 308, note 1; p. 406, note 1 and the edition by R. Basset, Patrologia Orientalis, xi. 562) and the Arabic Vita of Benjamin (Amelina, p. 400, note 1); of peculiar importance is the text edited in K. O. E., xx. 393, where the combined names Cyril and Mukawak\xattr\' appear. There is the additional fact that the period of ten years which, according to the history of the Patriarchs, lay between the flight and return of the Patriarch Benjamin coincides within a year with the period of office of Cyrus (631-642) in Egypt, whom the Christian sources describe as an "unbeliever" (παισιν, Amelina, Fragmenta coptica, p. 364, 366; Μαθητης in Severus of Assamniae, p. 495 [108]; godless and sinful Kuchios (ναχωκος παισιν καταραθινε),

Vienna Coptic fragments of the Vita of Apa Samuel in Kral, Kanzhia frequently in Amelina's, deceitful Antichrist (πατημιονος αναλος in Amelina, p. 366 sqq.), and Pseudoarchiepiscopal (ἐπισκόπος, p. 365). The double position of Cyrus or Mukawak\xattr\' as supreme head of the administration and archbishop, of which we have ample evidence (cf. G. Rouillard, p. 230, note 2), and which is quite certain from the testimony of Severus (p. 495, 495 [106-108]) and the Arabic and Ethiopic synaxa (Amelina, p. 406, note 1: درر أوخود ألك), (p. 399) and also by the Vita of Samuel (Amelina, p. 367), was quite unknown to the Muslim Arabic sources. Nöldeke has already called attention to this remarkable fact (p. 160) and it remains a crux for the identification of the two figures. There was however no necessity for the Arabs to refer to his name in the church. He was only of importance to them as head of the administration. If one wants to, one can see an indication of his ecclesiastical dignity in the wish expressed by Mukawak\xattr\' during the negotiations with 'Amr regarding the capitulation of Alexandria (in Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, ed. Torrey, p. 72) that he might be buried in the Church of St. John (thereon Amelina, p. 400 sqq.). How much the Christian sources differ in their ideas of the personality and position of Mukawak\xattr\' may be gathered from the description of the death of Mukawak\xattr\'. According to Severus of Assamnia (ed. Evette, p. 495; Seybold p. 168), the governor and Patriarch of Alexandria poisoned himself after the occupation of Alexandria lest he should be put to death by 'Amr, while John of Nikia (p. 335, 378) says that Cyrus was weakened by vexation at the faithlessness of 'Amr and sought disintegration and died. According to Caetani, the contratilities and obscenities on the part of the Arab historians show that they did not consider who Mukawak\xattr\' exactly was, but simply used the name as the family name of the chief personage in Egypt at the time of the Muslim conquest. Evidently all who negotiated with 'Amr in the name of the Copts are included in one individual. The same manner, with which Mukawak\xattr\' is described as a Copt and the different names given him suggests that Mukawak\xattr\' conceals not only Cyrus but also other Egyptian negotiators — e.g. perhaps the commander of Babylon, George, and the bishop of the same town, Menas. The Arabs must have made one out of these two negotiators and given him like Cyrus the name Mukawak\xattr\'. Of the attempts to explain this name, Karabacek's (p. 8) πνευματος is as little probable as Amelina's explanation (p. 407-408) which makes Kuchios "the man from Kaukhiin". We would rather think with Butler and Guidi of a connection with κοχιναιως, which indicates the home of Cyrus. But even this explanation is by no means certain and the connection of Mukawak\xattr\' with Cyrus has again (in Canterelli) given rise to serious doubts. Nau, p. 110 has compared Mukawak\xattr\' with μακαυκος. His name survived in the Kom el-Mukawak\xattr\' in the area of old Cairo (Ibn Du\xatr\', iv. 53).

MUKHDAM (A.), the term applied to an individual whose life fell within the periods of both paganism and Islam. Various explanations are given of the origin of the name. Some derive it from waah wubwadnaha "cropped ear" and say the meaning is that these people were cut off from the Djihiylia by Islam (cf. nuna wubwadnaha "a she-camel with cropped ears"). It is said that the tribes that adopted Islam cropped the ears of their camels differently from what they had done in the pagan period. A man who had therefore seen both the pagan and Muslim styles was called wubwadnaha. Others derive the word from wáh bhibrim "(a well) which contains much water" and explain that a man who has lived in both Djihiylia and Islam was called wubwadnaha, since he was fully acquainted with both periods.

The term wubwadnaha is occasionally found with the same application and the explanation given is that the individuals had mixed paganism and Islam. Some commentators describe wubwadnaha as "a person who adopted Islam after the death of Muhammad.

The word wubwadnaha is particularly used to describe one of the four classes into which the Arab philologists divide the poets. It means those whose work was begun in the period of Djihiylia but who lived to see Muhammad and his mission and some even adopted Islam. Among these for example were Labab, al-Asha'î and Ka'b b. Zuhair. These poets are still completely immersed in the poetic tradition of the Djihiylia. The new outlook was late in finding its way into poetry so that the change is not yet reflected in the poets who were Muhammad's contemporaries. The scheme of the qasida of the pagan period, with its fixed themes and stereotyped images also holds for the wubwadnaha and in their poems one can hardly find the slightest hint that they were contemporary with the great religious change in Arabia. The only exception is the qasidas composed in honour of Muhammad, like the qasid of Ka'b b. Zuhair called, after its opening words Bintam Sa'îd and the panegyric on the Prophet by al-Asha'î. While these still follow the scheme of the qasida, as regards form they reflect Muhammadan points of view and legal ordinances and also use Qur'anic phrases.


(See LITENSTADTER)

MUKHLIS AL-DAWLA. [See AL-MUKALLAD.]
Mihdjan, was his second cousin (al-Mukhtar's great-grandfather Musadd being the son of 'Amir b. 'Umair b. 'Awf; cf. Wustenfeld, *Gen. Tab.* G. 19). He is said to have been born in 622 (Tabari, i. 1264) a statement which has perhaps no real foundation (cf. Tabari, ii. 2). In 40, he was a "young man," ašāḥīsāʾ, and the thought that his adversary "Abdl Allah b. al-Zubair was born in the same year. His father having died the death of a hero at the battle of the Bridge in 13 against the Persians, the orphan was brought up by his uncle Sa'd b. Musadd who became governor of al-Madā'in under the caliph 'Ali. Al-Mukhtar was his deputy when Sa'd left al-Madā'in to go after the Kāhirīs who had left 'Ali's camp in 37 (Tabari i. 3366; al-Dinawari, p. 218). His early life and his family traditions therefore made him a partisan of 'Ali: al-Tabarī (ii. 2) however says that when 'Ali's son al-Hassan took refuge with al-Mukhtar's uncle when fleeing from Mu'āwiya in 40, the nephew proposed to surrender him to his rival and he was reproached with this disloyal act 25 years afterwards by the Shi'ites. This is all we know of the early days of one who was destined to become the champion of the extreme Shi'a: his refusal to bear witness before Ziyād b. Abīth against Ḥadhīr b. 'Adī, who was accused of having attempted an anti-Umayyad rising at Kūfa in 51 (Tabari, ii. 134), shows however that his feelings were already pro-'Ali. It is only when, after the death of Mu'āwiya, the hopes of the partisans of 'Ali's family began to rise again, that al-Mukhtar emerges from obscurity: he took part in the risings of Muslim b. 'Abīl in 61 and, imprisoned by the governor Umarb Allāh b. Ziyād, he was only released after the failure of al-Husain's attempt and returned to Mecca, where 'Abdl Allāh b. al-Zubair was secretly engaged in preparing the movement which was to take him to the head of the anti-Umayyad rising. It is alleged that al-Mukhtar, after vainly trying to compromise Ibn al-Zubair prematurely, disappeared from Mecca for a whole year which he spent in his native town of al-Tā'if. It was no doubt in this period that the ideas ripened in him which made him the initiator and leader of a new political and religious phase of the Shi'a movement; but of the way in which his ideas came to him, their immediate origin and the influences which went to form them, history unfortunately knows nothing. In any case, al-Mukhtar returned to al-Zubair, who had in the meanwhile been publicly recognised as caliph, and sought bravely at the first siege of Mecca in 64. But his adhesion to the cause of Ibn al-Zubair had no other object than to enable him to return to Kūfa which was then under the anti-Umayyad caliph. According to one source which is in contradiction to Tabari, al-Mukhtar was sent by al-Zubair himself to the capital of the 'Irāq to take charge of its administration, having promised him the support of the 'Alī派 ('Abd al-Mu'malin, al-Murādī, v. 70). It seems more probable that as Tabari says, he went there of his own accord to carry out his plans for a Shi'a revival. The Shi'a of Kūfa were at this time (Ramadan 64) under the influence of Sulaimān b. Ṣurād [q.v.]. Al-Mukhtar did not wish to join his party and began propaganda of his own: he was the emissary of Muhammad, son of 'Ali, called Ibn al-Hanāfīya from the name of his mother's tribe [cf. Muhammad b. al-Hanāfiyya]. The motives which gave al-Mukhtar the idea that he could pass off as the legitimate successor to the rights of 'Ali, this son, who was not born of Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet, have not been fully explained; but as the other children of 'Ali who had escaped the massacre of Kerbela were quite incapable, al-Mukhtar's choice was limited. In any case, his fiery and peculiar eloquence (he pronounced his discourses in saqīf with obscure phrases and expressions which recalled the Kurān, without being a slavey imitation of it; he also said or allowed it to be said of him that he was inspired by the angel Gabriel) was able to gain partisans for the idea of the Mahdi whose imminent coming would restore the rule of the true religion. Without being yet openly hostile to the rule of Ibn al-Zubair, al-Mukhtar's attitude was suspected. He was therefore imprisoned by the Zubairid governor 'Abd Allāh b. Yaṣir al-Asṣāfī but his captivity was not rigorous and enabled him to remain in contact with the people of Kūfa. After the death and death of Sulaimān b. Ṣurād, which he had predicted, he was set at liberty on guaranteeing he would not fight against the Zubairid government. Al-Mukhtar took advantage of the liberty restored to him to secure the cooperation of Ḥabīm b. al-Aṣqārī, son of 'Ali's famous general, who kept up his father's traditions. The latter hesitated long before accepting al-Mukhtar's proposals and only agreed on receiving a letter, undoubtedly a forgery, in which Ibn al-Hanāfīya introduced al-Mukhtar to him as his plenipotentiary (ṣamīl) and minister (ṣimāl). The rising then began (14 Rabi' I 69): the response of the chiefs of the tribes (the Ashīfrī), who while opposed to the Umayyads and former fighters by the side of 'Ali, had long lost their enthusiasm for the cause of his family, was overcome by the unslought of the troops composed for the most part of adventurers and sammāt led by Ibn al-Aṣqārī, a most capable warrior. The Zubairid government (he was at this time 'Abd Allāh b. Muṣṭar al-Karrābī) the Ashīfrī capitulated and al-Mukhtar, undisputed lord of Kūfa, rapidly extended his power over Mesopotamia and the eastern provinces, where he at once appointed governors: the south alone, with Baṣra, remained to Ibn al-Zubair. Al-Mukhtar had naturally to give the Ashīfrī positions of authority in his organisation but he could not completely gain their confidence. Although old partisans of 'Ali, or sons of partisans, they were moderates who distrusted al-Mukhtar as an extremist and demagogue: indeed, the favour which the latter showed to the mawāli, who formed his essential support, threatened to overthrow the system on which the political and economic supremacy of the Arabs over the native population was based, for not even the conversion of the latter to Islam had made them equal to their conquerors. Al-Mukhtar therefore was forced with the necessity of deciding for one or other. He preferred the mawāli party, probably more from genuine conviction than for political reasons: he must have believed that the triumph of the Mahdi whom he foretold would make all believers equal without distinction of race. During the absence of the army which had gone under Ibn al-Aṣqārī to fight 'Abd al-Malik's troops, the Ashīfrī made an attempt to overthrow al-Mukhtar who was forced to temporise with them; but succeeding in informing Ibn al-
Ashur of his difficulty, the latter returned to Kufa and completely routed the enemies of al-Mukhtar. This was the signal for putting into execution the latter’s full Shi’i programme; all those who had taken part in the murder of al-Husain, or had neglected to defend him, were put to death. This bloody deed seemed to have divine approval, for two days later the Syrian army which had marched out for the ‘Irak was completely routed on the banks of the Khabur by Ibn al-Aswar and its leader ‘Ubayd Allah b. Ziyād, who had defeated and killed al-Husain, was killed in the battle (Muharram 67). In the fanatical enthusiasm of these days in which the Shi’i cause seemed to have won a definite success there took place episodes of great religious interest although unfortunately not yet clearly explained, notably the worship of the empty chair (Tasbi, ii. 702—706; cf. al-Mubarrad, al-Ḵamil, ed. Wright, p. 597—600).

But in spite of his successes at home and abroad, al-Mukhtar was threatened by the presence in Basya of the brother of ‘Abd Allah b. al-Talhaib, Mu‘awiya, whose army, organised by al-Muhallab b. Abū Suffa, hardened in the war with the Kharijites and strengthened by the accession of the Kifan Asghar who had left the town, was one to be feared. Indeed, the Shi‘i troops were defeated by it at al-Madīnah on the ‘Irīs; a little later at Ḥarrūr, they suffered a complete rout, mainly because of the absence of Ibn al-Aswar who was in the north at al-Mawṣil and whom al-Mukhtar either through distrust of him or through excess of confidence in himself had neglected to recall. Al-Mukhtar who had taken refuge in the citadel of Kufa held out there valiantly for four months. Finally abandoned by most of his men, he was slain in a desperate sortie (Kamaṭan 14, 67). His body was mutilated, his hand suspended at the gate of the great mosque (and it was only taken down many years later by al-Halīlī); one of his wives, who would not disown him, was executed in brutal fashion, although she was the daughter of al-Nu‘mān b. Bāshīr al-Anṣārī, who had been governor of Kufa under Mu‘awiya. A great many of al-Mukhtar’s followers were also massacred.

The nature of the movement led by al-Mukhtar has been variously judged by modern historians. The historical tradition which grew up in Kufa, especially in the mille of the Asghāf, is naturally hostile and regards him as an adventurer and false prophet. His conduct was undoubtedly somewhat crooked occasionally; the way in which he exploited the name of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyah (who never wished to be completely compromized in the business of the Mahdi) was not quite fair. But neither these doings nor his double dealing with regard to the Asghāf (they paid him back however only too well) are sufficient to convict him of bad faith. They were tactical expedients which every one who wants to stir the masses is justified in employing for the triumph of his cause. It seems certain that al-Mukhtar sincerely believed in his mission, and his equilibrarian ideas about the ummah, although premature, were, as the future was to show, the only ones which could secure to Islam its later expansion and transform it from the exclusively Arab movement it was at first into a worldwide civilization. What is still and will remain mysterious is the personality of al-Mukhtar (Wellhausen rightly observes that “demoniac” natures like his are always problematic), the manner in which he arrived (no doubt through a crisis within himself) at the religious and eschatological conception of the Shi‘a of which he was the creator and which is infinitely greater than the expiatory sacrifice of the Isma‘īli of Sulaymān b. Ḥarūb. It is owing to this conception that the importance of the movement started by al-Mukhtar is far greater than the ephemeral political success which he enjoyed; in the popular enthusiasm which welcomed his prophecies we see the germs of the ideas which transformed the Shi‘a’s political movement to a religious doctrine. In what measure these ideas were in existence before al-Mukhtar, in what relation they stood to that eschatological personage ‘Abd Allah b. Sahl and his disciples are points that are still obscure. But if he was not the inventor of the doctrine of the Mahdi, it was undoubtedly he who in locating in a real person, Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafiyah, the mystical figure of the Messiah, the restorer of the true religion, gave it the stamp which was henceforth typical of Imām doctrines.

The name Murkhtār is borne by one of the many Shi‘a subdivisions given in the lists of the writers on heresies; but it is doubtful if it ever had any real existence as an organised sect, especially as the sources which mention it do not clearly distinguish it from the Kala‘iyya [q.v.] and the Khāshābiyya [q.v.], which seem very likely to be the legitimate successors of the teachings of al-Mukhtar.

Bibliography: The principal and almost the only source for the history of al-Mukhtar is al-Tabari (ed. de Goeje), ii. 530—572 and yassim, which is based for the most part on the statements of eye-witnesses of the events. The secondary sources add practically nothing new; they are quoted in Caetani, Chronographia islamica, a. 64 § 15, 65 § 6, 66 §§ 5—7, 9—12, 67 §§ 2, 4, 42 (a few details also in the biography of Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafiyah in Ibn Sa‘d, v. 71—77); H. D. van Gelder, Adjothr de witseke Prophet, Leyden 1898, J. Wellhausen, Die islam. Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam (Abh. G. Götts., N. S., v. 2, 1901), p. 74—89. Cf. also the bibliography given in the articles kala‘iya and khaṣṣābiyya (add al-Nawabkali, Pirār al-Saff, ed. Ritter [Bibl. Islamica, iv., 1931], p. 29—30). (G. LEVY DELLA VITA)

MUKHTAR PASHA, GHÀZI AHMAD, a Turkish general and statesman, was born in Sept. 1832, the son of a high official in Brussa, and received a military training there and in Constantinople (officer in 1854). He took part in the Crimean War, from 1860 taught in the Mekteb-ı Harbbye as professor of the art of war and in 1865 was tutor to the prince Yısauf ‘ıze al-Din. After holding a command in Albania (1867—1870), he distinguished himself under Redif Pasha in the Yaman campaign, the conduct of which he took over in 1871 as General of Division and Pasha. On his return he was given the title of mukhtar, the Herzegovina he was defeated in 1876 at the Duga Pass. After the declaration of war by Russia (April 24, 1877) he was given the supreme command on the Caucasus front, where after at first having to retire to Koprüköy, he counterattacked at Darab (June 21) and Ziwin (June 25) and forced the Russians under the Armenian generals Loris-Mellikoff and Ter-Huggestoff, to evacuate Ottoman territory and occupied Sukhum.
Successes in August on the Yagshuf Dagh and at Khil-Tepe (near Shaj Gardiler), earned him the title of Mir-i Qezari [q. v.] but did not prevent the collapse of the army in November—Nov. [cf. INER
BOVÁN, KARS AND ERZURUM]. Appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Artillery, he restored peace in Crete in 1878; in 1879–1885 he served as commissioner on the Greek frontier. As a result of the Anglo-Turkish agreement of Oct. 24, 1885, he became the first High Commissioner of the Porte in Egypt, holding the post till 1906 and playing a part in the Taif affair. In this period he busied himself with the question of reforming the calendar; he advocated a uniform Hijra solar year for all Muslims (see BIL). From Dec. 1908 Vice-President of the Ottoman Senate, he proposed in the National Assembly of April 27, 1909 to give prince Reshid the name Meşhed V in memory of the first conqueror (Fatih) of Constantinople [see MOHAMMAD II] (communication of Abd al-Rahman Shereef to Martin Hartmann); he himself led the deputation which announced his accession as Sultan-Caliph and brought him to the War Ministry to receive the oath of allegiance [cf. BÁFA]. On Oct. 14, 1911 he succeeded Said Pasha [q. v.] as President of the Senate and on July 22, 1912 as grand-vizier in the cabinet of the "Great Oman" (Bugübler). Under pressure from the association of old-Turkish officers (Kadir-kârîm) he persuaded the Senate on Aug. 4 by a bold interpretation of the constitution to declare the session of Parliament closed. He endeavoured to free the army and civil service from politics, obtained an amnesty for Albania, recalled Ahmed 'Izzet Pasha from the Yaman, instituted the Naval Medal and Medal of the Red Crescent, obtained favourable terms in the treaty of peace with Italy (Oct. 18, 1912) but could not avert the catastrophe in the Balkan War. On Oct. 29, 1912 he retired in favour of Kâmil Pasha, but remained a member of the Senate till 1918, in which on Feb. 12, 1917 he advocated the adoption of the Gregorian calendar and rejection of the Christian reckoning for the financial year. He died on Jan. 21, 1919. Mahmud Mukhtar Pashâ is his son.

Bibliography: Général Izzet-Fuad, Autres Occasions perdues... Critique stratégique de la Campagne d'Asie Mineure 1877–1878, Paris 1908. (C. JASCHKE)

MUKHTARI, ŞEHİD AL-DİN 'ÜDDEH M. MOHAMMAD AL-MUKHTARI AL-MAZBAH, was the poet of the later Ghaznavids Ibrahim b. Mas'ud II (1059–1099) and Mas'ud III b. Ibrahim (1099–1114). He lived for a considerable period in Kirmân, where he wrote panegyrics on the Sahîlîk Arslân-Shâh b. Kîrmânîshâh (1101–1114). The great poet Majd al-Dîn San'aî showed him the greatest reverence and celebrated him in a long ûşâde as the best poet of his time. He could not have been San'aî's teacher, as the Banklîpe Catalogue (l. c.) says, since he must have been only a year or two older than San’aî. His influence however is quite marked in many of San'aî's works. One of Mukhtârî's philosophical ûşâdîs may be regarded as the one of the finest examples of the old Persian school of poetry since Ma'bar on it were written by the best poets such as Khâshâ, Amir Khosrâw, Alîh-rî Alîkhanî, "Abd al-Rahman Lââmî and Nâwî. His chief work is a large ûşâde of lyrics, the majority of which are panegyrics in the style of the old Ghaznavî poets like 'Unurî and San'aî, and dedicated to Arslân-Shâh, Bahram-Shâh, Alâdî al-Dawla Dâlâmî, Tâmgush-Khân and a number of vîlîs. Besides these ûşâdîs there were in the ûşâde a few short maqâmânî, one of which of an astronomical nature seems to have had a great influence on later poetry. We should probably also ascribe to our poet the authorship of the Alâshârî-nâma, an imitation of the Şâhârî-nâma, the hero of which is Shâhriyar's son of Baranz son of Shahri, i.e. a great-grandson of Kustân, and the action of which is laid in India. The poem is dedicated to Mas'ud III, in the preface the poet says that he has worked at it for three years and hoped for a present worthy of this labour. If he does not receive this gift however, he will not write a satire this year, which must be a direct reference to Firdawsi. The year of Mukhtârî's death is not exactly known, 530 (1135), 533 (1138), 544 (1149) and 554 (1159) are mentioned. The last date seems to be the right one.

Bibliography: H. Elbe, Neuere Literatur (Gr. I. Ph. ii. 334, 356–357); Daulatabâhî, p. 93; Majdîm al-Funâsî, l. c. 508–507. A manuscript of the Şâhârî-nâma in Rien, l. c. 542. (E. BERTHEL) AL-MUKIT, [see ALLAH, II.]

MUKNÂ, a district and village in the Yaman, a day's journey south of Sana'a. The Arab geographers mention a cornelian mine here. The name is also given to a mountain in the Yaman Sarat. According to Sprenger, we cannot connect the Himyar tribe of this name with the Musqar of Piolemy.


MUQTAZAB, name of the thirteenth metre in Arabic prosody, very little used; in theory it consists of three feet, with two successive mustafîlîn, in each hemistich; but in practice it has only two.

There is one ûf and one dark: muqatsu mustafîlîn: muqatsu mustafîlîn. However, muqatsu should lose its û in mustafîlîn: (mudwallâ = mudwallâ) or change its û to a, which is very frequent (muqatsu = mudwallâ).

Mustafîlîn can never retain its û (mustafîlîn = muqatsu). (MOH. BENCHENNE)

AL-MUKTADI MI-AMRI 'L-LâH, ABD 'R-RAHMÂN 'ABD ALLAH M. MUKHTARI, 'Abbasîd caliph. His father was the son of the caliph al-Mukhtârî and his mother an Armenian slave girl named Urduwâna. After the death of his grandfather al-Kâlîm in Sha'bân 407 (April 757), al-Mukhtârî succeeded him as caliph. The real ruler was the Sahîlîk Sultan Malikshâh [q. v.] to whose daughter al-Mukhtârî was married in 480 (1087). By 482 (1089) however, she had returned to her father became
she was neglected by the caliph. Malikshāh, who wished to prevent the caliph interfering in affairs of state, endeavoured to induce him to leave Baghdad and take up his residence in another town; this plan however came to nothing through the death of the sultān in Shawwal 485 (Nov. 1092) and al-Muqtadī was left in peace in the capital. About this time the power of the Saljuq was at its greatest height and in all the lands conquered by them the spiritual supremacy of the caliph was recognised. Al-Muqtadī died suddenly on 15th or 19th Muḥarram 487 (4th or 8th Feb. 1094) at the age of 38. He was perhaps poisoned by Malikshāh's son and successor, Burkīyārūk [q.v.] whom he had offended by confirming the selection of his minor brother Muhammād as sultān.


AL-MUQTADIR [See ALLĀH, II.]

AL-MUQTADIR B. 'Abbās al-Abbāsīd caliph, son of al-Mu'tadī and a slave named Shaghāb. After the death of his brother al-Muqtadī in Dhu l-'Khādād 295 (Aug. 908), al-Muqtadī who was only 13 at the time was proclaimed caliph. Many however preferred 'Abbās Allāh, son of the caliph al-Mu'tazz, and after the murder of the vizier 'Abd al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbbās in Dhu l-'Khādād 295, according to the vizier's personal and sometimes by the viziers among whom special mention may be made of the intriguing Ibn al-Furāt [q.v.] and the brave Ibn al-Darrāsh [q.v.]. Al-Muqtadī's caliphate was therefore marked by a gradual decline. In his reign the dynasties of the Fāṭimids [q.v.] and Hamdānids [q.v.] became independent. The Karmājāns also rebelled once more. In the years 307 (919—920) and 310 (923) Baṣra was plundered by the Karmājān chief Abū ʿĪsā Sahābra (cf. AL-DJANSARI) and at the end of the year 311 (924) he fell upon the pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca. In Dhu l-'Khādād of the following year (925) he attacked the caravan which was going on the pilgrimage to Mecca from Baghdad and put it to flight. He next plundered al-Kufa and then returned to Baṣra. An army sent against the Karmājāns under the command of Muḥammad arrived only after they had retired. In 314 (926—927) Yūsuf b. Abī l-Slālā was summoned from Aḥurābadīdān to help, but Sulaimān defeated him in Shawwal of the following year (Dec. 927) and took him prisoner. The caliph's troops did not dare to give battle and in Muḥarram 316 (March 928) Sulaimān seized the town of al-Raḥba. After an unsuccessful attack on al-Raḥba he retired; in 317 (929—930), or, according to others, in 316, he plundered Mecca and carried off the Black Stone. On the Byzantine frontier both sides continued their raids with varying fortunes. In 305 (917) the Byzantines made an offer of peace and after two years the peace was definitely concluded, but hostilities very soon broke out again. In 314 (926—927) the Byzantines ravaged the district of Malkāyat and in the following year they crossed a considerable part of Armenia. After taking several Armenian cities which belonged to the Arabs (316 = 928—929) and occupying northern Mesopotamia (317 = 929—930) they lost all their gains in 319—320 (= 931—932). In Muḥarram 317 (Feb. 929) a rebellion broke out in the capital. Al-Muqtadī was forced to abdicate but was brought to a place of safety by Mu'āwīya, while the soldiery plundered the palace. His brother Muḥammad was summoned to be Commander of the Faithful in his stead with the style al-Kahtīr; but since the chief leader of the rebels, the head of police Niẓārī, could not satisfy the demands of the troops for higher pay, al-Kahtīr was deposed after a few days and al-Muqtadī placed on the throne once more. In Baghdad he continued in power until in 320 (932) the catastrophe came. The enemies of Mu'āwīya took advantage of his absence to persuade the caliph that Mu'āwīya intended to dethrone him and when Mu'āwīya approached at the head of his army, al-Muqtadī was persuaded with great reluctance to take the field against him; but he fell at the beginning of the encounter (27th Shawwal 320 = Oct. 932). See also the article MUHAMMAD B. YUSUF.


AL-MUQTAPFI B. 'Abd al-Abbāsid caliph, born on 12th Rabī' II 439 (April 9, 1096), son of al-Muqtadī and a slave girl. After the deposition of his nephew al-Rašīd, al-Muqtapī was acknowledged as caliph on the 8th Dhu l-Ḥijjah 530 (Sept. 17, 1136). While the Sādūqīs were fighting among themselves, he did his best not only to maintain his independence but also to extend his rule and one district after the other in the Irbīk fell into his hands. In 545 (1148) a number of enmities announced their allegiance to Sultan Mas'ūd and marched on Baghdād but dispersed after several encounters with the caliph's troops. According to some sources, the same thing took place again next year. In Rabī' II 547 (Oct. 1152) Mas'ūd died, and was succeeded by his nephew Malikshāh who was deposed in a few months and succeeded by his brother Muḥammad. In the meanwhile the caliph seized the two towns of al-Hilla and Wāṣit. In the following year Sultan Sanjar who lived in Kūršān was attacked and taken prisoner by the rebel Ghuzz [q.v.] whereupon his enmities proclaimed Mas'ūd's
brother Sulaiman-Shâh saltân in Muḥarram 552 (Feb.–March 1156) the latter was recognised by the caliph on condition that he did not interfere in the affairs of the Ṭarîq. Although al-Muktafi supported him he was defeated in Djinânâd I (June–July) of the same year by his nephew Muḥammad and the latter's auxiliary. In Dhu l-Hijjah (Jan.–Feb. 1157) Sulṭân Muḥammad advanced on Baghdad to take vengeance on the caliph. The latter had to retire to the eastern part of the town and was besieged there for several months. In Rabî' I 552 (May 1151) however, the sulṭân suddenly raised the siege because Maškîkhâb was advancing on Hamadân. As the latter therefore retired, hostilities automatically ceased and Mulâmmad b. Ṣâd was said in 1157 to have made peace with al-Muktafi. The latter twice besieged Ṭakrit in vain; on the other hand, he succeeded in taking Lihi. The Crusaders continued their hostilities in al-Muktafi's caliphate. The most powerful pillar of Islam was the Atâbeq of al-Mawṣûl, Imâd al-Din Zangî, and his son Nûr al-Din Muḥâmid in Syria. Al-Muktafi died on 2nd Rabî' I 553 (March 12, 1160).


(K. V. Zettersten)

AL-MUKTAFI b. 'IZZâD, ABD MUḤÂMÂD AL-'ÂLî b. 'ÂḤÂMîD, A'BBÂSîD CAliph, son of al-Muṭaadîd and a Turkish slave girl named Čiček (Arabic Džđjak). In 281 (894–895) he was appointed by his father governor of al-Kâyî and several towns in the neighbourhood, and five years later he was made governor of Mesopotamia and took up his quarters in al-Râkîa. After the death of al-Muṭaadîd on 22nd Rabî' II, 282 (April 5, 902), he ascended the throne and at once won the good-will of the people by his liberality and by destroying the subterranean dungeons in the capital. He proved a brave and fearless leader who fought with success against the many enemies of the caliphate. The Kârmaṭians were ravaging Syria; one town after another fell into their hands and Damascus itself was plundered. On the 6th Muḥarram 291 (Nov. 29, 903) the general Muḥâmad b. Saḥîmân finally succeeded in inflicting a crushing defeat on them and they scattered in all directions. Muḥâmad then turned his attention to Egypt where he put an end to the rule of the Tūlûnids. Many of their followers joined him and after the Tūlûnîd Ḥârîm b. Khumârâwaš had been slain, the capital had to surrender (Ṣâfâr 292 = Jan. 905) and Ḥâfiz al-Naḥârî was appointed governor of Egypt. An attempt to restore the Tūlûnîd was easily crushed (293 = 905–906). About this time the Kârmaṭians again began to be troublesome and at the beginning of the year 294 (Oct.–Nov. 906) they attacked the great pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca, massacred the men and carried off the women and children. In Rabî' I of the same year (Dec. 906–Jan. 907) they were defeated near al-Kâdiša by the caliph's troops under Wâfîl b. Śâwâstegân. The war with the Byzantines was also vigorously pursued. In 291 (903–904) a Greek named Leo who had adopted Islam undertook a number of raids on the Greek coasts with his fleet of 35 ships. The Byzantines however had the advantage by land. In 292 (904–905) Marâsh, al-Maṣjaḍa and Ťarûs were taken by the Greek general Andronicus and the following year the Byzantines advanced as far as Hâlab. Then the Muslims gained the upper hand and Andronicus went over to them. Al-Muktafi died in Dhu l-Ka'da 295 (Aug. 908) at the age of 31; cf. also the article AL-ÂḤÂMîD b. AL-ḤÂSÎN b. ÂḤÂMîD.


(K. V. Zettersten)

AL-MUKTÂNÂ, BAḤR AL-DIN, A Druze missionary and author, with his teacher Ḥamzû b. 'Âlî q.v. founder of the theological system of the Druzes [q. v.], the fifth minister of the Druse theogony, with several titles of honour, in addition to the above two: al-Djâbût, al-Âṣîr, al-Tâlî, kjhâyâl, al-Muktafrî etc. His "secular" name was Abû l-Ḥâsan b. Abû Ahmad al-Samâkî. Of his life practically nothing is known. As Arab historians are silent about him (Silvestre de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druses, ii. 320), his two writings are almost the only sources according to Druse tradition, he was a Druze of Alexandria in al-Ḥâkîm's time [q. v.]. (M. v. Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmeeer zum Perrischen Golf, i., Berlin 1899, p. 135). As his works reveal quite a good knowledge (not without misunderstandings) of Christian religion and literature, he may have been born a Christian, probably in Syria. Only for the period of his teaching do we have chronological exactness. His table of investiture is dated on the 13th Shawbân of the third year of Ťumâna mission i.e. 411 (1020) (S. de Sacy, op. cit., i. 474–475: ii. 309, 313; transl., ibid., ii. 297–309). The earliest of his known writings is of the tenth year of Ťumâna, 418 a.H. (ibid., ii. 326). In consequence one must assume that he came to the front after the disappearance of al-Ĥâkîm and Ťumâna. His activity was not a continuous one and he had even to live for a time in concealment (about the year 17–18 of Ťumâna; see S. de Sacy, op. cit., ii. 364), whether in Egypt or Syria is not certain (H. Guys, La nation druze, p. 114). The latest date known in his writings is the 29th year of Ťumâna, i.e. 433–434 (1042) (S. de Sacy, op. cit., i. 496; ii. 379). His farewell epistles dates from this year; according to it he had retired into concealment (ibid., i. 514–515; ii. 358); nothing more is known of him. The "Druze theogony" does not agree with these dates; it gives 17 years as the period of his activity (H. Guys, op. cit., p. 107). Ph. Hitti's assertion (The Origin of the Druze People, p. 11) that he died in 1031 is due to a misunderstanding.

Druze tradition not unjustly ranks him with Ťumâna and regards him as the greatest theological writer, to whom four of the sacred books are ascribed (M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., i. 135–137). These are not books
in the proper sense but collections of separate tracts, usually in the form of epistles, directed to followers of the Druse teaching or of other creeds in various lands (Byzantium, Syria, Egypt, Arabia, India). They are to this day frequently read by the Druses in their hālāwāt; commentaries were written on some of them by the last independent Druse theologian 'Abd Allāh al-Tanākī (d. 1480; on him see Ph. Hitti, op. cit., p. 53; 71; M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., l. 137). Of the some 110 Druse treatises so far known in Europe, 70 are ascribed by S. de Sacy to al-Muktānā (op. cit., i. 484 and 496). Except for a few that were published by S. de Sacy also, few other writings of Ḥanāfī, Ṣūfī, Ḥadīth, and Rabbānite authors have been printed, namely the Kīthā al-Bad' by Ch. Seybold (s. Bibl. and al-Kisāyāt al-Kaṭanṭanīyya, sent in 1208 to the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VIII., by J. Khalil and L. Romzeville (s. Bibl. and extracts in Hitti, op. cit., p. 64—67). Others are accessible only in translations and extracts (spec. in Silvaestri de Sacy; al-Kisāiyyat al-Manṣūhyya, a synopsis in Hitti, op. cit., p. 68—70). As with other Druse writers, the style is very obscure and artificial, frequently embellished with rhymed prose.

Silvaestri de Sacy, whose book still is the most important collection of material, regards al-Muktānā as "un enthousiaste de bonne foi" (op. cit., l. 508). It is highly desirable that some one should devote a special study to his life and work, paying particular attention to the authenticity of his works and to a critical edition of them.


MULAK [See MAWLĀ].

MULK (A.), royal power, is used in the Kūrān with reference to God and to certain pre-Islamic personages, who all appear in the Old Testament, and in the former case is synonymous with mutākib; the latter word however occurs only four times in the Kūrān and always with a dependent genitive ( kull išār or al-ramūsūt wa-l-tāriq) while mulk is often used absolutely. To God alone belongs mulk, He has no associate therein; to Him belongs mulk over heaven and earth as well as over the judgment. He gives mulk to whom He will; the unbelievers have no share in it. Shāfi‘ī promised Adam imperishable mulk and tempted him with this promise to eat of the shajarat al-khisīl (Sūra xx. 118). Nimrīd endeavours to claim for himself God's mulk against Ibrāhīm (ii. 260) but God gives mulk to the family of Ibrāhīm (iv. 57). Yusuf thanks God in prayer for the mulk which He has given him (xii. 102). Fir‘awn boasts of his right to the mulk Miyr (xiii. 50); God wills to give Talūt mulk over the recalcitrant Israelites and to send the fātūr as a sign (li. 248 sqq.). Dāwūd's mulk is mentioned ii. 522 and xxxviii. 19 and Sulaimān's li. 96; the latter prays for it (xxxviii. 34).

That the conception of mulk was not carried over into Muslim law generally has been explained in the article MAJL; an exception is Egypt during the Ayyūbī period and in quite modern times. See also the article TAKM and G. Richter, Studien zur Geschichte der altemen arabischen Rechtslehre (Leipz., Sem. Studien, N. F., iii, 1932), esp. p. 6. (M. Plessner)

MULĀN is an ancient town of the Pandjak situated in 30° 12' N. and 71° 31' E., and has been known at various times as Kasthpūr, Hanspur, Bāpūr, Sanb or Sanapūr, and finally Mulakshān, of which Mulān is a corruption. This name is derived from that of the idol and temple of the sun, a shrine of vast wealth, which the Arabs, who plundered it, named dār al-asbāh, or the house of gold. It remained the Arab capital, and the outpost of Islam in India, for three centuries but by A.D. 900 its ruler had become independent of Baghdaḍ. At this time it was seized by 'Abd Allāh the Karmāṭī, and became a stronghold of the Karmāṭī heretics, who were crushed and expelled by the orthodox Mahṣūmī of Ghazān. The town and province remained nominally subject to the descendants until Khūrānā Mūlik, the last of them, was carried into captivity by Mu‘īz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sūm, when it became a province of his Indian empire. On his death the governor, Nīsīr al-Dīn Kābakī, attempted to establish his independence of Dīlī, but Khūṭh al-Dīn Ablāk reduced him to obedience, and the province remained nominally subject to Dīlī from 1260 to 1438 when Shaikh Yūsuf Khurānī became independent ruler of Mulān and was followed by the kings of the Langāb tribe, who reigned until 1537. The town was occupied both by Timūr in 1397 and by Bābir in 1528.

The province was one of the ṣurūs of Akbar's empire, and remained nominally subject to his successors until 1752, when its allegiance was transferred to Kābul. It was occupied by the Sikhs as early as 1771, but was not annexed by them until 1818, when Ranjit Singh took the city by storm. It was not affected by the first Sikh war, but the murder of two British officers by Mūṛādī led to the second Sikh war, and the city was captured on January 3, 1849. Its fortifications were dismantled in 1854 and its garrison was disarmed in the mutiny of 1857.

Bibliography: Firāshī, Guljān-ī Ibrāhīmī (Bombay 1832); Tāwab-ī Akbārī, by Ni‘mān al-Dīn Ahmad; Sir Edward D. Maclagan, Gazetteer of the Multan District (Lahore 1902). (T. W. Hail)

MU‘MIN, title of sūrā 11. See also ALLĀH, II and IMAN.

MU‘MINŪN, title of sūrā 22. See also allāh, II.

MU‘MĪT. [See ALLĀH, II.]

MUMKIN. [See MAN̄T.]

MU-MUTAHNA, title of sūrā 19.

MÚMTÁZ, BAKKHWĪDRĀ b. MAḤMŪD TŪR-KĀNĪ, a Persian writer, a contemporary of the Saʿwīd Suṭṭan Ḥasan (1694—1724). At an early age he left his native town of Farah

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF ISLAM, III.
and went to Meaw where he entered the service of the governor Ayılan-Khan. After two years however, he left this post and became munsif with Hassan Kül Khân Şahînî Kürî-i-başî in Ḫalîfān. At a banquet there at his master's house he heard a story which attracted him exceedingly. He wrote it down and it became the foundation of a great collection, Maḥfīl, which contains about 400 stories and consisted of a masnadana, eight ṣâhî and a ḥātimâ. Soon afterwards he returned to Farāh, spent some time in Herât and Meshâh and then entered the service of the emir Mûnîkh Khan b. Kâğıtghây whose duty it was to defend Darûn and Kâğıtghây against raids by the wild nomad tribes. His stay there was disastrous for Mûmtâz, since he lost all his goods and chattels and the valuable manuscript of his Maḥfīl during a nomad raid; he did not have another copy of it. He resolved however to restore the book and wrote all the stories that he could remember a second time. Thus arose the second version of the Maḥfīl, which consists of a masnadana, five ṣâhî and a ḥātimâ and has come down to us under the title Maḥfī al-Ḳūtîb. The book is written in an extravagantly artificial style. The ḥātimâ is the best part; it contains the celebrated story of Zâhî and Ra'ânî, which is very common in Persia in a simplified form in many editions from the popular presses.


MUMTÂZ MAHALL, wife of Ṣâhî Dâjîn, and the lady for whom the Tâjî Mahâll (q.v.) was built. She was the daughter of Aṣâfī-Ḥân, who was Nûr Dâjîn's brother. Her name was Aḏrûmân Bîqî, the title Mûmâtâz Mahâll being conferred on her after Ṣâhî Dâjîn's accession. She was his favourite wife and bore him fourteen children, seven of whom grew up. She was born in 1593, married in 1612, and died at Bûrûnâbâd in the Deccan, very shortly after the birth of a daughter in 1631. She was beautiful and amiable, and Ṣâhî Dâjîn loved her tenderly.

Bibliography: Khâfi Khân, Muntâzâh al-Ḳūtîb, i. 459; Aḥd al-Ḥamid Lahûrî, Bad šâhânmâ i. 38, 374; Manucci, Storia de Mogor, translated by W. Irvine; Elliot-Dowson, vi. 27; Indian Magazine for December 1913, p. 316.

MUNADJĐJIM. [See Astrology.]

MUNADJÎM BÂŞH. The name by which the author of the most important general historical work written in Turkey is known. His real name was Aktâf Efsenî, son of Lâfi Aṭîh, a native of Ereğli near Konya. He was born in Selânik, in the first half of the xvith century, received a scholarly education and served in his youth for fifteen years in the Mewlewî-kâne of Kâsim Paşa under Shaikh Khalîl Dedî (Sigîlî- ṭâhânmâ, ii. 257). Afterwards he studied astronomy and astrology and became court astrologer (munadjiâm basî) in 1078 (1667—1668). In 1086 (1675—1676) he was admitted to the intimate circle of Sultan Muhammad IV as münâfiq-i pâdishâhî. He was dismissed in Muḥarram 1099 (November 1687) and banished to Egypt. From here he went some years later to Mecca, where he became Ḥâshî of the Mewlewî-kâne. In 1105 (1693—1694) he was obliged to move to Medina, where he lived for seven years. Soon after his return to Mecca he died there on the 29th of Ramazân 1113 (February 27th 1702) and was buried near the tomb of Ḫâdîjâ.

Besides writing his historical work, Munadjdim Basî displayed a considerable literary activity. Of his works are mentioned a ḥâtimâ on the Kur'an commentary of Bâḍîjâ, a commentary on the 'Ashâb al-ḥadîth of al-Qâdî, a Ḥâfiz-i 'Arâfî, a translation of the anecdotes of Uba'id-i Zâkâni, and a number of treatises on geometry, mysticism and music. His Turkish dâvî also gives him a place in the ranks of Turkish mystical poets; his tâhâfnâ was 'Ashâbi.

The general history was written in Arabic under the title Lâyân al-Dawâd, but although manuscripts of the Arabic original exist (the Somâ-Kânei Edeh of 'Ali Ewâr mentions two MSS. not mentioned by Bâbiner, viz. one in the library of the mosque of Selim II in Adrianople and the other in the imperial palace, in the library of Almâîdd Ilî), it is much better known in the Turkish translation made by the poet Nêdêm (q.v.) in the xvith century under the title Sayâtâf al-Ḳâhîrî (printed in three volumes in Constantinople in 1385). It is a well known, arranged, after the fashion of similar Arabic works, according to dynasties, with a main division into three parts: the first treating of the history of Muhammad, the second of the non-Muhammadan dynasties, and the third the Muhammadan dynasties. In the introductory chapters the author cites his numerous sources, not a few of which are lost in the original. Therefore the work has a special value for the knowledge of many smaller dynasties and for this reason it has been especially used by F. Sachau for Ein Verzeichniu wakhânien-dânischen Dynastyen (in SB, Pr. Ab., W., Berlin 1923 [cf. the introduction). The last dynasty treated is that of the Ottoman Sulûqu; it is proportionately longer and more detailed than the history of the other Muhammadan dynasties and is based on several imperfectly known sources; the last part, which ends in 1689 (1678), gives contemporary history. The Turkish translation of Nêdêm is very readable and not composed in the high-flown literary style that prevailed in his period. For this reason it is especially praised and represented in Ebuzziya Tewfîk's Nûmân-i Edbeleyi-i 'Eshâniyê, Constantinople 1330.

Bibliography: F. Bâbiner, O. G. W., and the sources mentioned there.

AL-MUNAFIKUN (t.), the term applied in the Kur'an to those Medîneî upon whose fidelity and zeal Muhammad could not absolutely rely. The Arabs (e.g. Muḥabbâr, Kûmil, ed. Wright, p. 153) derive the word from münâfîk (one of the entrances to the hole of a field mouse), but it is certainly the borrowed Arabic münâfîk, *heretic* from münâfîka to *aspire*, münâfîka to be divided, irresolute*. The meaning *wavering*, doubter* quite fits the usual use of the word in the Kur'an, while the usual translation *hypocrite* can only apply to a few passages. Another description of the same people in the Kur'an is: *those in whose hearts there is sickness (weakness, doubt)*, again in contrast to the unashakably firm believers. Sometimes (ix. 68
Muhammad also on one occasion speaks of Ma'nafi'Kun among the Beduins. The first group found their leader in 'Abd Allah ibn Umayya (q. v.) who would have been the chosen head of the Kaila tribe, if a new and superior force, which he could not meet, had not opposed him in Muhammad. Nevertheless these claimants, joined by other unreliable elements, were strong enough to cause the greatest embarrassment to the Prophet in critical moments e. g. before the battle of Uhud (III. 160 sq.), in the War of the Ditch (xxxili. 1, 12-24, 60, 73) and before the march on Tabuk (I. 63-69, 74, 78), as he had always to be careful not to drive them over into the enemy's camp. It is no wonder then that his utterances about them are always made in a tone of great irritation. He describes them as hypocrites, who say something different from what they mean in their hearts (III. 161; xiii. 7); in this irresolution, the enemy, according to their view of the future, sometimes the Muslims and sometimes the enemy (IV. 137-143; v. 57); if it goes badly with the believers, they think that their religion has deceived them (vili. 51). When they are together among themselves they revenge themselves for the restraint which they must put upon themselves by malicious remarks about the Prophet and his revelations, but are in great anxiety, lest Allah may communicate their secret conversations (I. 65 sqq.; x. 79, 123 sqq.). They are indolent at prayer (I. 141), refuse to take part in the fighting or to contribute from their means (xlii. 22, 31; xlii. 1 sq.; Ixii. 71; cf. iv. 40 sqq.); they hope for a weakening of his power so that the more worthy may expel the measurer (Ixii. 8). As representatives of the true Meccan aristocracy, their attitude and eloquence made a certain impression on the Prophet but on closer examination they are nothing but "propped timbers" (Ixii. 4). In a word, they are no better than the unbelievers. God makes them err (iv. 59 sqq.) and their abode shall be hellfire (I. 74; Ixii. 13 sqq.). We cannot help feeling in some ways a certain sympathy for these men who were deprived of their rights; but in the end they deserved their fate for their complete lack of ideas and courage at decisive moments and their conduct with regard to the Jews in Medina, whom they incited to resist Muhammad and then left in the lurch (cf. I. 11), makes a very unfavourable impression. With the death of 'Abd Allah they lost their leader and their opposition was forced to be silent before the great successes of Muhammad's last years.

The word munafik remained however and like other Kur'anic terms was used in the fighting between the various parties as a term of abuse; cf. e.g. its application to Ibn Zubair (Tabari, ii. 467, 3 and his party (Abhawari, An-Nasir wa al-aqabi, Chronik, p. 73, 4). In the Qur'an Sura Iviii. is called after the Munafikun; it is connected by most commentators

with the campaign against the Banu Mu'attal.


Muhammad ibn al-Munafikun. [See Umayyads II.]

Mu'nis ibn al-Munafikun, title of Sirr lxvii., which is also called al-mustabil and al-munafiya.

Munafikun (Munafiqun), the head-quarters of the Munafik District in Bihar and Orissa in India, situated in 25° 25' N. and 86° 28' E. on the south bank of the Ganges. The population of the district in 1911 was 2,132,593, of whom 200,339 were Muhammadans. Muhammadan historians state that Bakhittar Khaled was the first Muhammadan who conquered Munafik during his subjugation of Bihar about 593 (1198). Henceforth it became a place of military importance. In 1177 (1705) Nawwâb Mir Khâshim, the Nawwâb Sildar of Bengal, when he proposed to fight against the British made Munafik his military head-quarters. He founded here an arsenal under Gurgin (Gregory) Khân, his Armenian general. The gun-making industry for which the town is famous is said to date from the establishment of this arsenal.

Bibliography: Imperial Gazetteer of India, xvii. 401-403; O'Malley, Bengal District Gazetteers, Monghyr, Calcutta 1909, xvii.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

Munafikun (Munafiqun) deereh Munis, ottoman poet of Adrianople. He belonged to the Mewliwî order. He received his education from the famous Enis Dede (d. 1147 = 1734). He died in 1145 (1732) in Adrianople, where he is buried. (cf. Bibilography: Fath, Teskeh, Constanti- nople 1277, p. 387; Tahtip, Sigüit-i-işmaîli, iv. 527; Ali' Ewver, Sema'âbi-i-işteh, Istanbul 1509, p. 226.

Mu'min al-Munafikun, principal 'Abîbîsî general from 926 to 931 (926-933), and latterly virtual dictator (usual attribution to him of mitha al-Kafrîh seems to rest on passage — p. 347 — in Hîlal al-Sâhib's Kiwa al-Wusâra [ed. Amedroz], where Naṣir should be read for Mu'nis), a staunch (passage of Ibn Miskawayh [ed. Amedroz and Margoliouth, i. 100] shows that ðhdûm in this case does not mean merely freedman, as suggested by Massignon, al-Hallaj, p. 205, N°. 2), said by al-Dhababi, Ta'bîlî al-Bizâm (followed by Ibn Taghrîbî, ed. Juybîlî, ii. 255) to have been 90 years old at death (though this age would seem incredibly great for a recently active commander), i.e., to have been born in 931 (845-846), and to have held the rank of amir for 60 years.

Mu'nis first appears (if passage of al-Taθârî, iii. 1953, refers to him) as a Khâdîm of al-Mu'tâjid (not yet caliph) in Zandâ [q. v.]. He was appointed of 267 (980-983) and is mentioned as Chief of Police in caliph's camp in 287 (990). Al-Dhababi (also Ibn Taghrîbî, loc. cit.) states, again, that he was banished to Mecca by al-Mu'tâjid, to be recalled on accession of al-Muktâdîr [q. v.]; and as Mu'nis is nowhere referred to during intervening reign of al-Muktâfî, the statement may be true. (If so, in al-Mu'âthî’s description, Munûdî
at-Lūhahā, ed. B. de Meynard, viii. 212, of al-Mu'tadid's death, Ibn al-'Aṯīm read al-'Aṯīm, as in 'Arib, ed. de Goeje, p. 295.)

Mu'nis owed his later eminence mainly to his leading the defence, in 296 (908), of the Ḥasanī palace at Baghdād for al-Mu'ātkīr against the partisans of the latter's cousin, the pretender Ibn al-Mu'tazz [q. v.]. During the caliph's youth his gratitude and that of his powerful mother for this service assured Mu'nis's position; and though later al-Mu'ātkīr's favour turned to enmity, by that time Mu'nis's authority was hardly in need of support, owing chiefly to his almost invariably successful generalship. For though he undertook no very important campaigns, except perhaps the repulse of the Fāṣīmīd al-Mahdi [q. v.] in 307 (915-920) (for which he received the Ḥākāb al-Mu'āznārī, and the defence of Baghdād from the Karmāratīs [q. v.] in 315 (927-928), he was only once defeated—in 306 (918).

Mu'nis early fell out with the wazīr Ibn al-Fūrāt [q. v.], repeatedly opposing him, till in 314 (925), on Ibn al-Fūrāt's third term of office, Mu'nis played a prominent part in securing his dismissal and execution. He now became all-powerful, being invariably consulted on the appointment of viziers and so controlling the government. Hence the change of al-Mu'ātkīr's affection to dislike, first signalled (315 = 927) in an abortive plot of the caliph's to murder him. In 316 Mu'nis lent himself to al-Mu'ātkīr's deposition in favour of his half-brother al-Kāhir [q. v.]. He almost immediately restored him, however, thereby becoming more absolutely his master than ever. Al-Mu'ātkīr eventually deigned Mu'nis (319 = 931), who thereupon left Baghdād. Next year, however, having meanwhile collected a strong force, he marched on the capital intending to reinforce his authority. He duly defeated the caliph's army outside the walls, but al-Mu'ātkīr himself was killed on the field.

Mu'nis now restored al-Kāhir. But by resuming his dictatorial ways he soon so alienated him that he was obliged in self-defence to keep the new caliph a prisoner in the palace. He even contemplated deposing him. Al-Kāhir, however, succeeded in luring Mu'nis, together with his chief supporters, into the palace, where he shortly had them executed in Sha'bān 321 (August 933).

Mu'nis's influence was on the whole exerted for good; but he was neither strong nor intelligent enough to prevent the decline of the caliphate. His example of depriving the caliph of real power was pernicious. It was to be followed all too soon by the series of adventurers who, with the style of amir al-samāri [q. v.], were to dominate al-Kāhir's successors.


MUNKAR WA-NAKIR (the forms with the article are also found), the names of the two angels who examine and if necessary punish the dead in their tombs. To the examination in the tomb the infidels and the faithful—the righteous as well as the sinners—are liable. They are set upright in their tombs and make out their opinion regarding Muḥammad. The righteous and the faithful will answer, that he is the Apostle of Allāh; thereupon they will be left alone till the Day of Resurrection. The sinners and the infidels, on the other hand, will have no satisfactory answer at hand. In consequence of this the angels will beat them severely, as long as it will please Allāh, according to some authorities till the Day of Resurrection, except on Fridays.

In some sources a distinction is made between the punishment and the pressure (saqūfa) in the tomb, the righteous being exempt from the former, not from the latter, whereas the infidels and the sinners suffer punishment as well as pressure. (Abū l-Mu'īn Māmah b. Muḥammad al-Naṣfī, as cited in the commentary on the Waṣayṭ Abu Ḥanīfa, Haidarābād 1321, p. 22.)

The punishment in the tomb is not plainly mentioned in the Kūrān. Allusions to the idea may be found in several passages, e.g. sūra xxvi. 29: "But how when the angels, causing them to die, shall smite them on their faces and backs"; sūra vi. 93: "But couldst thou see, when the ungodly are in the floods of death, and the angels reach forth their hands, saying, Yield up your souls: this day shall ye be recompensed with a humiliating punishment"; sūra viii. 52: "And if thou went to see when the angels take the life of the unbelievers; they smite their faces and their backs, and taste ye the torture of burning" (cf. further sūra is. 102; xxiii. 21; lii. 47).

The punishment of the tomb is very frequently mentioned in Tradition (see Bibliography), often, however, without the mention of angels. In the latter group of traditions it is simply said, that the dead are punished in their tombs, or why, e.g. on account of special sins they have committed, or on account of the weighing of the living.

The names of Munkar and Nakir do not appear in the Kūrān, and, so far as I can see, once only in canonical Tradition (Tirmidhī, Q. 80). Apparently these names do not belong to the old stock of traditions. Moreover, in some traditions one anonymous angel only is mentioned as the angel who interrogates and punishes the dead (Muslim, Tāhir, trad. 163; Alī Dāwūd, Sunnā, bāb 30h; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, lii. 233, 346; iv. 150; Taṣā'ilīs, No. 753). So there seem to be four stages in the traditions regarding this subject: the first without any angel being mentioned, the second mentioning the angel, the third two angels, the fourth being acquainted with the names Munkar and Nakir.

This state of things as reflected in hadith finds a similar reflex in the early forms of the creed. In the Fāḥiṣh Akbar i., which may date from the middle of the viiiith century A.D., the punishment of the tomb appears as the only eschatological representation (art. 10). In the Waṣayṭ Abu Ḥanīfa, which may represent the orthodox views of the middle of the viiiith century, we find, apart from an elaborate eschatology, the two following articles (arts. 18, 19): "We confess, that the punishment in the tomb shall not without fail take place. We confess, that in view of the traditions on the subject, the interrogation by Munkar and Nakir is a reality". The term "reality" is apparently intended to oppose the
allegorical interpretation of eschatological representations as taught by the Mu'attashim.

The Pišk Akhbarī, which may represent the new orthodoxy of the middle of the 10th century A.D., is still more elaborate on this point (art. 23): "The interrogation of the dead in the tomb by Munkar and Nakir is a reality and the reunion of the body with the spirit in the tomb is a reality. The pressure and the punishment in the tomb are a reality that will take place in the case of all the infidels, and a reality that may take place in the case of some sinners belonging to the faithful."

In the later creeds and works on dogmaties the punishment and the interrogation in the tomb by Munkar and Nakir are expressed in similar ways.

The Karramīya [q.v.] taught the identity of Munkar and Nakir with the two guardian angels who accompany man ('Abd al-Khāliq al-Baghlākī, Uṣr al-Dīn, Stambul 1932, p. 246). Qazwīnī admits the idea that eschatological representations are a reality that takes place in the malakūt.

The origin of the names is uncertain; the meaning "disliked" seems doubtful. The idea of the examination and the punishment of the dead in their habits is found among others peoples also. The details to be found in Jewish sources (bībīt ha-ab-hab) are strikingly parallel to the Muslim ones.


MUNSARĪ, the name of the tenth metre in Arabic prosody; it has three feet to the hemistich. It has three ʿarūf and four ṣūrū: 1st ʿarūf: mustafīlān maṣfūlātum mustafīlān mustafīlān 2nd ʿarūf: mustafīlān maṣfūlātum mustafīlān mustafīlān 3rd ʿarūf: mustafīlān maṣfūlātum maṣfūlātum

We rarely find mustafīlān in the ṣūrū of the first ʿarūf. The second ṣūrū of the first ʿarūf is not indicated by al-Khalīl b. Ahmad but Ibn Bari notes it was much used by the muwaddāl poets, among them Ibn al-Rūmī. It may be noted that the second and third ʿarūf are regarded as belonging to the ṣūrūf metre.

Mustafīlān may lose: 1. its ʿa except when used as the first ʿa in the first ʿarūf; 2. its f and the foot becomes (mustafīlān = maṣfūlātum); 3. its s and f at the same time (which is very bad) and the foot becomes (mustafīlān = faṣūlātum). This last change cannot be undergone by the first ʿarūf.

Maṣfūlātum may lose: 1. its f, which is very bad and the foot becomes (maṣfūlātum = maṣfūlātum); 2. its w and the foot becomes (maṣfūlātum = faṣūlātum).

3.

MUNSĪF, [See ISNĪL].

MUNSĪF (A.), part active iv. of m-w-f, "to be just, to act with justice", the title of a native judge of the lowest grade in India.

Bibliography: Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, s.v. moonnisit.

AL-MUNTAFAQ, a section of the Arab tribe of the Bani 'Ukayl, which in turn is a subdivision of the great group of the 'Amir b. Sa'āya [q.v.]. Genealogy: al-Munktakī b. 'Amir b. 'Ukayl (Wustenfeld, Gen. Tab., p. 19). The very scanty information in Wustenfeld can be supplemented by the notice which Ibn al-Kalbī gives of the Bani 'l-Muntafāq (Jami'at al-Ainan, MS. Brit. Mus., fol. 130v.-131v); but this little clan nowhere appears to play a great part in early history. The territory inhabited by the Bani 'l-Muntafāq is the same as that of the other divisions of the Bani 'Ukayl, in the southwest of Yamūma; some places belonging to them are quoted by al-Bakri (Muqaddam, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 567), Yāḥyā (Muqaddam, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 793-794; iv. 712, l. 78: we may note that in these two passages al-Muntafāq is said to be the surname of Mu'awiyah b. 'Ukayl while the usual genealogy makes this Mu'awiyah a son of al-Munktakī), al-Hamāshī (Jāhānra, ed. D. H. Müller, p. 177, l. 12-15: note the mention of gold mines in their territory). The Bani 'l-Muntafāq numbered among their clients the Banū Tahār (Wustenfeld, Gen. Tab., C 14) whose eponym was said to have been made a prisoner by them (Kitāb al-Ākāhd, vii. 110); one of the few episodes of the pre-Islamic period in which this clan is mentioned is the battle of Shīb Djabala where Kays b. al-Muntafāq distinguished himself (Ākāhd, x. 44; Naḥāf, ed. Bevan, p. 671 l. 12-672, l. 14, where Ibn Ṭafāl should be deleted). In the history of the origins of Islam, several of them appear as ambassadors of the Bani 'Uqayl to the Prophet: such were Abūs b. Kays b. al-Munktakī and Lāyīq b. 'Amīr b. al-Muntafāk (Ibn Sa'd, l. 144, 45 etc.; on the latter the bibliographic collections have long discussions as to whether he is to be identified with this or that muḥaddith: cf. among others Ibn Ḥaḍjar, Taḥādhūl al-Ṭabarī, viii. 456). In the period of the conquests, the Bani 'l-Muntafāk settled in the marshy region between Kufa and Basra (al-Kalbāghandi, Nikāyat al-ʿArab, p. 65-66). All that we know of them after this period is the names of a few individuals who held public offices: a certain 'Amīr b. Mu'awiyah b. al-Muntafāk, mentioned by Ṭabarī, i. 3284 at end, as fighting at Siffin, is said by Ibn al-Kalbī to have been governor of Armenia and Ādharbājān under Mu'awiyah according to Ibn al-Kalbī, 'Abd Allāh b. Mu'awiyah b. Rabba b. 'Amīr b. al-Muntafāk was governor of Marw and Ahvāz, also under Mu'awiyah, and 'Abūda b. Kays b. al-Muntafāk of Armenia, under Yazīd I. These men are not mentioned elsewhere: the same is true of the poet Djam b. Awar b. al-Husain b. al-Muntafāk (Ibn Ḥaḍjar, ibid. [ed. Sharafīya, Cairo 1325], v. 124 follows Ibn al-Kalbī).

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(Leo Vetti Della Vida)

AL-MUNTAKIM. [See ALLAH II.]}
AL-MUNTAŞIR (also called Mustansir) b. 'LLAH, ABU 'DhabiyyIR MUHAMMAD b. 'DhabiyyIR, *Abū ʿAbdAllāh caliph, son of al-Mu'awakkil by a Greek slave. After his father had been murdered in Shwawdīl 247 (Dec. 861) by conspirators, among whom was al-Muntasir, the latter ascended the throne, aged 25 according to the usual statement. As a ruler he was only a tool in the hands of the violent Aḥmad b. al-Khaṭīb and the Turkish generals. His brothers al-Mu'taq and al-Mu'ayyad were forced to surrender their claims to the throne and Wāṣif, the commander of the bodyguard, was sent to the Byzantine frontier. Unlike his father, he treated the *Ālids with great consideration; nothing else remarkable is recorded of him. Al-Muntasir died in Rabī' II 248 (June 862) or, according to a less trustworthy report end of Rabī' I, in Sāmarrā' after a reign of six months.


MURĀDĪ. [See Aḥmadīyār, 11. 9. 9.]

MURĀD, the name of an *Aram* tribe, belonging to the great southern group of the Madābiḥ [q. v.]; genealogical tradition (al-Kalbi, Djamārat al-Murād, Esqelār MS., fol. 113b—117b, which is followed by Ibn Durānī, Kitāb al-L-kitābah, ed. Wüsstenfeld, p. 328; cf. also Lūnān al-ʿArab, iv. 409) regards Murād as a nickname, for this tribe was said to have been the first to rebel (tamarrāda) in the *Yaman*; an etymology which is not convincing. Murād's own name is said to have been Yaḥyā b. *Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā* and he was therefore a brother of the *Ām* and the *Ṣaḥil al-ʿArbaʿa* (Wüsstenfeld, General Tabellen, p. 17, n. 9). Although they were neighbours of the Southerners, the Murādīs, the Murādīs have always retained a typical Beduīn character; their country (usually called al-Dār and placed to the east of Naḍjan and Maʿrib) is bare and sterile (cf. the picturesque description given of it by the Kitâb al-Aghânî, viii. 135 and the mountains of the Murādī* mentioned by Yâkūt, Murâjīn, ii. 78) and its inhabitants are notorious as brigands (Farāvâr Murād; cf. Kitāb al-Aghânî, x. 147). The land inhabited by the Murādīs and by their neighbours, the Hamdānīs [q. v.], had once belonged to the Taʾīyī (Yâkūt, Murâjīn, i. 129), who had left it to settle in the north of the Arabian peninsula; it is probable that it was from the old masters of the country that the Murādīs and the Hamdānīs inherited the cult of the god Yaghūth (cf. below).

The Murādīs appear for the first time in history in connection with an episode, not however at all clear, of the last days of the dynasty of the ʿAbbāsids of *Albârāʿ; as the king *Amr b. al-Muẓaffar (III) b. Muʿāwīya b. *Saʿd* had excluded his half-brother *Amr*, a son of Usāma, sister of Hind mother of the first of their chief, *Amr*, from a share in the kingdom, the latter sought refuge with the Murādīs, who recognised him as their chief but when he began to rule tyrannically, they killed him, which gave *Amr b. Hind a pretext for invading the land of the Murādīs and putting to death the murderer of *Amr* b. Usāma (al-Muṣaffar al-Dārī, Amīr, al-ʿArab, Constantine, 1300, p. 68—69, who gives a more satisfactory account than that contained in the passages quoted by G. Rothstein, Die Dyn. der Lahmīdān, p. 99, in which Yaḥyā, iv. 130 should be read for i. 130). *Amr* is said to have been killed by a certain Ibn al-Dīnāʾī (the same story is given by Ibn al-Kalbī, Dīnār al-muḥājirīn) according to Yaḥyā on the other hand by Hubrâzī b. 'Abd Yaghūthi surnamed al-Makhlībī, the latter's son Kāsī seems to have been one of the most powerful chiefs of the Murādīs at the time of the rise of *Albârāʿ.*

The Murādīs had just then suffered a disastrous defeat, which had considerably weakened them, at the hands of the ʿAbbāsīs, as the result of a quarrel which had arisen in connection with the control of the worship of the god Yaghūth (cf. Wellhausen, Reste arab. Heidentums, p. 19—22 and the sources mentioned by him). It is probably this defeat (Yaḥyā al-Raʾmānī), which traduced places in the same year as the battle of al-Qadār, which made a section of the Murādīs think it advisable to seek an alliance with Muḥammadīs but Kāsī b. al-Makhlībī refused to join in this. It was therefore another Murādī chief, Farwa b. Musulīkī, who went to al-Madinā in the year 106 A.H. and concluded a treaty there with the Prophet (cf. Caetani, Annali dell Ištām, iii. 332). To what extent tradition is right in saying that Farwa was given authority to levé *naẓīl* on all the tribes of the *Yaman* is very difficult to ascertain. In any case, the policy of the Murādīs was not oriented towards Muḥammad under the leadership of Kāsī b. al-Makhlībī. In the great rising led by al-Awsād al-ʿAnṣārī against Persian hegemony in the *Yaman*, the Murādīs were against him. But if, as tradition has it, Muḥammadīb used his connections with some chiefs of the *Yaman* to prevent al-Awsād's success, after the death of the Prophet these same chiefs refused obedience to Abī Bakr and resolutely threw themselves into the struggle against *Albârāʿ.* It is again the Kašī b. al-Makhlībi who, as chief part in these events. Taken prisoner, Abī Bakr granted him his life and consequently the chief of the Murādīs and his tribe played their part bravely in the conquests. We find them sometimes in Syria, sometimes in the *Itāl* and Kašī everywhere distinguishing himself by his exploits. He lost an eye at the battle of Yārnūk (cf. Caetani, Annali dell Ištām, i.—v., index e. v. Qays b. Hubayrah). But the account of his death in the civil war between *Alī* and Muḥṣīya at the battle of Sīṭin is based on confusion with another man of the same name of the tribe of Badīla (the fact, which is clearly indicated by Ibn al-Kalbī, Dīnār al-muḥājirīn and Tabāri, i. 3301—3302, has already been noted by Ibn Hādīj, Ṭabkīrī, ed. Sharafīya, v. 288; Annali dell Ištām, iv. 638 should be corrected). We also find the Murādīs in the conquest of Egypt (Annali, iv. 573, 21 A.H., § 101 b—209). But it was of chief that they settled in the largest numbers. It was their chief, Abī al-Raḥmān b. Mulīṣām, who, assassinated the caliph *Alī; it was there also that in 60 (679) Hānū ḏ. *Urwā al-Murādī was executed by orders of the governor *Ubaḍ b. ʿAbd Allah b. Ziyād after being found guilty of conspiring with Muḥammadī b. *Abī Bakr in favour of al-Ḥusain (Tabāri, ii. 227 sqq.). He was a descendant of the poet *Amr b. Kīšī (R. S. O., xiii. 58, 327), one of the very few poets.
of this tribe, which does not seem to have produced many individuals of note either during the Dākhiliyya or under Turkish rule. We may however mention Uwāiṣ al-Kārānī (of the Banū Karān b. Ādām b. Nādjiyya b. Murād, Wāstenfeld, Genial. Tab., p. 72), one of the prototypes of Muslim asceticism.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

MURĀD I, according to the common tradition the third ruler of the Ottoman state, was a son of Orkhan and the Byzantine lady Niliše. Although some Ottoman sources profess to know the year of his birth (Sīğil-i ‘collision, I. 74 gives the year 726 = 1326), this date, like all dates given by Turkish sources relating to this period, is far from certain. The name Murād (Greek sources such as Phrantzes have Αναφημ, from which later Latin sources make Amurath, while contemporary Latin sources from Italy have Muratthi) must have originated in mystical circles and hardly occurs in earlier times. An ‘Abdāl Murād lived in Orkhan’s time (Sīğil-i ‘collision, iv. 354, ‘Aṣḥāb Paghī, ed. Gis, p. 200; photographs of his tomb in R. Hartmann, Im neuen Anatolien, Leipzig 1928, plates 9 and 10). The ancient Turkish chronicles often call Murād Gazi Khünkār, later Turkish historians Kudāwāndikār (q.v.).

During his father’s lifetime Murād had already been entrusted with the governorship of ‘In ‘Uthūl and later of ‘Ushūr. His brother Sulaimān Pasha had held the more important sanjaks and was destined to become Orkhan’s successor. Sulaimān’s untimely death, shortly before that of Orkhan himself, placed Murād unexpectedly at the head of the Ottoman principality. This happened about 1350; the date of Orkhan’s death is uncertain.

Murād I became the first great Ottoman conqueror on European soil. In this he followed the footsteps of his brother Sulaimān Pasha and of other Turkish emirs before him.

It is not yet possible to gain a clear idea of the succession of military achievements by which the Ottomans succeeded in establishing themselves firmly on the Balkan Peninsula. Even the outstanding victories are confounded with each other in the Ottoman and Western sources, and the exact dating of even important events is subject to great difficulties. The Byzantine sources, the most reliable of all, are mainly concerned with the tortuous policy of the Byzantine rulers. On the other hand, many tales of a legendary character have entered the historical accounts of later times. The impression on the whole is that the Ottoman successes were mainly due to the mutual rivalry between the then existing Balkan states, Byzantines and Bulgarians, and the Austrian and Serbian kingdoms, complicated by the struggle of Venice and Genoa for an advantageous position in the Levant, and the zeal of the popes for bringing the Greek church back to Rome. This secured the Ottomans at all times although in the Christian camp itself. Nor is it possible to ascertain in which Ottoman expeditions were really planned by Murād and his councillors and which were merely successful raids by Turkish bands. All this makes it extremely difficult to form an adequate judgment of Murād’s personality as a warrior and as a statesman.

 Provisionally three periods can be distinguished.

The first begins shortly after Murād’s accession with the conquest of Western Thrace, in which were taken Çorlā, Demotikā (if this town had not already been taken by Orkhan), Gümüldjina, Adrianople (about 1352; cf. KÜREN) and Philippopolis, mainly through the activity of the beglerbeg Lala Şahin and Ewremos Bego. These conquests provoked a coalition of Servians, Bosnians and Hungarians, who were beaten on the river Maritsa by ‘Hājjāt Ibēki. The western part of Bulgaria was raised up to the Balkan Mountains and the Byzantine Emperor John Palaeologus made his first submission as vassal to Murād. Murād himself had been on a campaign in Anatolia, which brought him as far as Votçat (q.v.), during which he consolidated the Ottoman hold on Angora (already taken by Sulaimān Pasha in 1354; cf. Wittek, Festschrift Jacob, 1932, p. 347, 351 n.). He then came to Rūm-līlī and took up residence in Demotikā, to change this town in 1366 for Adrianople, from this time on the European capital of the Ottomans. The story about a treaty between Ragusa and Murād concluded in 1365 has a legendary character (cf. Gis, Festschrift Jacob, 1932, p. 42, after Jireček). In the meantime the hostility between Byzantines and Bulgarians gave Murād the opportunity of taking Izbetbul (Sofopulis) near Burgas, and the same hostility led to the fall of, about 1356, of a crusade undertaken at the instigation of Pope Urban V by count Amadeo of Savoy to come to the rescue of the Byzantine Emperor; the expedition only drove the Turks from Gallipoli for a short time.

A second period of Murād’s reign may be said to begin with the crushing of a Serbian advance on the Maritsa, near Čirmen, probably in 1357. This Serbian defeat is known to the Turkish sources as ‘erf tămâh vi and gave the Turks during the following years the important Macedonian towns of Sesre, Drama and Kavalla, and at the same time the possibility of advancing west of the Vardar. These conquests were made by Ewremos and Djan- darī Khalīl Pasha, while Lala Şahin obtained about the same time successes in eastern Bulgaria (battle of Samakow). Then followed again some years of comparative tranquillity, in which the newly won regions were partly colonized with Ottomans; the still unsubdued northern parts of Serbia and Bulgaria were governed by the local rulers as vassals of Murād. The latter had more than once to interfere with the dynastic affairs of the Palaeologoi. After John Palaeologus had been sold in 1375 the island of Tenedos to Venice, this led to an action of Genoa in combination with the Turks, in course of which John lost his throne and was imprisoned, until, by the favour of Murād, he became Emperor again in 1379; his dependency went so far as to help the Turks, together with his son Manuel, in the conquest of Philadelphia (Ala ‘Shehir), the only remaining Greek fortress in Asia Minor. The end of this second period is marked by a new activity in Anatolia. A part of the territory of the Germiyān-Oghlu (q.v.) was acquired as a wedding gift to Prince Bayazid when he married the daughter of that ruler (probably in 1381); this territorial accession was followed by the sale of the greater part of the lands of the Hamid-Oghlu to Murād and by the conquest of a part of the principality of Teke.

About 1385 there followed new conquests in Europe. Turkish troops intervened in Epirus and Albania (under Khalīl Pasha), but decisive for the establishment of Ottoman power in the Balkans
was the taking of Sofia (1385?) and Nish (1386?). About the same time, the Italian republics, Genoa and Venice, obtained by treaties with Murad, concluded respectively in 1385 and 1388, commercial privileges in Turkish territory. Immediately after the successes in Serbia, probably also in 1386, Murad went to war with the Karatan-Oghlu ‘Ali’ al-Din, his son-in-law; this conflict had long been threatening [cf. Karatan-Oghlu]; now the Ottoman power had grown so as to destroy the political equilibrium in Anatolia. Murad was victorious in the battle of Konya, but left ‘Ali’ al-Din in his possessions and set the example, henceforward traditional, of lenency in dealing with the Anatolian population. This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian troops which had taken part in the battle of Konya. These Serbians are said to have contributed to the anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general, who, under the leadership of Lazar Gresljanowitch, and with the Bosnian king Tvrtko as a powerful ally, were preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish vassalage. They succeeded in defeating an Ottoman army at Plouchnik (1388). The results were meagre, however, for at the same time the Turks made new conquests in Bulgaria (Shumla and Timuro) and even raided Morea. In 1389 Murad himself marched against the Serbians and their allies and fought the famous battle of Kosowo Polje (Turkish Kosova), where he himself lost his life, although the Serbians, partly owing to treachery in their own ranks, were defeated. The most probable date is June 20, 1389 (Gibbons, cf. also Giese, in Ephemerides Orientales, No. 34, April 1928, p. 2 sq.). The way in which Murad was killed, during or after the battle, is not clear from the early sources; the later Serbian epic tradition has the well-known tale that Murad was murdered by Milosh Obranowitch, Lazar’s son-in-law, who, claiming to be a deserter, had obtained an audience with Murad after the battle, was admitted to his presence and killed him with a dagger. Murad’s body was transported to Brusa and buried in a tübe near the mosque which he had built at Cekirge in Brusa (cf. Ahmed Tewhid, in T.O.E.M., vol. iii.).

Murad I was the first ruler under whom the state founded by ‘Oghlan rose to be more than one of the then existing Turkoman principalities in Asia Minor. This development is symbolised in the successive change of titles given to him in different building inscriptions dated in his reign (cf. Taeschner, in J. E. S., xx, 151 sqq.). While the oldest inscription calls him simply Bey, when his son Orkhan, and gives him a ‘Abd (Shahab al-Dunya wa-l-Din) after the Salladik fashion, he is already called Sultan (q.v.) in 785 (1385), while in the inscription from 790 (1388) on the *Imaret* built by him in Iznik, we find the style which afterwards became a tradition with the Ottoman sultans (al-malik al-mu’azzam al-‘Alî al-Dîn al-madîk-râm al-sultanî ibn al-sultanî). It was a time when the old Salladik traditional institutions no longer held and new forms of government and administration came into being, to which the example of Byzantine institutions, and also those of Manûlî Egypt may have contributed. Even if it is not true that Djandarli Khur al-Din Khallil Pasha — who was appointed Murad’s vizier at the beginning of his reign and died about 789 (1387) — was the first Ottoman grand vizier, it cannot be denied that the activity of this man — who by his origin belonged to a higher culture than the Ottoman — as Murad’s councillor as well as his military deputy and administrator in Macedonia, makes him a true prototype of the grand viziers of a later age (cf. Taeschner and Willett, in J. E. S., xviii. 66 sqq.). His son ‘Ali Pasha began also to play an important military part during the later years of Murad’s reign. It is also with Khalil Pasha that the old Turkish sources connect the institution of the janissaries as troops formed from converted Christian prisoners of war. In the administration of the times (q.v.) a Kâmilus of Murad I is said to have brought improvements. Some of these measures were closely connected with the problem of acquiring a quiet and loyal population in the newly conquered Christian territories; this was not possible by Turkish colonisation only but succeeded mainly through a humane treatment of the original inhabitants, after the region had once been conquered.

The more important buildings of Murad I are all in Asia Minor. The best known are the Kuddawenlik or Djâmi-i in Cekirge, near Brusa, where Murad himself is buried, and the Djâmi-i in Brusa; further a mosque in Bilecik, the Nûrîn Imâret in Iznik (recently described by Taeschner, in J. E. S., xx, 127 sqq.). There is also a mosque of Murad in Serres. The old Ottoman chronicles enumerate his foundations. — On Murad I’s coins cf. ‘Ali, in T. E. M., xiv. 224.

Bibliography: The information given by the old Turkish chronicles (‘Ashik Pasha Zade, Anonymous, ed. Giese, Urfûj, the translations of Leunelavius, also Djuûd-nâmê, Eyears), ed. Mûkrimin Khatîl, Istanbul 1928 and this editor’s *Medjâl*, Istanbul 1930) is sometimes supplemented by the later historiographers (Sa’d al-Din, ‘Ali, ‘Ataschqâm, † Yearli, † Yezddejâm-Resghi,*). The Byzantine historians (Phrantzes, Ducas, Chalcondylas), however, give a far clearer survey of this period so far as it came under their attention, while documents from Venice, Genoa and Rome throw light on the diplomatic activities evoked by the advance of the Turks in Europe. Ibn Hadjar al-Asqâlâmî, *İnşeâl al-Ghâber fi ‘Abd al-Umm*, contains also a biography of Murad I. Further the historical works of von Hammer, Zinzens and Jorga, and H. A. Gibbons, *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire*, Oxford 1916, p. 110 sqq.; C. Jireček, *Geschicke der Seheren*, Gotha 1918.

(J. H. Kramers)

MURAD II, sixth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born in 806 (1403–1404) and ascended the throne in May 1421; when he arrived in Adrianople some days after his father Muhammad I’s death; his decease had been kept secret on the advice of the vizier 1wa? Pasha until the young Sultan’s arrival. As crown prince he had resided at Magnesia, and he had taken part in the suppression of the revolt of Simawna Oglu Badr al-Din. Immediately after his accession he had to face the pretender known in Turkish history as Düzme Muștafa (q.v.) and his ally Djiudâl (q.v.). Both were supported by the Byzantine emperor Manuel and at first were successful in the European part of the empire. Bayazid Pasha, sent from Brusa, was defeated and killed in the battle of Staff Ders (between Seres and Adrianople) and the allied Greek forces took Gallipoli. Then Murad himself had to face them in Asia; he suc-
ceeded in sowing discord between Mustafa and Djumaïd and defeated the first in the battle of the bridge of Ulubâd. Then Murâd went over, with the help of ships from the Genoese colony of New Phocas (Veniè Folla) and discovered Gallipoli, after which he entered Adrianople and killed the pretender. In 1422 he began a siege of Constantinople; this siege was raised, either by the effect of Byzantine gold (through the intermediary of the graecophil vizier İbrâhîm Paşa) or as a result of the rise of a new pretender in İznik in the person of Murâd’s younger brother Mustafa. The latter was at last betrayed by his former supporter İyâs Paşa and killed. Then followed a struggle with Djanâld, who had established himself again at Aidin, but surrendered at last in 1425, after which he was killed. Murâd was now at peace with all his European neighbours and vassals; the Emperor Manuel had died in 1424 and was followed by John Paleologos, with whom peace was concluded. Several towns had been taken in the meantime in Morea, and Wallachia paid tribute. In eastern Anatolia there had been a conflict in 1423 with Isfendiyar of Sindi, ending with the acquisition of a part of his territory by Murâd; after 1425 the Ottoman power was confirmed in Teke and Menteshe and the Karamân Oghlu İbrahim, who tried to take the already Ottoman Adalia, had to retire and made peace. In eastern Anatolia Yûrkedji Paşa subdued the Turkomans round Toğat and Amasia and of the region of Djamîk. In 1428 there began difficulties on the Hungarian frontier. The most noteworthy exploit of this period was however the capture of Salonic (Selinik; q.v.) in March 1430; after the Greeks had sold this town to Venice in 1427; Murâd had never given up the plan of avenging that transaction. Peace with Venice soon followed.

Occasionally the Turks had taken several fortresses in Epirus and Albania, but their interest began more and more to concentrate on the northwestern regions, where George Brankitich ruled as vassal over Serbia. With the latter peace was renewed in 1432 and a daughter Mara was given to Murâd, but the Turkish raids continued in Serbia as well as far into Hungarian territory. In 1438 the Turks made, together with Serbians and Wallachians, incursions in Hungary (capture of Semendra); in 1440 they beleaguered Belgrad in vain and in 1442 Turkish troops under Murâd Bey laid siege to Hermannstadt. Here they suffered a heavy defeat by John Hunyadi, who in the coming years was to act as champion of Hungary and Christian Europe. He was the leader, in 1443, of a big crusading army including Serbians, Poles and Germans; the Turks were thrown back at Nish, after which Sofia was taken. The campaign ended with a heavy defeat of the Turks at Jalce which was between Sofia and Philippopolis. In the same year Murâd had to oppose again the Kârânâm Oghlu, who supported the Christian allies. But the peace with Hungary, concluded in July 1444 at Sejred, though advantageous to Hungary, maintained the former frontiers of the Ottoman political influence; only Wallachia became tributary to Hungary.

After this peace, which was to last ten years and seemed to Murâd a guarantee for the future, he abdicated in favour of his son Muhammad, leaving with him Khalîl Paşa, son of İbrahim Paşa (who had died of the plague in 1429) and Khusraw Molla [q.v.] as counsellors. He retired himself to Magnesia, but had to come back when, in September of the same year, the Hungarians, meeting the peace treaty, were preparing a new crusade. They marched south of the Danube to Varna; here the army of Murâd inflicted on them a crushing defeat, in which King Ladislav of Hungary was killed. Again Murâd II went back to Magnesia, but in the following year a Janissary revolt broke out in Adrianople and it was the vizier Khalîl who invited Murâd to return a second time, as the young Muhammad did not seem to be able to face the situation.

During the last six years of his reign Murâd led again several campaigns in the Balkan peninsula. In 1446 an action was undertaken against the Paleologoi in the Morea (destruction of the Hexamillion, capture of Corinith and Patras); in 1447 against Albania, where the activity of Skander Beg [q.v.] had begun in 1443; in 1448 he faced again a Hungarian invading army, which was beaten on the plain of Kossowa; and in 1450 he was again in Albania (siege of Croja). In that year Constantine Paleologos became, by the grace of Murâd II, the last Byzantine Emperor, after the death of John. Shortly afterwards, in the first days of February 1451, Murâd died at Adrianople. He was buried in Brusa at the side of his mosque (cf. Ahmad Tewfîk, in T.O.E.M., iii. 1856).

His reign was of extraordinary importance for the future political and cultural development of the Ottoman Empire. After the first critical years he continued his father’s work of consolidation. His aim was mainly to live on peaceful terms with the vassal princes, of whom the ruler of Sindi and the despots of Serbia gave to their daughters to Murâd. This peaceful policy was in accordance with his character; the Byzantine historians and other Christian sources describe him as a truthful, mild and humane ruler. His most influential visiters were not yet the renegades of later times; they belonged to the old families that had supported the cause of Murâd’s forefathers and were becoming a kind of hereditary nobility: İbrahim Paşa and Khalîl Paşa of the Djamart Oghullari (F. Taeschner and P. Wittek, in H., xviii. 92 sqq.); Hâddiji, İwaç Paşa (Taeschner, in H., xx. 154 sqq.); the sons of Timurtash, of Erewnos and others. The mystical tradition was strong in his surroundings, as is proved by the great influence of a man like the Şaihit Amir İbnikkî; other shâhîs came to his court from Persia and Mesopotamia. This determined also the direction which the classical Ottoman literature was to take in following centuries.

Murâd II was the first Ottoman prince whose court became a brilliant centre of poets, literary men and Muslim scholars [see TÜRK, B., iii.]. But his court was also open to non-Islamic envoy and visitors and Murâd’s court seemed a centre of culture (cf. Jorga, l. 464 sqq., which description applies principally to Murâd II). Amongst the sultans’ buildings a mosque in Brusa (cf. H. Wilde, Brusa, p. 57) and one in Adrianople (the U Kerveli Dâme), are notable and some large bridges. His army organisation is well known from a full description by Chalcondylas.

Bibliography: The older Turkish sources: Neçir (Haniwaldanus), Aşık Paşa Zade, Uraç, Küçü, Anonymous Giesa, are completed by the Byzantine historians Phrantzes (who himself played a part in the diplomatic history of the time), Ducas and Chalcondylas, and also by
the later Ottoman authors Sa’d al-Din, ‘Ali and Mineşştîm Begh. A curious contemporary description is that of an unknown captive from Mühlenbach in Transylvania (captured 1438) in his *Tractatus de moribus conditionibus et negotiis Turcorum* (cf. K. Poy, in *M.S.O.S.*, iv., v).

General later descriptions of Murad II’s reign in the works of von Hammer, *G. O. R.*, i.; Zinkeisen, i. and *Jorga*, i.

(J. H. KRAMER)

**MURAD III**

**MURAD III**, twelfth ruler of the **Ottoman Empire**, was born on the 5th *Dümâdâr* 953 (4th July 1546; *Sâhibîl-i ʾethnâmî*, i. 76) as son of the later Sultan Selim II and the êkârî Nûr Bânî. He arrived at Constantinople on Dec. 21st, 1574, after Selim II’s death and reigned until his death on January 16, 1595 or a few days later. His reign is not characterized by great conquests in Europe. The peaceful relations with Austria were officially maintained; peace was several times confirmed (in 1575 and 1584) by a new treaty and by extraordinary Austrian embassies. Nevertheless there were continual Turkish raids into Austrian territory, especially in Croatia in 1578 — where even a new sandjak was formed — followed by triumphal processions in the capital, which the Austrian envoys were forced to witness. It was only in 1593 that a formal war broke out, in which the then grand vizier Sinân Paşa took the town of Raš (1594). The relations with Venice were of the same kind as with Austria; notwithstanding several serious naval collisions peace was maintained, mainly through the influence of Murad’s kâsî Efendi Safiye (of the family of Baffa) and the Kapudan Paşa, who were Italian regenades. In the Danube principalities the never ending dynastic disputes went on; this was also the case in Transylvania. Even Poland was considered more or less an Ottoman tributary vassal state; the Polish king, Stephen Bathory, owed his crown to the sultan’s protection and after his death (1586) the new king Sigismund began to reign by the grace of Murad. The Forte had to intervene several times in the disturbances caused by Polish cosacks in Moldavia and the Tatar Khânate and by Tatar incursions in Poland. In the Crimea the Ottoman intervention was even stronger, because the Persian war necessitated in 1581 and 1583 expeditions by the way of Kaffa and the Crimea against Díghistán and Transcaucasia.

The most outstanding military exploit of the Ottoman Empire during Murad III’s reign was the war with Persia, which lasted from 1577 to 1590. Persia passed, after Shâh Tahmâsp’s death in 1576, through serious inner troubles. This gave the Turks a favourable opportunity of enlarging their territory. Between 1577 and 1584 the chief theatre of the war was Georgia. Lala Mustafâ Paşa won the battle of Lake Céldir (August 9, 1578), after which the princes of the small Georgian kingdoms became nominally Ottoman vassals, while several towns, like Tiflis and Shaki, came under direct military occupation. In 1579 the town of Kâra was fortified. That same year Sinân Paşa became ser-Sâker on the Georgian front. The completion of the conquests confronted the Ottoman armies with serious difficulties, especially after Simou, the former king of Kârtli, had come back to life in Persia. This made necessary the already mentioned expedition by the way of the Crimea in 1581, under Ösdemir ʾOthmân Paşa who was joined in 1583, by the same way, by Dâyer Paşa; they came back to Constantinople again via the Crimea and ʾOthmân Paşa was received with great honour by the sultan after his return, although it would seem that the real aim of the expedition — a junction with the Turkish forces of the south — was not reached, owing to the combined efforts of the peoples of Georgia and Shîrwân (cf. W. E. D. Allen, in *History of the Georgian People*, London 1932, p. 157). The second phase of the Persian war began with the taking of Tabriz in 1585 by ʾOthmân Paşa, followed by other successes on Persian territory (Gandja in Transcaucasia and Nîhtwend). In 1587 Shâh ʾAbbâs I ascended the throne: soon afterwards there began peace negotiations, ending in a peace treaty (March 21, 1590) which left Georgia, Shîrwân, Karabâgh, Tabriz and Luristan to the Ottoman Empire. One of the peace conditions was that the Persians should give up most of their anti-Sunni religious practices.

During Murad III’s first years Muhammed Paşa Şoqollî [q. v.] had continued to administer the huge Empire as grand vizier, but his once unquestioned authority began to wane and the influence of the sultan’s courtiers like Şemît Paşa and the defterdâr Uwez; an influential personality also was the Khâdía Sa’d al-Din — the historian — and the eunuch Qhazaner Agha. Home and foreign politics were influenced also by Murad’s mother Nûr Bânî and the already mentioned kâsî Efendi Safiye (Baffa), who used as a powerful agent outside the palace the Jewess Kira (Chierazza in the Italian sources). Şoqollî’s confidants were relegated from the capital (as the *nizâmî*) Fertûnî or executed (like Michael Cantacuzeno). But he was still grand vizier, when he was murdered on October 11, 1579. After him the grand vizierate was changed no less than ten times under Murad III. Sinân Paşa, already mentioned, held the office three times; ʾOthmân Paşa, appointed in 1585, after his return from Díghistán, died eight months, was as weak himself to direct a consistent policy, — as he acknowledged himself according to Allî (cf. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, ii. 567) — all kinds of abuses gradually began in this epoch, especially in the stipulation of the fiefs [cf. *tâmâl*] and the enrolling of the Janissaries; they are summed up in Köbi Bey’s *Rûstâ*. This sultan’s reign witnessed for the first time revolts of the Janissaries directed against the imperial dwân itself. The first mutiny, in April 1589, was caused by depreciation of the coinage and could be appeased only — as so often afterwards — by the sacrifice of the lives of high officials. In 1592 there was a similar Sipahî revolt. More than one provincial rebellion had to be subdued by force; the most celebrated expedition was that of İbrâhîm Paşa, the later démâd and favourite of Muhammed III, to Egypt and Syria in 1585; in Syria he persecuted severely the Bântû, the leaders of the Druses, but very soon afterwards the successful career of Fakhr al-Dîn [q. v.] began.

Murad’s reign can be characterized as the beginning of the internal weakening of the Ottoman power. The sultan did not possess the strong personality of his grand father; his amorous tendencies were much encouraged by his mother and his wife Safiye, and he had far more than a hundred
forces him to surrender, after which Abasza played a part as governor of Bosnia and of Silistria. In the meantime several vain efforts were made to recover Baghdad, by Hafiz Ahmad Pasha in 1626, and by Khosrew Pasha [q.v.] in 1630.

From 1632 Murad IV prepared with incredible energy the mobilisation of all the country’s resources for the war against Persia, where Shah Abbas I had died in 1629. He suppressed with great cruelty the rebellious movements among the Janissaries and reduced their number by not applying the deuchirmes for twelve years. New and more reliable troops were formed from the desherdja, bastandjas and especially the sighdjas (squads). The necessary funds were procured by drastic financial measures, amongst them the confiscation of large fortunes. Every attempt at opposition was cruelly suppressed; in 1633 even the Shikh al-Islam Aghj-Zade Husain was executed. In October 1633 an army under the new grand vizier Tabant Vaqf Muhammad Pasha left Constantinople, but that year and the following no important military operations took place. The Kapudan Pasha Djeyr, however, was successful in suppressing the power of the Druse Amir Fakhr al-Din [q.v.] and bringing him alive to Constantinople. In 1635 Murad himself left the capital, joined the grand vizier’s army in Erzerum and conquered Erivan (August 1635). Then the undefended Tabriz was taken and destroyed, after which the sultan returned. In the following year the Persians recaptured Erivan. Finally, in 1638, Murad took the field for the second time with the grand vizier Tahtja Muhammad Pasha; Bagdad was taken by them in December 1638, and thousands of Shafs were massacred. This was the end of the Persian war; in 1639 a peace was concluded, which left Bagdad to Turkey and Erivan to Persia.

In comparison with the events in Asia, European affairs were of secondary importance. The peace with Austria was several times renewed (1623 at Gyarmath and 1627 at Seoa) although predatory raids from both sides never ceased. Serious trouble was caused in 1624 by the appearance of Cossack ships in the Bosporus; they were defeated only in 1626. Another hotbed of unrest was the Crimea, where from 1624 till 1628 the Porte had to suffer against its will the Khans Muhammad Giray and his brother Shahin Giray, who even took Kaffa for a time. After 1628 the Tatar Mirej Kantemir (or Kankins), chief of the Noghays, became the most powerful man in the khanate; his continual incursions caused serious conflicts with Poland (peace restored in 1634) and in Moldavia. At last Kantemir was executed at Constantinople in 1637.

The peaceful relations with Venice and the western sea powers continued; in 1624 the capitulations had been renewed, but as the Porte was without authority over the Barbary states of Algiers and Tunis, England, Holland and France concluded separate treaties with their rulers in order to avert as much as possible the damage done to their trade by the ships of the corsairs. In 1636 a more serious battle took place in the Adriatic between the Venetian fleet and Barbary corsairs; at first Murad ordered the massacre of all Venetians in his Empire, but in 1639 peace was restored.

In Constantinople the ministers of Holland (Haga) and England (Roe) intervened successfully in the
troubles between the Porte and the Greek Patriarchate.

Murad IV died on February 9, 1640 and was buried in the türbe of the mosque of his father Ahmed; he was the last warlike sultan of the Empire; by his energy he restored for some time its military authority, but his reforms did not last after him. Still a separate hünkâmâne bears Murad IV's name. He was a man of considerable physical strength and of high personal erudition and he liked the company of poets. His attachment to the poet Tili [q. v.] is famous in literary tradition. The poet Nefî [q. v.] on the other hand was executed by his order. On verses written by Murad, cf. Gibb, H.O.P., iii. 248 sqq. He had four sons, all of whom died young; at his death there was only his brother İbrahim to take the succession. His brothers Bayezid and Sulaiman were killed by his order during the Erian campaign, and later also his brother Kasim. In course of time Murad had become ever more ferocious, and he is said to have sworn in 1639 that he would subdue all his Christian neighbours (Jorga, iv. 1).

Bibliography: The chief Turkish sources are Na'imi's, Peçevi and Kara Celebi Zede's Rûmât al-Abîr. Further the continuation of Aştıy's biographical work by Uğâlî-zade (G. O., W. p. 255); Ewiya Celebi's Siyâhat-name is also particularly rich in information about the reign of Murad IV. Of Western contemporary sources must be mentioned the Venetian Relazioni and the correspondence of Sir Thomas Roe and Cornelius Haga (Rijks geschiedenh. Publikat. u. a.); Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van den Levantijnse handel, 1590-1600, ii. a. Gravenhage 1910). Later treatment of this period in the general works of von Hammer (v.), Zinkeisen (iv.) and Jorga (iii.).

(J. H. KRAMERS)

MURAD V, Ottoman Sultan from May 31, till Sept. 7, 1876. He was born on Sept. 21, 1840 as son of Sultan 'Abd al-Medjid and was deprived of all influence on public affairs during the reign of his elder brother 'Abd al-Aziz, who had the plan of altering the succession in favour of his own descendants, so as to deprive Murad of his rights. Murad was called to the throne by the coup d'état of the recently established cabinet, of which Midhat Pasha [q. v.], Muhammad Rughdi and Hüsnü 'Awni were the leading members. By deposing Sultan 'Abd al-Aziz they hoped to eliminate the influence of reactionary elements who were opposed to their schemes of reform and they expected to find an ally in Murad. In the night from 30th to 31st May 1876 Murad was induced with some difficulty to proceed to the Ser'akerate in Constantinople, where he received the homage of the troops and the high dignitaries. He confirmed the cabinet in office. Very soon afterwards took place the suicide of the deposed sultan (June 5) and the murder of the ministers Hüsnü 'Awni and Rughdi Pasha during a cabinet meeting in Midhat's house (June 15). These events seem to have been fatal to the mental equilibrium of the new sultan, who, already in the night of his accession, had shown signs of abnormal nervous excitement. He was unable to appear before his people at the selâmet, nor could the sword-girding ceremony (bâb-i aley) be applied to him. Midhat Pasha and his friends, although fearing that a new change of ruler might endanger their plans, had to arrange another deposition; they had the sultan's health examined by a number of physicians and, on their report, obtained a fatwa from the Shaikh al-Islam Ḥasan Khair Allâh Efendi, authorizing Murad's deposition (September 1). His younger brother 'Abd al-Ḥamid II became sultan and Murad went to live in the Çiragan Palace, where he died on August 29, 1904. His confinement during 'Abd al-Ḥamid's reign continued to excite speculation as a yet unsolved mystery and was occasionally represented as one of the crimes of the Hamidian regime.


(J. H. KRAMERS)

MURAD PASBA, Turkish grand vizier under Ahmîd I, was a Croatian by birth and was born about 1520. He served the empire as military commander and later as wali in different provinces (Egypt, Yaman, Anatolia) and was made prisoner by the Persians in the battle of Tahriz (Sept. 1585), where Çiğâle's army was defeated. In 1601 he was paşa of Budin and in 1603 commander-in-chief on the Hungarian front. In these posts he repeatedly conducted for the Porte peace negotiations with Austria. He was the chief negotiator of the peace of Zsitvatorok (Nov. 11, 1606). A month afterwards (Dec. 11, 1606), after the execution of Derwish Pasha in Constantinople, he was appointed grand vizier, being then already about 80 years of age.

As grand vizier Murad Pasha became particularly famous by his relentless persecution and repression of the many rebellions in the Asiatic provinces. In 1607 he defeated the Kurd Dîbûnlî [q. v.] in North Syria (battle of Urmâî, Oct. 1607). After having passed the winter in Aleppo, he succeeded in crushing the forces of the arch-rebel Kalender Oghlu at the pass of Gökçam in Cappadocia (July 1908), where he decided the battle by his personal courage. Then he pursued from Siwâs the rebel Maimûn and defeated him near Bairut. His habit of throwing the captured rebels into pits and dag for that purpose brought him the name of Koyudîj Murad Pasha. Notwithstanding the sultan's order — provoked by his enemies in the capital — that he should proceed immediately against Persia, he returned in December to Constantinople, where he was received with great honours. Poets celebrated his achievements against the rebels. In 1609 Murad Pasha went to Scutari for the Persian campaign, but he went no further that year, because he wished first to deal with two remaining dangerous rebels: Muselliyan in Fâlî and Yüsuf Pasha in Aïdân. By false propositions of reconciliation these two were at last induced to surrender and afterwards killed. Murad Pasha had to make use more than once of his personal influence with the sultan to restrain the latter's impatience before his plans had succeeded.
On the other hand, the sultan had to protect several dignitaries against the personal hatred of the terrible old man. In 1610 the grand vizier at last marched to Persia and destroyed Tabriz; then he went to Erevan, from where he began long and extended negotiations with Shah 'Abbas. Before the following year's campaign had begun, he died (August 5, 1611). He was buried in a tsakeh near the medresah he had founded in the quarter Wemehjiller in Constantinople.

By his successes in restoring the internal order of the empire Murad Pasha is considered as one of the most able grand viziers; the historians give ample proofs of his sound judgment of persons and situations. To his initiative is due a compilation of the šāmāni regulating the timar administration (G. O. W., p. 141).


MURAD SÜ. [See Al-Fārābī.]

MURADĀBĀD. [See Muradābād.]

MURĀDI, tağhālat of Murād III [q. v.] and Murād IV [q. v.].

MURCIA (Ar. Muḥsira), a town in the S. E. of Spain, 140 feet above sea level in the centre of the famous huerta de Murcia ("gardens of Murcia") watered by the river Segura (Ar. Wādī Shallūra [q. v.] or Wādī 'l-ayyān, "the white river"). The area of Murcia has a large population: over 150,000, although the town in the strict sense has barely 30,000. Murcia is the capital of the province of the same name and the see of a bishop; it has also a university. Its port, 40 miles to the south on the Mediterranean coast, is Cartagena, the Karfajjum or karfājanat al-Khulafā' of the Arabs.

The situation of Murcia in the centre of very fertile gardens, forming an island of vegetation in a barren country poorly endowed by nature, had been noticed already by the Arab geographers who give more or less long accounts of it. Abu 'l-Fidā, for example, says that it was like Seville for the number of its groves and parks (mānṭārāt), among which he mentions the famous al-Rushākā.

Murcia in the Umayyad period was the capital of a province or kūra which bore the name of Todmir [q. v., iv. 805]. This name which is connected with the name of Theodemir, a Visigothic chief of the region at the time of the Muslim conquest, was also applied to the town of Murcia itself, from the time when it supplanted Ornhuela [q. v.] as the chief town of the region. Indeed almost all the Arab authors who speak of Murcia agree in saying that it was a comparatively recent foundation; it was built by order of the Umayyad emir 'Abd al-Raḥmān II al-Hakam about the year 210 (825), according to the al-Rawd al-mašir in 216 by the governor Džabhir b. Malik b. Labid.

The land of Todmir and with it of course Murcia was much involved in the civil wars provoked by the rivalry of the Yamanis and the Maḏāris in Spain in the period of the independent emirs of Córdova. In the reign of 'Abd Allāh (725-300 = 888-912), a rebel, the renegade Dāsam b. Ḥabīl, rose there with the connivance of the famous agitator Ibn Ḥas-fān [cf. Umayyade I]. He ruled independently all the province of Todmir until the emir of Cordova sent to suppress him in 283 (896) an army led by his uncle 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Hakam and the general Ahmad b. Muhammad Ibn Ahi 'Abda. Daisam was defeated between Aledo and Lorca and the latter town besieged. The country was only definitely pacified and restored to the central power in Cordova in the reign of the caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III and his successor al-Hakam II.

During the events which ended in the break up of Umayyad Spain, Murcia became, like the majority of the great towns of the Peninsula, the capital of a little independent state. At first in the hands of the "Slavs" [cf. Ṣubaylī]. Khairun and Zuhair, along with Almeria and Jaén, the principality of Murcia was then for some time attached to the kingdom of Valencia, in the reign of 'Abd al-Aziz al-Mansūr Ibn Abī 'Amir and his son 'Abd al-Malik Ibn al-Mujaffar. The governor who then ruled Murcia was Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Iḥāṣa Ibn Tāhir; when he died in 455 (1063) after amassing a considerable fortune, he was succeeded by his son Abī 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad who soon proclaimed himself independent and repudiated the authority of the Valencian dynasty.

The principality of Ibn Tāhir soon aroused the covetousness of the minister of al-Muqaddib [q. v.] Ibn 'Abbad, king of Seville, and an expedition was sent against Murcia with the help of an independent lord of the district, Ibn Rakiş. Ibn Tāhir was taken prisoner and shut up in Montagut, but escaping, he reached Valencia where after acting as adviser to al-Kādir Ibn Dhi 'l-Num [q. v.] and having almost succeeded him, he finally died in 508 (1112). The conquest of the kingdom of Murcia by Ibn Aḥmār in the name of the 'Aḥbāsids took place in 471 (1075), but it was only nominal and it was Ibn Rakiş who exercised the real power instead of Ibn Tāhir.

The kingdom of Murcia was one of the first districts of the Peninsula to be conquered by the Almoravids. Murcia was taken for Yūsuf b. Tābi'fīn [q. v.] in Shawwal 484 (Nov.-Dec. 1091) by the Lantunian general Ibn 'Aṣja who next took Denia and Játiva. Ibn 'Aṣja remained governor of Murcia; he was replaced later by Abū Bakr b. Ibrāhim Ibn Tālibwīt, then by a brother of the sultan 'Ali b. Yūsuf, Abī Ishaq Ibn Ibrāhim.

A general rising against the Almoravids took place in Spain in the beginning of the 12th century and gave rise to the formation of a new series of kingdoms of taifas. Murcia therefore between 1145 and 1147 was in the hands of two rival leaders, 'Abd Allāh b. Iṣāq and 'Abd Allāh b. Farajī; until the Valencian ruler Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. Sa'id Ibn Mardānīn seized it and took up his residence there. This individual, who was of Spanish origin (cf. above, ii., p. 403), soon became the powerful ruler of all S. E. Spain, between Valencia and Almeria, and instituted a series of fruitful alliances with the Christian rulers of Catalonia, Aragon and Castile. He was for long able to resist the attacks of the first Almohads 'Abd al-Mu'min [q. v.] and Yūsuf [q. v.], and it was only after his death in 567 (1172) during the siege of his capital Murcia that his kingdom passed finally to the Mu'āwīd sovereigns.

From the fall of the Almohad empire in Spain until its conquest by the Christian monarchs Murcia had
a very troubled existence. It was in turn the residence (from the beginning of the 12th century) of princes of the family of the Banu Hidr of Saragossa: Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Mutawakkil, the latter's uncle, Muhammad, Abi Bakr Muhammad al-Wathik, then it passed to the Nasrids of Granada to 'Abd Allah b. Ali ibn Ashkullu. For details of the obscure history of this period see the monograph by Gaspar Remiro quoted below. According to Ibn al-Abhar (cf. M. Bencheneb, Notes chronologiques sur la conquête de l'Espagne, in Milanges René Basset, Paris 1923, ii, 73), Murcia was surrendered to the Christians by Abbad b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah son of the governor, on Thursday 10th Shawwal 56 (April 2, 1243). But if we may believe the Christian chronicles it was in February 1266 that Don Jaime of Aragon took definite possession of Murcia.


MURDÁDHI (v.), the fifth month of the Persian solar year running from July 10 to Aug. 18 (Murdádhi wáli). Murdádhi is also the name of the seventh day of each month (Murdádhi rúd); it is the last of the series of days which are called after the Ameša Spenta. Murdádhi (Pehlevi amurdádhi "immortality") forms with Khur dédhi [q.v.] (Pehlevi khránddhi perfection) an indivisible pair, the days which bear these names come together. They denote a pair of archangels, of whom Murdádhi has charge of the gifts of the earth on which the life of man depends. The seventh day of the month Murdádhi on which the name of the day and of the month are the same is called Murdádhi-khán.

Bibliography: al-Biruni, Athár, ed. Sauchau, p. 42, 43, 70, 221; Geiger-Kuhn, Gr. j. Ph., ii, 638, 675 sqq. (M. Pleisner)

AL-MURDJÁA, name of one of the early sects of Islam, the extreme opponents of the Khatirjites [q.v.]. The latter thought that a Muslim by committing a mortal sin becomes a Khatirjite. The Murdja, on the other hand, were of opinion that a Muslim does not lose his faith through sin. This doctrine led them to a far-reaching quietism in politics: according to their doctrine, the inadum who was guilty of mortal sins did not cease to be a Muslim and must be obeyed. The caliph performed behind him was valid. Occidental and Oriental explanations of the name show considerable divergences (cf. e.g. Sale, Preliminary Discourse, p. 229 sqq.; Goldsätz, "Richtungen der islam. Ketzerglaubigen," p. 179; v. Kremser, Gesch. d. herrschernden Ideen, p. 205; Houtsma, Sirjáer over het opeenlopende, p. 34). It seems to me that the origin of the name must have been sought in the term irdjá, in this way that Murdja's most adherents of the doctrine of irdjá (Abd al-Kahir al-Baghdádi uses the term for their doctrine) and that this term goes back to verse 107 of sûra iv. The context of this verse not only explains the term irdjá, but may also give an insight into the evolution of the ideas of the Murdjaites. In the preceding verses Muhammad makes a distinction between two groups among the Madinese who had forsaken him in the expedition to Tabuk [q.v.]: some had shown násfak without penitence; they were to receive punishment in this and in the other world (verse 102). Others had shown penitence (tawwah); they were left to Allah's mercy (verse 103). The third group, who had not made penitence, were left in suspense (murdjáa, or, according to a different reading, murdjauna). The distinction in Madinah after the expedition to Tabuk was generalised by later sects. As a matter of fact, the third group mentioned in the passage discussed—viz. sinners who did not show penitence—was relegated to Hell by the Khatirjites. In opposition to this, the Murdjaítes taught the doctrine of irdjá mentioned in sûra iv, 107 and therefore they were called Murdjaí, i.e. the adherents of the doctrine of respite or hope for this the term irdjá means; the variants murdjaína and murdjaína are irrelevant in this respect.

In the course of time the doctrine of the Murdjaí assumed a double aspect. Their chief thesis was the indelible character of faith, in opposition to the Khatirjites. Their second thesis was of an eschatological nature: where there is faith, sins will do no harm. On account of the latter doctrine they were called the adherents of promise (abi al-wasd), in contra-distinction to the Mu'tazila [q.v.] who were called the adherents of threats (abi al-i'la). So the doctrine of irdjá had acquired a triple aspect—viz. accounts for the divergent explanations of the name—viz. the doctrine of faith bearing an indelible character, an indigent attitude towards sinners in the Muslim community, and a hopeful prospect for them in the Last Judgment. These are the chief tenants of the Murdjaí as they appear to us as well as to later Muslim writers such as al-Shahristání. Earlier authors enumerate a number of divergencies among the different groups of Murdjaítes. Al-Ash'arí mentions their variety of opinion regarding faith, unbelieft, sins, násfak, interpretation of the Karán, excommunication, moral and venial sins, forgiveness of mortal sins, the impenetrability of the Prophets, punishment of sins, the question whether there were infidels among the early generations of Islam, redness of wrongs, the beatific vision, the nature of the Karán, the quddasíti of Allah, His names and tiját, predetermination.

'Abd al-Kahir al-Baghdádi mentions three groups of Murdjaí: a. those who taught irdjá regarding faith and free-will; to this group belonged Ghallám Abù Marwán al-Dimashkí, Abù 'Amir, Muhammad b. Abú Shabhir al-Basrú; b. those who taught irdjá regarding faith and compulsion (dirá); c. those who gave faith the pre-eminence before works and
belonged neither to the adherents of the doctrine of free will nor to those of predestination; to the latter group belonged the followers of Yūnūs b. 'Uwa's, Ghasṣān, Abū Thawbān, Abū Mū'īna al-Tablewī, Būhr b. 'Abdālī Ṣafarī (q. v.). The followers of Ghasṣān reckoned Abū Ḥanīfa as one of their friends, not, however, quite rightly, according to al-Baghdādi. That Abū Ḥanīfa shared the general views of the Murdiyya, appears from his (unedited) letter to al-Battār, which is preserved in a MS. in the library of Cairo.

Although al-Baghdādi mentions a hadīth in which the Murdiyya are cursed, the high esteem in which Abū Ḥanīfa stood as a dogmatist and as a doctor of the law would be in itself sufficient proof of the fact that the hadīth was too eccentric. As a matter of fact, their political quietism was largely practised by orthodoxy itself. As regards eschatological punishment, the Fīqh Abīn, ii. (art. 14) rejects the Murdiyya doctrine of our good deeds being accepted and of our sins being forgiven, Allah being free to punish the sinner or to grant him forgiveness. — The same 'azāda, however, shares the Murdiyya doctrine of the constancy of fate (art. 15).


MURGHĀB. [See MERK AL-SHĀHDIYAH, MURUD, novice, the term applied during his period of preparation to one who wishes to enter a derwiš order [fākhra]; q. v.; cf. also DERWIŠ.] A gold [gold; q. v.]. The task of the murād and his obligations to his master (‘alīṣāb, pīr) and to his ideal and their mystic and erotic foundations have been often and fully discussed, so that it is here sufficient to give a reference to the most important literature of modern times, which will guide one to the sources themselves. In the wider application of the word murād has become a term for mystic in general.


AL-MURIYĀNĪ, Abū ‘Abdālī Sulaimān b. Ḥārīm al-Mubahallāh, visierr of the caliph al-Manṣūr. When the governor of Fārā Sulaimān b. Ḥābīb al-Mubahallāh in the period of the Caliph al-Manṣūr was accused of embezzling state funds, sought and intended to treat him with still greater indignity, the latter was saved by Abū ‘Abdālī al-Muriyānī who was Sulaimān’s secretary. According to another story, al-Manṣūr purchased him as a young boy and sent him in some capacity to his brother, the caliph al-Saffāḥ, who was so pleased with him that he at once took him into his service and retained him there after his manumission. Al-Muriyānī was in any case appointed visierr by al-Manṣūr in succession to Ḥābīb b. Barmak. He had a great influence over the caliph; in 153 (770) however, he was arrested with his brother and the latter’s sons and deprived of all his property. According to some, his crime was that he had embarrassed a large sum received from al-Manṣūr to be paid to the district in Kūfia in order that the caliph when he came to inspect it by making the place look as if it was excavated. According to others, he had a son of al-Manṣūr murdered. He died in 154 (770). — The nāsir al-Muriyānī comes from Muriyān, a town in Kūfia.


MURSALAT [see also SIR], part. pass. IV. From w sala “send”. As a technical term it denotes a. an apostle of Allah; b. traditions of which the hadīth is defective in a certain sense; cf. Ḥādīs, iii. e.

Al-Mursalat, title of sūrat Ixxviii., after the first verse: “By those which are sent by Allah, following another in a continual series”. According to some interpreters a certain group of angels is meant here; according to others, however, the mursālat are the verses of the Qurān. See the commentaries on the Qurān on sūrat Ixxviii. 1.

MURSHIDĀBD, district in the Presidency Division of Bengal; area 2,143 sq. m.; pop. 1,372,774; of whom 713,152 are Muslims. The public offices are at Barhānpūr, but the old capital is at Murshidābād, which before Murshid Kāli’s appointment was known as Mahārābād or Makrshidābād. The district is mainly agricultural, and produces much rice, jute, etc., and is famous for its mangoes. The silk industry was formerly of great importance, but has now much declined. The district played a very prominent part in the history of Bengal, and is full of historical sites though Plusey is now outside its borders. The history of Calcutta and of the English in Bengal is intimately connected with Murshidābād. But the Nawāb is no longer of political importance.

MURTADDE (A.), "one who turns back", especially from Islam, an apostate. Apostasy is called *idādād* or *ridād*; it may be committed verbally by denying a principle of belief or by an action, for example treating a copy of the Qur'an with disrespect.

1. In the Qur'an the apostate is threatened with punishment in the next world only; the "wrath of God" will fall upon him according to a Sūra of the latest Meccan period (xvi. 108 sq.) and severe punishment (*nağāh*) "except he did it under compulsion and his heart is steadfast in belief". Similarly it is written in the Medina Sūras. So *sūra* 2: 144. This is the punishment for them, that the curse of Allah, the Angels and of men is upon them for all time (82); the punishment shall not be lightened for them and they shall not be granted alleviation, (83) except for those who later repent and make good their fault, for Allah is forgiving and merciful. (84) Those who disbelieve after believing and increase in unbelief, shall not have their repentance accepted; they are the erring ones. (85) Those who are unbelievers and die as unbelievers, from none of them shall be accepted the earth-fall of gold even if he should wish to ransom himself with it; this is a painful punishment for them and there will be no helpers for them" (cf. also iv. 136; v. 59; ix. 67). Sūra 2: 214 is to be interpreted in the same way although it is adduced by Shāfi'i as the main evidence for the death penalty: *...* He among you who falls away from his belief and dies an unbeliever these, their works are fruitless in this world and the next, and they are the companions of the fire for ever*.

2. There is little echo of these punishments in the next world in the Traditions (cf. Ibn Mādjā, *Hudūl*, bāb 2; Ibn Ḥanbal, l. 499, 430, 464 sq.; v. 4, 5). Instead we have in many traditions a new element, the death penalty. Thus Ibn Abābās transmits an utterance of the Prophet: "Slay him, who changes his religion" or "behead him" (Ibn Mādjā, *Hudūl*, bāb 2; Nāṣr, *Tahrīm al-Dān,
A. Whether attempts at conversion must be made is a question of *itlabat*. A number of jurists of the first and second (*vi^* and *vi^ii*) centuries deny this (as do the Zahiris) or like *A^* (d. 115 = 733) make a distinction between the apostate born in Islam and one converted to Islam; the latter is to be put to death at once (so also the Sh^i^is). Others insist on three attempts at conversion (relying on *Sura* iv. 136; cf. Tabari, *Tafsir*, v. 193 et seq.) or have him in the first place imprisoned for three days (cf. above 2). According to others again one should await the round of the five times of prayer and ask him to perform the *sala^r* at each; only when he has refused at each is the death punishment to be enforced. If however he repents and professes Islam once more, he is released (cf. them Sh^i^is, *Umm*, p. 228; Ab. Yusauf, *Khor^ay^i*, p. 109). In later times *itlabat* was always applied.

c. Apart from the fact that apostasy deprives the muhtadd of burial with Muslim rites it has certain civil consequences. The property of the muharid is *f^ar*; according to Sh^a^f^i^ and the Malikis, if the fugitive muharid returns penitent, he is given back what remains (cf. *Umm*, p. 223 et seq., where Sh^a^f^i^ opposes the contrary Hanafi view). Others, especially later Sh^a^f^i^s, regard the rights
of ownership of the apostate as suspended (सम्बन्ध) and regard him as one who is under guardianship (प्रवर्तिष्कर्त): only if the fugitive apostate dies in the दर अंतर, does his property become free (शीतल, महान्धोध, छौ 1342, ii. 240; cf. शाही, औम, vii. 355). Among the Marathas and Shāhī the estate is allotted by the कंद to the legal heirs (cf. also the traditions in दरिंग, परवाह, बाब 40, the mukhābār and mukh wadāl are set free, even when the apostate escapes into the दर अंतर, for this is equivalent to his death. If he comes back penitent, however, he receives of his property what still exists; the heirs however are not liable for compensation. — The marriage of the muttad is void (बाज़ल). Of his legal undertakings the irridā is effective (प्रवर्तिष्कर्त), i.e. the mukh wadāl becomes free; the शान्त also continues. Other legal activities, like manumission, entailment, testamentary sale are suspended (सम्बन्ध) according to Aḥāb Hanża; according to Aḥāb Yūnā they are effective as in the case of a person in good health, according to Muhammad al-Shahābī however only as in the case of an invalid, i.e. they cannot deal with more than one third of the estate. In the case of the female apostate however, they are always effective. If the apostate makes such legal arrangements after his flight into the दर अंतर, they are invalid (सराख, सियार, iv. 152; cf. also Aḥāb Yūnā, कहाड़, p. 111). But since according to Shāhī and Mālik his whole estate becomes free, such legal arrangements are invalid; only the manumission of a slave remains suspended until his possible return penitent; in the case of his death also this slave becomes free (cf. however above the view of later Shāhī).

He is punished for crimes committed before apostasy, if he returns penitent; for crimes committed during riḍda, no notice is taken of the शान्त (i.e. no hadst) but only of the दर अंतर, and he must for example pay the diya (सराख, सियार, iv. 163, 208 sq.; cf. Shāhī, औम, i. 231).

Bibliography: In addition to the books on Tradition and Fikh see especially: Shāhī, किताब अंतर, खुद 1321, i. 227—234; v. 51; vii. 330—335, 355; Aḥāb Yūnā, कहाड़, खुद 1302, p. 109—112; Sarākh, दर अंतर, सियार, दर अंतर, खुलासा़, खुद 1336, iv. 146—219; Dabāl, तातील, नाम, खुद 1323, p. 22, p. 22; Goldhirt, Muh. Studien, Halberstadt 1890, lii. 215 sq.; Santillana, इतिहास मुस्लिम, मुस्लिम, भारत 1924, German transl., Götterloh 1926.

**HEFFING**

Mūsā, the prophet Moses of the Bible. 1. In the Kūrān, Muhammad regards Mūsā as his predecessor, his model, and believes he had already been foretold by Mūsā (vii. 156); his religion is also Mūsā's religion (xiii. 11). Mūsā is also conceived in Muhammad's image. Charges are brought against him similar to those made against Muhammad is said to want to pervert people from the faith of their fathers, (x. 79); he practises magic (xxviii. 18). Mūsā and Hārin seem rather to be sent to the stubborn Pharaoh than to the believing Israelites. Revelation is granted him: शान्त, किताब, जफ़र, सुभाष (v. 50; xxi. 49; iii. 37; xxvii. 37; xvii. 19; 15), illumination, instruction and guidance. The picture of him is made up of Biblical, Hegagadie and new elements. Mūsā is exposed, watched by his sister,

refuses the milk of other nurses and is suckled by his own mother. Coming to the assistance of a hard pressed Israelite he kills an Egyptian but repents of this crime to which Satan had tempted him. He is pursued and escapes to Madian. At a well there he waters the flocks of the two daughters of a शाही. One of them invites him home modestly. He receives her as his wife at the price of 8—10 years service. This preliminary history is told in Sūra xxviii. 1—28; the mission itself is often mentioned.

Mūsā receives from the burning bush in the holy valley of Tīwān (xx. 12; lxxix. 16) orders to take off his shoes, the message to Pharaoh, the signs of his mission, the rod, the snake, the hand that becomes white. His speech is difficult to understand (xiii. 52); Hārin accompanies him as warrior (xx. 30; xxx. 37). Pharaoh reproaches Mūsā with ingratitude, saying he had been brought up by them (xxxv. 17). Pharaoh assembles his magicians but their rods are devoured by Mūsā's. The magicians profess their belief in God and are mutilated in punishment (vii. 106—123; xx. 59—78; xxxv. 36—51). Pharaoh wishes prayers to be offered to God, orders Hāryn to build him a tower so that he can reach the God of Mūsā (xxxvii. 38; xxxvi. 38). Mūsā performs nine miracles (xxxvii. 33; xx. 59—78; xxxvii. 13). These are: 1. the rod and snake; 2. a white hand; 3. deluge; 4. locusts; 5. lice; 6. frogs; 7. blight; 8. darkness; 9. dividing the sea (cf. e.g. Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 455).

Mūsā spends 30 and 10 nights with God (vii. 138). He brings instruction and admonition on the tablets. In his absence Sāmūr makes the living golden calf (vii. 146; xx. 79—98). Mūsā breaks the tablets. He desires to see God. God crucifies the hill to death (vii. 139). Israel fears war and has to wander 40 years in the wilderness (v. 24—29). Mūsā's enemies, Kārin (Korah), Pharaoh and Hāryn, perish (xxxv. 38).

Some details differ from the Biblical story. Instead of Pharaoh's daughter, it is his wife who rescue the infant; instead of seven shepherdesses Mūsā assists two. Instead of ten plagues, Muhammad speaks of nine miracles. Mūsā strikes twelve springs out of the rock, one for each tribe (vi. 57, a memory of the twelve springs of Elim, Exodus xxv. 27). The divergence is greater when Hāryn is made minister to Pharaoh. Then there are new features: Mūsā repents of having slain the Egyptian. Mūsā sees the burning bush at night and desires to take a brand from its fire for his house (xx. 10; xxviii. 29). Pharaoh's magicians die for their belief in God.

The following seems to originate in Haggada: God forbids the infant to be suckled by an Egyptian mother (xxviii. 11). In the Haggada Moses is offered to all Egyptian suckling mothers; but the mouth that is to speak with God cannot imbibe anything impure (568, 128). That God lifts the mountain over Israel (vi. 60, 57; vii. 170) is explained from the Haggada: Israel hesitated to accept the Torah and God lifted Sina: over them: Torah or death (Sebatb, 894, 895; Aboda Zara, 2b). The turning of the Sabbath breakers into apes (vi. 61; iv. 50; v. 215) recalls the Haggada in which the builders of the tower of Babel become apes (Sanhedrin, 105a). Kārin is represented as an exceedingly rich man, the keys of whose treasure can hardly be carried by many strong men (xviii. 76, 79); the Haggada
MÜSA — MÜSA b. NUŞAIR

The story of Mūsā accompanying a wise man on a journey seems without parallel (xviii. 59—81). The attempt is often made to distinguish this Mūsā of Khaḍir from Mūsā b. Imanū and Mūsā b. Imanū [cf. the article Khaḍir].

2. Mūsā in post-Ku'ānic legend. The histories of the prophet (especially Thalabī’s) supplement the Ku'ānic story with much from the Bible, Haggada and folklore.

Mūsā is added to Haggada. Pharaoh’s sick daughters are cured as soon as they touch Moses’ cradle. Exod. Rab. i. 25 makes Pharaoh’s daughter be cured of leprosy. — The infant Mūsā scratches Pharaoh’s cradle. Pharaoh wants to slay him. On the interpolation of Āsīya he tests him by putting gold and jewels on one side and burning coal on the other. Mūsā reaches for the gold but Gabriel directs his hand to the burning coal. Mūsā puts his burned hand on his tongue and therefore becomes a stammerer (Ginzberg, v. 402 sq.; Hamilton, Zeitschr. f. romantische Philol., xxxvi. 125—159).

Elements of other legends are woven into the legend of Mūsā. The Ibrāhīm-Namūdī legend supplies the following features: Pharaoh frightened by dreams persecutes the infants; Mūsā is hidden from the infants in the burning oven but the fire becomes cool and does him no harm. Pharaoh orders prayers to be offered to himself as to a god, has a tower built, shoots an arrow against heaven; the arrow comes back blood-stained and Pharaoh boasts he has slain God (Tabari, i. 459).

From the story of Jacob and Labân comes the following: Mūsā serves 8—10 years for his wife (xxviii. 27). His father-in-law offers him the spotted lambs born in his flock and the ewes for the watering troughs be spotted lambs (Thalabī, p. 113). There are frequent references to a pious Egyptian woman who is martyred by Pharaoh with her seven children, the youngest of whom is still at its mother’s breast (in Thalabī, p. 118, 139); this is of course modelled on the martyr mother of the Maccebes.

There are many fanciful embellishments, e.g. the miracle of the snakes, the plagues, the scenes on the Red Sea; Moses’ rod in particular plays a great part. It came from Paradise; Abī Dībar, Abū Dībar, Shīth, Isrā, Nūr, Mūsā, Shīth, Abī Mūsā, Isrā, and Yākīth had previously used it (Khaṣṣ, p. 208). In Tabari (p. 460 mourn) an angel brought the rod. Mūsā obtained it from his wife; his father-in-law quarrels with him about its ownership and an angel decides in favour of Mūsā. It is a miraculous rod and Thalabī (p. 111—116) in particular relates the wonders it performs. It shines in the darkness; it gives water in a drought, and placed in the ground it becomes a tree bearing fruit; it produces milk and honey and fragrant scent; against an enemy it becomes a double dragon. It pierces mountains and rocks; it leads over rivers and seas; it is also a shepherd’s staff and keeps beasts of prey from the herds of Moses.

When Mūsā was asleep on one occasion the rod slew a dragon, on another occasion seven of Pharaoh’s assassins.

The varied Biblical, Haggadic, legendary and fairy tale features in the Islamic legend of Mūsā are thus blended into a very full picture and in Thalabī form a regular romance.

Bibliography: Sāra ii. 45—120; vii. 101—160; x. 75—85; xx. 8—95; xxvi. 2—76; xl. 24—56 and the commentaries thereon; Tabari, ed. Leyden, i. 414—449; Thalabī, Kitāb al-Anbiyā', Cairo 1335; p. 105—156; Khaṣṣ, Kitāb al-Anbiyā' ed. Eisenberg, p. 194—240; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, Bulak, i. 61—78; Alt. Geiger, War hat Mohammed., 1902 p. 149—177; M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge, p. 153—185; J. Horovitz, Keramische Untersuchungen, p. 141—143; R. Basset, rook, Centres, chrifts et langues arabes, ii. 87, 85; D. Sieder, Les origines du Legendaire musulman dans le Coran et dans le Prophétique, Paris 1933, p. 73—103; J. Walker, Bible Characters in the Koran, p. 84—111.

(BERNHARD HELLER)

MÜSA b. NUŞAIR b. 'ABD AL-RĀMĪN b. ZAID AL-LAKHIMI (or AL-BAKKI) Abd 'Abd al-Rahmān, Arab governor, conqueror of the western Maghrib and of Spain. He was killed in 79 (698); his father had been in the immediate entourage of Mu‘āwiyah (q. v.). Mūsā was at first appointed by the caliph 'Abd al-Malik to collect the khārid at al-Baṣra, but having been suspected of embezzlement, he fled and took refuge with the caliph’s brother, the governor of Egypt 'Abd al-‘Aziz b. Marwan, who the latter took Mūsā to Syria to the caliph who fined him 100,000 dirhams. 'Abd al-‘Aziz provided half of this sum for Mūsā and brought him to Egypt where he gave him the governorship of Ifriqiyya which had been previously held by Hassān b. al-Nu‘mān. The various chroniclers are not agreed as to the date of his appointment to the office but it possibly took place in 79 (698) of the following year.

Mūsā and his troops thereupon entered on a career of successful conquest which ended in the consolidation of Arab power in Ifriqiyya and in the conquest of the rest of north Africa and of Spain. Here we give only the most essential details. Assisted by his son 'Abd Allah al-Mu‘āwīya he sent successful expeditions against Zaghwān and Sājjāna and reduced the Hansira, the Zanṭa and the Kutum. The Berbers taking refuge in the west of the Maghrib, Mūsā decided to bring them to submission; confirmed in his office by 'Abd al-Malik’s success at al-Walīd, he continued his advance to Tangier and Sūs [q. v.] and returned to Ifriqiyya leaving as his deputy in the Maghrib his freedman Tārīk [q. v.]. The latter in 92 (710—711) invaded Spain and Mūsā anxious about and at the same time jealous of the progress made by his lieutenant crossed himself in the following year leaving his son 'Abd Allah as governor of Ifriqiyya. Landing at Algeciras in Ramāḍān 93 (June—July 712) with his other son 'Abd al-‘Aziz, he refused to take the same route as Tārīk and taking the towns of Sidon (Shadīlūn; q. v.), Carmona, Seville and Merida, he was on his way to Toledo when Tārīk came to meet him and was bitterly reproached by his master. Mūsā b. Nuṣair then continued his march and completely subjugated the north of Spain from Saragossa to Na-
varce. In 95, he left Spain with immense booty, leaving his son ‘Abd al-‘Aziz as governor; he reached Kairouân at the end of the year and continued by land to Syria in a triumphal procession of Arab chiefs and Berber and Spanish prisoners. The caliph al-Walid then sent his end to urge him to harry while his brother and heir presumptive Sulaimân, eager to appropriate the vast wealth brought by Mūsā, tried to delay him. He arrived in Damascus shortly before the death of al-Walid and when Sulaimân assumed power he at once expressed his hatred of the conqueror. Regarding Mūsā b. Nuṣair’s stay in Syria before his death in 98 (716–717), the Arab historians give a number of details which are obviously of quite a legendary character.


(E. LÉVI-ProVergnal)

Mūsā Čelebi, one of the younger sons of the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid I. According to some sources: he was younger than his brother Muhammad I [q.v.], who is generally considered as the youngest. Mūsā had been taken prisoner in the battle of Angora (1402) and was left by Timūr in custody with the Gennulph Oghlu Ya’kūb Beg. The latter sent him afterwards to his brother Muhammad in Amasia, and for some time he became Muhammad’s helper in the re-establishment of Ottoman power in Anatolia; he is even said to have driven their brother Ǧal from Brusa, though the current opinion is that Muhammad went there himself. When, in 1404, their eldest brother Sulaimān Čelebi appeared in his turn in Brusa, Mūsā first opposed him in the name of Muhammad and went afterwards, with the latter’s consent, to Europe, where he hoped to make an end of Sulaimān’s reign with the aid of Mirče of Walachia and Stephan of Serbia. At first this enterprise failed through a defeat inflicted on Mūsā near the walls of Constantinople. Sulaimān resided in Adrianople. Here Mūsā appeared suddenly in 1411 (or 1410); Sulaimān had to flee and was killed on his way to Constantinople, after which Mūsā took his place as ruler of the Ottoman territory in Europe, surrounded by the military and political councilors of Sulaimān, as Ewrenos Beg and the Djemarrī Oghlu Buchām Pasha. Mūsā began his short reign with great energy, recovering nearly all the Ottoman possessions in Serbia and Thessaly, and sending raiding ex-

positions as far as Carinthia. At the same time he adopted a despotic attitude which displeased his entourage and prepared the final victory of his brother Muhammad. Ibrahim Pasha, sent to Constantinople to exact tribute, went from there to Muhammad’s court (cf. Taeschner and Wittek, in Jsl., xviii. 94) and, when Musa soon afterwards began a siege of Constantinople, Muhammad came to the rescue of the emperor. In this he failed for the moment and he was obliged to return to Anatolia. But in 1413 Muhammed appeared again in Europe, having found allies in the Serbians. Meanwhile, the Turkish commanders in Serbia and Thessaly were drawn to Muhammad’s side and even the old Enemies prepared to leave Mūsā’s cause; his son and other military chiefs went over openly to Muhammad. The latter approached Adrianople from the north and followed from here Mūsā’s army beyond Philipopolis; then he joined his allies in Serbia and met Mūsā’s army on the plain of Cumalio, east of Sofia. Here Mūsā’s army was defeated (July 1413) and Mūsā himself perished in the flight. His corpse was found and buried in the Bâb el-Mûlî in Brusa.

Biography: The ancient Ottoman chronicles of Ǧalal Pasha Zāde, Nehrut, Ūridī Beg and Ǧaγravīkhī Al-ʿAṣīm (Anonymus, ed. Gries), besides the Byzantine historians Phrantzes, Ducas and Chalcondylas. Further all general Ottoman histories since the Tārīkh al-Tuwairikī and the modern works of van Hammer (G. O. E. L.), Zinkeisen and Jorje; Mehmed Zaki, Mağlub Şehzadeler, Constantinople 1332, p. 11 sqq.

(J. H. KAermen)

Mūsā, and Muhammad al-Hādí, an ʿAbāṣid caliph. After the death of his father on Maḥarram 22, 169 (Aug. 4, 785) al-Hādí ascended the throne and at once put an end to the influence of his mother al-Ḥashūrān, by forbidding her to interfere in the slightest in matters of state. When he proposed to exclude his brother Hārūn from the succession in favour of his son Dīrac, he met with vigorous opposition from the Barmaquīs Yaḥyā b. Khalīl [q.v.]. When the latter boldly persisted in his opposition, he was arrested; but the caliph’s plan came to nothing for he died suddenly in Kāhīrā in 786 (Sept. 687) in ‘Īshāhīd near Baghdād. According to the usual but not at all certain story, he was poisoned or stabbed by his mother’s orders. Al-Hādí who was only 26 when he died is described as brave, just, liberal and full of joie-de-vivre. The most important event of his brief reign was an ʿAlīd rising in Mecca and Medina. ʿUmar b. ‘Abd al-ʿAziz, the governor of Medina, had punished an ʿAlīd along with some other citizens of the town for drinking wine. As a result the ʿAlīds rebelled and renounced their allegiance to the caliph. After several days fighting the ringleader of the movement, a descendant of ʿAlī called al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī, marched on Mecca where he obtained a number of additional followers. Soon afterwards the pilgrims arrived; at Fakhkhā near Mecca, a battle took place and al-Ḥasan was killed (2Yūb 1-Hiddija 169 = June 786). As regards the fighting with the Byzantines, the Muslims under Mağlub b. Yaḥyā invaded the island of Minor where they took much booty.

MUSA AL-KAZIM

The seventh Imam of the Twelver Shi'a, son of Dja'far b. Muhammed al-Sadiq [q.v.], was born about 128 (745) at al-Abwe (q.v.), the traditional burial-place of 'Ali, mother of the Prophet. He grew to manhood in his father's house in Medina and remained there as Imam after the latter's death in 148 (765) without playing any part in politics. In particular he took no share in the great rising of the Hassanid 'Alids which collapsed at Fakhhk in 169 (786). Nevertheless the caliph was suspicious of him. He was perhaps already imprisoned by al-Mahdi. In 179 (795) Harun had him brought first to Basra and then to Baghdad; he is said to have been released for a time but he died in prison in Baghdad, according to the usual story in Radjub 183 (Aug.-Sept. 799).

Little attention was paid to Musa, the Shi'a, but we find him occasionally, as the Shi'a point out, quoted as an authority, for example for a strongly pro-'Ali tradition in Ahmad b. Hanbal, Muhammed Sharif infra (cf. al-Dhahabi, Mawta al-khadij, N° 1835). The Shi'a records are more voluminous. It is said he had been the favorite of the Imam 'Abd Rsarran his ange' because he returned kindness for injury to an opponent so that the latter came over to him. As evidence of his fitness for the Imam he is reputed to have had great knowledge of the religious and was thus brought into connection with 'Abd Rsarran. The chapters on miracles, usual in all biographies of the imams, credit him with being born with a knowledge of languages, e.g. Ethiopic and the language of birds, in later stories also of "Frankish" to fill a story, modelled on a later Kerbelah motif, that Harun could not find a Muslim to assassinate him and therefore brought Franka, who were so impressed by his nobility that they refused to kill him. Prayers for Musa have been handed down; a letter of warning to al-Husain b. 'Ali b. al-Hanlan, the leader of the Fakhhk rising, letters from prison; a statement of his claims to the Imamate against Harun and throughout a relationship with the Prophet, not through 'Ali the 'Abbasids through 'Abbas but through Fatima, whom he compares with the mother of Jesus. Considerable portions of the biography are the result of the disputes within the Shi'a, even the account of his conception and birth. That his mother was brought from a slave dealer is not disputed; but great pains are devoted to proving she was a virgin. When at the death of his father a group of the Nawaiya "remained" steadfast to him, the Isma'iliya [q.v.] and the Fatimya branched off, the claims of Musa had to be based on a will of Dja'far, the authenticity of which is as doubtful as that of Musa in favour of his son 'Ali al-Kadim; this was used against the followers of another son Ahmad, as well as against the Manfula who "remained" by Musa himself and a similar party in the Mawsiliya (Mawa'ila, for details see the writers on here, especially al-Ahdari, Mawta, ed. Bitter, Constantinople 1930, p. 25 sqq.). The dispute with the latter groups also explains the very detailed stories of witnesses who had seen Musa's corpse. Bitter differences of opinion within the family are revealed by the fact that even Musa's son Ibrahim for a long time denied his father's death, and also by the fact that Musa's brother Ibrahim or a nephew 'Ali b. Ismad played the traitor with Hurrin, inciting him by pointing out the great sums which were given to Musa as the true caliph by his followers; on the other hand, the inequities acknowledged of Musa's "inam" teeth by the theologian Hisham b. al-Hakam is made responsible for his capture. The "bunya of Musa is 'Ali l-Hasan also 'Ali All; the statements regarding the number of his chidren vary between 50 and 60; 37 is the usual figure. Besides his successor 'Ali al-Kadim some prominence was ascribed by the partial imam Ahmad, but more by 'Azad, who at the time of the great rising of Abu l-Sarayi in Basra, by burning the houses and followers of the "Abbasids acquired the name 'Azad al-Nar, 'Azad of the fire" (Tabari, iii. 986), and Ibrahim, who on account of similar activities in San-at was called al-Djazzar, "the butcher" (Tabari, iii. 987); a daughter Fatima, who died in Qum, has given to this city in her tomb its most important sanctuary. Musa himself was buried in the cemetery of the Kurish in Baghd, where his grandson, the ninth imam Muhammad al-Djawi [q.v.], was in time interred beside him; thus arose the twin sanctuaries al-Kajaim [q.v.]

Bibliography: Mufid, al-Tirdad (Teheran without date or pagination arranged in the order of the imams); Ibn Ruhya, 'Uyin Al-Abbas al-Kadim (MS. Berlin. N°. 9663). exp. fol. 103 sqq.; comprehensive collection of Shi'a accounts with references to the sources in Muskain Baki, al-Majdilist, Bishar al-Anouir, Teheran 1903, p. 290-317; Abu l-Faraj al-Ishahat, Maqalat al-Takiyya, Teheran 1930, p. 172-176; Ibn Khaliljan, Waqifat, Biial, 1299, p. 172 sqq. (from al-Khahlil, Ta'liqah Baghdad); Musa, Marufi: (cf. Barhier de Meynard, vio. 309 sqq., 334 sqq.; E. de Zamberen, Manuel de genereologie et de chronologie, Hanover 1927, table D. -

As the importance of the imams like Musa lies less in their own personality than in the views of the dogmatists upon them, their nitasus should also be compared: cf. in Kashif, Maqalat Al-Abbas al-Raghib, Bombay 1917, section Alaa l-Musulun, 18; Abu l-Musa, p. 344 sqq.; and also the nitaus of Hisham b. al-Hakam, Hisham al-Dhahabi, Ammar b. Musa al-Salhi, Almadi; and the same names in the alphabetically arranged works of Nadji, al-Raghib, Bombay 1917; Tusi, Fihrist, Caireau, 1853-1855; Astara'dah, Manufa al-Majd, Teheran 1926.

BANU MUSA, more precisely BANDI MUSI b. SHAKIR, the usual name for the three brothers Abu l-Dja'far Mubammad, Abu l-Kasim Ahmad and al-Hassan b. Mubammad b. Shakhir, who made a reputation under the 'Abbasids from al-Ma'mun to al-Mutawakkil as mathematicians, astronomers and technicians and also at times played a part in politics. The father is said
to have begun life as a bandit in Khurṣān, then to become an astronomer and geometer. We have no means of testing such stories or learning how a bandit could become an astronomer. If we assume however that Mūṣā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Mūṣā al-Khwārizmi joined al-Maʾmūn’s train in Khurṣān as astronomer and astrologist and then came with him to Baghdad, we can understand that al-Maʾmūn took his three sons, still young, into his service on Mūṣā’s death and had them educated in mathematical science under the astronomer Yahyā b. Abī Manṣūr. The Banū Mūṣā thus at a comparatively early age were admitted to that circle of scholars who, by their thorough and expert translations, introduced Greek science to Islam and by their own researches laid the foundation for the glorious development of the sciences in the 9th (i.e., 9th) and 10th centuries. Attaining fame and fortune, they used their wealth to purchase Greek manuscripts and sent agents into the Byzantine provinces to seek for and purchase books. Of Muḥammad b. Mūṣā it is related that he met Thabit b. Qurra in Harrān while on a journey and induced him to settle at the caliph’s court. It may be assumed they treated scientific subjects to some books and scholars did not take place without the caliph’s support.

History also records political and literary links. A particular custom is said to have existed between the al-Kūf and the three brothers, because the caliph al-Maʾṣūmah did not entrust them but al-Kūf with the education of his son Almād. The feud went so far that the Banū Mūṣā are later said to have intrigued against the choice of Almād as caliph. This story can only be understood in connection with court intrigues, in which the ambitions of the brothers and the jealousy of the courtiers played the same part as elsewhere. If all is true that is recorded of the malevolent attitude of the brothers to recognised scholars, little praise can be bestowed on their character. The stories of the huge incomes are especially that of Muḥammad b. Mūṣā — he is said to have had for a time an annual income of £300,000 — exceed all that even the most liberal caliphs could hope for a scholar.

The works of the Banū Mūṣā include translations and original works on geometry, astronomy and mechanics. Many of their works are written jointly by two or three brothers, others only by one. Muḥammad b. Mūṣā is regarded as the most versatile al-Hassan, the best mathematician, Almād as specially interested in mechanical and technical problems. The astronomical and metrological observations of the brothers were probably made mainly in Sāmarrā; their tables of observations of the sun are mentioned by Ibn Yūnus, M. Curtze, H. Suter, E. Wiedemann and F. Hausser. They have devoted special attention to the editing and elucidation of these works that have survived in Arabic or Latin.


Mūṣā b. al-Zubair, son of the famous Ḥārūn ar-Raʾš, the Prophet, al-Zubair, and brother of the anti-Caliph ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubair. Handsome, chivalrous, generous, the most ambitious and prodigal, he resembled his elder brother ʿAbd Allāh and the family of the Zubairids only in his bravery and in its distinction of severity in exacting punis-
ment which bordered on barbarity. He began his military career at the beginning of the caliphate of Marwān I by a boldly planned invasion of Palestine. Later sent as governor to Baṣra by his brother 'Abd Allāh, he soon found himself called to the help of the people of Kūfa, tired of the yoke of Muhātir b. Abī 'Ubadh [q.v.]. He began by putting to flight the army brought against him by the redoubtable Ṭabāqīt agitator and then besieged him for four months in the citadel of Kūfa. On the death of Muhātir, Muṣṭafā ordered several thousands of his followers to be executed and by this savage act made as many enemies as the victims had relatives. He was less successful against 'Ubadh Allāh b. Abī Ḥurr [q.v.], who had been sent into the Ḥirā to stir up a counter-revolution in favour of the Marwānidīs. A similar attempt at Baṣra by the Unaylādī Khalīd b. Asid failed. But by proceeding with great severity against Khalīd's followers Muṣṭafā alienated the most influential personages in the city.

Soon he found he had to defend the Ḥirā which was directly threatened by the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik; troops were massed at Bādījmāʾa. Muṣṭafā awaited the Syrian army here and then retired to Dair al-Ḍajāhilī [q.v.]. His position soon became critical for the Bāṣrān troops refused to follow him. The best troops of the province were far away with Muhātir, engaged in an interminable campaign against the Khārijītīs. The Zubairīdīs' troops displayed only moderate enthusiasm. His officers tired of his iron hand were prepared to betray him and entered into negotiations with 'Abd al-Malik. The Marwānidīs was not stingy in his promises. He also tried to negotiate with Muṣṭafā, who learning of the parl.sy of his followers rejected all offers and decided to die a brave man. Among his followers Ibrāhīm b. al-ᾀzhārī alone fought vigorously in the battle; the others folded their arms during the fighting or went over to the Syrian ranks. 'Abd al-Malik offered Muṣṭafā his life for the last time with the government of the Ḥirā, but in vain. Thrown from his horse, the Zubairīdī received the coup-de-grace from an avenging Bakrī, 'Ubadh Allāh b. Ṣahābān. This took place about the middle of Dhumādā I (October) of 72 (691). 'Abd al-Malik wept for him and ordered his poets to commemorate his heroic end. Muṣṭafā's great generosity earned him numerous eulogies from poets. He is also famous for the fact that he had in his arcade the two most independent and haughtiest women of the time, belonging to the most distinguished aristocracy of Islam, Triḥa bint Talha [q.v.], the second wife of the Prophet, and Sukain, grand-daughter of 'Ali; feminine types, remarkable in their spur of vitality for having bravely tried to avoid the degradation of their sex in Muslim society.

Bibliography: Tabari (ed. of Goeze), I. 1330; i. 59, 60, 118, 340—349, 484, 576, 592—593, 602—603, 652—657, 688, 716—727; 531—535; 749—754; 749—753; 764—765; 670—680, 733—822, 830—831, 1064—1072, 1260, 1262; 1466; Kithā al-Aghāth, ii. 138—159; iii. 1003—104, 122; vili. 85, 135, 178; xi. 54—57; xii. 33, 38, 42; xiv. 84, 160—172; xvi. 262—266; xxi. 10; Balādīrī, Anwār al-Aʿlāf (ed. Alwaldūrī), p. 3—4, 8, 10, 16—19, 25—24; Menūf, Menufī (ed. Barbier de Meynard), v. 240—143, 247—49; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāfīrīn (Cairo), iv. 123—124, 137, 159; H. D. van Gelder, Moṣṭafā al-ʿalāma prov (H. Lammen)
Lakhkut died in Armenia and Daisam was betrayed by his vizier Abu l-\'Asim b. Asufar who had come to an arrangement with Marzuban for both were zajis (Ibn al-Muakallah, II. 32)). Marzuban occupied Ardash and Tabr, and finally Daisam surrendered to Marzuban and received from him a castle in Taron. Marzuban extended his territory, and as far as Darband. In 336 (943-944), the Russian (\'Arsaf) was caused by the Caspian, and the river Kar and took the capital of Arjas [q. v.], as Rarda\'a (q. v.), in spite of the death of the subjects of Marzuban. At the same time, the Hamdanids of Mavasli had concluded a peace with Adharbadjar and Marzuban had to deal with force under Abu l-\'Aab Allah Husain b. Sadiq b. Hamdani and the Rashidun Kaud Djiafar b. Shakhay, which had reached Salmis [q. v.] but was soon recalled to Mavasli by Nasir al-Dawla. On the other hand, the Russians, driven by disease and harassed by the Musulmans, beat a retreat (cf. the sources on the Russian invasion including the Armenian historian of the tenth century, Moses Kabaqquturi, in Dorn, Cagga, St. Petersburg 1876; the text of Ibn al-Muakallah, II. 62-67, was translated with commentary by Yakobowski in the Viisam. Fremsmel, Leiningrad 1926, xxiv., p. 63-92).

A new danger arose in the south-east of the lands of Mavasli when in 335 (946) the Buyid Rukan al-Dawla occupied Rayy (disputed by the Salmians and Ziyadis), which had filled with wrath at the Buyids decided to attack them in 336. But Rukan bade them time to get reinforcements from his brothers. In 336 (949) Marzuban, defeated near Karw, was besieged in the castle of Suseiarum (in Fars). The fugitives from his army gathered round his father Muhammed and occupied Ardash while Wahsudan remained in Taron. Muhammed gave satisfaction to his captains and was shut up by Wahsudan in his castle at Shahgahan (?). Rukan al-Dawla sent to Adharbadjar Muhammed b. Abu l-Rasul, the former governor of Tes [q. v.], who had deserted the Salmians. Wahsudan released Daisam in the hope that he would be able to organise resistance. Daisam who had time to take Ardash, was defeated by Ibn Abu l-Rasul but the latter was disputed by the intruders around him returned to Rayy in 336 (949). Daisam recaptured Ardash but the advantage of Alt b. Mujjti, a supporter of Marzuban, forced him to seek shelter with the Arturids of Wusul-

Ahmar and Wuzarzhan (N. E. of Tabr), of Shurvan (N. of Ebul), as well as the Arturids, Enguaidi and the princes of Khazar (west of Barzgan).

Wahsudan and his nephews, Marzuban died in Ramadan 336 (Dec. 957) and while bequeathing the power to his brother Wahsudan forgot to cancel his first will by which his sons Djaunsh, Ibrahim and Nasir were to succeed him in succession.

The commanders of the fortresses would not surrender them to Wahsudan who returned to Taron in disguise. Djaunsh b. Marzuban was recognized by his brothers but was only interested in his karem. Marzuban's old general Djan b. Sharmarzen set up in Crumia [q. v.] and won to his side Ibrahim, with whom he occupied Marzagh. In 345 (955) the grandson of the caliph Mahdi b. Ishaq rebelled in Gilan and took the name of Mustadidji b. Isma'il. Djaunsh and Ibrahim became reconciled and defeated the rebels at Musran [q. v.].

Wahsudan began intriguing among his nephews and detached Nasir from Djaunsh but the plot was of short duration. Under assurances from Wahsudan, Djaunsh, with his mother and Nasir came to Taron but were thrown into prison. Wahsudan sent his son Ismail b. Adharbadjar. Ibrahim, who was ruling Armenia (Dawia) made a move in 349 or 350 which gave Wahsudan an excuse to massacre his prisoners. Ismail soon afterwards died at Ardash and after which Ibrahim recaptured Adharbadjar and laid Taron waste while Wahsudan sought refuge in Dailam. Meanwhile Wahsudan's general Sharmarzen b. Mujjti, however, succeeded in defeating Ibrahim and the latter, abandoned by all his soldiers, sought refuge with his brother-in-law Rukan al-Dawla who had married a daughter of Marzuban (355 = 966).

Rukan al-Dawla, with his usual chivalry beared favor to Ibrahim and sent to Adharbadjar his famous minister Ibn al-Amid (Ishak Raja) who reinstated Ibrahim and subjected the lands of Djaunsh and Djaunsh b. Sharmarzen to him. Ibn al-Amid who was much impressed by the wealth of Adharbadjar, proposed to Rukan al-Dawla to annex this province but his master recalled him to Rayy, saying that he did not wish to be accused of coveting the inheritance of one who had sought his protection. After the return of Ibn al-Amid matters went badly and from the allusions in Ibn al-Muakallah we know only that Ibrahim was deposed and imprisoned (probably about 369 = 979, the year in which the Tifajir al-Dawla stops).

The end of the Muslim and the Seljuk Empire in the Muslim world. The sources of the situation in Adharbadjar till 420 are obscure but the statements of the Armenian historian Stephen Asotik, Hist. Universelle, part II, book III, trans. by Macler, Paris 1819, ch. 14, 12, 18, 19, 29, 38 and 41, enable us to fill the gaps. According to Karawat, Dinas (369 = 979) Ibrahim b. Marzuban was dispossessed of the lands in Adharbadjar by the Rawwidi family (see the above articles in the A. M. R. M. T. R. R. S. and Karawat, op. cit., II.). The son of Ibrahim Abu I-Haik (the "Ahbaul Dalmastani" of Asotik) retained Devon [q. v.] and on the invitation of King Musul of Kars in 982-983 made an expedition into Armenia where he desecrated the churches. This Ahbaul later lost all his lands to his neighbour Althaph of Gotb (I.e. Abul Dulfu Shalibak, lord of Ordubad). He later wandered in Georgia and Armenia and even visited the Byzantine emperor in...

(Y. Minsky)

MUSAILIMA (a contemptuous diminutive from Maslama, which is the form of his name given in Muharrad, Kāmil, ed. Weigert, p. 443; J. Baldsīhūrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 422 ill.; cf. Tulāfī q.v. for Talja), a prophet of the Banū Ḥāšīfa in Yamāma, contemporary with Muḥammad. His genealogy is variously given but always contains the name Ḥāshim; his name was Abū Ḥāshim. According to the usual account, he appeared as a prophet soon after the death of Muḥammad, and having visited the latter in Medina, he received a divine építaph for his deputation. There is however another tradition according to which he began his prophetic career before Muḥammad died, and D. S. Margoliou has given very cogent reasons for accepting this. According to Ibn Iḥāṣī (Ibn Iḥāṣī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 200), Muḥammad's enemies reproached him with having obtained his wisdom from a man of Yamāma named Rāḥūmān. Now we have ample evidence (Wāqīdī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 28; Tabari, l. 1935, i. 48; Baldsīhūrī, p. 105; Bāghawī on Sunn xxv, 61) that Musailima, who preached in the name of Rāḥūmān, was himself called Rāḥūmān. Further, the story recurring in all traditions that Musailima proposed to the Medine prophetic division of authority or a transfer of his power to him on his death (a similar story is told of the Ḥanīfī chief of Makka Sulaymān) becomes more intelligible if this prophet already occupied in Yamāma a position similar to that of Muḥammad in Medina. It is also worthy of note that the prophetic miracles attributed to Musailima recall the earliest Mekkan miracles with their short rhyming sentences and curious oaths and have no resemblance at all to the later Medine miracles. In particular the fact that all the Banū Ḥāšīfa followed him into battle against the Medine shortly after the death of Muḥammad shows that he must have been active for a considerable time and was no upstart imitator of Muḥammad. That the latter was the usual method of explaining the "that" Musailima, is readily intelligible, but it is to be wondered at that orthodox tradition could not deny itself the pleasure of depicting his relations with the Tanīm prophetic Sulaymān [q.v.] in the most scurrilous fashion. Fortunately however, the otherwise little reliable Bāghawī gives quite a different story, which although influenced by later ideas (Musalima in order to gain followers reduces the daily jānāṯū to three; he has a masūdībān and a jānāṯū; he tries in vain to imitate Muḥammad's miracles, etc.), gives a picture of him which is in the main correct and we can agree with Wellhausen that his utterances have a distinctly Yamāma
colouring. According to Sa‘i’s account, he must have been considerably influenced by Christianity for he speaks of the kingdom of heaven and that he would come from heaven. Like several other men of the time in Arabia of deep religious feelings, he favoured asceticism. He forbad wine, and marital intercourse after the birth of a son. It is interesting that Palgrave on his journey into Najd found a number of sayings still current under Musallima’s name; unfortunately he did not trouble to record them so that we cannot compare them with what is recorded of his utterances in literature. This rival community in the heart of Arabia meant a serious danger to the young faith of Islam. Therefore when the first attempts to repress it had failed, Abu Bakr sent his ablest leader Khidîr b. al-Walid against Musallima and the Banî Hamîs. A battle was fought at ‘Akrâbah’ [q.v.] in 2 A.H. which at first went against the Muslims, but Khidîr’s superior strategy finally prevailed and Musallima and many of his followers fell martyrs for their faith. The battle was unusually fierce and the Muslims also suffered heavily, among both sides being a number of the best authorities on the revelations of Mu‘ammad.


MUSALLÂ (A.), part. pass. II of tef-az, before where the salât is performed on certain occasions. When Muhammad had fixed his abode in Madina, he performed the ordinary salât’s in his dâr, which was also his madfîd (not in the sense of temple). The extraordinary salât’s, however, were performed on a place situated southwest of the city in the territory of the Banî Salîma, outside the wall, northeast of the bridge on the wâdi; where at present the street from the suburb al-Ankuraya reaches the market-place Barr al-Munâkhba (cf. Burton, Personal Narrative, plan opp. i. 239). The picture of the musallâ as well as of the mosque of ‘Umar situated on the place, opp. l. 329; al-Batânî, al-Ri’âla al-Hâjîyya, 2nd ed., plan of Madina opp. p. 252; part of the Barr al-Munâkhba, ibid., opp. p. 264; Caetani, Annali, vol. ii. i, opp. p. 73.

On this spot the salât was performed on the 1st Shawwal and on the 10th Dhu ‘l-Hijja (Tabari, i. 1281, 1362). On the latter day the salât was combined with the slaughtering of two spotted rams (Bukhârî, Adâ‘î, bâb 6). On the two days of festival Muhammad and his followers on their way to the musallâ were preceded by Bilal who bore the spear (Amâna; q.v.).

It is also said that the salât for rain was held on the musallâ (copious data in Tradition, cf. Wendack, Handbuch, s. v. Rain; and do., Mohamm.
MUŞH — MUŞHAF

(as spelled by Yaşar, iv. 534) is sometimes used for the town itself as in Tabari, ili. 1408 (cf. J. Markwart, Süd-Armenien und die Tigreergürtel, Vienna, 1930, p. 354). The tradition of the Armenian historians connects the foundation of Mûsh with Mûşel Mamikonan, the ancestor of the powerful, originally non-Armenian family of the Mamikonsians, who lived in the 11th century A. D. To him is ascribed the construction of a castle, the ruins of which are still visible on one of the hills that dominate Mûsh. This town itself is situated at the mouth of a mountain gorge and before it extends, as far as the river, a large fertile plain, the "plain of Mûsh." During the first centuries after the Muhammadan conquest, Mûsh remained a centre of Armenian national life; from 825—851 it was the residence of the Bagratid Bagrat. After the abdication of this prince to Bagdad in 851, the inhabitants revolted and killed the Muhammadan governor Yusuf b. Abu Sa'îd al-Marwani (Tabari, ili. 1408 sq.). Later on it was part of the vassal kingdom of the Bagratids. Occasionally it was occupied by Muhammadan invaders, as in the days of Saif al-Dawla ( Ibn al-Athîr, viii. 468) in 353 (964). About this time the same Mûsh appears for the first time in Islamic geographical literature (al-Masâkidî, p. 150). In Saljuq times the influence of the Armanishe dynasty disputed the territory of Khîlî and Mûsh with the Utqûshids and even the Sayyûbd Nadjâm al-Dîn laid siege to Mûsh in 604 (1207) (Ibn al-Athîr, xii. 169, 185), and in 652 (1252) Djâjîl al-Dîn Khîrâhûmshah was master of the country; in that year a battle was fought by him and lost on the plain of Mûsh against the Saljuq ruler of Erzurum (Ibn al-Athîr, xii. 314; Djuwainî, Târîhî-i Djuhâr-ûshah, ili. 181). This accounts for the ruined state of the town in the middle of the xith century (Hamm Allah Mustawfi). After the Mongol period Mûsh was ruled by Tûsîr in 1356, when he invaded the possessions of the Karm Khoyunlu (Sharaf al-Dîn, ili. 419). In 1473 the power of the Karm Khoyunlu ruler Uruan Hâsan was definitely broken in Armenia and from that time on Mûsh belonged to the Ottoman Empire. At that time the population of its surroundings was already strongly mixed with Kurds and Turcomans. The direct authority was exercised by Turkish local chieftains, who, in the ruling system of the Empire, were subordinated, as sandjak-bey, either to the pasha of Bitlis or to that of Van. At the beginning of the xith century the rule of the khans the Akkoyunlu Emîn Pasha, who was deposed in 1828—1839 (Ritter, x. 676 and Shîfînî, 'Ethnok., i. 426). In the middle of that century, Mûsh became the chief town in the mutesh bânil Mûsh, in the sandjak Mûsh in the wilayet of Bitlis, and in the Turkish republic it is a bânil in the wilayet of Bitlis. The population of the town (some 5,000 inhabitants) was, until the Great War, half Armenian and half Muhammadan; one of the ancient Armenian churches had been converted in 966 (1571) into a mosque, according to an inscription (Ritter). The environs of Mûsh had also a mixed population, where, however, ancient Christian sanctuaries had long continued to exist, such as the monastery of Sûr Karpert, called by the Turks Câ достиж of and described by Ewliya Celebi.

During the Armenian troubles in the last years of 'Abd al-Ḥamd II's reign, in 1905, there began in Mûsh a revolutionary movement of Armenian tashnakists, which brought about an intervention of the Kurds and a suppression by government troops, in which the population suffered much. In the Great War the Russian advance in Armenia had gone as far as Mûsh, when, in accordance with the treaty of Brest-Litovsk (1917), the Russian troops retired in 1918, leaving this part of Armenia again in Turkish possession.


J. H. KRAMER

MUŞHAHF (see TASHKHêt.)

MUŞHÂF (m.), Ethiopic loanword (cf. Nîldeke, Neue Beiträge, p. 49 sqq.; the forms mus'hâf and muşhâf occur also; according to some grammarians they are less correct, especially the latter), codex, or, according to the definition of Arabic lexicographers, leaves (ms'Hâf, plural of ms'Hîf), when they are bound together between two covers. In the tradition on the redaction of the Kûrân (q.v.) by Hûdâlîa b. al-Yâmân during 'Uthmân's caliphate, it is said indeed, that the collection of leaves that had been made by 'Abî b. 'Abd Allâh at 'Umar's instance was copied and arranged into a muşhâf. These were sent to all regions (as standard copies); the ms'Hîf were restored to 'Umar's daughter Hâfîza, in whose possession they had ever since her father's death. Other ms'Hîf were annullated as often as occasion offered itself (Bâkûrî, Faqîl'î al-Kûrûmî, bâb 31; Ibrîm, bâb 7; Dîjâmî, bâb 12; Tûsîr, sûra 9, bâb 20; A'bâmîn, bâb 37; Tîmîrî, Tûsîr, sûra 9, trad. 19).

From the time of the redaction of the Kûrân under 'Uthmân maş'ûfîs are frequently mentioned in Arabic literature. In a tradition (on 'Amîr b. al-Ā's well known stratagem during the battle of Sûfîn it is said that a huge ms'Hîf from Damascas was tied to the points of three lances (al-Dînârî, Kîlît b. A'bâmîn al-Sûfînî, ed. Gûsas, p. 201 sqq.; Na'îr b. Musîmîn, Waft Sûfîn, Bairût 1921, p. 350; cf. p. 353); in other traditions "copies of the Kûrân" in several numbers are mentioned (e.g. Tabari, l. 3329).

In a tradition on the sâfî it is assumed that in the mosque of Madina the ms'Hîf had a fixed place (Bâkûrî, Sûfîr, bâb 95; Musîm, Sûfîr, trad. 265, 266; nowadays this place is by the fikca (cf. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, chap. Religion and Law, and see also, art. MUS'HÂF, I, D, f. —).

It is said that 'Uthmân had a ms'Hîf copied for her private use by her maid 'Abî Yûsûs (Tîmîrî, Tûsîr, sûra 2, trad. 29; cf. Bâkûrî, Faqîl'î al-Kûrûmî, bâb 6).

Ms'Hîf were taken into the field by Muslim soldiers (cf. Tîmîrî, Tûsîr, bâb 28; Abû Dâwûd, Dîjâmî, bâb 135); this practice met, however, with objections (cf. Bâkûrî, Dîjâmî, bâb 129; Musîm, Sûfîr, trad. 92, 93), founded on the fear that they might fall into impure hands. For a similar reason manuscripts impure in a ritual sense were prohibited from touching ms'Hîf, save in a special cover (ms'Hîf; Bâkûrî, Hâlî, bâb 3).

Bibliography: The lexica, a.v.

(J. H. WERNSINCK)
MUSHIR (a.), councillor, Turkish pronunciation mowshir and musfar (modern orthography mowshar) with meaning "Marshall". Mowshir literally means "one who points out, advises". Cf. also the Arabic musammār.

According to some authorities, mushir was at first (before the 'Ahlifisde) the title of the ministers (later mawṣūr) or secretaries of state (kaṭīb). So at least we are told by Ibn al-'Tiḥaṣṣī (ed. Dardenbourg, p. 206; transl. Aran, p. 344). Khalīf al-Zahrī (ed. Ravaisse, p. 106 and 114) says that it was "formerly" an official to whom he gives fourth rank in the hierarchy, which shows he clearly distinguishes him from the mashir, the title of a military. We seem however to have very little other information about this dignity. On the other hand, the word mowshir in a non-technical sense is often found along with mashir of which it sometimes seems to be a doubt or synonym (cf. Maqṣūr, ed. Wiet, iv, fasc. i, p. 20 and 74; Nolden, Die Erkennung von Mäuschen und einen Minister, Göttlingen 1879, p. 53: mowšir mawšir, mawšir mawšir).

We may note however that this older and broader conception did not survive. According to Ibn Khalidūn, the mawṣūr is, it is true, an "assistant to the sovereign, but to his predecessor Mawārid (Les statuts gouvernementaux, transl. Engman, p. 43 sqq.) the mawṣūr is not the adviser of the mawṣūr but his delegate.

If Ibn al-'Tiḥaṣṣī's statement is correct we must see a survival of this older state of affairs in the usage of the Murālik chancellery where we find among the honorifics šalātul of the title of that of mawšir al-da'wāt (or al-ṣalifam or al-mušir wa 'l-salifum). Cf. Kallugahndi, vi. 70.

The same usage, which perhaps came from the Ṣalīḥīya, is still more clearly established in the Ottoman chancellery. We actually find the word mawṣūr among the alfāb of the Turkish mawṣūr (mawṣūr) and almost at the head of the formulas, which shows its importance: diwāni mawṣūr, mawṣūr-i neṣṣābār, kibān al-Sīrīm etc. Whence in the epistolary style the epithet mawṣūr and mawṣūr-i čihrān are written along with diwāni and diwān-i čihrān or kibān and kibān-i čihrān to designate all that belongs to an official of the rank of the mawṣūr.

Maḥmūd II in creating the principal ministries naturally thought of again giving a real value to this title of mawṣūr, which he gave to the principal ministers, and in the reign of his successor 'Abd al-Maḏjdī "the privy council (medjīla-i bāši, a regular council of ministers) consisted of the grand vizier, the šalīk al-tāṣūm, eleven mawṣūr and three officials of the first rank" (Bianchi, Le premier ministre impérial de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris 1845, p. 7; Bianchi translates mawṣūr by "councillor or under-secretary of state" and has been followed by Barthier de Meynard in his Supplément, the references in which should be taken with this reservation). In 1250 (1835-1836) the title of mawṣūr was given to the new šalātul of the interior (mawṣūr-i neṣṣābār = the former šalīk al-tāṣūm) and of Foreign Affairs (medjīla-i neṣṣābār = the former neṣṣābār; cf. Lutfī, v. 20). The epithet mawṣūr-i čihrān was created in 1263 (1846) (Lutfī, viii 87).

Maḥmūd II also created the post of neṣṣābār-i da'wār or chief of the imperial guard, who bore the title mawṣūr-i neṣṣābār-i da'wār (mawṣūr-i da'wār), an officer who took rank after the šalīk al-tāṣūm or War Minister (Hammer, Hist. de l'Emp. Ott., xvii, 188 and 189). This title was soon to be contrasted with that of mawṣūr-i 'alā iš-khānūm by the other troops (Lutfī, v. 28).

The ministers did not long bear the title of mawṣūr which gave place to mawṣūr-i da'wār, but the former of these titles, perhaps under the influence of the word "mashir", which it more or less resembles, became a special military title. It became the highest rank in the army, corresponding to visir in the civil service and of ḥāṣkār in the religious hierarchy. At first the title ṭuḥbīl-i muṣṭafīr mawṣūr-i da'wār (cf. Lutfī, v. 68, 74) was given to the vizirs of certain provinces, or simply mawṣūr of such and such a province (bid. p. 165 sqq.; vi. 104, 105; vii. 70). This corresponded to the demarcation of the army corps.

The number of mawṣūr or "mashir" soon increased and in the reign of 'Abd al-'Amīd II, there were 39 in 1890 and in 1895, 31 (see the Sehīl-i 'asākīr of the years 1906 and 1911). Those who had the right to this title were the sa'ādeth or tāṣūm-i muṣṭafīr or "grand master of artillery", the sa'ādeth or tāṣūm-i da'wār or "grand master of the Palace" (replacing the old ṭanāfseh; according to Ahmad Rūsūm, Ta'rikh, i, 156 and 186), the ṭuḥbīl-i muṣṭafīr (as under Maḥmūd II), the commanders of the seven army corps (polāb, the heads of the army services, the bāshi-de camp to the saltān (jāfār-i shāhī). The only duty of the mawṣūr was to superintend the ceremony of the Sehīl-i shāhī (sehīl-i rūmān-i suḥra). The officer in charge of the police station (mutāhara) of Bejahteh, notably of Villits Kious, was also a mawṣūr (M.S.O.S., vii, 1908, p. 4, p. 40). Instead of sa'ādeth or tāṣūm-i mawṣūr the more usual phrase was muṣṭafīr-i mawṣūr (Lutfī, vii. 62).

The honorific form of address for a mawṣūr was dewāli (dewvetli) esfendīb kāhāzīl. In the plural the Persian form mawṣūr-i mawṣūr-i or with epithet mawṣūr-i mawṣūr-i. The name of the office is mawṣūr-i mawṣūr-i, more rarely mawṣūr-i mawṣūr-i (Lutfī, v. 94).

The title of mawṣūr, which has been borne by Muṣṭafā Kemāl Pāshā himself, has survived in the Turkish republic but there is at present only one mawṣūr in office, the Chief of the General Staff, Fawād Pāshā.

In Khedivial Egypt they stopped at a stage where the influence of the reforms of Maḥmūd II was still felt. The ṭuḥbīl mawṣūr there was down to the present reign exclusively the highest grade of officers but without distinction between military and civil officers. It was also in theory a civil rank (rūhā mawṣūr) to which all the princes of the khedivial house had a claim.

In Persia the title mawṣūr has been rarely used. Cf. however the case of the mawṣūr ed-devali (cf. the similar title above) borne by an aide-de-camp of Nasr al-Dīn Shāh (Fawwār, Trois ans à la Cour de Perse, p. 135-136).


MUSHRIK. [See SHIRK.]
AL-MUSHTARI, the planet Jupiter, Pers. ʿAmrūn, ʿAmerūn (Amr-naswād). The name of the planet is in Sumerian U.Su-nu, later also as Al-ʿUmarūn, “the white star” (Al-ʿUmarūn). In the later Acadian period it is always identified with the main star of Capricornus (Biblical Merodach). In Hebrew it is called ʿAvot, in Greek — just as among the Babylonians, and the symbol of the highest deity — of ʿAvot Ha-Aretz. As a synonym of Al-Mushtari we find (e.g. in Hadyah) the name Būrīq (cf. Luʾūm al-ʿArab, ii. 333).

The Arab astronomers, like Pythagoras and Plato, put Jupiter in the sixth sphere (spheres) from within i.e. the third from without. On the interior it joins the outer surface of the sphere of Mars and on the exterior the inner surface of the sphere of Saturn. The following table gives the least, mean and greatest distances of Jupiter from the centre of the earth, expressed in radii of the earth, as given by Al-Battāni (Opera astronomica, ad. Nallino, ch. 50), al-Farghani (Complutense, ch. 21), Ibn Rusta (Khitbat al-Maʾālik, ed. de Goeje, p. 18-20) and Abūthām bar Ḥiyā (Shābān al-maʾālik, ch. 9), as well as the Hindu values given by Al-Būrī in the compilation by Yākūb b. Ṭāhir of the year 161 A.H., and the modern figures for these distances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance (radii of the earth)</th>
<th>Mean distance</th>
<th>Greatest distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Battāni 3,022</td>
<td>10,473</td>
<td>14,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Farghani 2,876</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>14,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rusta 2,820</td>
<td>11,503</td>
<td>14,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Ḥiyā 8,000</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>14,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu (Al-Būrī) 3,019</td>
<td>10,866</td>
<td>13,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern 3,500</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>154,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The radius of the earth is here estimated at 3,200 (Al-Battāni, Al-Farghani and Bar Ḥiyā) and 3,818 Arab miles respectively (Ibn Rusta), while, according to Al-Būrī, the Hindu gives it as 4,050 (Glass 3,180 Arab miles (1 Ar. m. = 1,973 metres; ad. Nallino, Il valore metrico del grado di meridiano). The true geocentric distances of the planet Jupiter are actually about 11.5 times greater than given by Al-Battāni for example. It should however be pointed out that the relation of 37:23 or 11.5 to 1, the greatest and least observed apparent diameter taken by this scholar, with the help of which the distance of the apogee was calculated from the estimated distance of the perigee at 8,022 radii of the earth agrees remarkably well with the modern estimate. The apparent diameter of Jupiter at the mean distance is given by Al-Battāni as 1/13 of the diameter of the sun. From this and the mean distance he calculates the true diameter of Jupiter at 4/13 of the earths’ (82/4 radii) and its volume at 81 times that of the earth (i.e. 4/3). The true values are 2.56 (i.e. 170 times larger); diameter of Jupiter = 13,14 diameters of the earth, volume = 1,330 times the volume of the earth.

Following Ptolemy (Almages) Al-Battāni gives the greatest observed northern (geocentric) altitude as 2° 4′, the greatest southern as 2° 8′. On the other hand, he points out (ch. 31 and 42) that he found the length of the arc of the eccentric circle from his observations to be about 8° smaller (in 8° 9″ 4′ 16″ 28″ than was to be expected from the Almages, taking into account the precession.

The movement of Jupiter is as in the Almagest represented to be through four “spheres” (spheres), ʿalāf (cf. al-Battāni, O.P. astr., ch. 31). The astronomical tables take for its mean daily sidereal motion the value of 3°. Its period of sidereal revolution is given by al-Kaswin (Aḥsan, ed. Wüstenfeld, l. 756) at 11 years, 10 months, 15 days. Al-Mushtari in astrology. Al-Mushtari is the ruler (rāḥuk) of the Rūbāt al-Rūmān (Sagittarius), the right-hand and al-Fīrāw (Pisces, day-house), also right-ruler of the 1. Muthallath (Tiwetrum), which consist of al-Rumal (Aries), al-Aus (Leo) and al-Rūmān (Sagittarius), whose ruler by day is the sun, and finally companion (rāḥuk) of the 3. Muthallath, ʿAlī al-Rūmān (Cancer), its Haitā in the 15° of al-Sarafān (Cancer), its Haitā in the 15° of al-Qiyād (Capricornus). According to al-Kaswin (l. 22), “the astronomers call al-Mushtari the largest star of fortune”, al-Salīm al-dāhī, because its good influence surpasses that of Venus; they attribute to it numerous happy states and the greatest of all fortune. The idea that the planet Jupiter is a star of good fortune is general among other peoples also; we also find it in Babylonians, India and China. For further details of the part played by Jupiter in Arab astronomy see the works of Abū Maʿṣūr.

Bibliography: See that of the articles ʿUṣālī and Miṣṭārā. (W. Hartner)

MUSIKI or ʿaṣās or ʿaṣās as it was written in the West (al-ʿArabī, al-ʿIlum; Schiaparelli, Vocalisus in Arabico = Latinus musicus), is the name given to the science of music. It is a post-classical word derived from the Greek μουσική, and was already current at the time of Ikhān al-Mawili (d. 356 = 850) (v. i.). In the Moḥāfith al-ʿIlum (12th = 4th century) maʿṣūrī is one of the four mathematical sciences. Its author says: “As for maʿṣūrī, its meaning is the science of the composing of melodies (al-majdūl). It is a Greek word, and it is said to us the maʿṣūrī and the composer of the melodies is called maʿṣūrī or maʿṣūrī.” (p. 276). The contemporary Ḥakīm al-Saff (say 9 877): “Maʿṣūrī is qaḥān, and the maʿṣūrī is the maʿṣūrī, and the maʿṣūrī (maʿṣūrī kātarī in Dieticis) is the instrument of music (qaḥān).” The maʿṣūrī was the name given by the Arabs to the Greek or mathematical theory of music as distinct from al-ʿIlum al-ʿIlum (musical theory), as we know from the Kitāb al-ʿAṣīnī and Yaḥyā b. Abī b. Yaḥyā b. Abī Maʿṣūr (d. 300 = 912). The latter tells us (Brit. Mus. MS, Or. 3261, fol. 236v) of the “disagreement between the masters of Arab and the masters of [Greek] maʿṣūrī”. Of course, the Arabs and Persians possessed a theory of music longer before they became influenced by the translations made from the Greek.
at the end of the 8th (vith) and beginning of the 9th (ixth) century.

The Pre-Islamic System. The source of both Persian and Arabian theory of music was an older Semitic one which had influenced, if it had not been the actual foundation of Greek theory (cf. Farmer, Hist. Facts, p. 123). No Persian or Arabic technical nomenclature of a theory of wsflj (i.e. speculative theory) has come down to us from pre-Islamic times, although it must have existed. Al-Faṣrī (d. 339 = 950) describes a musical instrument, still used in his day, called the ṭemūr al-baghdadi or al-maṣrī, the frets (darāţa, a Persian word) of which gave a "pre-Islamic scale" (Kosegarten, Lib. cont., p. 98: Majāf al-Ultūm). It was a quarter-tone scale which was arrived at by dividing a string into forty equal parts. The idea could be traced to Eratosthenes (Ptolemey, Harm., ed. Wallis, i. 14) but probably was of far greater antiquity (Farmer, Influences in, Proceedings, Musical Association, 1926, p. 124). Although al-Faṣrī's instrument did not actually give the following scale, yet the theoretical division mentioned above would produce a scale which, expressed in cyclic cents, would register:

Frets: Nut 2nd 4th 6th 8th 10th
Cents: 0 89 182 285 368 498

J. P. N. Land was of opinion that the later Pythagorean lute scale of the Old Arabian School was derived from the system of the ṭemūr al-baghdadi. It is more likely however, that there was an earlier lute scale than that of the Old Arabian School, as has been hinted elsewhere (Farmer, Hist. of Arabian Music, p. 70). This was a one-octave scale fixed by the accoçtura (farāţa) C-D-G, the frets of which gave the following scale:

Cents: 0 204 408 498 702 906 1100 1200

For a discussion of this scale see Farmer, An Old Moorish Lute Tutor, p. 27; do., Hist. Facts, p. 310.

The Old Arabian System. In the 9th (vith) century we get definite glimpses of a theory in the music of the Arabs and Persians. We read of a certain Ibn Mīṣāḥ (q.v.) (d. ca. 97 = 715) who had learned Persian music (ghina) and accomplishments in playing (gār), and had received instruction from Byzantine (rīmā) bariton players (harbūtā) and theorists (mīṣāghānī = ṣuṣuqīrānī). These borrowings from abroad he incorporated into a system which came to be recognized throughout the peninsula (Kīth al-Asbūn, ill. 84). We are told however, that Ibn Mīṣāḥ rejected from Persian and Byzantine methods what he found to be "alien to Arabian music" (ghina). This would appear to show, as Land once pointed out (Remarques, p. 156), that these foreign importations did not supersede the national music, but were grafted upon an Arab root with a character of its own. We know that about the same time, or perhaps slightly later (Kīth al-Asbūn, i. 98), that the Arabs adopted the Persian lute in the place of their own instrument. This latter, as we have seen, gave a one-octave scale based on the accoçtura C-D-G, whilst the Persian lute was tuned in fourths thus: A-D-G-C, which enabled the performer to attain (with a shift) the double octave. Yet only the highest and the lowest strings of their old lute needed to be altered, and these were given the Persian names of sīr and ḥamm, whilst the second and third strings retained their old Arabic names of wsflj and maṣlāth. The new accoçtura of the lute brought about a change in the scale (bāְaţu), which was the following distribution of the frets shows (Brit. Mus. MS., Or. 2361, fol. 237). The lute with the Arabs was the basis of all "theory", just as the lyre was with the Greeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>Strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-D-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭemūr</td>
<td>0 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Open string)</td>
<td>996 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhāka</td>
<td>204 702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1st Finger)</td>
<td>1200 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansū</td>
<td>294 792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2nd Finger)</td>
<td>90 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīnšir</td>
<td>408 906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3rd Finger)</td>
<td>204 702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānšir</td>
<td>498 996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4th Finger)</td>
<td>294 792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, this scale did not satisfy everyone, and we find that the Persians introduced a new wusfāl fret at 303 cents, whilst later a famous musician at Hārūn's court named Zalāzīq (q.v.) (d. 175 = 791) adopted a fret at 355 cents, half-way between the new Persian wusfāl fret and the bīnsūr fret. By the time of Ištāk al-Mawṣūli (d. 236 = 850) these Persian and Zalāzīq frets seem to have created such confusion that the musician attempted to recast the lute scale in its old Pythagorean mould, which, as we are told, he did without recourse to Euclid or a solitary book of the "Ancients", as the Greeks of old were called (Kīth al-Asbūn, v. 52 = 53; Iṣṭak al-Fārābī, iii. 185). His reform appears to have been successful in Iran and lasted there until the 9th (xth) century (Kīth al-Asbūn, i. 2; Rasūl Aḥmad al-Safī, i. 98). Elsewhere however, Persian and Zalāzīq notes continued in favour, as we know from al-Faṣrī (Kosegarten, Lib. cont., p. 85) and the Majāf al-Ultūm, p. 239. A century later, whilst the Persian note of 303 cents had disappeared, that of Zalāzīq was still popular (Ibn Sinā, Šīfāt, India Office MS., fol. 177v).

There is but little preserved of the writings of the theorists of the Old Arabian School. Whether the books of Yūnus al-Kūtib (d. ca. 148 = 765) and the more famous al-Khūdī (d. 175 = 791) on music (magām and ṣawā) dealt with these theories we know not since they have perished (Fīshīrī, p. 43, 143). A similar fate appears to have overtaken the music books of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭāhir (d. ca. 300 = 912), ʿAbd b. Hārūn b. ʿAli b. Yahyā b. ʿAbd Manṣūr (d. 352 = 963) and Sulaymān b. Aḥṣāf al-Madīnī (Kīth al-Asbūn, v. 45; Fīshīrī, p. 144, 145). Beyond the sparse information given in the Kīth al-Asbūn and the Maṣūdī of al-Masūdī (viii. 89 sq.), we have only the Rivaţa fī ʿl-Muṣīqí of Yahyā b. ʿAli b. Yahyā b. ʿAbd Manṣūr (d. 300 = 912) to depend on, since the Kīth al-Lakw wa ʿl-Manāthī of Ibn Khurān-Dibbīh (d. ca. 300 = 912) (q.v.) is in private hands (Hillūt, xxvii. 209).

Although we read that Ištāk al-Mawṣūli made his calculations by ʿṣīb (Yahyā b. ʿAli, fol. 237v), yet the Old Arabian School, so far as we know from Yahyā b. ʿAli b. Yahyā, did not adjust the
frets of the lute (ʻūd) or pandore (punhār) by this method. Their rule for fixing the frets was based on tuning a note with its octave or, as they termed it, its ṣaḥār or ḍīf, although the latter term shows that they recognized the interval ratio 1:2. When the Greek scholiasts came to deal with the theory of music all this was changed.

The Greek Scholiasts. By the middle of the 5th (αὐτή) century, the efforts of the writings of the ancient Greeks on music, which had been translated into Arabic, began to be felt. Among these treatises were Aristotle’s Problems and De anima, the commentaries of Theonius and Alexander Aphrodissias on the latter, two works by Aristoxenos—excluding the ἀρχαία it would seem, the two books on music attributed to Euclid, a treatise by Nicomachus, presumably the lost book, and the Harmonics of Ptolemy, all or most of which had been translated by the first half of the 4th (αὐτή) century at least, as we know from al-Fārābī (Fīrārist, p. 266, 269, 370); Ibn al-Kişī, p. 65; al-Maḥṣūrī, Anāʾ, ii. 57; al-Qalqālī, iii. 186; B. G. A., vii. 128; Rūṣūl al-Ḥımūn al-Ṣūfī, l. 102; and Farma: Greek Theorists of Music in Arabic Translation in Jisr, xi., p. 325).

The ḥumūn al-muṣāḥah now became one of the courses of the wakāṭa rasūya or quadrivium, and was studied by most savants at this period although later a few sought shy of the subject probably, as in Western Europe (Farmer, Hist. Facts ..., p. 184), because it was too abstract (Ibn Khalīlī, iii. 471). The early scholiasts dealt with the theory of music, intervals (ṣaḥār), genera (ṣāhīh), species (ṣaḥān), systems (ṣāfīn, ṣawān), mutation (ṣuḥūl), and composition (ṣuḥūl), after the manner of the Greeks, and from the above order we can see that Euclid influenced them in this respect. To this was added rhythm (ṣuḥāl). All this was of immense value to Arab theorists and their later encylists, the Persians and Turks. Instead of the old method of describing intervals according to their frets they were now given definite names and recognized by ratios. The octave became al-kāl ("the whole"), whilst the fifth, fourth, and diatonic were given identical names in Arabic. The tone was variously known as the ṣāfīn, ṣawān or maṣla. The semitone or waṣṣ ḥādī was recognized in two forms, the ṣuḥāl or ṣawān, and the ṣuḥāl or ṣawān, whilst the quarter-tone was the ṣuḥāl. In some ways the Scholiasts were slavish and diffuse in what they borrowed, although in others they were eclectic. On the question of the physical bases of sound however, and their treatment of musical instruments, they pushed ahead of their masters.

The first to take advantage of the newly-found treasures of the "Ancient" was al-Kīn dī (d. 260 = 874) [q. v.]. Seven treatises on music theory appear under his name (Fīrārist, p. 255-257); Ibn al-Kişī, p. 370; Ibn Aḥt Usūlīn, i. 210, and four of them would seem to have survived (Farmer, Hist. of Arabian Music, p. 27); so, Some Musical MSS. identified, p. 99. Three of them are at Berlin (Alwārdī, Fīrārist, Nrs. 5593; 5593; 5531); Rūṣūl al-Ḥımūn al-Ṣūfī, l. 85; and another without title. The fourth, the Rūṣūl al-Kāl al-Dīn, is in the British Museum (Or. 2361), and is probably later than the others. In the latter we see the author’s indebtedness to Euclid and Ptolemy. He had written a Rūṣūl al-Kāl al-Dīn, presumably Euclid’s ʿAlītān, notation which was an improvement on Greek methods, but his pointing the way to a reform of the scale was probably of greater import to the Arabs. By introducing a fifth string on the lute, so as to reach the double octave without recourse to the shift, he obtained the Complete System (ṣam al-ṣam: Ptolemy’s συμμέτρια ρῆμα). To accomplish this a fret called the muṣāḥah had to be introduced at 114 cents between the watīf and the rabbīha fret, which in itself created another problem, and eventually led to frets being tried between the watīf and the above muṣāḥah at 90 cents and between the watīf and bīṭīf frets at 384 cents. Here was the germ of the ḥumūn, which, coming scale of the latter wakāt rasūya al-kāmīn, the forerunner of the Systematic scale.

After al-Kīnī, we have a gap of a century in actual documents. There are names of theorists in abundance but their works have not survived. Al-Kīnī’s two disciples, Aḥmad b. Muhammad al-Sarāḥkhī (d. 286 = 899) and ʿAlī b. Ṭalḥa (Tāhir, contributed works on the theory of music, the former writing six (Fīrārist, p. 117, 149, 261). More important perhaps were the three books of Ṭabīb b. Kurra (d. 288 = 901) [q. v.], as well as those of Muhammad b. Zakariyā al-Āzīzī (d. 320 = 932) [q. v.] and ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Ṣamīʿ (d. ca. 320 = 930) [q. v.]. The greatest of all the scholiasts however was al-Fārābī (d. 339 = 950) [q. v.]. Ibn Aḥt Usūlīn, i. 309; Kitāb al-Aghāni, viii. 34; Ḥalījī Khallī, v. 164). The Kitāb al-Muṣāḥah al-adwī, has been preserved. This treatise, so he tells us, was written because he found an "incompleteness" in what had been handed down from the Greeks. It has been called the "most important treatise on the theory of Oriental music" (cf. vol. ii. 54), but it probably deserved to rank as one of the greatest works that had been written on music. His treatment of the physical and physiological principles of sound and music is certainly an advance on the Greeks, whilst he was the first to devote a detailed study to musical instruments, a subject on which nothing has come down to us from the Greeks. Al-Fārābī was a good mathematician and physicist, and that enabled him to do justice to what the Arabs called the ibn al-naqṣ or speculative theory, even to not repeating the errors of the Greeks (Farmer, Hist. Facts ..., p. 292-293). Yet he was something more. He was a practical musician and could appreciate the art as well as the science, which was more than Themiustus could do, as al-Fārābī himself mentions. As a performer with a reputation (Ibn Khalīlī, iii. 309; Rūṣūl al-Ḥımūn al-Ṣūfī, l. 85) he could bring the ibn al-naqṣ or practical art to bear upon the discussions. So whilst he was more thorough than the Greeks in handling the physical bases of sound, he could also make valuable contributions to physiological acoustics, i.e. the sensations of tone, a question which the Greeks left practically untouched.

By the time of al-Fārābī further additions had been made to the scale. The principle by which the Persian and Zatalian muṣāḥah frets at 303 and 355 cents had been determined, was also applied to the insertion of corresponding muṣāḥah frets,
between the muqāṣaṣ and the abābān, at 145 and 168 cents, with the result that there were now three muqāṣaṣ frets known respectively as the Ancient, Persian, and Zalzālān, whilst the one at 114 cents had disappeared. Here is the fretting of the lute in al-Fārābī’s day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>Strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At-Fārābī also noted the scale of the paukār al-khurādān proceeding by the ḍumma, ḍumma, ḍumma, which doubtless was prompted by al-Kindi’s speculations. It became the parent of the later theory of al-Farabi. In describing the scales of the ṭabāb or rebec he shows one that gave the just minor third (316) and just major third (356).

The next great writer after al-Fārābī was Abū ’l-Wafā’ al-Buzjānī (d. 388 = 993) [q.v.], the most eminent of the Arabic writers on mathematics. His book on rhythm (ṣaṣr) has unfortunately disappeared, although its importance has been testified to (Bibl. Ind. 1849, p. 93). The contemporary encyclopedists, the Ikhwān al-Safā’ in their Rasa’il, and Muḥammad b. Āḥmad al-Khwārizmi in his Maqāṣid al-Ulūm, also dealt with the theory of music. The latter does not break fresh ground although his work is helpful in controlling others. The former, however, are of considerable importance because of their able and lucid treatment of acoustics. Here is an instance. According to Helmholtz (op. cit., p. 10), musical tones are distinguished by their force, pitch, and quality, and the force of a musical tone, he says, increases and diminishes with the extent or so-called amplitude of the oscillations of the particles of the sounding body. Preece and Stroh refused to accept this definition and pointed out that loudness does not depend upon amplitude of vibration only, but upon the quantity of air put in vibration (P. R. S., xxvii., p. 366). The Ikhwān al-Safā’ had already enunciated this opinion. *Holony bodies* they say, *like vessels ... will resound for a long time after they are struck, because the air within them reverberates time after time until it becomes still. Consequently, the wider the vessels are, the greater the sound, because more air is put in vibration* (l. 89). They also recognized the spherical propagation of sound (l. 88), which was an improvement on the Aristotelian De auditibus (802, 4), which said that “the direction of sound follows a straight line” (cf. Vitruvius, De arch., v. 3).

The next writers whose works have been spared are Ibn Sinā (d. 428 = 1037) [q.v.] and Ibn Zālīs (d. 440 = 1048). Two treatises on music stand to the credit of Aviceanna, as he was known in Europe, and they are contained in the *Shifā* (India Office MS., 1811) and the Nāqīṭ (Bodleian MS. Marsh, 321) (Ibn al-Ḫūṭīṭī, p. 413; Ibn Abī Usbīḥ ḩūṣî, ii. 23; cf. Cašīrī, i. 271). Unlike al-Fārābī, the Sāfī al-Wāṣīṣ was not a professional musician, yet his biographers claim that he dealt with questions on the theory of music which were neglected by the Greeks. He is scientific and philosophic in his approach, and even critical at times, but he displays little of that originality that is so apparent in his other writings. Ibn Zālīs was his disciple and echoed his opinions, although some fresh details emerge when dealing with the practical art. He quotes from al-Kindi on the question of rhythm, and is useful on that account.

Egypt also contributed its quota of music theorists, two outstanding writers being Ibn al-Haitham (d. 430 = 1039) [q.v.] and Abū ’l-Ṣāliḥ Umrīyya (d. 528 = 1134). Ibn al-Haitham appears however to have written commentaries on both the *katara* and the *kayāra* above of Euclid (Ibn al-Ḫūṭīṭī, p. 168; Ibn Abī Usbīḥ ḩūṣî, ii. 90). Although there were several Arabic commentaries on Euclid’s *Music* not all one appears to have survived. Yet we have at least two in Hebrew whose authors probably depended on Arabic works. One of these was Moses N. Levy (Halevy), who writes Ḫemm Tob b. Isaac Shabrīj, and the other was Ḫemm b. Isaac. (Bīḥr ḥabāḥ hāʾrāʾṭ, Yar. li., xxii., xxx.). The Ṣāfī al-Wāṣīṣ by Abū ’l-Ṣāliḥ was probably of some importance since it is quoted by Jewish writers (Ibn Abī Usbīḥ ḩūṣî, ii. 52; Al-Rawādī, Fars, N. 5536 [5]; P. Duran, Gramm., Vienna 1883, p. 37). In Syria we have Ibn al-Naḡīṣā (d. 574 = 1178), Abū ’l-Hākam al-Baḥḥīl and his son Abū ’l-Maḏđī Muḥammad (d. 576 = 1180), and Alum al-Dīn Kāʾṭar (d. 649 = 1251), all of whom are interested in music theory (Ibn Abī Usbīḥ ḩūṣî, ii. 144, 155, 162, 181; Ibn Khālīkān, iii. 471), whilst farthest East we have such names as Ibn Man’a, ‘Abū al-Mu’allā b. Ṣaff al-Dīn (d. 551 = 1158), ‘Abū al-Mu’īn b. Ṣaff al-Dīn (d. 564 = 1169) [q.v.], Faqhī al-Dīn al-Ṭāfī (d. 605 = 1209) [q.v.], and Naǧīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī (d. 673 = 1274) [q.v.] (Ibn Khālīkān, ill. 467; Bodleian MS. Ouseley, N. 117; Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2972; Paris Bibl. Nat. MS., Arabe, N. 1456). In the West, the two theories of consequence are Ibn Mandūq (d. 532 = 1142) [q.v.] whose book on music enjoyed the same reputation in the West as that of al-Fārābī in the East (al-Maḵṣṣār, Arab, ii. 125), and Ibn Rūḥāl (d. 594 = 1198) [q.v.] whose commentary on Aristotle’s De anima reveals that lucidity of treatment in the section dealing with the phenomena of sound that made him so famous on other questions.

The *Systematīc School*. After Ibn Sinā and Ibn Zālīs, the most thorough exposition of the theory of music, so far as existing documents show, was made by a musician in the service of the last Caliph of Baghdaḏ, named Ṣaff al-Dīn ‘Abū al-Mu’īn b. Faḥīr (d. 652 = 1294) [q.v.], the author of two estimable works, the Ṣafīlāt al-Ṣarāfīyya and the Ṣafīlāt al-Aḥṣābār, which almost every subsequent writer in music uses as his principal authorities. A later theorist, ‘Abū al-Khaṭīr b. Ghulām, frankly admitted that Ṣaff al-Dīn was the fountain head in the theory, whilst a modern has called him “the Zarlino of the Orient” (Kiesewetter, p. 135, and many commentators have been pressed on his theories. Ṣaff al-Dīn was no mere philosopher, and he attacks both al-Fārābī and Ibn Sinā when
he finds that their terms and definitions are inexact. Much of it may be more quibbling over verbal niceties, but it redounds to his credit that he realized that in a science we must start off with terminological exactitudes. Like al-Farabi, he was a practical musician, and the reform of the scale, which must be attributed to him (cf. Helmholz, p. 280), was possibly due to this fact. The Greek scholars had done much to stabilize Arabic music theory, yet anomalies still existed. The most notable was the Zalzalian maqāṣid note at 355 cents together with its attendant sixth at 853 cents. These did not conform to the scholastics' scale which produced a succession of fourths (cf. Helmholz, p. 281). It was to remedy this defect, it would seem, that Šaff al-Dīn laid down a new theory of the scale in which the octave was divided into seventeen intervals in the succession of limma, summa and comma, which enabled him to embrace the fractious Zalzalian notes at 355 and 853 cents by close approximations which worked out at 384 and 882 cents. This scale, which has been considered "the most perfect ever devised" (Perry, Art of Music, i, ed., p. 29), gave commoners no more trouble than our scale of equal temperament can afford us (Riemann, Catechism of Musical History, i, 65). It is no wonder therefore that Helmholz has considered the theory of the Systematist School so "noteworthy in the history of the development of music" (p. 285). Here is the scale of Šaff al-Dīn:

**Frets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>498</th>
<th>996</th>
<th>294</th>
<th>792</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strings</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musāqāt</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sabūsū</strong></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parsīn maqāṣid</strong></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>792</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zalzalian maqāṣid</strong></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bahīṣṭ</strong></td>
<td>408</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Khuṣṣār</strong></td>
<td>498</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the fall of Baghān (654 = 1256), the hub of culture moved further East, and the writings of the Systematist School have to be sought as much in Persian as in Arabic. Most of this literature has been preserved. Kūth al-Dīn al-S̱hāṟḻāṟ (d. 710 = 1310) [q. v.], who devoted a valuable γράμμα to the "science of music" in his Durr al-Tafqīl (Brit. Mus., MS. Add. 7694), was the first of these writers in Persian. He was followed by Muḥammad b. Mahbūb al-Amuli (viiith = viiiith century), whose Nafis al-Funūn also has a section on music (Brit. Mus., MS. Add. 16826). Another viiiith century Persian work deserving of mention is the Kamo al-Tahaf (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 2361). More important were the four works of Abd al-Kādir b. Ghashī (d. 839 = 1435) [q. v.], entitled the Qāni al-Alkān, with its two epiphanies the maqāṣid al-Alkān and the Misqat al-Alkān (Bohler MSS., Marsh, No. 282, Qaseyley, No. 264, 353), and the Sharḥ al-Adwar. A fifth work, the Kamo al-Alkān, the most precious of all since it contained noted music, has disappeared. Ibn Ghashī depends on al-Farābi, Ibn Sinā, and Šaff al-Dīn, but is by no means servile. What he adds to our knowledge of the music of his day concerns the practical art. Both his son and his grandson were theorists, and their works still exist, the Nafis al-Adwar and the Misqat al-Adwar (Burns Urmóhána Library, Nos. 3640, 3649). They were in the service of the Turkish sultāns, who were now patronising this class of savants, and we find two theorists, Kūth b. Abd al-Lāh and Ahmad Ughlā Shakhrukhā, writing in Turkish, the latter translating the Kitāb al-Adwar of Šaff al-Dīn (Lavigne, No. 2978). They were eclipsed, however, by two Arabic writers, the author (d. 855 = 1451—1481) of the Muḥammad b. Muḥāfiz Tratatīs (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 2361), and Muḥammad b. Abd al-Hamīd al-Lāhijā (d. 880 = 1478—1512), the author of the Risāla al-Shāfīyā (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 6629). Lāhijā was the last writer to deal in an appreciable way with the speculative theory of music which had been suggested by the Scholastics (cf. Kiesewetter, p. 88).

As for the author of the Muḥammad b. Muḥāfiz Tratatīs, we have in him an able mathematician who places the Aritmētēs of Nicomachus and Ibn Sinā under contribution. He is replete with argument and carefully examines the statements of his predecessors on questions of acoustics. We find him saying that he had put certain theories to practical test and found them wanting. He gives divisions of the string other than those laid down by Šaff al-Dīn.

The contemporary encyclopedia also contains a section on music, the most noteworthy being the Durr al-Naṣmim (Vienna MS., IV, No. 4) by Jāhān al-Qādirī (Brit. Mus., MS. Add. 2497 = 1438), the Maqāṣid al-Ultām (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 3143) attributed to Ali b. Muḥammad al-Djurdjānī (d. 816 = 1413), and the Umūma al-Djurdjānī (Vienna MS., IV, F. 3, No. 7) by Muḥammad Shāhī Cēbūlī (d. 839 = 1435). To al-Djurdjānī may also be ascribed the Sharḥ Maqāṣid Muḥarrāk Shāhī, the most thorough and illuminating commentary on the theories of Šaff al-Dīn, Abd al-Maʿmīn, and the most strikingly original treatment of the physical and physiological rudiments of sound (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 2361). After the close of the viiith (xvith) century, treatises on the idār al-maṭālāt are rare. Writers abound who profess to deal with it, but actually they are concerned primarily with the practical art. If any idār is displayed in these later books it is the idār al-maṭālāt, and authors all their pages with astrological tables linking up the twelve buqūṭ of the heavens with the twelve maḥāmāt, and so forth. Many treatises are written in verse, a form which, however much it may attract the pure aesthete, is scarcely suitable in dealing with a science. The author of one of these however, Shams al-Dīn al-Sahlānī al-Dhahabī (or al-Dimashqī), is worthy of attention: by reason of his use of a stave for the purpose of a musical notation, a device which may be traced to the year 1200 at least (Bohler MS., Marsh, No. 82; Paris Bibl. Nat. MS., Arabic, No. 2453). In the West, treatises on the theory of music are scarcer still. Ibn Khalīdīn (d. 809 = 1406) [q. v.], gives a glimpse of what was taught under this heading in his day (Prot., li, 410), but actual works are rare. A certain Abd al-Rahman al-Fāris wrote a treatise in 1650 entitled the Kitāb al-Dhābībī fi līm al-Maṭālāt wa l-Tamār (Shahrendī, Pers., No. 5521), but its author borrows his theory from older authorities (Farmer, An Old Moorish Lute Tutor, p. 14).
The Modern School. The chief feature of this school is the so-called quarter-tone system, and its most important theorist is Mīkhāʾil Muḥāska (d. 1888) [q.v.]. The system was not invented or introduced by him as Parisot thought (Koppert, p. 21), because Muḥāska himself tells us that it existed before his day (M. F. O. B., vi. 52, 103). Nor can we say that the sixteenth century was the period of its origin (cf. Lachmann, Grove’s Dict. of Music, iii. 576) since we know that it was practised in the eighteenth century as Baron de Tott (La Borde, i. 436–439), Todorini (l. 243) and Murat (Félix, iii. 363) have shown. Nor can it be traced in a MS. mentioned by Villoteau, as Land suggested (Recherches, p. 77–78), because this work can be identified with a MS. entitled al-Shafīʿa al-Muḥāska (Brit. Mus., MS. Or. 1535) in which there is no mention of the quarter-tone theory. How did the system originate? Dr. Lachmann holds that it was due to the needs of transposition (Grove’s Dict. of Music, iii. 567). On the other hand, Collanettes averts that in actual practice (for the lute is no longer fretted) it is simply the Systematist scale to which several smaller intervals have been added (p. 440). Some of the technical terms used in the system are of Persian origin such as those for the quarter-tone, three-quarter-tone, and tone, min’arabah, tk. ’arabah, and bardo. Further, as early as the ninth century, as we know from Ibn Ghāthīr, Shīhāb al-Dīn al-ʿAdilī, and the author of the Muhammad b. Muḥāska treatise, intervals finer even than those of the Systematist School were being used in the newly-adopted ḥabīb or modal extensions, which were not used in the time of Ṣafī al-Dīn ’Abd al-Muḥāska, although they are part of the earlier? Persian system as reflected in the Bahjat al-Ma’ṣūm by ’Abd al-Muḥāska b. Ṣafī al-Dīn (Boedean MS., Qasim, No. 137). A Persian origin of the quarter-tone system is, therefore, not unlikely, although Mahmod Rāghūnā, a well-known writer on Turkish music, argues in favour of a Greek origin (see τὰ Ῥωμαϊκά τῶν Μιντēν τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος, May–Oct., 1924, and the Türkische Post, June and Aug., 1928). In the eighteenth century we have evidence (La Borde, i. 436) that the octave was divided into twenty-four equal parts of 50 cents each producing a scale comprising three major tones of 200 cents, each divided into four quarter-tones, and four minor tones of 150 cents, each divided into three quarter-tones.

This is the same scale as the preceding with the exception that the base has been given a lower note in the system, i.e. yākhā instead of vast. The system of the quarter-tone scale is generally accepted to-day throughout the Islamic Near East (Collanettes, p. 415), and even the Middle East (Ali Naṣīr Khān Waziri).

Although in the Maghībīr very little is written about the theory of music nowadays, yet in Egypt, Syria, Persia, and Turkestan, there is a mass of books on the subject, as the Bibliography will show, although many of the treatises are merely manuals for practitioners. Even in Turkestan, under the auspices of the Soviet, works are being published. During the last decade a great fillip has been given to the study of the theory of music by the establishment of conservatories of music in the great Oriental capitals and chief cities, notably the Tar al-Akhār at Constantinople and the Nāṭī al-ʿUṣūr bi-l-Sirāj at Cairo.

Bibliography: General works quoted of the... Aḥṣāfī, Leyden 1888; Cairo, Bibli. Arab. Hist. Eserkenten. sterling, 1760–
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MUSIKI — MUSLIM


(H. G. Farmer)

MUSLIM (m.), part. IV of s-lm., denotes the adherent of Islam [q.-v.]. The term has become current in some European languages (also in the forms musulm, muslim), as a noun or as an
Still, it is not difficult to trace in the order of the traditions in Muslim's Şāhī the closest connection with corresponding ideas of ǧāh. As a matter of fact the groups of traditions have been provided with superscriptions which may be compared with Bukhārī’s tārījī; this was not, however, done by Muslim himself, as appears from the fact that the headings are not uniform in the different editions of the Şāhī.

A second difference between Muslim and the other collections consists in the fact that he pays peculiar attention to the ismāʾ, to such an extent that a tradition in his work is often followed by several different ismāʾ which serve as an introduction to either the same or a slightly different mata. Such a new ismāʾ is indicated in the text by t (tabut or ḫumūla "change"). Muslim is praised for his accuracy regarding this point; in other respects, however, Bukhārī is superior to him, as is even recognized by a man so devoted to him as al-Nawawī, who wrote upon the Şāhī a commentary, which in itself is a work of immense value for our knowledge of Muslim theology and ǧāh.

Muslim has prefixed to his work an introduction to the science of tradition. The work itself consists of 52 books which deal with the common subjects of hadīṯ: the five pillars, marriage, slavery, heretic, hereditary law, war, sacrifice, manumission and customs, the Prophets and the Companions, predetermination and other theological and eschatological subjects. The book closes with a chapter on the Kurʾān (tajjīr), the shortenings of which is several times outweighed by the value of the Kitāb al-ilmūn, which opens the work, and which is a complete survey of the early theology of Islam.


MUSLIM b. KURAIŠH SHARAF AL-DINWALA ʿAUʾL-MAKARIM of the Arab family of the ʿUkailī [see Qaṭilīn] was the most important ruler of the last great Arab dynasty in the Near East; during his reign the struggle between Pāṭimids and ʿAbbāsids for supremacy in Syria and Mesopotamia was decided in favour of the latter. In the year 433 (1043) the 20 year old Muslim was chosen chief of the tribe after the death of his father Kuraišh b. Badrān and succeeded him as ruler of Mūṣul. Like most Arab rulers of the lands of the Euphrates he recognised the Pāṭimid caliph in Cairo as his suzerain, although he was himself a Shīʿa. Early in his reign he began to cherish the ambitious plan of gradually extending the rule of his tribe over Mesopotamia. Every means of extending his power was taken by him. The first opportunity occurred
when in 458 (1066) the Saljūq Sultan Alp Arslan [q.v.] after conquering the kīwarīmshans was proceeding to establish his supremacy in Syria. For this he had to entice the Arab chiefs from the sphere of influence of the Fatimid caliph and win them over to an alliance with him and to a recognition of the Fatimid caliph. He therefore concluded an alliance with Muslim and granted him several towns in Mesopotamia. As a partner in this alliance Muslim defeated the Banū Kilāb who were vassals of the Fatimids. In 463 (1070) Alp Arslan died. The alliance was renewed with his son Sultan Malik Shāh [q.v.]. With his help Muslim was able a few years later to extend his power into Syria and take Aleppo. In 472 (1079) this town had no strong owner; the town was ruled by the Rāj al-Khūta 'īni, and the citadel by one of the last Mirdāšids [cf. the article Ḥalāb]. There was a lack of provisions, as the town was continually threatened by enemies and the roads to it were cut off.

Damascus was in possession of Sultan Tūtūsh [q.v.], to whom his brother Malik Shāh had granted Syria, which was still to be conquered. It was natural for Tūtūsh to wish to conquer Aleppo also into his power, but the people did not care for him because of his cruelty and greed, shut their gates against him, and appealed for help to Muslim. After Tūtūsh had withdrawn, Muslim approached the town with large supplies of provisions and after lengthy negotiations both town and citadel were handed over to him [see Ḥalāb] and the Mirdāšid chieftain received some smaller towns in compensation. He received a grant of confirmation from Malik Shāh, who did not want his brother to become too powerful, on paying a considerable annual tribute (£ 150,000). Muslim extended his territory by adding to it Ruha (Edessa), Harrān and a number of smaller fortresses, out of which he drove the leaders of Turkish bands so that his power stretched from Northern Syria to the Euphrates. Instead of being content with this his unbounded ambition made him overestimate his strength. Like Tūtūsh he dreamed of conquering all Syria, especially Damascus. He could not obtain the town from Malik Shāh who had granted Central Syria to Tūtūsh. He therefore again joined forces with the enemy of the Saljūq, the Fatimid caliph, who promised to send troops to assist him to take Damascus. Muslim took advantage of the absence of Tūtūsh who was engaged in a campaign against the Byzantines in Antioch, to advance on Damascus. He occupied several towns in Central Syria, including Rašīb (q.v.). But the Fatimid help did not materialise and Tūtūsh was called back by his vassals who hated Muslim. These circumstances and a rising in Harrān forced him to retire. To replace Muslim who had deserted him, Malik Shāh bestowed his favour on the sons of a former vizier of the 'Abbāsid, ibn Dājrī, and sent them against a supporter of the Fatimids, the Marwānid Manṣūr, to depose him of his chief possession 'Amīd. The latter found support from Muslim. They joined forces, were attacked at Khadd and withdrew into the fortified town leaving their other possessions undefended. Sultan Malik Shāh seized the opportunity to send 'Amīd al-Dawla, another son of Dājrī, to Mūsul, to take this city from Muslim who had in the meanwhile escaped from 'Amīd. When Muslim saw that he had lost his possessions he made overtures to the Sultan through the son of the vizier Niẓām al-Mulk and humbly begged for mercy. The Sultan, who thought Muslim no longer dangerous, pardoned him and restored his lands to him but Muslim could not be at peace. Perhaps in secret agreement with Malik Shāh, he turned in 477 (1084) against a Saljūq prince of Asia Minor, Sulaimān b. Ḥūtalnī, who had taken Antioch from the Byzantines and demanded from him the same tribute as the Byzantines had paid. When Sulaimān refused to pay, he advanced against him with a force of Arabs and Turkmans. In the neighbourhood of Antioch in Safar 478 (May 1085) the forces met, unexpectedly for Shāraf al-Dawla; his troops, who hated Muslim, went over to Sulaimān. Muslim was defeated and slain along with 400 of his Arabs (cf. Ibn al-'Ādīm, fol. 650). With his death the power of the 'UkJalīs was at an end. They lost Aleppo on Muslim's death and only survived a few years longer (till 489 = 1099) as governors of Mūsul [see 'UkJalīs]. Muslim is described as an able and just man and his tolerance of Christians was remarkable. His rule is said to have been able and orderly and indeed he did bring the finances of Aleppo into order in a very short time after taking it. In any case he had wide vision and successfully endeavoured to maintain the power of the Arab tribes in Syria and Mesopotamia. It ceased with him; Turkish generals became the rulers of Syria and Mesopotamia.


MUUSLIM b. UKBA of the tribe of the Banū Mūsul, a famous leader in the armies of the Sufyānid caliphs. We know very little about the early stages of his career. We find him early established in Syria to which he probably came with the first conquerors. Completely devoted to the Umayyads and of great personal value, he led a division of Syrian infantry at the battle of Siffin. But he failed in an attempt to take the oasis of Dūmat al-Djandal [q.v.] in 480 (1090) with the help of All. The caliph Mu'tawiyya appointed him to take charge of the Ḥakīla, the finances, of Palestine, a lucrative office in which he refused to enrich himself. Muslim was prominent at the death-bed of Mu'tawiyya. The caliph had charged him and Dājrī b. Kā'īn with the regency until the return of Yazid who was in Anatolia at the head of his troops. The confidence which the great Sufyānīd had in his loyalty is seen in his advice to his heir: "If you ever have trouble with the Hijāz, just send the one-eyed man of the tribe of Mūsul there" (Muslim had only one eye). This time had now come.

Muslim had been a member of the embassy sent to Medīna to bring the Anšār back to obedience. All other efforts at conciliation having failed, Yazid I decided to resort to force. In spite of Muslim's age and infirmities, Yazid felt he was the man to command the expedition. He was obliged to travel in a litter so infirm was he. At Waqqūf al-Kurāsh, Muslim met some Umayyads who had been driven out of Medīna; these exiles informed him of the military situation of the town. When he reached the oasis of Medīna, Muslim encamped on the harrān of Wāqīm and for three days awaited the result of the negotiations begun with the rebels. Anšār and descendants of the muhājīrin of the Kurāsh. On the fourth day, all overtures
having been rejected, he made his plans for battle. It was a Wednesday, the third last day of Luḥa #Hijjah 63 (Aug. 26-27, 683). After a slight initial advantage for the Anṣār, the battle ended at midday in the complete rout of the rebels. The Syrians followed them into Medina and began to plunder the city. Anti-Umeyyad legend has much exaggerated the horrors and the duration of this pillaging which it extends to three days. On the day after the battle, Muslim's intervention restored order and he used the next few days in drawing up the case against and trying the principal leaders of the rebellion who had fallen into his power.

Having established order in the town, which he left in charge of Rawḥ b. Zinaa', in spite of the aggravation of his malady, he resumed his march on Meccat to deal with Abd Allâh b. al-Zubair [q.v.] who had rebelled against the Umayyads. Arriving at Muhshallat [q.v.] he became so ill that he had to stop. In obedience to the caliph Yazid's instructions, he appointed to succeed him in command of the army Husain b. al-Nunmar [q.v.], his second in command. He died at Muhshallat, where his tomb long continued to be stoned by the passers-by. Writers with Shia sympathies are fond of twisting the name Muslim into Murujī (criminal: an allusion to Kūrān, v. 36; vii. 79; xl. 29, 36 and passim). One statement must be a ridiculous exaggeration puts his age at 90. Every thing, however, points to his having been born before the Hijra. He died a poor man. This disinterestedness is not the only feature in his character which makes us take him as one of the most representative of the types of this generation of soldiers and statesmen, whose talents contributed so much to establish the power of the Umayyads. Dovy described him as "un Bédouin mécréant". Muslim, it is true, retained all the proverbial uncouthness (djebare) of the Hann Murra. But his whole career reveals the Murrii general as a convinced Muslim of a rectitude rare in this period of unsettlement, which saw so many extraordinary vicissitudes of fortune and wavering loyalties.

Bibliography: Tabart, ed. de Goeje, i. 3283; ii. 198, 409-415, 427. Other references are given in the writer's Califat des Yezidis, vol. 2, p. 223 sqq., reprint from M.F.O.B., v. 225 sqq., and in his Etude sur le régime du califat omayyade Mecca, in M.F.O.B., i. sqq., p. 19, 45, 260, 373. (H. Lamens)

MUSLIM B. AL-WALID AL-ANŠARĪ (called Sharī al-Ghamzāi = "the who is laid low by the fair ones", as was al-Kurāni [q.v.] before him), an Arab poet of the early 'Abbasid period, born in Kufa c. 130-140 (747-757), d. 208 (825) in Djeddih. His father, abu suwaila [q.v.] of the Anṣār [q.v.], was a weaver. Nothing is known of the poet's education. He probably got his literary training not from particular teachers or from books but in the busy life of the Meopotamian cities, the intellectual life of which had risen to a still higher level with the advent of the 'Abbasids. Like most of his contemporaries he earned his living as a poet by writing panegyrics and was acquainted with many statesmen and emirs. Among them were the general Yazid b. Mas'ud al-Shallahi (see. Dinwān, i. 1, 10, 16, 49), Dāʾi b. Yāziq al-Muhammadi (Ngl. 20), Mansūr b. Yāziq al-Himyarī (Ngl. 31) and many others. He gradually won the favour of the influential Barmakids (cf. Ngl. 17, 40, 45) and of the caliph Harūn al-Rashīd (Ngl. 14, 41, 57); according to one story, he received his nickname from the latter on account of a verse of his (Ngl. 3, 33; cf. also Ngl. 23, 23). He even mentions the caliph's sister 'Abīnā (the emir of Ngl. 57, sqq.). The fall of the Barmakids about 803 did not affect his career: he dedicated some of his odes to al-Amin (Ngl. 3, 32, 39) but his principal patron in later times was al-Ma'mūn's visir Fadl b. Sahl [q.v.]. Through his intervention he received from al-Ma'mūn an official post (probably gāḥ̄f al-kalârī) in Djeddih. He remained faithful to Fadl b. Sahl until his death in 802 (818), and out of grief for him he wrote no more. There is a story told by his rawi according to which he destroyed a considerable part of his poems before his death.

As regards the manner and style of his poems he was on quite traditional ground. In addition to his old-fashioned odes and elegies his stanzas are particularly interesting in this respect; in his poems the (otherwise little known) poet Ilū an-Kāsarī on the merits of the Anṣār and Kuraqīs he revived the coarse and bitter tone of the polemics of an al-Farābī [q.v.] or an al-Imrānī [q.v.] on a similar subject. The few hundred years of development of Arabic poetry were naturally not without influence on him; in his nadhīr we frequently find the style of an 'Unār b. Abū Rabīʿa's or al-Abdāb b. al-Ahmadī [see m. al-Ahmadī], Muslim's contemporaries. His drinking songs deserve special mention. Although Nīlaiche only very rarely finds in them the natural effusion of Bacchantic joy as so frequently in Abu Nawās [q.v.], Arab critics are of another opinion. These two poets are to them practically the same in this respect and we must confess they are right. His drinking-songs are not only of great value for the descriptions of society and social life in the cities but from the point of view of poetry they are among the best of Muslim's work. If we must, as regards subject matter, number Muslim among the imitators of the old poets, in style he belongs to a more modern period. The historians of Arabic literature frequently mention him as the first to introduce the "new style", al-salbī, with its tropes and figures. This is however not quite such a simple point; the "new style" arose only gradually in Arabic poetry, although Muslim with his contemporaries, Bashār b. Būri [q.v.], Abu Nawaws, e.g., was one of the first who definitely struck out on the new path. The younger generation, especially Abū Tammūrī [q.v.], dwore this new style to banality.

Muslim was on terms of friendship or enmity with many contemporary poets, e.g. Abu Nawawī, Abu l-Athiyya [q.v.], al-Abdāb b. al-Ahmadī (who maliciously called him al-Sarī al-Ghamēn or Sarī al-Kāsī; cf. Dinwān, Ngl. 44), Abu l-Shaib [q.v.], al-Hassān al-Khaffa'ī etc. His literary influence was not considerable: Dībil [q.v.] was his pupil (which did not prevent him exchanging satires with Muslim), Abū Tammūrī was particularly fond of studying his poems. Muslim's Dinwān has been transmitted in very unsatisfactory fashion; it was collected in an alphabetical order by al-Sulānī [q.v.] but this edition has not come down to us (there are a few traces of it in the Kustāl al-Aghaštāt), another story speaks of the collection made by the philologist al-Mubarrad. The only known European manuscript (Leyden)
on which de Goeje's edition is based, contains only a portion of his poems (including a few spurious; see Barbier de Meynard, op. cit., p. 17 sq.); it represents an unknown edition and is of little importance for the criticism of the text.

Bibliography: Dwan, Poets of the East, 2nd ed., 1875, unfortunately without an index of rhymes); the Cairo edition of 1325 (Maḥbūbat Madarat Waliyyat 'Abbās al-Awwal, 5, p. 97) although called al-Tufā al-Rūmī, repeats de Goeje's text in an alphabetical arrangement; the Bombay lithograph of 1303 (1886) is not accessible to me (see Rescher, op. cit.); it claims to give a better text than the Layton edition; see Sarkis, op. cit.). Most of the sources are given by de Goeje in his edition (p. 228-310); the most important is of course the Kitāb al-Akhbār (p. 228-271).


MUSNAD. [See Hadīth, iv.]

AL-MUSTAḌĪ, B. AMR, 'ILĀH, ABD MUḤAMMAD AL-HABĀN. 'Abd al-Wadīd al-Kalībī, born on 23rd Shawwāl 536 (March 23, 1142), son of al-Mustad之意 and an Armenian slave named Ghajīla. After his father's death on 9th Rābi‘ I 566 (Dec. 20, 1170) al-Mustad之意 succeeded him and at the beginning of the following year was formally recognized as caliph in Egypt also, which passed into the hands of the Ayyūbid dynasty at this time (see the article Ṭā'būt, ii, p. 96). The massacre of al-Mustad之意 soon quarrelled among themselves. 'Aḍūd al-Dīn (q. v.) whom al-Mustad之意 had forced to make vizier was dismissed 592 (1171-1172) at the instigation of the emir Kīmaiz. In Dhu l-Qa‘da 570 (May 1175) the latter was about to attack the treasurer Zāhir al-Dīn b. al-ʿAttī, but the latter fled to the caliph whereupon Kīmaiz began to besiege the palace of the latter. Al-Mustad之意 appealed to the people to help him; the house of Kīmaiz was pillaged and he himself fled but died soon afterwards and 'Aḍūd al-Dīn again became vizier. Al-Mustad之意 had already quarrelled with Shīja, lord of Kūthīr. In 596 (1173-1174) a war broke out between the latter's nephew Ibn Şanqa and al-Mustad之意; Ibn Şanqa was soon taken prisoner and put to death. The insignificant al-Mustad之意 died on the 24th Dhu l-Qa‘da or, according to another statement, at the end of Shawwal 575 (end of March 1180).


MUSTAḌĪ-QĀNĪ BĀHĀDŪR (NAWĀB), thirteenth son of the celebrated Rohella leader Hāfiz al-Mulk Ḥāfiz Rahmat-Khan (1707-1774) and author of the biography of his father, which he wrote in Persian under the title Gulîṣtān-i Raḥmat. Ḥāfiz Rahmat-Khan, who was an Afghan of the tribe of Vaiṣālī by descent, had been since 1748 a chief in Rohilkhand (Katerh) and throughout his life waged a bitter warfare with the Mahrā�s. He fell in 1774 in a fight at Mudāpur Kāstra where he was fighting against the combined forces of the Nawāb of Oudh Shuja‘dī al-Mulk and the English. Warren Hastings' act in supporting the Nawāb with English troops became the subject of a judicial investigation. Mustaḍī-Qānī Khan's book describes Ḥāfiz Rahmat Khan as a fine representative of Afghan chivalry and contains much of value for studying the relations between the individual Afghan tribes.


(E. Lebert)

MUSTAṬĀFĪ, the fifteenth Ottoman Sultan, was born in the year 1000 (1594) as son of Muhammad III. He owed his life to the relaxation of the jāmin authorizing the killing of all the brothers of a new sultan, and was called to succeed his brother Ahmad I at the latter's death on November 22, 1617. But his weak-mindedness—which is said to have made him expose his death on account of superstitions fear of Ahmad—made him absolutely incapable of ruling. Ahmad's son Othmān, who felt himself entitled to the succession, had little difficulty in procuring Mustaṭāfī's deposition in a meeting of the Imperial Divān, by the šahār aga, the nāršūr and the haθmā plural, the grand-vizier Khālid Paša [q. v.] being absent. This happened on February 26, 1618.

Unexpectedly Mustaṭāfī was again called to the throne when, on May 19, 1622, the rebellion of the Janissaries broke out against Othmān II. He was taken by force from his asylum in the harem and the Janissaries forced the 'alam to acknowledge him as sultan. The next day Othmān was killed and until June the grand-vizier Dawūd Paša, the man responsible for the murder, remained in power. Then he was deposed by the caliphate. The real masters were the Janissaries and the Sipahis; several grand-viziers were nominated and deposed again at their pleasure. The Sipahis
party began, after some time, to exact vengeance for Oğlan and in January 1623, when Gürşü Muhammad Pasha [q. v.] was grand vizier, Dawud Pasha was killed. Soon the Janissary party came again to influence under the grand vizier Mere Hüsâin Pasha (Feb. 3). The latter succeeded in maintaining himself until August 20; then the general feeling amongst the ‘ulama’ and the people, combined with the steadily growing opposition in the provinces against the tyranny of the sultan in the capital, as manifested by the action of Saff al-Din Oğlu in Tripolits and still more by the revolt of Abaza Paşa [q. v.] in Erzurum, brought about Mere Hüsâin’s deposition.

The new grand vizier, Kemâneşî Âli Paşa, together with the mujâhidîn, deposed the sultan on Sept. 10, 1623 and called Ahmed’s son Murad to the throne.

During all his reign Mustafâ had continued to give signs of his complete mental aberration; he died in 1638 and was buried in the Aya Sofia. The only important international act that took place during his reign was the peace concluded with Poland in February 1623.

**Bibliography:** The Turkish sources for this period are the historical works of Na’in, Hâjjî Khalîfî (Ferâkî), Pocet, Hassan Bey Zade and Tüctûg. Contemporary reports in the Memoirs of the English envoy Sir Thomas Roe. Further the general historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

(J. H. KRAMER)

**MUSTAFA II.** the twenty-second Ottoman sultan, was a son of Muhammad IV. Born in 1604, he succeeded to his uncle Ahmed II on Feb. 6, 1605, at a time when the empire was at war with Austria, Poland, Russia and Venice. The new sultan in a remarkable (shâfi‘i) speech proclaimed a Holy War and carried out, against the decision of the âdîman, his desire to take part in the campaign against Austria. Before his departure a mutiny of the Janissaries had cost the grand vizier Mehter Ahmed Pasha his life (April 24, 1603) and the campaign was led by the new grand vizier Elras Muhammad Pasha [q. v.]. The Turkish army operated not without success in the region of Temesvár, taking Lippa, Logos and Sebes. The Venetians had been beaten in February near Chios and were beaten again in September. In October Azof was delivered from the Russian siege. Next year the sultan and his army were again successful in raising the siege of Temesvár, but no part of the lost territory could be recovered from the Austrians. That year, however, the Russians took Azof. The campaign of 1606 is memorable for the heavy defeat inflicted on the Turks near Zenta on the Theiss (Sept. 11), where Elras Muhammed lost his life, while the sultan, who had already crossed the river, had to fly to Temesvár. The imperial seal fell into the hands of the Austrians. From Temesvár Mustafa nominated ‘Âmmâ’idî Zade Hüsâin [q. v.] of the Köprülü family, his grand vizier. Under this very able statesman peace was at last concluded. In 1608 the grand vizier went to the frontier, while the sultan stayed at Adrianople, but the peace negotiations were pursued more earnestly than the war. In October of that year began the peace negotiations at Karlowitz (Turk. Karlolca, see CARLOWITZ) on the Donube, where on February 20, 1699 peace was concluded with Austria, Poland and Venice. With Russia only an armistice was concluded to be followed in 1700 by a definite peace. The English and Dutch ministers took part in the negotiations as intermediaries. The peace treaty meant the loss of Hungary and Transylvania, with the exception of the district of Temesvár; Poland recovered Kamienica, while Venice had to cede Lepanto and some other towns in Morea. With Russia the Dniestr became the frontier.

The peace enabled the grand vizier to bring order into the affairs of state, which had suffered from the long and disastrous war. The Re’s Efendi Râmi and the mujtâhid Feizullah, who had great influence with the sultan, were his collaborators. Some interior troubles were easily appeased; only in 1701 a campaign in Istârâ was needed to take Bâgra from the hands of a local party that had submitted to Persia. Fortresses were put in a better state of defence and a new Ahlûs-sûrî waiss was issued for the fleet. Hanân Paşa resigned his office in Sept. 1702 and died soon afterwards. His deposition was partly the work of the mujtâhid Feizullah, who made the sultan appoint in his place Dâlibahâm Muhammad Paşa. When the latter showed himself of too warlike a disposition and caused at the same time unrest in the capital by favouring the claims of the Tartar Khan, the influence of the mujtâhid caused his deposition and execution (Jan. 1703). Râmi [q. v.] became grand vizier. Râmi’s measures to enforce the authority of the central government were salutary but made him many enemies; moreover the Janissaries were not contented with a grand vizier who was not a military man. The general unrest was increased by the permanent residence of sultan Mustafa in Adrianople. All these circumstances brought about in July 1703 a Janissary revolt in Constantinople, directed at first against Râmi Paşa and against the mujtâhid. The latter’s deposition was obtained without much difficulty, but the rebellion continued under the leadership and organisation of a certain Hasan Agha. A deputation of the rebels to Adrianople was imprisoned and treated in an insolent way. Too late the sultan promised to come himself to Constantinople; the Janissaries were constrained to give a fetwâ authorising the sultan’s deposition. In August 1703 a rebel army went again to Adrianople, after having agreed on Mustafa’s brother Ahmed as successor to the throne. When Mustafa saw himself at last abandoned by his own Janissaries he resigned on August 21. He died soon afterwards on Dec. 31, 1703 and was buried in the Aya Sofia. He is rightly considered as a wise and good ruler, as is proved by his careful choice of able statesmen. He wrote poems under the takhlîl of Mejînî and Kâlîli. Under him the imperial pasha appeared for the first time on the Ottoman coins.

**Bibliography:** The chief source is the Târîkh of Râshid, besides an anonymous historical work, used by von Hammer and only mentioned in a note by Babinger, G. O. W., p. 247 and 248. Useful information also in the history of the Crimean by Meşîh Girî (G. O. W., p. 233) and Saiyîd Meşîh Rîfî (G. O. W., p. 496). The takhlîl of the grand vizier Râmi Paşa (not mentioned in G. O. W.) has importance as containing contemporary documents. Further the general histories of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

(J. H. KRAMER)
MUŞTAFA III, the twenty-sixth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was one of the younger sons of Ahmed III and was born on 11 Sabah, 1129 = January 28, 1717 (Stirihi-i Shevahd, 1. 80). When he succeeded to the throne, after Oktaman III's death on October 30, 1757, his much more popular brother and heir to the throne, Muhammad, had recently died, in December 1756. Turkey enjoyed at that time, since the peace of Belgrad of 1739, a period of peace with her neighbours. Since December 1756, the very able Râghib Pasha [q. v.] was grand vizier and remained the real administrator of the empire until his death in 1763. Râghib had removed from the capital all those who might have contrived to influence, taking at the same time all financial measures and endeavours to keep the military forces in good condition. The sultan meanwhile, who was of a vivid and active temperament, busied himself, like his predecessor, with regulations concerning the clothes of his non-Muslim subjects and the appearance of the public of Muhammadan women; at this time there was also taken up again the never-ending plan of linking the gulf of Iznik with the Black Sea [see Şsandja]. The Seven Years' War in Europe (1756—1763) had not remained without influence on the policy of the Porte; after long hesitation Turkey agreed at last to conclude a treaty of friendship with Prussia (March 29, 1761). Râghib himself was inclined to conclude even an alliance, but the sultan and the influential **ulama** were peacefully minded.

After Râghib's death Muştafa began to reign and different grand viziers succeeded one another at short intervals. From 1765 to 1768 the grand vizierate was held by Muştafâ Zâde Muhammad Pascha, under whom the disastrous war with Russia broke out. Difficulties with Russia had already commenced in 1762, when Russia had supported the ruler of Georgia against the Turkish Pascha of Akhisar (Çaldır); here, as well as in Montenegro, Russian emissaries worked in secret against the Turkish rule. Moreover, the Khan of the Crimea repeatedly complained about Russian military measures on her northern frontier, while the party of the Confederates in Poland urgently appealed for the intervention of the Porte against the oppression of Catherine's government on Polish liberty. In these circumstances the Porte had no more interest in seeking alliance of Prussia, where, in 1764, Ahmad Rumi Efendi had gone as envoy, of which embassy he afterwards wrote his well-known **Seferret-nâmesi**. The sultan himself was decidedly anti-Russian, but the diplomacy of the Russian minister Obreńskoff and the pacifism of the **ulama** delayed the war, until, in August 1768, Muştafâ obtained from the then mufti Wah al-Din a fâvâ'ul authorising the war with Russia. War was declared only on October 6, after the dismissal of the grand vizier Muştafâ Zâde, who had advised delay until the spring. Obreńskoff was imprisoned in Yedi Kule.

The war began in January with destructive raids of the Crimean Tatars in southern Russia under their newly appointed Khan Kutche Gitâ; at that time de Tott was an eye-witness with the Tatar army. In March 1769 the then grand vizier Muhammad Emin Pasha left Constantinople with the Holy Banner; on this occasion there was an outburst of Muhammadan fanaticism against the Austrian internuncios and his party, who had come to witness the procession. While the grand vizier went to the Dobruja, the Russians made an attack on Chotin (Turk. 8hotin), which they were able to take only in August. In the meantime the grand vizier had been deposed and executed; his place was taken by Moldovândji 8Ali Pasha, who had encountered with the Russians on both sides of the Dniester. Other Russian armies took Jassy and Bucarest and advanced into Transcaucasia. The year 1770 was still more disastrous for Turkey. The Russians reached, through Rumânia, the Danube, and in the autumn they took Kili, Bender and Brăila, in the immediate neighbourhood of the Turkish general headquarters in Baba Daghli. In the same year a Russian fleet appeared in the Mediterranean; several towns in Morea were conquered and evacuated again, but the heaviest blow was the burning of the Turkish fleet in the bay of Çeşme (July 1770). Moldovândji 8All — already dispossessed of his grand vizierate — was sent to strengthen, with de Tott, the defences of the Dar-danelles. But the Russian fleet had ceased to be a danger and the Danube campaign of the following spring also was rather favourable for the Turks. In the beginning of 1771 the military organisation had been improved. That year, however, the Russians forced the isthmus of Perekop and conquered the entire Crimea. This was a definite loss for Turkey, and a great majority of the Tatars declared their allegiance to the Russian empress. The Turks were able, however, to remain in Otkawai and Kilburna. In Constantinople meanwhile laborious diplomatic negotiations went on with the envoys of the European powers who offered to mediate, notably Austria and Prussia. With Austria the Porte concluded in July 1771 a secret "treaty of subsidy" for diplomatic services, while the Porte disinterested herself completely in Polish affairs, going so far as to propose a partition of Poland. The result was an armistice, concluded in June 1772 at Giurgewo, followed by the peace congress of Polanik (August 1772), where Turkey's chief representative was the arrogant uchchandji 8Othman Efendi. After the failure of the negotiations the armistice was prolonged and a new conference began at Bucarest in November. These negotiations were again broken off in March 1773, mainly from lack of agreement on the subject of the Turkish fortresses on the Black Sea; as to the Crimea, Turkey had already agreed to a formula such as was later adopted in the peace of Küçük Kânardji. In Constantinople it was chiefly the **ulama** who had opposed the Russian peace conditions. The war in 1773 was not very eventful; the general headquarters had been transferred to Shumen after Muştafâ Zâde had become grand vizier a second time (Dec. 1771). The Russians won a victory at Kara-su in the Dobruja, but attacked Silistra and Warno in vain. Bezirik was bombarded by Russian ships in connection with the rebellion of the Mamlûk 8Ali Bey [q. v.] in Egypt, who was supported by them. In the summer of 1773 sultan Muştafa made known his desire to accompany the army against the Russians, but he was prevented from doing so by his ill-health, which he succumbed on December 24, 1773, to be succeeded by his brother 8Abd al-Hamid I. Muştafâ was buried in his own **sâri**, connected with the **lêle Dzhâmi**, which he had begun to build in 1759 (**Hâfit al-Dhârâmi**, 1. 23).
Muṣṭafā III is praised in the Turkish sources as a good ruler. He had a special liking for religious disputations in his presence and was particularly interested in astrological calculations. He took an interest in the least important affairs and this prevented him from such a real statesmanlike insight as was much wanted in the later years of his reign. In his way he was an "enlightened despot". But even a more able ruler would probably have failed to save Turkey from her military inferiority against the Russian armies; measures of military organisation were taken with the aid of de Tott, but this could not prevent the desertion of the troops from assuming disastrous dimensions during certain episodes of the war. Besides the Lălău Dūkum, Mustafą built the Ayazaşa Dūkum at Scutari for his mother; he caused a new suburb of Stambul to be built outside the Yeni Kapı. His reign is further marked by the extremely severe earthquake that laid large parts of the capital in ruins in 1766.

Bibliography: The Tuğrāh of Wāṣif [q.v.] is the chief historical source for Mustafą's reign. Wāṣif himself played a prominent part as secretary during the long-drawn-out peace negotiations with Russia. It is completed by the Tuğrāh of Eswert. The Wāṣif's name of Dīvān, son of Ḥakīm Oghlu 'Āli Paşa, seems not to be preserved (G. O. W., p. 300). The well-known Aḥmad Rasūl Efendi wrote a history of the war with Russia under the title Kuṭṭāšt al-' ḍīrār (G. O. W., p. 310). The Tāḥkīd of the learned general Rāghīb Paşa (G. O. W., p. 288) gives an important supplement to the beginning of Mustafą's reign. A contemporary western source is the Māmūr to the Tuğrāh of the Tarikhs of Baron Fr. de Tott, Maastricht 1785. Further the historical works of von Hammer, Zinzinew and Jorga.

(J. H. Kremers)

MUSTAFÀ IV, twenty-ninth sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was a son of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd I and was born on Shabān 26, 1123 = Sept. 19, 1775 (Meleşçil Thāʾrīq, Sījlīt, 1st ed., i, 81). When the anti-reform party, headed by the ḍīrār, Mūsā Paşa and the mufīt, and supported by the janissaries and the auxiliary troops of the Yamanı had dethroned Selim III [q.v.], on May 29, 1807, Mustafà was proclaimed sultan. Immediately afterwards, the unpopular muṣīm-ı ḍīrār corps was dissolved and Kāhakdji Oghlu, the leader of the Yamanı, was made commander of the Bozorus fortresses. Turkey was at that time at war with Russia and England, but peace negotiations had already begun and, moreover, the foreign affairs of the empire were really governed by general European politics. A secret article annexed to the peace treaty of Tilsit (July 7, 1807) had in view — already at that time — a conditional partition of Turkey. Turkey's ally, France, tried to urge a peace with Russia and obtained a Russo-Turkish armistice at Siobozia (near Girmow), by the terms of which the Dasebe principalties were to be evacuated. When in the end Russia was unwilling to put into effect the terms of the armistice, relations with France became strained (departure of Sebastani in April 1808) and new preparations for war followed, while overtures were made to England; the English admiral Codrington had already entered into negotiations with 'Ali Paşa of Yasmine.

Meanwhile the ḍīrār, the mufīt and the sultan were

the real rulers in Constantinople; the grand vizier Celebi Mūsā Paşa remained with the army in Adrianople and had no influence. The Janissaries and Yamanı, however, continued to be rebellious; measures had to be taken against them and the sultan himself went so far as to favour secret plans for restoring the sījlīt-ı ḍīrār under another name. In December 1807 Mūsā Paşa was dismissed from the office of ḍīrār — on account of disaffection with the mufīt — and was succeeded by Tāyyp Paşa. The latter, dismissed in his turn, fled to Bairakdīr Mustafà Paşa [q.v.], an acknowledged friend of the reform party, in Roumania. From here he began the action against the régime in the capital. Bairakdīr went first to Adrianople and joined forces with the grand vizier in June 1808. They arrived in July before the gates of Constantinople at Dāvūd Paşa. Sūlān Mūṣafat came there on July 23 to accept their terms, which, for the moment were only the destruction of the ruling party and of the Yamanı. On July 28 Bairakdīr, after having saved the sultan's real from the grand vizier, began to act on his own account. He went with his troops to the palace, where the sultan — who had left shortly before for an excursion — returned in haste. He had only the time to order the execution of Selim III but was deposed immediately afterwards by the intruders, who put his younger brother Mahmūd on the throne. After having passed some months in confinement, he was killed by order of the new sultan on November 16, in the days of the general revolt against Bairakdīr's régime, when the existence of the former sultan had become a real danger for Mahmūd's position. Mūṣafat was buried in the türbe of his father 'Abd al-Ḥamīd I, near the Yeni Dūkum.


MUSTAFĂ, name of several princes belonging to the Ottoman dynasty:

1. Muṣṭafà Čelebi, eldest son of Bāyızd I; the date of his birth is not recorded. He disappeared in the battle of Angora (July 1402). This Muṣṭafà is the first Ottoman prince to bear this name, which, like such other names as Bāyızd and Murad, originated in mystical circles in Asia Minor in the sixteenth century. According to the Byzantine sources, this Muṣṭafà is the same as the person called by the majority of the Turkish sources:

Dūrme Muṣṭafā, who came forward in 1419 as pretender to the Ottoman throne against Muḥammad I. He was supported by Mirc of Carlchis and by the Irmi Oghlu Dışanad [q.v.]. Near Selânik they were beaten by Muljasmaad and Muṣṭafà took refuge in the town together with Dışanad; the Byzantine commander refused to give them up to the Sultan and sent them to Constantinople. In a treaty concluded with the emperor Manuel, the sultan promised to pay a yearly subsidy to provide for the maintenance of the prisoners, while the emperor undertook to keep them in custody. This treaty was observed until Muḥammad's
death; Mustafa was relegated to a monastery on the island of Lemnoi. After Muhammad’s death, however, he was released and the emperor supported him against Murad II [q.v.]. In a short time he was master of the Ottoman territories in Europe; the army sent against him under Bayazid Pasha went over to his side at Sazl Dere between Serez and Adrianople. He was joined likewise by great feudal lords like the sons of Eremos. He soon felt strong enough to break his alliance with the Greeks and expelled them from the recently taken Gallipoli. After having resided some time in Adrianople, he went together with Djemalid to Azia Minor, where they met Murad’s army in a battle near the bridge of Unfaz. By the treacherous retreat of Djemalid, Mustafa was beaten and fled to Gallipoli and Adrianople; from there he tried to reach Wallachia, but was taken by Murad’s troops and executed at Adrianople. All this happened in the first year of Murad II’s reign (1421–1422).

Mustafa, son of Muhammad I and younger brother of Murad II, was supported as pretender against the latter in 1423, while Murad besieged Constantinople. This Mustafa was about 13 years of age; he had fled to the Karaman Oghlu with his father Ilyas. From there they took Iznik and marched against Brusa. Mustafa even went for some time to Constantinople, but Murad, raising the siege, returned to Brusa, where Mustafa was delivered to him by the treachery of Ilyas; he was executed by the sultan’s orders.

Mustafa, son of Sulaiman the Magnificent, was born in 921 (1515) and educated at the Khedivial school of law there and, on taking his examination, went to study in Toulouse where in 1604 he took his “licence en droit”. When still a student of 18 he began his political activity and entered into personal relations with the Khedive ‘Abbasi II [q.v.]. On his return from France he founded in 1604 the second Egyptian national party (al-‘Ilah al-muqaddas) with the object of inducing England by appeals to justice to abandon the occupation and restore the complete independence of Egypt. Later he also aimed at getting the Sultan handed back to Egypt and tried to prepare the Egyptians by modern education for parliamentary government. As a representative of his party he spent each year a considerable time in Europe, especially France where he consorted with politicians and journalists and conducted a vigorous propaganda for his object. All his life he was very friendly with the journalist Juliette Adam; he had dealings with Rochefort, Drumeat, Col. Marchand, Pierre Loti and in 1896 had a correspondence with Gladstone. Later he visited Berlin, London, Vienna, Radapost, Geneva and Constantinople where he was highly thought of because he insisted on the Sultan’s suzerainty over Egypt; Sultan ‘Abdu al-Hamid II [q.v.] gave him in 1894 the title of Paşa. In Cairo he founded in 1898 a school for training the youth in nationalist ideas, and in 1899 started the newspaper al-Liwa’ (The Banner), which appeared early in 1900, had a great success and from 1907 appeared also in English and French editions. From 1903 he published the nationalist quarterly Madijfalar al-Liwa’. In his speeches and articles he emphasised his aims with fiery eloquence; at the same time he expressed his approval of the building of the Turkish strategic Hijasz railway and his sympathy with the Japanese
in their war with Russia (1904—1905). Müștafa Kâmil also regularly emphasised the privileged position of Muslims as belonging to the state religion and recognised the sultan as caliph and head of Islam and thus contributed to the pan-Islamic movement which began early in the twentieth century.

The "Erente Cordiale" concluded on April 8, 1904, between England and France was a severe blow to him and the nationalist party; by it France, in return for a free hand in Morocco, dropped its objections to the English occupation of Egypt. The Egyptian nationalists thus lost all hope of open or secret support from the French government and were thrown upon their own resources. This situation caused Müștafa Kâmil to redouble his energy and in vigorous speeches and writings against France and England, in travelling and negotiating with statesmen of different lands, he endeavoured to make Egypt's point of view clear. As a result of the intensity of his agitation there was a breach between him and the Khedive 'Abbas II (Oct. 1904); on the other hand, his following in Egypt rapidly increased and began to be troublesome to Lord Cromer who had so far treated the new nationalism created by Müștafa Kâmil as a "quantité négligeable". The Dinaẖwâdi (a village near Tańţah in the Delta) affair gave the nationalists a great stimulus; on June 13, 1906, some English officers out shooting were said to have wounded an Egyptian woman and were attacked by fellâhûn with clubs and one of the officers was killed. A special court set up by the English government sentenced four fellâhûn to death and 17 to prison or fine and the sentence was carried out next day. The indignation in Egypt and Europe rose to great heights and even in the House of Commons the authorities were criticised. Müștafa Kâmil hurried to London and discussed the matter with the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, whom he endeavoured to convince of the necessity of recalling Lord Cromer and giving greater freedom to Egyptians. On this occasion he is mentioned as suitable representatives in a parliament system of government all those Egyptians who in the later political movement after the war played an important part. On his return to Egypt, through the press and mass meetings in which he urged Egyptians to unite against England, he gave a great stimulus to the nationalist movement and soon had the satisfaction of seeing Lord Cromer recalled — although he was not at all the only cause of this—and replaced by Sir Elton Gorst. The latter adopted a milder tone with the Egyptians, was on good terms with the Khedive and endeavoured to support him with a newly founded party. Müștafa Pasha attacked his representative of England vigorously also, in Oct. 1907, put his national party on a broader basis and summoned it to a "national congress", which met on Dec. 7 of the same year in Cairo; 1,017 delegates from all over Egypt appeared and after a speech by Müștafa Kâmil which carried them away the latter was elected life-President of the party. This was however his swan-song; he had been ill since the summer of 1905; he died on Feb. 10, 1908 (8th Muharram 1325) at the age of 54 of a slow internal trouble (intestinal tuberculosis). The surname spread that he had been poisoned at English instigation. His funeral was an impressive expression of the national grief.

Müștafa's creations did not long survive him and his party, which produced no leader to equal him and was broken up by dissensions, gradually sank into insignificance. Although he obtained no positive results by his agitation, he prepared the way for the third and greatest nationalist movement (under Sa'd Zaghlûl Pasha from Nov. 13, 1918). It is to his credit that he conducted his whole campaign without any appeal to force, which would have been quite useless against the British Empire, and without bloodshed.

Of his numerous writings only the more important can be mentioned; many of them were only printed after his death, some in the great (never completed) biography by his brother 'Ali Bey Fahmi Kâmil al-Malâša 'Ichaş'âya (1898 and 1909); Mişr wa-l-Fâhilli il-miṣrî (collection of speeches and essays, Cairo 1213); Dîfâ' al-Miṣrî 'an Bilâdîkî, Cairo 1234 (1906); al-Shâm al-muṣâfiqî (Cairo 1904, on the Russo-Japanese war); Leçons françaises-égyptiennes (Cairo 1909; also in Arabic and English transl. His letters to Juliette Adam; Egyptiens et Anglais, Paris 1906 (speech of July 4, 1895 in Trougome); Le pèlerin anglais, Paris 1899; What the National Party wants, Cairo 1907, speech of Oct. 22, 1907.)


AL-MUŞTAFA II-DIN ALLAH. [See Nizâr B. AL-MUŞTAFAQ.]

MUŞTAFA PASHA BAIRAKDAR, Turkish grand vizier in 1808, was the son of a wealthy landowner at Rusçuk; born about 1750. He distinguished himself in the war with Russia under Muṣâfâ III, and acquired in these years the surname of bairâkdar. After the war he lived on his estates near Rusçuk and acquired the semi-official position of aştûm of Hafizgrâd and later of Rusçuk. With other officers he took part in an action against the government at Adrianople, but became finally a reliable supporter of the govern-
the last hereditary war of Scutari (hence often called iğdır seferi), the son of the celebrated Kara Mahmut Paşa Bushatli [q. v.], succeeded his uncle Ibrahim Paşa about 1810 and received the rank of war in 1812. In 1816 the sandjak of Berat and in 1824 those of Orhid and Elbasan were put under his government and he received the title of Ser'asker. Nevertheless like his father he aimed at greater independence and when Mahmut II's reforms threatened to deprive him of his hereditary rights and privileges, he became strongly hostile to the Sultan and maintained friendly relations with the Serbian prince Miloš, the discontented Bosnians (cf. J. Deny, Sommario delle arriere turques du Caire, p. 264 and 553). He therefore maintained quite a passive attitude in the Russo-Turkish war (1828) and only towards the end of it, in May 1829, did he appear with his Albanians on the Danube (Vidin, Rahovo), then went on to Sofia and Philippopolis, but without taking any active part in the fighting.

On the conclusion of peace the Porte (beg. of 1831) demanded of Mustafa Paşa that he should hand over the districts previously held by him (Dukakan, Delvar, Elbasan, Orhid and Trgovište) to the grand vizier Reshid Mehmed Paşa (on him cf. Siddiqi, jahāl, ii. 391) and carry through certain reforms in Scutari itself. Mustafa Paşa resisted and with the financial and moral support of prince Miloš, led an army in the middle of March 1831 against the grand vizier. He was joined by the other Pashas of northern Albania and old Serbia who objected to reforms. The rebels had at first certain successes including the occupation of Sofia but they were completely routed at Prilep by the regular troops led by the grand-vizier (beginning of May). Mustafa Paşa hurried back to Scutari via Skopje and Prizren and shut himself up in the fortress. When he surrendered on Nov. 10, 1831 after six months' siege, he was pardoned on Metternich's intercession and taken to Constantinople.

Fifteen years later he again held various governorships, chiefly in Austria (from 1826), then in the Herzegovina (1833) and lastly in Medina where he died on May 27, 1860.
same Ilonian locality from which came the grand vizier Şokollu [q.v.], and began his service in the imperial strait. He rose in rank under the grand vizier Ahmed (1535-1555), but was not in favour with the latter's successor, who made him in 1556 to prince Selim with the object of turning him. The outcome of this nomination was the contrary of what was expected; Mustafa became the chief originator of the intrigues by which Selim came into conflict with his brother Bayazid and which ended with Bayazid's execution in Persia [cf. Selim II]. After these events Rustam Pasha managed to relegate the intriguer in administrative functions to different parts of the empire; for eight years he was wâli in Damascus. Nor was the grand vizier Şokollu favourably disposed to Mustafa, but in the beginning of 1569 Selim II called him to the castle and in the following year 1570, when Selim died, he went to Cairo to take charge of the command. He became involved in serious disputes with the wâli, Sinan Pasha, on the equipment of his army. The end was that Sinan was appointed in Mustafa's stead and the latter had to return to Constantinople. Selim's protector had saved him from death and in the beginning of the following year he was appointed again as wâlif and the position destined for the conquest of the island of Cyprus. Lala Mustafa Pasha led this memorable campaign with complete success; Nicoria was taken in July 1570, while Famagusta surrendered in August 1571. With the surrender of this town is connected the brutal and cruel execution of the Venetian commander Bragadino. After his return he became a serious candidate for the grand vizierate, should Şokollu disappear from the scene. His only rival was Sinan Pasha, when in 1577 the war with Persia broke out [cf. Sulayman III] both were appointed as wâlifs, but, on account of Sinan's arrogant character, the latter's appointment had to be withdrawn. In April Lala Mustafa began his campaign in Georgia, fought the memorable victory of Caldir (August 1578) and took Tiflis besides a number of other towns. These military glories did not bring him to the ambition of the sultan. After Şokollu's assassination, Rustam's son-in-law Ahmed Pasha had been made grand vizier and, on the latter's death in May 1580, it was Sinan [q.v.] who got the sultan's seal. Lala Mustafa died in October of the same year and was buried in the court of the mosque at Abyth, apart from the unquestionably important events in which he played a prominent part, Lala Mustafa Pasha has a particular importance in Ottoman historiography because the historian Ali [q.v.] had been attached to his person as scribe since the beginning of his career. Therefore his able, but intriguing and reckless character is known better than that of many other Turkish statesmen or generals. By his marriage with the grand-daughter of the last Mamlik Sultan Kâzîglî he was a very wealthy man, who, notwithstanding his reputed avarice, founded several mosques (as in Erzerum) and many buildings of public utility in the different places where he resided as governor.

**Bibliography:** The chief Turkish sources are, as has been said, Ali, not only in his *Kâzîglî*, but also in a treatise entitled *Nâdir-i Mabûrî*, describing the war between Selim and Bayazid (MS. unknown, cf. Balbinger, G.O., *W.*, p. 134) and in his *Nâdir-i nâmâ*, which gives a description of the Georgian campaign. Other sources are the works of Pâvey and Solak Zîde. Western contemporary sources are the Diary of Gerlach, the Letters of Bunbeck, and, especially for the conquest of Cyprus, the Italian historical description [J. H. Kramer].

**Mustafa Pasha Rashid.** [See Rashed.]

**Musta'idd Khan.** [See Shabakat.]

**Mustafa Pasha.**

**MUSTA' IDD KHAN, MUHAMMAD SÀYÊT, born about 1501 (1559), was brought up as an adopted son by Muhammad Bakhšawar Khân, whom he faithfullly assisted in various capacities. After the death of his patron he passed into the service of Awrangzib. In the reign of Shah Jahan, Mirza Shahzâd Khan, the minister of Bahadur Shâh, and by his desire Musta'ìd Khan composed the history of the reign of Awrangzib, entitled *Mûsâ' i-`Ali* [Amirgrî]. Part i. is a mere abridgement of Mirza Khân's history of the first ten years of the emperor's reign; part ii. contains the history of the last forty years of *Ali* [Amirgrî]'s reign [edited in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta 1870-1871]. He died at the age of seventeen at Diilh in 1626 (1723).


**AL-MUSTA' IN B. ILAH, ABU L-'ABBâS AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD, an *Abbâsid* caliph. His father was a son of the caliph al-Mu'tasir, his mother a slave-girl named Mašḥûrî of Slav origin. After the death in Kabul II 248 (June 862) of al-Mu'tasir the pretorians appointed his cousin Ahmad caliph under the name al-Musta'in. The choice aroused discontent in Samarrâ and unrest broke out among those who supported al-Mu'tazz [q.v.], which was only put down after much bloodshed by the Turkish soldiers. When al-Musta'in was recognised as caliph he confirmed the governor of Baghdad, Muhammad b. `Abd Allah b. Tahir [q.v.], in office. He bought all the property of al-Mu'tazz and his brother al-Mu'ayyad and then had them arrested. The Turks wanted to put them to death but they were protected by the vizier Ahmad b. al-Khâshî who soon afterwards fell into disgrace and was banished to Crete. In 249 (863) trouble broke out as a result of a defeat of the army by the Bajantâris; the rebels were however scattered by the vizier Uthman and the two Turkish generals Wâsif and Bogha Jânâ. Uthman was afterwards murdered at the instigation of the latter. As the caliph no longer felt safe in Samarrâ he went to Baghdad in Muharram 251 (Feb. 865). Al-Mu'tazz was then taken by his supporters out of his prison in Samarrâ and a war broke out which ended in Dhu l-Hijja 252 (Jan. 866) in the abdication of al-Musta'in [cf. Baghdad]. By the arrangement made the latter was to live in Medina in future; but he was detained in Wâsif and murdered in Shawwal 252 (Oct. 866) at the age of 35. See also the article MUHAMMAD b. `ABD ALLAH b. TAHIR.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Kûtâiba, *Kitâb al-Mu'tazz*, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 200; Ya'qûbî, ed. Houtsma, ii. 603-610; Tâmir, iii. 150 sqq.
AL-MUSTAFI (B. 1001, A.D. 1691) was the nephew of Abd al-Malik, a Turkish nobleman who had been appointed as governor of Damascus by the Ottoman Empire. After the death of his uncle, Mustafi succeeded him and became the ruler of Damascus and surrounding areas.

AL-MUSTAFKI (735-34 A.D.) was the son of Ali, the grandfather of al-Mustafki. He was a Byzantine nobleman who led troops against the Sassanians in the Battle of Varsa (333 A.D.). His victory allowed the Byzantine Empire to expand its influence in the region.

AL-MUSTANDJI'IB, also known as Ali, was the son of Ali, the grandfather of al-Mustafki. He was a major figure in the political and military affairs of the Byzantine Empire during the 7th century.

AL-MUSTANIS (1350-1400) was a prominent figure in the Persian court. He served as a diplomat and advisor to several Persian rulers.

AL-MUSTANIS (1150-1220) was a Byzantine nobleman and military leader. He was known for his military victories against the Crusaders and his role in the Battle of Manzikert (1071).

AL-MUSTANIS (1465-1512) was a notable figure in 16th-century Persia. He served as a military commander and diplomat for the Safavid dynasty.

Throughout his reign, the actual power was entirely in the hands of al-Afjal [q.v.]. At first some successes were gained in Syria; Famiya (Apamea) made a voluntary submission in 489, and Tyre was recovered from a rebel governor in 490. A project of alliance with the Seldjuk Buwam of Aleppo against Damascus in the same year fell through. On the appearance of the Crusaders in Syria (q.v. 997), an Egyptian embassy was sent to open negotiations with them, and in 491 (July-Aug. 1005) Jerusalem was recaptured from the Orenfids Sukman and El-Ghazan. The advance of the Crusaders in the following year took them at Ascalon; 491 appears to have been in possession. Two years later, al-Afjat died (17th Sajar, 495 = Dec. 12, 1101) and was succeeded by his son al-Mansur (al-Afjal) (q.v.).

The personal character of al-Mustafi is highly praised by his Sunni contemporary Ibn al-Kalunisti; later writers speak of him as a fanatical Shi'ite, and it would seem that the Fatimid organization and propaganda was intensified in his reign. Lufris refers especially to his close relations with the Fatimids in the Yemen, represented by al-Malika al-Hurra and her ayyal Yabia b. Lamak b. Malik al-Hamadani. In the capable hands of al-Afjal, order and good government were maintained, and Egypt continued to enjoy prosperity, except for a famine in 492-493, due to the influx of Syrian refugees.
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AL-MUSTANIS (1465-1512) was a notable figure in 16th-century Persia. He served as a military commander and diplomat for the Safavid dynasty. 
to murder the heir-apparent when he entered his father’s apartment. Al-Mustanjidh however heard of his arrest and the intriguer and his son were arraigned. A few years after his accession the Mahrudis were expelled [q.v.]. The end of the Fwmids also fell within his reign although the ‘Abbasids were only officially recognised as caliphs of Egypt under his successor al-Mustanjidh. In 562 (1106—1107) Shimia, lord of Khabba, invaded the ‘Iraq and demanded from the caliph the grant of a portion of the lower Euphrates territory as a fief. The caliph however sent an army against him. Shimia’s nephew, Khabba, was routed and Shimia returned home. Al-Mustanjidh died on 9th Rabi’II 566 (Dec. 20, 1170). When he was very ill, his physician arranged with his chamberlain Asad al-Din [q.v.] and the emir Kuf al-Din Kalmor to give him a bath to hasten his end. The caliph refused to agree; he was nevertheless shut up in the bath until he died.


AL-MUSTANṣIR BI ‘LLĀH, ABU DI‘ĀRĀK AL-MANṣūr B. AL-ZAHĀR, ‘Abbasid caliph; like his father whom he succeeded on the 14th Rabi’II 623 (July 11, 1226), he is described as a just and devout man and was generally liked although he played no great part in politics. He acquired tribal by a legacy in 630 (1233—1233) and eight years later his lands were increased by the acquisition of the town of ‘Arba which he bought from its previous owner. About this time the Mongols began to threaten the lands of Islam. Cingia Khan [q.v.] had died in Rama‘Jan 624 (Aug. 1227) but his sons continued his campaign of conquest. In 635 (1237—1238) the Mongols were defeated by the caliph’s troops; the strongest defender of Islam however was Dalaif al-Din Shah of Khurram [q.v.]. Al-Mustanjidh died on 26th Djamād I or 10th Djamād II 640 (Nov. 15 or Dec. 5, 1242). According to Ibn Khaldūn however, he did not die till the following year. The al-Mustanjidha university founded by him in Baghādād bears his name.


AL-MUSTANṣIR BI ‘LLĀH, ABI TAMĪM MAṢʿŪD B. ALI AL-ZAHĀR; eighth Fwmid Caliph; born 16th Djamād II, 420 (July 2, 1029) (according to Lāṭa, on 16th Rama‘Jan = Sept. 29), succeeded his father al-Zahir [q.v.] 15th Shab ‘a‘ 427 (June 13, 1026), and died 18th Djamād I, 487 (Jan. 10, 1046) after the longest recorded reign of any Muslim ruler on one throne, which, besides being marked by the most violent fluctuations of fortune, was of critical importance in the history of the Fatimid family movement.

Internal history. During the childhood of the al-Mustanjidh the authority remained first at first in the strong hands of his father’s wālī Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Qādirjār. On his death (7th Rama‘Jan 430 = March 28, 1045) it was seized by the evil genius of al-Mustanjidh’s reign, his mother, who was a Sūdān slave, and her former master, the Jewish merchant Abū Sa‘d al-Tustarī. When Abū Sa‘d was assassinated in 439 (1047), after an outbreak of rioting between the Turkish and Berber troops, his place as the queen-mother’s agent was taken by his brother Abū Najīr Hārūn [see however the documents published by Mann, BHM.,] and the khāt Abū Muhammad al-Husayn al-Vāṣirī, who eventually accepted also the wazīrat (7th Shab ‘a‘ 442 = June 1, 1050) and held it for eight years [cf. AL-YAZÚR]. Meanwhile there was considerable unrest and perhaps also economic unsettlement in the country. If a statement in al-Mṣīr (i, 82 [q.v.]; ed. Wiet, ii, 4 [67]) is to be believed, the khāt of the Egyptian provinces amounted only to one million dinārs in the time of al-Yazúr, but this may have been exceptional, though it is plain from other sources that the government had already been forced to the familiar expedient of confiscations and indemnities. The Delta was disturbed by Arab risings, the most serious of which, that of the Banū Khura, was put down only with great difficulty by Nāṣir al-Dawla (see below) with the ‘Alawī and other Arab troops at Kōm Shahir in 443 (1051) (cf. Ibn al-Ša‘rīf, p. 42 sq.; Ibn al-Athir, ia, 396 sq., and for the date Ibn al-Kalānī, p. 85). At the capital there was an increasing state of tension between the Turkish and Berber troops and the enormous bodies of Sūdān slaves raised by the Caliph’s mother (cf. Maṣṣūrī, i, 94 [ed. Wiet, ii, 43] and p. 335; detailed but probably unreliable figures also in Nāṣir-i Khurasān, ed. Kavānī, p. 66). In striking contrast to this is the magnificence of the court and prosperity of Mīsāṭ-Fuṣūṣī described by Nāṣir-i Khurasān [q.v.]. There can be little doubt that the source of much of this prosperity, apart from the manufacture of luxury goods for the court, is already to be sought in the commercial relations between Egypt and the Indian Ocean on the one hand (cf. Nāṣir-i Khurasān’s account of ‘Aydāb) and Constantinople on the other. The general insecurity deepened after the execution of al-Vāṣirī, who was the last waste to attempt to control the situation. He was followed by a rapid succession of puppeteers in office, many of whom, despite the pompous titles duly recorded by Ibn al-Ša‘rīf, held the position for no more than a few days at a time.

The Fatimid Caliphate was now destined to pass in a few shrinking years through the same agony as the ‘Abbasid Caliphate at Baghādād had suffered in the early part of the previous century. The breakdown of the civil administration and subsequent exhaustion of the treasury gave a free hand to the tax-farmers, and the sinister position of the Caliph’s mother brought matters essentially to a head. In a pitched battle at Kōm al-Rish (close to Cairo) in 454 (1062) (sometimes confused with the previous battle at Kōm Shahir) the Turkish and Berber troops led by Nāṣir al-Dawla Ibn Hamālān, a descendant of the Hāmidānīs of Mōqāl, defeated and drove the Sūdāni into the Sa‘d, but the struggle continued for some years and the blacks were not finally routed and driven out until 459 (1067) thereafter they were confined to the Sa‘d.
Additions and Corrections

p. 7018, l. 48. To be added: In an early period Turkish has also known the form  asher (from Sanscrit Sā tua, many, under, cf. W. King and A. von Gneist, Turc. Tauch-Tyche, t. 51).

p. 7941, l. 66. To be added: Signature was something of a privilege. Of the surviving engravers of Istanbul two only possessed it—Omar, the son of a famous father of that name, and Aşık. The personal seals in Latin characters, made up to this day (1933), are, with a few exceptions, barbarous.

The etching and graphic museums at Ankara possesses a curious collection of mural seals preserved from the shrines of the now dissipated sects of the Bekasheh.
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wars and generals who kept him virtually a prisoner. The statements of the later anti-Fātimid sources must, of course, be entirely discounted; the Fātimid sources, on the other hand, praise his sagacity and infallibility (imān) as Muslim.

External relations. The empire to which al-Mustansir succeeded was beyond any doubt the most powerful Muslim state of its time. It extended from Iraq and Syria in the west, to Moghul and Central Asia in the east, and included an active propagandist organization in India, Persia and Khurasan (see the following section). Within a few years of his elevation its territories were still further expanded by an Egyptian conquest of Aleppo in 478 (May 1038) [cf. the articles FATIMIDS and NAṢĀʾIR] and extension of his authority even across the Euphrates, on the one hand, and on the other by the conquests of Afīn al-Shāhīd in the Yemen, after establishing himself there in the same year [cf. 521/1031] also H. F. al-Hamalînî, in Journal of the Royal Central-Asian Society, 1931, p. 305 f., and in J. E. A.S., 1932, p. 150 f., after the deaths of Anis al-Dīn and the wāli al-Imām, the men of whose rivalry constantly maintained the interests of the dynasty, the power and prestige of the Egyptian court steadily declined. The Arab tribes in Syria, though defeated in the field, remained unsubdued, and the Caliph had to be content with the little more that he extorted of the tribesmen, like the Mālikis [q.v.] at Aleppo. At Damascus, the rivalry between the Beitha and Turkish troops and the hostility of the citizens reduced the government to impotence. The disturbed state of Syria was the more disastrous that it made it impossible for the Fātimid government to give effective support to the amir al-Basra [q.v.]; see the list of war material and subventions sent from Egypt! Ibn Taghribirdi, p. 177 in his attempt to oppose the advancing Sālimids. With the result that his occupation of Baghdād, and proclamation of al-Mustansir in 496 (1058—

499) was speedily brought to an end. The subsequent military and economic disorders in Egypt followed a free hand to the Turkmen (Ghuzz) bands, who had appeared in Northern Syria as early as 447 (1055), though it was not until 465 (1071) that the first Sālimid armies entered Northern Syria and the Ghuzz bands under Ata [q.v.] occupied Palestine and began to press Damascus. In many of the other towns and districts of Syria the authority was seized by local chiefs, such as the khalīf Ibn Aamān [q.v.]; also G. Wiel, in Mem. Henri Raschi, p. 239 sqq. [at Turkˆbûns and Ibn Abî Aalî at Tyr, though both of these acknowledged the spiritual authority of the Fātimid Caliph] [cf. also the account of the foundation of the castle of Sarhad by Hāsūn b. Mismir al-Kabîl in 466 (1073—1074), quoted from Sībīl b. al-Djâwâl in Ibn Taghribirdi, p. 255]. The menace of the Sālimids became substantial after the death of Tawâsh [q.v.] in 470 (1078—1079), but the latter never actually organized a full campaign against the Fātimids. On the contrary, the offensive was taken by Badr, who succeeded in restoring Egyptian control on the coast as far as Sidon, Sībi and Dijbalîn in 482 (1089), but not in restoring the interior of Palestine and Damascus (lost in 468), in spite of a certain revival of fighting in Syria in favour of the Fātimids. It is difficult to know how much with a few exceptions, the weight to lay on the story (Ibn Taghribirdi,
p. 273] that Tutaq at one time proposed to ally himself in marriage with Badr.

The success of the Saljukids also affected the position of the Fatimid in Arabia. In 420 (1030) the 'Abbasid Caliph was acknowledged in the Holy Cities, and after a brief return to the Fatimid obedience between 427 and 473 the Khidr passed definitely to the 'Abbasid cause. In the Yemen, the 'Alids in the interior and the Zatids in the important commercial centre of Aden maintained the autonomy of the 'Abbasids, the latter until the 'Alid conquest by Tunaqshah in 569 (1173) [cf. the REV. SALAHI].

Meanwhile the Fatimid empire had been similarly shorn of its possessions in the West. About 435 (1043-1044) al-Mu'aqqil b. Rabi'a [q. v.], the Zidat lieutenant of the Fatimid Caliph in Kairouan, began a series of repressive measures against the Shi'ites of Ifrikiya; in 440 he seems to have made his first overt gesture of independence, and in 441 succumbed the Fatimid coinage; but it was not until 445 (1051) that he formally renounced the Fatimid suzerainty and obtained an audience from the 'Abbasid Caliph. According to the traditional account (already fully developed in Ibn al-Salari), the wazir al-Yahsi in revenge launched against him the nomad bands of the Bani Hilal [q. v.]; the tribes mentioned in the Egyptian sources are Zugbha, Ryah, al-Ahshaphi, and 'Adiyi, who had been a cause of much trouble to the government in the Sa'id and were now given a free hand to plunder the territories of the Zidat [cf. TUNISIA, vol. iv. 851]. As Wustenfeld has already indicated (p. 234 n.), the story as it stands is open to serious objections, and there can be little doubt that it has been amplified by popular legend. The westward movement of the Hilal tribes began as early as 440, and there is no reason to reject the account of Ibn 'Idhri that it was al-Mu'aqqil himself who invited the Arab tribes, then in Barqa, to enter Ifrikiya at his behest (since he was not on good terms with the Sanadhi), and that they, having set out in response to his invitation, began to fight amongst themselves and their own army, and already before the close of 445 had inflicted a severe defeat and captured his troops. The two traditions are not, however, mutually exclusive and may be reconciled by supposing that the Bani Hilal were transported in the first instance to Barqa (the governor of which had thrown in his lot with al-Mu'aqqil), and that their advance into Ifrikiya was facilitated, for opposite reasons, by both al-Mu'aqqil and the wazir (cf. also Ibn al-Ashir, ii. 387-388). During the first years of his reign, the son and successor of al-Mu'aqqil, Tamin (453-501 = 1061-1107), temporarily returned to the Fatimid allegiance (Lance-Poire, p. 138 n. 1), but with the conquest of Sicily by the Normans in 453 (1067) Barqa became the western limit of the Fatimid state.

The diplomatic relations of al-Mustansir with non-Muslim states covered a wide field. In 429 (1038) the existing treaty with the Byzantine Emperor was renewed and relatively cordial relations established. If Naffi-i Khusrav [ed. Kaviani, p. 67], is to be trusted, the Egyptian government was in communication in 439 (1047) also with the Georgians, the Dailamites, the Khusraw of Turkestan, and even the rulers of Dibbi, all of whom shared with Egypt a common hostility to the Saljukids and the Ghurids. The friendly relations with Constantinople, however, were broken off in 446 (1054), when the Empress Theodora demanded an offensive alliance against the Saljukids. Egyptian troops were despatched on an unsuccessful expedition against al-Maghita, the Empress retaliated by opening negotiations with the Saljukids, and al-Mustansir seized the treasures of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (al-Khulami). This breach with Constantinople had important consequences for the future of Egypt, since to it may perhaps be ascribed the opening up of direct commercial relations with the Italian trading cities, though documentary evidence on the point is lacking. (Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i. 105, 143).

Religious Conditions. The wide expansion of the Fatimid power under al-Mustansir is reflected also in the religious situation. Propaganda on behalf of the Fatimid faith was synonomous with the disseminated of the official state religion of the Fatimids, the Isma'ili-Shi'ite faith. Not only in Egypt and other lands in actual submission to the Fatimid authority, but in all quarters of the Islamic world, we learn of missionaries (jihds), who during the time of the Fatimid rule transmitted the Fatimid faith with great success, to secure recognition of his claim to be the religious Imam. In the East, in Persia, and especially in Shiraz, at the court of the Buyid prince Abu Bakr [q. v.], we can trace the activities at least since 429 (1037-1038) of the 'Alid Naqib Hilal Allah b. Musa al-Mu'aqqil [ed. Ibn Allah, see AL-MU'AQQIL], doubtless the most prominent personality of his time in the Isma'ili sect. He endeavoured to win over the court and the Dailamite troops to the Fatimid cause, but was forced to leave his post in 430 (1047-1048) as the result of pre-'Abbasid intrigues in the first part of his autobiography (see Bibliography), al-Mu'aqqil gave a detailed account of his activity, and in particular publishes his correspondence with an unnamed Sunni from Khurasan, in which he explains the religious and political principles of his mission. To what an extent the power of the Fatimid and the success of their emissaries in Iraq and Persia was feared at Baghdad is shown by the fact that several times and latterly in 444 (1052), there was published a special decree, to which the 'Alids also subscribed, with the object of declaring false the claims of the Fatimids to descend from 'Ali. At the same time the Fatimid cause gained also new ground in the Yemen. After the political power of the Fatimid had been reduced there to a minimum, in the course of the fourth century, it now acquired in the 'Alids 'Ali b. Muhammad a powerful supporter. He and his successors regarded themselves not only as political but also as religious representatives of the Fatimid Isma'ili in the Yemen. The voluminous correspondence between the 'Alids and al-Mustansir, which is still preserved, collected in a separate work (Kelim al-Safilliyah wa l-Tawqah wa l-Khawar bi Manqabat al-Mustansir bi 'l-Mak., MS. Sch. Or. 8.), many of these letters are also reproduced in Idra', vol. viii. [see Bibliography], deals, along with political questions, in the first place with the position of the da'irun in the Yamani and in the Fatimid state.

In Egypt itself, soon after the accession of al-Mustansir, the doctrines of the moderate official Ismaliyya were threatened by the appearance of extremists related to the Druzes [q. v.]. A pretender, al-Sikhin, together with his associate al-Ami, gave himself out as the returned Caliph al-Hikim, but
was promptly unmasked (fsr, nl. 129). Al-
Ma'ānīyid, who came to Cairo in 439 and
won the goodwill of Mustansīr, was entrusted with the leadership
of the mission to the town of al-Dawā'ir (it
should be remembered, however, that al-Ṭāṣrīf
among the missionaries also held the title of
al-Dawā'ir; cf. Ibn al-Safrā'ī, p. 49). In the reopened
seminary in Cairo, where the ḍawr of the various
countries received instruction, he gave his lectures
and gathered into his bands the strings of the
whole ḍawr. He appears to have exercised a
special influence over the development of the
Ḥanāfī in the Yaman, as the future Yamanī
Ṣalmān b. Mālik was numbered amongst his pupils.
From Persia the newly-converted Ismaʿili ʿAbd al-
Qār [v.] came to Egypt, to find his master in
him. At the same time al-Ma'ānīyid seems also to
have played an important political role. In his
autobiography he quotes numerous letters which he
wrote to al-Baṣrī and other generals of the
Fāṭimid in Syria and Mesopotamia. In particular
it was at his instigation that the ḍawr of the
Fāṭimid was introduced into the prayer at Baghdat
in 450 (cf. Ibn Mayyara, p. 6, nl. 10, 2.),
In his poems he eulogizes the Ismaʿilī al-Mustansīr in a
similar manner to Ṣaif al-Qāravar. Other important
authors of this period were the poet Ḥasan b.
Maḥṭūl, the ḍawr Abū al-ʿAbd al-Qār al-Mustansīr,
and the author of the Kitāb al-Manṭik li-
al-Mustansīr (lectures in which the Ismaʿilī of
al-Mustansīr is demonstrated with the skill of the
Ismaʿili ḍawr) which are ascribed by the
Fāṭimid tradition to Badr al-Dālamāt. — For the ḍawr of
the Fāṭimid propaganda in Transoxiana see also Barthold,
Turkistan 2, G. M. X., p. 304—305.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Safrā'ī, Abu l-Ḥāfīfa,
al-Ṭāṣrīf, ed. A. M. Makhlīf, Cairo 1924, p. 57—77; Ibn al-Kalāmī, Qāhill, ed. M. Dānihā, Amelium, p. 83—123; Nāṣir al-
Qārvar, Sāfī al-Ḥāfīza, ed. V. Kaviani, Berlin 1841,
p. 54—55; transl. Schefer, Paris 1881, p. 110—
162; Abū l-Majmūʿ, ed. V., fol. 90, 341—339, 339;
Qāhill al-Dīn al-Halāh, Tayrīz al-Dīnawal-
al-Mustansīr, British Museum Coll. 10, 1859, fol.
68—72; Gotth. No. 1355, fol. 152a—158a; Abū al-
Qār, Sinī al-Ḵᵛās, ed. T. M. Pringsheim, Berl. 1919;
Abū al-Qār, ed. V., fol. 63—209, 298;
Shaikh al-Dīn al-Dīnawal, Al-Maṣū'a, Qāhri;
Abū Salām, ed. V., fol. 32—358; Ibn Ḥallāk, transl.
Abu al-Qār, Qāhri; Ibn Taghhrī, Abū al-Nawāf al-
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MUSTĀRĪB(A) (v. n.), "arabicized," the
name of one of the groups into which the Arab
genealogists divide the population of Arabia. The
first is the ʿarbā'īnī, the original Arabs of pure
stock; they numbered nine (some say seven) tribes
which are regarded as the descendants of Aram
b. Šūm b. Nīḥ [v.] and the first settlers in
Arabia: Ḥad, Ḥamūtī, ʿAbil, Ṣaqr, Ḍād, ʿImār, Ḍāḥim and ʿAbāb. These are
extinct except for a few remnants incorporated
in other tribes. The second group comprises
the ḍawrīs [v.] who are not pure blooded
Arabs. They are regarded as descendants of Khalīfān
(they are the list of nations in Gen. 3. 25—
27) and live in southern Arabia. The third
group is called mustārībīs; this name is also applied to
tribes who were not originally Arabs; they trace their
descendents from Muḥammad b. Adna, a descendant
of Ismaʿil [v.]. All the north Arabian tribes are
included among the mustārībīs, so that the Hanī
Karājī which Muhammad belonged to is one of
them; his genealogy is in this way traced back
to Abraham and he thus thought he could prove
his connection with the Biblical prophets. The
old term ḍawrīs, for tribes not originally of
Arab descent, obtained a new meaning after the
conquest of Spain. It was applied to the Christian
Spaniards who adopted Islam; the word mustārībīs
was corrupted to Mozārib [v.].

Bibliography: Castani, Annali dell'Islam,
l. 3, 154; D. A. S. O., Studi d Storia Orientale, l. 306,
q. v.; Cassani de Prez, Essai sur l'histoire de l'Arabie, l. 6, q. v.; C. Ritter, Arabien, l. 572;
al-Suyūtī, Mushfr, 2 v. New Edition; Aṣbaḥ al-
ʿĀrāb, l. 571; q. v.; Lane, Lex., l. 9, q. v.

[After Lichtenstaüer]

AL-MUSTASHRID BY 'ILĀH, ATTARI 'ALIGHI, A. ḍawrīs, the descendant of the Caliph, born in 488 (1093—
94), son of al-Mustaghvir and a slave-girl. Al-
Mustashrid, who was proclaimed his father's suc-
cessor after the latter's death on 16th Ramdān l
1118 (Aug. 6, 1118), was the first caliph since the
occupation of Baghdat by the Byzantines who were
not content with spiritual supremacy but also
desired to revive the caliph's authority in
 temporal matters. The Saljūq sultān had
 died before al-Mustaghvir (Dhu l-Ḥijjah 511 = April
1118) and his son Mahmund [v.], was appointed
successor. His uncle Sandzar and his brother Marīd
fell rebelled against the new sultān and the tur-
bulent Mustaghvir, b. Ṣaqr [v.], was raising trouble in the ḥiras and had also quarrelled with the
caiphib. The latter defeated him in 517 (1223)
and after al-Mustashrid had repelled a regular
attack on the capital he was able to adopt a more
independent attitude to the Saljūqs. But as his
increasing power aroused the suspicions of the
governor of Baghdat, the latter in Ramdān 520
(July-Aug. 1125) went to Sultan Mahmund and
asked him to put a limit to the caliph's powers.
Mahmund agreed and attacked the capital while
al-Mustashrid sent an army against Wāṣīt in order to
seize this town. The attempt failed however;
towards the end of the year Mahmund entered
Baghdat and al-Mustashrid could not hold out
infinitely but had to make peace, whereupon the
sultān appointed. Ḥadīl al-Dīn Zangi governor of
Baghdat and all the ḥiras. But in Dhu l-Ḥijjah l
521 (July 1127) the latter was given the governorship
of al-Mawīl and after Mahmund's death (535 =
1135) the succession was again disputed. In 536
Dubaiti and Zangi undertook a campaign against
Baghdat but were defeated by the caliph at the
end of Rajab (June 1332) and in the same year Musta'sī (q.v.) had to give him complete control of Baghdad, which was then佔着 a surrounding country. After some time he attacked the state and took it prisoner in Ramadan 659 (Jan. 1335) and murdered in Duḥūr 'Iḥkāmī of the same year (Aug. 1335) (cf. the art. 1352 H. (1652) the Mongol Khan Hūlagū (q.v.) demanded that the Muslim rulers should throw the main man on the Islamic. The caliph did not trouble about this and in his caliph at 655 (March/April 1257) a Mongol embassy came to Baghdad and demanded that al-Musta’sī should raise the defences of the city and appear in person before Hūlagū for further negotiations or send a deputy. As the caliph refused to meet these demands, Hūlagū threatened him with war. After another message in which al-Musta’sī tried to intimate Hūlagū, the latter set out against the ancient city of the caliphs. On the way he met another embassy, offering him an annual tribute but this effort to appease the cruel foe was useless and by May 656 (Jan. 1258) the Mongols were at the gates of Baghdad. Preparations for the siege advanced rapidly and after all attempts to resume negotiations had failed against the relentless Hūlagū, al-Musta’sī had to surrender on 4th Safar (10th Feb.) and the city was sacked. Ten days later Hūlagū had the caliph with some of his relations put to death (cf. the art. 1352 H.).


**MUSTASHAR** (a.), councellor, Turkish pronunciation müstāṣchar, meaning "general secretary to a ministry" or "under-secretary of state". The word which means literally "one who is consulted" comes from the root mustā‘ (q.v.) which properly means "he who gives advice". Saint Raynart regards the word müstāṣchar as a synonym of the old Turkish inat. The office was called müstāṣchar or more simply müstāṣchar. Like the title müstā‘, that of müstāṣchar was created by Mahmūd II. There were at first two müstāṣchar in the grand vizierate, one for foreign and the other for home affairs. The latter was later replaced by a minister of the interior who had in his turn a müstāṣchar. The number of müstāṣchar gradually increased but some less important departments had müstā‘un assisstant, deputy in 1259 for example there were müstā‘un in the finance and police departments. The office has been retained under the present republic and each ministry or mellā‘ah has its müstāṣchar, that of national defence has three (for army, navy and air force).

The chief judge of Istanbul used to have a müstāṣchar. According to Latif Efendi, the post of müstāṣchar of the Navy was created in 1233 (569 h. p. 91) and that of müstāṣchar of the navel or of the two boxers in 1262 (viii. p. 127). On the honorary grades of müstā‘un of the same author, vi., p. 66; cf also p. 103, line 8 from below.

**Councilor** is also the name given to the "counselors" of Turkish or foreign ambassadors or legations. The title of müstāṣchar animal being by the ambassador himself, sent by the Sultan of Morocco to Istanbul in 1297, is inexplicable to us (cf. Djelewet Pasha, edition 1309, ii., p. 231; Recueil des Missions Orientales de l’Etr. des Langues Orientales à Paris, 1905, p. 6).

As to the term müstā‘un, a synonym of the preceding and from the same root, it is applied to technical advisers, whether foreigners or not; ṣafākh müstā‘un, "legal adviser".

**Bibliography:** Cf. the various Ottoman sal̲īhibs. The historians Ahmad Djelewet and Latif, following their predecessors, give no details of the administrative organization. (J. Deny)

**AL-MUSTA‘SIM BI‘ALLAH, ABD AL-AHMAD ALI AND AL-MUSTA‘SIM, THE LAST AKHABJIDAH OF BAGHDAD, born in 609 (1213/4). After the death of his father in Dhul-Qa‘dah I or II 620 (Nov./Dec. 1242) he was raised to the caliph’s throne but he had neither the talent nor the strength to avert the catastrophe threatening from the Mongols; he allowed himself to be guided by bad councillors who were not agreed amongst themselves but working against one another. In 683 (1285/6) the Mongol Khan Hūlagū (q.v.) demanded that the Muslim rulers should throw the main man on the Islamic. The caliph did not trouble about this and in his caliph at 655 (March/April 1257) a Mongol embassy came to Baghdad and demanded that al-Musta’sī should raise the defences of the city and appear in person before Hūlagū for further negotiations or send a deputy. As the caliph refused to meet these demands, Hūlagū threatened him with war. After another message in which al-Musta’sī tried to intimate Hūlagū, the latter set out against the ancient city of the caliphs. On the way he met another embassy, offering him an annual tribute but this effort to appease the cruel foe was useless and by May 656 (Jan. 1258) the Mongols were at the gates of Baghdad. Preparations for the siege advanced rapidly and after all attempts to resume negotiations had failed against the relentless Hūlagū, al-Musta’sī had to surrender on 4th Safar (10th Feb.) and the city was sacked. Ten days later Hūlagū had the caliph with some of his relations put to death (cf. the art. 1352 H.)


**MUSTAWFĪ, AN OFFICIAL IN CHARGE OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS.** Under the Turkish system, e.g. under the Ghaznakids and Saljuqs, the title of this function was by a functionary of high rank who was at the head of the administration concerned with keeping the tally of public income and expenditure. Under the Nāṣir al-Mulk, the office of the mustawfī was second only to that of the viceroy (Bundārī, ed. Houtsoum, p. 100) and appears to have corresponded to the dīwān al-samā‘ or dīwān al-zimā‘, the "Bureau of (Financial) Control" of the 'Abbasids (Tahārī, iii. 532), although the Saljuqs also had a dīwān of this same tenable by the mustawfī himself (Bundārī, p. 58). The qualities requisite in him were such as to fit him for the vizierate itself (ibid., p. 96), and indeed there were duties which were common to the two offices so that the same man could act as the nāṣir in both (ibid., p. 126, last line). The vizierate might be refused by a powerful mustawfī holding all the reins of government in his hands and reluctant to expose himself to the dangers inherent in the nominally more exalted office (ibid., p. 136, 141). But no officer was so prudent or greedy monarch and the mustawfī Sa’d al-Dīn suffered death and the confiscation of a large part of his property at the hands of Sultan Maḥdī (ibid., p. 174). It is probable that the actual title of the State mustawfī was mustawfī wa-l-mawāla something similar (ibid., p. 31), the ordinary mustawfī, the accountant, holding a subordinate position (ibid., p. 37).)
Under the Mongol the title was given to the superintendent of provincial finances (e.g. Hāmid Allāh Mustawfi and his great-grandfather; cf. E. G. Browne, *Litt. Hist. of Persia*, iii. 87), and under the Timurids, Safavids and Kājārān the *mustawfī* *μύσταβιφ* filled the office of a secretary of state in charge of the public treasury accounts while the ordinary *mustawfi* was one of the lesser officers of the court (R. du Mail, *Études de la Perse* en 1860, ed. Schefer, Paris 1860, p. 26, 178 sqq.; A. Olearius, *Voyages et Travaux*, London 1669, p. 274; Sir J. Malcolm, *History of Persia* London 1815, ii. 457; R. G. Watson, *History of Persia*, London 1866, p. 16 sqq.). *Mustawfi* *μύσταβιφ* might however, under the latest Kājārān, be a title personal to a particular individual, who might be the Minister of the Interior (as in 1890), or even Prime Minister (as in 1910).

In Egypt, under the Fātimids and Mamluks, the *mustawfi* might be the head of a *muğāla* (as of the *muğālāt al-ğazī* or of a *muğālāt al-ğazî*): or hold a less exalted, but still important, position as financial controller in such matters as the *jlālal*, or military fees (cf. Makṭūr, *Khāfīj*, Caireen 1870, ii. 195; middle and p. 227, under *mugālāt al-ğazī*). The ordinary *mustawfi* was a minor official of the *shāhid* or, overseer, in land-revenues or crop-estimation or else in a government office such as the depot of the government grain monopoly (*qātār*, c.e.t., ed. Witt, ii., ch. 32, p. 227-255).


(R. Levy)

**MUSTAWFI [see Hāmid Allah.]**

**AL-MUSTAẒĀRHI B. ILĀH,`ABBĀD AL-ĞAZĪ**

After the death of his father in Muḥarram 487 (Feb. 1094) the young al-Mustazārhi succeeded him; about this time the power of the Saffārids was beginning to be weakened by internal dissensions (cf. *bānī Yarām)*. The Assassins, who had already appeared on the scene in al-Muḳtaḍar's reign, were able to take advantage of the situation and fighting this dangerous sect soon became one of the most important tasks of the sultān and caliph. The Crusades also began at this time. In Ṣaḥīḥ 492 (July 1099) Jerusalem was taken and in the following years numerous fugitives reached Baghādūd who urged 'Āmmīn Muḥammad to come to part in the struggle. He therefore sent an army under the emir Mawdūd against the Crusaders in 505 (1111/12). Al-Mustazari, who is hardly ever mentioned in the political history of this period, died on 16 Rabi' II in 512 (Aug. 6, 1113) at the age of 41.


(K. V. Zettersten)

**MUSULMAN** [see Muslim.]

**MUTA, a town in the centre of a fertile plain in the land east of Jordan, east of the southern end of the Dead Sea, about two hours' journey south of Kerak, and described for the defeat of the Muslims there in the Dhu‘dādī I. of the year 8. According to the Arabic account, the reason why Mu‘ādh sent 3,000 men to this region was that an envoy whom he had sent to the king presumably the imperial commandant of Byzantium had been murdered by a Christian band, and the real reason seems to have been that he wished to bring the (Christian or pagan) Arabs living there under his control. If the story is correct that he chose three leaders for the expedition, 'Abyd b. Ḥārīrī [q.v.] and if he felt his cousin Dā‘ūr b. Alī Ṭallīb [q.v.] and if he also felt the poet 'Abd Allāh b. Āwāla Ḥāyi [q.v.], he must have fully recognized the hazardous nature of the enterprise, but the danger of the story to describe the dangers of the expedition and the overwhelming nature of the opposing force as very great in order to put the unfortunate result of the battle in a better light; quite evident. In Ḥāṣan b. Thā‘libi (xxii., calviii.), we are only told that the three leaders above mentioned fell in succession: When the Muslims arrived in Mā‘ṣūm in eastern Edom, they learned that there were about 100,000 Byzantine soldiers and Beduins — a much exaggerated figure which Ibn Ḥādīm doubtless had assimilated in Ma‘ṣūm (Arabic *Pertuna*, I. 29); according to Tabari, in 501, was not a town but a camp (ṣā‘il), and the historian, which according to Tabari, 29, 508, was not a town but a camp (ṣā‘il), a place near a spring with traces of an old Roman camp. But Abu ‘l-Fadl identifies it with al-Rabba which he describes as a village on the site of the former capital of the district, i.e. the Rabban Moab or Arcepulis (P. Thomsen, *Loca Sacra*, p. 25; Brünnow, *N. D. P. F.*, 1895, p. 70 sqq. with photographs; Muṣlih, *op. cit.*, p. 370 sqq., 381). According to the Arab story, it was the emperor Heraclius himself who assembled this great army in Ma‘ṣūm, which is of course not true. When the Muslims heard this, they were told, they lost courage and were afraid to wait until the Prophet could send them reinforcements but ‘Abd Allāh b. Rāwaṣa was able to fill them with such enthusiasm for a possible martyr's death that they marched on the imperial army. According to Ibn Ḥādīm, the latter met them at a village belonging to al-Muṣ‘īd called Māshrif, but this must be a misunderstanding as this term means the Syrian fortresses on the edge of the desert. At the sight of the great force of the enemy, they withdrew to the south but fighting began at the village of Mā‘ṣūm and they were routed. When the three leaders named by Mu‘ādh had fallen in the order indicated, they wanted Thā‘lib b. Ṭallīb b. ‘Abbās to take command but he gave it to Dā‘ūr b. Alī Ṭallīb who succeeded in the rest of the force; this was the first occasion on which his military talents benefited the Muslims; how he did it, we do not know as the sīrah related by Wāḥīd, p. 512 is not to be taken seriously. Besides the Muslim account, we have a Byzantine one, the earliest in the history of the Prophet, by the historian Theophanes, whose version bears the stamp of veracity. According to Muḥammad sent four chiefs to the land east of Jordan against the Christian Arabs there. They went to a village named-Muṣʻūn, which de Goeje, Mémoires sur la compilation de la Syrie, p. 6 sqq., takes
to be a copyist's error for Muḥā, while Muṣil, *et al.*, p. 135, identifies it with Khīri al-Muḥān which lies in a broad depression, in order to fall upon the Arabs on a feastday (*ṣabāʾa tāhāt:* *khīri naʿābār,* which seems to indicate a haven rather than a Christian population) but the sūris *Theophanes* there learned of their plans and rapidly collecting the garrison of the forlorn ones, fell upon the Muslims at Muʿān and defeated them. Three of the leaders and most of the force were killed and Chalafos who was called the "sword of God," alone escaped. The terrors of that night and the tumults of war, which fell there, are mentioned in the poem of Muʿān, where a mausoleum was built over them.


**MUTA (A).** Temporary marriage (according to the Arab lexicographers "marriage of pleasure"); a marriage which is contracted for a fixed period on rewarding the woman.

1. **Before Islam.** According to Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv. 4, 4, temporary marriage was in use among the Arabs already in the fourth century A.D.; but this can hardly be a reference to muta's as the woman being a feme loci and free to the man and can leave him if she dislikes the period after the marriage has elapsed. It is also doubtful if there is a distinct muta's character in the marriage of Hishām with Salma bint ʿĀmm, who married during a temporary stay in Yathrib and left with her family there after the birth of her child (Cassani, i. 111, § 92).

From the passage ʿAḥārī, xvi. 63 (muṣīlīt bīk ʿAḥārī) as well as from Muslim traditions it may be concluded that muta's was known in the Qādīliya. If we remember that the same kind of temporary marriage as the muta's was known in Erythraeus (Corni Rossi, *Principi di diritto comune e canon*, Rome 1916, p. 189, 249) it seems to us certain that muta's is an old Arabian institution. (Temporary marriage is also found among other peoples, cf. Wilken, p. 28 sq.; Westernmarck, *History of Human Marriage*, London 1925, iii. 207 sqq.; cf. also the ʿayāsah in Egypt, to which Grifflin, p. 327 calls attention; in a domestic document there is a reference to such a marriage for five months: cf. Mittelschik, *Grundzüge der Papyruskunde,* i/i, p. 205 sqq.所做的。)

II. In the Kurān there is undoubtedly a reference to this form of marriage in the Muslim era iv. 26, although the orthodox explanation of this passage as early as the first century refers it to the ordinary *muta*; after giving a list of the classes of women with whom marriage is forbidden, it goes on: *and further you are permitted to seek out wives with your wealth, in modest conduct but not to intoxication; but give them their reward (wāср) for what you have enjoyed of them* (salam) *in keeping with your promise.* After *surūt* 3,CXIX. sur. 2, Ka'āb ibn *Abi Muhammad 3, 9* Abbas read the words *itās suqaʿah tuṣumman* *for a definite period,* (Tafsir, *Tabārī, v. 93), a reading which naturally has not found its way into Sūra circles but is often added in Shī'ī books.

III. The traditions are contradictory on the question of muta's. According to some, it was in use in the time of the Prophet and he was even said to have practised it (muta'ahāb: *Tabārī, Amīrāt,* i. 1775, 1776; cf. Cassani, ii. 428, N. 17 and 19). In return for a robe or a handful of dates one could take an unmarried woman (nawwāb) for a period of cohabitation (Muslim, *Nabī, tr. 13*; Taylī, *Nabī, tr. 16*). Especially when a man came to a strange town he could find a wife there for the period of his stay so that she could look after him (Tirmīzī, *Nabī, b. 28*).

On the other hand, according to one tradition related by Alī, it was forbidden by the Prophet on the day (or in the year) of Khaibar (Bukhārī, *Magāzī,* b. 38, *Dāhībī,* b. 28; *Nabī,* b. 33; Muslim, *Nabī, tr. 31—34; Nasā', *Nabī, b. 71; in the day of Hunain must have been a mistake: for Khaibar): *Said,* b. 31; Im Mādū, *Nabī, b. 44; Tirmīzī, *Nabī, b. 28; Aḥmad, b. 6; *Mālik, *Nabī, tr. 41; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 70, 103, 142; *Tawāris, N. 111; Zakī, *Magāzī,* N. 718).

According to other traditions, he is said to have permitted it for a short time on particular occasions. In this connection we have a group of traditions which goes back to Sahāb b. Muḥān; the various accounts of this, some long, some short, which supplement one another, are in part given without date (Muslim, *Nabī, tr. 20, 26; Nasā', *Nabī, b. 71; Aḥmad Dawdī, *Nabī, b. 13; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 404), in part referred to the conquest of Mecca (Muslim, *Nabī, tr. 21, 22, 23, 27, 27; Dārīmī, *Nabī, b. 16; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 404, 405), and in part to the farewell pilgrimage (Im Mādū, *Nabī, b. 44; *Dārīmī, *Nabī, b. 16; Aḥmad Dawdī, *Nabī, b. 15; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 404 sq*). Their substance is as follows: The Prophet permitted muta's. Sahāb therefore went with a companion to a woman and asked offered her his cloak. She chose the younger of the shabblers cloaks and slept three nights with him; thenceupon the Prophet forbade it. According to the stories associated with the farewell pilgrimage, the woman wished muta's only for a fixed period so that ten days or nights was agreed upon, but the Prophet forbade it after the first night, saying: *Whoever of you has married a woman for a period, shall give her what he promised and ask nothing of it back and he shall separate from her; for God has forbidden this up to the day of resurrection.* (For the conclusion cf. also the fragment in this in Muslim, *Nabī, tr. 33—50*.)

According to a second group of traditions, which goes back to Dālārī b. Abī Allāh b. Salama b. al-Akāwī, the Prophet permitted muta's for three days on a campaign (Bukhārī, *Nabī, b. 71; Muslim, *Nabī, tr. 14, 15; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, iv. 47, 51; according to Muslim, *Nabī, tr. 19 and Aḥmad b. Hanbal, iv. 53, this was in the year of Awtār, i.e. shortly after the capture of Mecca). In Bukhārī we have at the end: *The partnership of the two parties lasted three nights; and if they agreed to extend it, they did so; and if they wished to separate, they did so.* A prohibition is given in only two versions in this group.
According to other traditions, mut'a was first forbidden by the caliph 'Umar at the end of his caliphate (Muslim, Niḥāḥ, tr. 16-18; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 302, 380 and iii. 325, 356, 363; there is no reference to the two kinds of mut'a, i.e. tāmattūʿ on the pilgrimage and mut'at al-
akhthah). 'Umar threatened the punishment of stoning so that he regarded mut'a as fornication (Ibn Māḍir, Niḥāḥ, bāb 441; Mālik, Niḥāḥ, tr. 42; Ṭayyālī, Niḥāḥ, tr. 1792). Cf. the angry exclamation of Ibn 'Umar when he was asked about mut'a: 'By Allah, we were not inmodest in the time of the Prophet of Allah nor fornicators!' (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 95, 104).

What then is at the bottom of these contradictory traditions? While Wellhausen regards mut'a as simply prostitution and not an old Arabian custom, Caentini points out that the traditions agree in connecting mut'a with an entrance of the Prophet into Mecca and sometimes even with the ḍa'ud and that a three days' duration is a feature of the mut'a; taking account of other considerations, he concludes that mut'a in the pagan period was religious prostitution on the occasion of the Meccan festival. However, tempting this explanation may be, there is a complete lack of evidence for any religious prostitution in Mecca. With Wilken and Robertson Smith, we must rather regard mut'a as the survival into Islam of an old Arabian custom. The Prophet gives this custom sanction in the Kur'ān and also practised it himself. In his lifetime he allowed the custom of prohibited by the Prophet Khaṣab and Mecca. As both these are later than the above Kur'ānic passage (years 5-9, according to Noldaik-Schwellin, l. 198) this prohibition would be quite possible. But since on the other hand the caliph 'Umar prohibited mut'a, which is without reason to doubt, we may regard the tradition of prohibition as representing later views, which, as is often the case, are put back to the time of the Prophet.

IV. Attitude of the fāṭihā. Ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 68) was an ardent champion of mut'a (Bukhārī, Niḥāḥ, bāb 31; Muslim, Niḥāḥ, tr. 18; Ṭayyālī, Niḥāḥ, tr. 1792). In Mecca and the Yamam, according to Ibn Rūḥi (Ridā‘ī, Cairo 1339, ii. 54) he also had following: but before his death he is said to have been converted to the opposite view (Tirmidhī, Niḥāḥ, bāb 28; Rāzī, loc. cit., bāb 9). In later times, people still spoke derisively of a marriage by a fītawī of Ibn Abī Ṭālib. In the second half of the first century in Mecca, fītawī were still given permitting mut'a (Muslim, Niḥāḥ, tr. 29). The Kur'ān commentators Mākjādī (d. 109), Sa‘d b. Bahār (d. 95), and Ṣa‘d b. Suhd (d. 127) also referred the above verses of the Kur'ān to mut'a. Suhd said that it is a marriage for a fixed period and that it should be concluded with the permission of the mut'āt and with two witnesses: that after the expiry of this period the man has no longer any claim on the woman and that the two parties cannot inherit from one another (Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, v. 8). With the second century, the contrary view begins to predominate; although individuals like Amr b. Ḍā‘ūr (d. 126), Ibn Ḥaḍramawī (d. 150) and the Zaidi sect of the Gūfiyya permit mut'a (Ibn Rūḥi, loc. cit., v. Aqīmān, Ophensdat et al., Leyden 1916, p. 74, note 9), al-Thawrī (d. 161), Ibn al-Muhsir (d. 181) (Tirmidhī, Niḥāḥ, bāb 28) and all the Sunni schools of law as well as the Shāfi‘īs (al-Nawawī, b. Ḥābi‘, Taha‘rī, Berlin MS., Glasses 74, fol. 53b) consider mut’a forbidden. Its recognition was now limited to the Shi‘ī. And if the caliph Maʿmūn tried to introduce mut’a again, this was certainly due to his Shi‘ī tendencies (Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, ii. 215f).

At the same time, we still have in the second century the expression of a period of transition. According to Zafar (d. 158), the marriage concluded under the form of mut’a was valid as a marriage and not its limitation in time was invalid (Sarshāf, Muṣaffā, v. 133; cf. also Bukhārī, Ḥāfi‘, bāb 4). According to al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-ʿAqīm (d. 204), the mut’a was valid if the partners could not survive the time fixed, e. g. 100 years or more (Sarshāf, loc. cit.).

But in spite of their refusal to recognize mut’a, the Sunnīs made concessions by which mut’a gained a footing in another form. It became the practice not to insert a definite period in the contract; any agreement made outside the contract was not affected by the law Al-Shaf’ī (Umm, v. 71) for example, declared a marriage valid when it was concluded with the unuttered resolution (niyyah) to observe it only for the period of stay in a place or for a few days only, so long as this was not expressly stipulated in the contract. Similarly if agreement to this effect (mut‘atunā) had been previously made and even if made on oath; but he describes such an agreement as sunnah. There are also traces in later literature of a decision by Mālik by which he permitted mut’a of 100 days, (d. 154), Bādh al-Muṣaffā, Muṣaffā al-Tirmidhī, ed. Lees, ii. 208, 209, although only the contrary is recorded in the Maṣāḥih and Muḥaddisun (v. 46).

A good exposition of the two opposite points of view is given from the Sunnī side by Khāṣit (d. 207), Baddī‘ al-Sanadī, Cairo 1327, ii. 272-275, and in Rāzī, loc. cit., ii. 193-198 and from the Shi‘ī side by ʿAlī al-Hudh al-Muṣaffā, Mī‘ār, Tehran 1315, p. 60-65. The Sunnīs refer the verse above mentioned from the Kur’ān to regular marriage and declare the āḏir to be maḥr, while the Shi‘īs base their view on this verse and consider: the traditions of prohibition not to be abrogated and do not consider ‘Umar authoritative for a prohibition. The Imamīs say as much, as to say: "The belief is only perfect when he has experienced a marriage" (al-Ḥurr al-ʿAmīlī, v. 69, 70).

V. Teachings of the Ima‘īmīs.

1. Form. Mut’a is an irreversable (hāzīm) contract which, like every contract, comes into existence through qabāl and ḍa‘ūd. It may be concluded with the words niḥāth or ḍa‘ūd or tāmattū‘, but must always contain a precise statement of the period (āḏir) and a definite recompense (āḏir or maḥr). This recompense may be the dowry usual in other marriages or a handful of corn, a drachm or such like. The period may vary from a day to months or even years. Witnesses are not necessary; nor need it be concluded before the ḍa‘ūd, if the partners are capable of using the formal coercitely. If the maḥr is not given, the contract is under the condition that it is invalid. If the period is not given, according to some it is a regular marriage if the word ḍa‘ūd was not used at the end of the ceremony; in the latter case the contract is again invalid.

2. The two partners must naturally fulfill the usual conditions for the conclusion of an agreement. The woman must further be unmarried.
and chaste ('afa'a) and if possible ought to know about mut'a, i.e. be a ḥā'ī, and can only contract a temporary marriage with a Muslim. According to the Bihārī and al-Mufid (d. 443), mut'a with an unbeliever is forbidden, even with a member of the possessors of a scripture (ṭabābū). The wadā'īḥ (extreme: Ḫirrīs) are included among the unbelievers. According to most Ḥanfīs (and Tūsī also), however, mut'a with a Christian or Jewish woman is permitted but muḥāna with a wādīya. Mut'a with a slave-girl is only permitted with the consent of her master. Usually the woman contracts the marriage without a muḥā; only a virgin (ḥikr) according to some, requires her father's consent (Abu 'l-Sa'ādī, d. 82; Ibn Bihārī, d. 384; Ḥasan al-Barrājī, d. 481; cf. Hilāl, iii. 92). The man may in this way take other wives in addition to his four legal wives, especially on journeys. He must not, however, take two sisters at the same time, not even during the 'Īdā.

3. The mut'a ends on the expiry of the period agreed upon. It cannot be prolonged by arrangement between the two parties; a new temporary marriage with a new muḥā must rather be contracted at the end of the period. Divorce is impossible; according to some, however, Zāhīn and ṭahā are permitted.

4. There is no obligation on the man to provide food for the woman. The two partners cannot inherit from one another; but according to some, inheritance may be provided for in the contract. The 'Īdā after the expiry of the mut'a is two periods or 45 days, i.e. the 'Īdā of a slave-girl. There is, however, disagreement whether on the man's death the period of waiting is the usual one for a wife or that for a slave. The children go with the father.

VI. Modern practice. Although these Shi'i views have a certain amount of moral support, the mut'a in many cases can only be described as legalised prostitution. It is true that in Persia such marriages are made for very long periods, e.g. 99 years, but the Persian, when on a journey, temporarily marries in any place where he is stopping for some time and in the towns a caravanserai mollā and other brokers offer a wife to each new arrival. To make this business more profitable, the 'Īdā period is extended by concluding a second temporary marriage with the same man after the expiry of the first, for in the case of such a marriage the 'Īdā is not necessary. This marriage and a woman of this kind is called in Persia ūlla (lit. "form" i.e. of the contract).


The constantly quoted story (first in Wilken, p. 19) of Alex. Hamilton (cf. new account of the East Indies, Edinburgh 1727, i. 51) that at the beginning of the sixteenth century temporary marriages were publicly negotiated in Soumān (="Soum") in South Arabia and concluded before the kahtī, is a very improbable one; for Hamilton knew only the coast-towns from his own observation and wrote his account of his travels later from memory. He seems to be confusing them with conditions in Persian towns, and he makes mistakes on other matters.

In Morocco, as well as in ancient times (cf. Litān al-dekhawan wa-nawz al-teswī bi-Mahān minād), temporary marriages were concluded among the Sennees but nothing is said of this in the marriage contract or this would make it invalid; everything necessary is arranged previously by word of mouth. On the conclusion of the contract, the man utters the ṭalā'h formula with a time limit. Such agreements are as a rule kept (Soukouc Hurgronje, Meχra, li. 156; do., Verrf. Gebr. v: ch. 47). The same applies in such cases as Shāfi'i indicated long ago (cf. above).


A.-MUTA′ALĪ. [See ALI, A.-]

A.-MUTA′ARRĪBA (A.-) "mottailed", the term applied to the descendants of ʿAlī (the Biblical Yātān) who were regarded by the genealogists as "having become Arab" in contrast to the supposed native "pure" Arab tribes like "Ab, Ṭhāmir, etc. They settled in South Arabia and adopted Arabic from the "pure" Arabs. The latter had learned it through Ḍirham, the only man who spoke Arabic in Noah's ark (all the rest spoke Syrian), and his son-in-law Aram b. Šam b. Nīn. He was the ancestor of the "Ab, Ṭhāmir, etc. (From South Arabia, their main centre, tribes of the Band of Kahtī migrated to the north, so that there are in Northern Arabia also tribes whose genealogies make them belong to the Band of Kahtī (cf. the article Muta′allī that the literature is given).

MUTADARIK, name of the sixteenth metre in Arabic prosody, added to al-Khalīl b. Ahmad's list by al-ʿAkhshāb al-Awsat (q.v.). It is also called muḥānta, ḥaḍ, ḥaḍ, ḥaḍ, muntā, dār al-ḥaḍ, ṭāḥ al-ḥaḍ, ṣāḥ al-ḥaḍ. It does not seem to have been used by the poets before Īsmāʿīl or of the first century. A.H.
It has four feet to the hemistich and two scrips and four loric.

1st scrip: Fātīmā sūllam sūllam sūllam sūllam Fātīmā sūllam sūllam sūllam sūllam Fātīmā sūllam Fātīmā sūllam sūllam sūllam Fātīmā sūllam Fātīmā sūllam sūllam Fātīmā sūllam Fātīmā sūllam sūllam Fātīmā sūllam sūllam Fātīmā may change to sūllam (sūllam = sūllam).

(Mont. BEN.KRINSKI)

AL-MUṬAḌĪḌ BI'L-LĀH, Abu Ahmad "Abubakr Ahmad b. Ẓalḥa, Abū 'Abdallāh Caliph, son of al-Muwaṣṣaṣ, co-regent with the caliph al-Mu'tamid [q.v.], and a Câriftî slave named Dirâr. Al-Mu'taḍīḍ was already the real ruler in the two last years of al-Muwaṣṣaṣ's life and after the death of al-Mu'tamid in Râjdâl 270 (Oct. 892) he ascended the throne.

The new caliph who had inherited his father's gifts as a ruler and was distinguished alike for his economy and military ability is one of the greatest of the 'Abbasids in spite of his strictness and cruelty. On the accession of al-Mu'taḍīḍ the Tullāhid Khumarawâlh [q.v.], who had been the long war, concluded peace and gave the caliph his daughter in marriage, while the Khârjâṭ in Mesopotamia were weakened by internal dissensions, al-Mu'taḍīḍ in 280 (893–894) undertook an expedition against the rebel Bâlilk Shâhân and brought them to obedience. In the next two years the allies of the Khârjâṭ chief Hârdûn b. 'Abd Allâh were defeated and in 283 (896) the Tullāhid Shâhâl b. 'Abd Allâh was sent to Baghdad where the caliph had him crucified. The influence of the Hamânâdâh now began to increase in Baghdad. The Tullāhâd [q.v.] who had given the caliph such trouble were soon finally conquered. After al-Hârîrî 'Abd al-Azzâ cailed 'Abî Lâdhâ had been defeated and slain in Ibn 'l-Haḍjâl 284 (Jan. 898) near Isfâhân, al-Mu'taḍīḍ had the other Tullâhâd imprisoned and the family now disappears from history. The Sâmânâdâh increased their power at the expense of the Tullâhâd and the 'Alîd. In 287 (900) the Sâmânâdâh 'Abî b. al-Lâdhâ [q.v.] was captured and brought to Baghdad. In the same year the 'Abîd Muhammad b. Zâd, lord of Tabûristân, occupied Dijâtâr marched against Khûrâtân but was defeated by the Sâmânâdâh general Muhammad b. Hârûn and died of his wounds while Ibn Hârûn took possession of Dijâtâr and Tabûristân in the name of the Sâmânâdâh. About the same time the governor of Armenia and Adiriṣâdân Muhammad b. Abû 'l-Ṣādî endeavoured in combination with his friend Menîfî to conquer Egypt. The latter however was taken prisoner by the caliph's troops and as the most influential men in Tarsus had promised their help, al-Mu'taḍīḍ had them arrested and the fleet there burned. Muhammad was however allowed to retain his post but died soon afterwards of the plague. The Karmânîs [q.v.] now appeared on the scene and in the same year the Karmânî leader al-Dumâṣâr [q.v.] inflicted a complete defeat on the caliph's troops. Al-Mu'taḍîḍ died in Baghdad on 22 Râjdâl II, 280 (April 5, 902) at the age of 40 or 47. According to some he was poisoned.

See also the art. ISMA'IL B. MUṢÂBIL.

Bibliography: Tabari (ed. de Goeje), iii. 2133 sqq., 'Arîb (ed. de Goeje), see Index; Masûdî, Ma'ârif (ed. Paris), viii. 172–213.


AL-MUṬAḌĪḌ BI'L-LĀH, Abu Ahmad 'Abû 'Abd Allâh, the most important and most powerful sovereign of the 'Abbâsid dynasty [q.v.], who reigned over the little kingdom formed by his father Abû 'l-Kâsim Muhammad b. Abû 'Abdâdâd, with Seville [q.v.] as its capital, at the time of the break up of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain and the rise of the reis de taifât (mâlûk al-taifât) [q.v.]; in the course of a reign of nearly 30 years (453–480 A.H./1063–1090 A.D.), he was very considerably increased his territory by making himself the champion of the Spanish Arabs against the Berbers in Spain whose numbers, already very considerable in the tenth century, had been much increased since the period of the Amîridi dictators.

When he succeeded his father, the new king of Seville, who was then 26, following the usual practice of the period, assumed the title of ṣâhid, and a little later the title of 'Abbâsid bi'l-Lâh by which he is best known. Gifted with real political ability, he was not long in realizing his character, that of an autocratic ruler, the ambitions and cruel and slight scruples which he used to achieve his ends. As soon as he came to the throne he continued the war begun by his father against the petty Berber ruler of Carmonas [q.v.], Muhammad b. Abû 'Abd Allâh al-Bûrâjî, then against the latter's son and successor Isâbâk. At the same time, al-Mu'taḍîḍ was extending his kingdom in the west between Seville and the Atlantic Ocean. It was with this object that he attacked and defeated successively Ibn Taṣîfûr, lord (ṣâhid) of Merinda, and Muhammad b. 'Abû 'Abd Allâh al-Vâbîbêš (or Viabius) of Nîbil [q.v.], who in spite of his Arab descent had had the audacity to ally himself with the Berber chiefs. In face of these successes of the king of the 'Abbâsid, the other mālûk al-taifât who disturbed him formed a kind of league into which entered the princes of Badajoz [q.v.], Algeciras [q.v.], Granada [q.v.] and Málaga [q.v.]. This soon became a war between the 'Abbâsid of Seville and the Afgâd [q.v.] of Badajoz al-Mu'tâsâf [q.v.]; it was to last for many years in spite of the efforts at mediation by the Djâbard-râr ruler of Cordova which only achieved their end in 1054. Down to this year, while maintaining the frontiers of the kingdom of Badajoz, al-Mu'taḍîḍ displayed other activities, in succession he defeated Muhammad b. Nâhil al-Hâtîr, lord of Huelva, Ibn al-Salîm, Abû Zâdâh, and Salîs [q.v.] (whose son was the famous geographer), the Banû Ma'ârîn, lords of Babelôs [q.v.], and Muhammad b. Sa'dî b. Hârîrî, lord of Santa Maria de Algare, [q.v.], and annexed their territories. To justify these annexations, al-Mu'taḍîḍ used a very crude pretext; he alleged that he had found the unfortunate Hûṣîn II, who had really died in obscurity a few years before, and would go on till he had restored to him his former empire subdued; and
pacified in its integrity. In order not to be exposed to the cruelty of the king of Seville, the majority of the petty Berber chiefs settled in the mountains of the south of Andalusia, sequised in this make-believe, and paid homage to the 'Abdáddi and to the Commander of the Faithful miraculously restored to the cause of al-Mu'ta'did but at the same time carefully concealed by him. It was labour lost for them. One day the 'Abdáddi invited to his palace in Seville all these petty chiefs with their suites and put them to death by asphyxiating them in baths the openings in which he walled up. In this way he took Arcos (q.v.), the capital of the principality of the Banu Khizárin, Mornor (q.v.) defended by the Banu Dammár, and Ronda (q.v.), capital of the Banu Fran (1053).

This aroused the wrath of the most powerful Berber ruler in Spain, Baddis b. Judhbbi the Zidid (q.v.), who ruled in Granada and who alone seemed able to resist al-Mu'ta'did. The latter however found that fortune favoured him in this war and a little later took Algeciras from the Hamidídd al-Kazím b. Hammud. He next tried to seize Cordova and sent an expedition against it in charge of his son Issá'd, the latter tried to profit by the occasion to rebel and create for himself a kingdom with Algeciras as capital. This rash plan cost him his life, which his father took with his own hand, just as before him 'Abd al-Rahma'n III and al-Mansúr b. Abi 'Amir had inflicted the supreme penalty on their unworthy sons. This was the beginning of the political career of al-Mu'ta'did's other son Muhammad al-Mu'ta'mid (q.v.) who was to succeed him in his death by his father's order. He went with an army to support the Arabs of Malaga, who had rebelled against the tyrannical ruler of Bâhí, the despotic Berber of Granada. But the latter routed the Sevillian army and al-Mu'ta'did in arrery reached Ronda from which he sought and received the pardon of his terrible father. The latter had long before repudiated the fiction of the pseudo-Hamidídd which he no longer needed. He was now by far the most redoubtable and the most feared of the Spanish rulers. He had no enemies but the Berbers, Muslims like himself but much further removed from his social ideal of a Spaniard than his Christian neighbours in the north. In another land he might have been called "Berberokimos". But the bitterness of his hatred cast a shadow over his last days; it was not without fear that he followed events in the western Maghreb, hither to the beć of Muslim Spain; at least in the sub-Mediterranean zone. The irresistible advance of the Almoravids (q.v.) following Yúsuf b. Tádhbí through all Morocco, to which he could not find the straits of Gibraltar an insurmountable obstacle for long, Al-Mu'ta'did realised this very well. During at least prevented him from seeing his kingdom, entirely built up by his own energy and bold initiative, pass in two weeks into the hands of invaders, brethren of these Berbers of Spain whom he had detested and in part destroyed.


**MUTAFARRIKA** (a.), name of a corps of guarda, who were especially attached to the person of the Ottoman Sultan in the ancient Turkish court. The name is also applied to a number of the guard. Their occupations were similar to those of the Čuvaš [q.v.], not of military character, nor for court service only, but they were used for more or less important public or political missions. Like the Čuvaš, the Mutafarríka were a mounted guard. In later times there were: two classes, the Čuvaš or 'Abúwéth-Mutafarríka, and the Čuvaš. Their chief was the **Mutafarríka Aghádi.** In course of time their number constantly increased; at the end of the sixteenth century the maximum was fixed at 120 (G.O.R. II, 950, after Rághid), but in the beginning of the sixteenth century von Hammer gives the number 500 for the total. The Porte needed sometimes to lay stress on the importance of the office to make them acceptable as extraordinary envoys by foreign governments (G.O.R. II, 929, after Rághid).

Among those who have occupied this rank was the well-known first Turkish printer Ishá'íthu Mutafarríka.

Although different explanations of the title mutafarríka are given, the most probable interpretation is, that these functionaries were not given a special duty but formed originally a corps used for "different matters". This is still the use of the word in modern Turkish.

**Bibliography:** J. von Hammer, Der osmanischen Reiches Staatserziehung und Staatsverwaltung, Vienna 1815, II, 55, 105; Riezzi, Histoire de l'État Princier de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris 1806, p. 338. (J. H. Kramers) al-MUTA'KABIBIR. [See Alláh, ii.]

**MUTAKALLIM.** [See Káthám]

**MUTA'KARIB, name of the fifteenth metre in Arabic prosody; it contains four feet to the hemistich. There are two 1† and six 14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st 14</th>
<th>1st 14</th>
<th>1st 14</th>
<th>1st 14</th>
<th>1st 14</th>
<th>1st 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 14</td>
<td>1st 14</td>
<td>1st 14</td>
<td>1st 14</td>
<td>1st 14</td>
<td>1st 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside of the 14, the foot 14 often loses its a and becomes 14; used as the first 14. It further undergoes the following changes: 14 and (s)al. According to al-Khátib, this foot which proceeds the 14 cannot suffer any change. The first foot of the first hemistich of the first line of a piece of verse may become (whom) and (be) (whm) (b). (Mosk. Res. Chéshir.)

**MUTAKAWIS, term in prosody; cf. the art. 1†.**
MUTAMAD KHAN, MUHAMMAD SHAHRI, was born in an obscure family in Persia, but coming to India, he attained high honours in the reigns of Quliqangar and Shah Jihan. He received in the third year of Quliqangar a military command and the title of Mutamad Khan (the trustworthy Lord). Subsequently he joined Prince Shah Jihan in his campaign in the Deccan as a hadrat (paymaster). On his return to court, in the 15th year of Quliqangar's reign, he was entrusted with the duty of writing the Emperor's memoirs. He attained a higher rank in the service of Shah Jihan and was appointed as a haidar (adjutant-general) in the 23rd year of the new reign. He died in 1629 (1630). He is the author of a history called Alamgir Namaq-i Quliqangari, in three volumes: 1, the history of Akbar's ancestors; 2, Akbar's reign (MSS. in the India Office Library and in the Bankiopir Library); 3, the reign of Quliqangar (printed in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1865). and in Lucknow, A.H. 1286.

Bibliography: Matthiae al-Usmani, iii. 451; Tuusni Quliqangari, p. 358; F. A. L. N. N., iii. 459; Elliot and Dowson, History of India, vi. 400; Rien, Cat. Br. Musseum, l. 255; Ehd, Cat. of the India Office Library, p. 121 and Motley, Catalogue, p. 120.

(M. Hidasar Hosain)

AL-MUTAMID AL-SAM, AHI L-AMIR AHMAD b. QIIRAR, Al-Abbasid caliph, son of Al-Mutawakkil and a slave-girl named Fisah from Kufa. He ascended the throne on the deposition of Al-Muhtadi in 256 (June 770) and had no ability as a ruler, but relied on the vizier Ubaid Allah b. Yahya b. Khaylan and left most of the affairs of government in the hands of his brother Abu Ahmad Al-Muwaffak. In 282 (July 875) he designated his son Dahir Al-Muwaffak as his successor and governor of the western provinces and Al-Muwaffak as his successor and governor of the east. The able Al-Muwaffak soon became the real ruler and gradually restored order in the empire against which the Abbadids (qq.v.) of Seville in the 11th century is best known; his real name was MUHAMMAD b. ABBAAAD AL-MUTAMID (q.v.) B. MUHAMMAD b. KAM'il b. SAA'd b. ABBAAD. While still a boy—barely 13—he was born in 431 (1040)—he was placed by his father in nominal command of an expedition against Silves (Al, Silves [q.v.]), but in the possession of Ibn Muzain, and this town was taken by assault as was Carmona Maria d'Algarve soon after (Ab. Khusaymar bar al-ghaur, now Faro [q.v.]) which was held by Muhammad b. Sa'id Ibn Hiram [q.v.]) (444 = 1052). The young 'Abbadid prince was then appointed by his father governor of these two towns. His elder brother Isam had been executed in punishment for his rebellion (455 = 1063; cf. AL-MUTAMID), Muhammad Al-Muwaffak became heir-presumptive to the throne of Seville. A little later, the army which he was leading to the help of the Arabs of Malaga, who had rebelled against the tawaz [q.v.], against the Berbers of the Zaitin [q.v.] dynasty, was routed by the latter and Al-Muwaffak had to take refuge in Ronda [q.v.] in which his father was at first very angry at his failure, finally sent him his forgiveness. When the powerful ruler of Seville died in 460 (1069), his son succeeded to a considerably extended kingdom which included the greater part of the south- west of the Iberian peninsula.

A whole series of more or less romantic episodes is associated with the reign and life of Al-Mutamid. If we may believe several authors of the Muslim west, an individual called Ibn Ammar, the historian and poet, exerted a very considerable influence during the greater part of the career of this prince from his governorship of Silves. Al-Mutamid's relations with a young slave girl Al-Rumaikyta, a gifted with considerate poetic talent, has also been the subject of much literary embellishment. It was from the surname of this young woman that Al-Mutamid is said to have adopted his which comes from the same root. She became his favourite wife and presented him with several sons. As to Ibn Ammar, exiled by Al-Muwaffak, he was recalled on the accession of his patron to Seville from which he went at his own request
to be governor of Silves before being appointed grand vizier.

In the second year of his reign, al-Mutamid was able to annex to his kingdom the principality of Cordova [q.v.], over which the Dhishwarid had been ruling, in spite of the efforts of the king of Toledo, Al-Mu'tamid [q.v.]. The young prince 'Abbās was appointed governor of the old capital of the Umayyads. But at the instigation of the king of Toledo, an adventurer named Ibn 'Ukhnas, was able in 468 (1075) to take Cordova by surprise and put to death the young 'Abbās's father and his general Muhammad b. Mārtīn. Al-Mu'tamid took possession of the town where he died six months later. Al-Mutamid whose paternal affection had been wounded and pride insulted tried for three years vainly to reconquer Cordova. He was not successful until 471 (1078); Ibn 'Ukhnas was put to death and the part of the kingdom of Toledo between the Guadalquivir and the Guadix was conquered by the armies of Seville. Nevertheless at this time it took all the skill of the vizir Ibn 'Ammār to conclude a peace by paying double tribute with Alfonso VI of Castile when he sent an expedition against Seville.

This was just the time when through the energy and efforts of the Christian princes taking advantage of the feuds which were setting the Muslim rulers of the taifa against one another, the reconquista, which had received a check and then a setback from the Umayyads, resumed its advance on the south of the Peninsula. In spite of their successes, of which the Muslim chroniclers make a great deal, it must not be forgotten that by the middle of the 10th (20th) century, many Muslim dynasties of Spain were being forced to seek on payment of heavy tribute the temporary neutrality of their Christian neighbours. Shortly before the taking of Toledo, which had far-reaching effects, by Alfonso VI in 478 (1085), al-Mutamid began to be involved in serious difficulties. On the imprudent advice of his vizier Ibn 'Ammār, al-Mutamid tried to add to his kingdom, after the principality of Cordova, that of Murcia [q.v.], which was ruled by a prince of Arab origin, Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Sālih. In 471 (1078), Ibn 'Ammār went to the Count of Barcelona, Ramon Berenguer II, and asked him for assistance to conquer Murcia in return for a payment of 60,000 diners; until this sum was paid al-Rashīd, a son of al-Mutamid, was to remain as hostage. After animated negotiations which ended in the payment of a sum three times as large to the Count of Barcelona, Ibn 'Ammār resumed his plan of conquering Murcia and succeeded in doing so with the help of the lord of the castle of Xàt (now Xàtches), Ibn Rashīd. In Murcia, however, Ibn 'Ammār soon rendered himself obnoxious to his master by assuming the attitude of an independent ruler and in al-Mutamid's reproaching him he replied by insults to the king of Seville, his wife and his son. Betrayed by Ibn Rashīd, he had to take refuge in Murcia and then successively in 480, Saragossa and Lerida. Returning to Saragossa, he endeavoured to join its ruler al-Mu'tamid I b. Hājīd [cf. Saragossa] on his expedition against Saragossa, but he was taken prisoner and handed over to al-Mutamid, who in spite of the bonds of friendship which had so long linked them together, slew him with his own hand.

In the meanwhile, Alfonso VI was no longer concealing his designs on Toledo, the siege of which he began in 473 (1086). Two years later, when he sent a mission to enforce payment of the annual tribute due to him from al-Mutamid, his men were insulted and the Jewish treasurer Ibn Shāhīd who accompanied it was put to death because he had refused to accept debased money. He therefore invaded the province of the flourishing town of Almería (Ar. al-Shassaf [q.v.]) advanced through the district of Sidón (Ar. Shaldīna; q. v.) as far as Tarifa [q.v.] where he uttered his celebrated remark expressing his pride at having reached the utmost limits of Spain.

The capture of Toledo by Alfonso VI dealt a serious blow to Islam in Spain. The king of Castile soon demanded of al-Mutamid that he should surrender those of his lands which had formed part of the kingdom of the Umayyads (a part of the modern provinces of Ciudad-Real and Cuenca). Throughout Muslim Spain, his demands which increased every year, made the position very serious. In spite of their reluctance, the Muslims in Spain, led by al-Mutamid, were forced to seek the help of the Almoravids (Ashūr b. Tājifīn [cf. Almoravid] who had just conquered the whole of Morocco in an irresistible advance. It was decided to send him an embassy consisting of the vizier Abū Bakr b. Zaidīn and the šāhīd of Badajoz, Cordoba and Granada. An agreement having been reached, not without difficulty, Yūsuf b. Tājīfīn crossed the Straits at Gibraltar and on the 22nd Ramadan 479 (26th August 1086) inflicted on the Christian troops the disastrous defeat of Zallāqah [q.v.] not far from Badajoz. We need not recall here how Yūsuf b. Tājīfīn recalled to Africa, could not follow up his victory as the Muslim rulers of Spain had hoped, which was the influence exercised by the Spanish factions on the Almoravid, soon lost all prestige in his eyes. After his departure the Christians began again to harass Muslim lands, to such an extent that al-Mutamid had this time to go in person to Yūsuf b. Tājīfīn in Morocco to ask him to cross the Straits once more with his troops. Yūsuf consented and landed at Algiers in the following spring (482 = 1090). He laid siege to the fortress of Alcud but without taking it; then stimulated by popular feeling and the advice of the factions, he came to the conclusion that it would be more advantageous for him to wage the jihād in Spain on his own account and proceeded to dethrone and dispossess the princes who had sought his intervention. With this object he sent an army to invade the kingdom of Seville under Abu Bakr, who, as soon as the end of 1090 took Tarifa, then Cordova where one of al-Mutamid's sons, Fātih al-Mutamid, was in command of his forces. Fātih al-Mutamid was killed at Carmona, then Seville, which was captured in spite of a heroic sortie by al-Mutamid himself. The latter was taken prisoner by the Almoravids and sent with his wife and children first to Tangier, then to Meknes and a few months later to Aghmat [q.v.], near Marrakesh. There he led a miserable existence for several years until his death at the age of 55 in 487 (1095).

The end of al-Mutamid touched all his biographers, who are particularly numerous and expansive on his natural gifts, poetical gifts, munificence and chivalrous spirit. He is one of the most representative types of the enlightened Spanish Muslims of the Middle Ages, patrons of letters
and scholarship, liberal and tolerant, but living in an atmosphere of luxury and ease little compatible with the care of a kingdom with frontiers open to constant neighbours on all sides. Not so great a ruler as his father al-Mu'tamid, al-Mutanabbi is however a much more attractive figure, perhaps just on account of his misfortunes. He is entitled to a place among the great figures of Spanish Islam, alongside of Abú al-Rahmán al-Hakam II, al-Mansúr b. Abú 'Amir and at a later date Lísten b. al-Khattìjib.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

**Mutanabbi and Ouaipra, a poet contemporary with the Prophet.** He was the brother of Mâlik b. Nuwair (p. v.), chief of the Banu Yarûf, a large clan of the BanuTamim. Mutanabbi was its prince to the eulogies in which he memorialised the tragic death of his brother Mâlik and these poems have made the latter's name immortal. The Arabs said there was nothing comparable to these elegies, overflowing with emotion. They regarded their author as the type of brotherly devotion. Mutanabbi does not seem to have played any prominent part before the Huljâb. He was eclipsed by the striking personality of his brother, to whose qualities he never resented to pay homage. He is represented as having been of unpromising appearance — one-eyed and short in stature. The Banu Tamim al-Hawásan eulogised the humanity with which Mutanabbi treated him during his captivity. Falling in his turn into the hands of the Banû Taghhib, Mutanabbi was delivered by a stratagem devised by his brother. He seems to have adopted Islam at the same time as his brother. Like the latter, he is numbered among the 'Companions' although we never find him in direct relations with the Prophet. He escaped from the disaster in which Mâlik was overwhelmed; a few fragments of other poems suggest he did not write elegies exclusively.

But the death of Mâlik he devoted himself to celebrating his memory and demanding vengeance for his death. Refused by the Caliph Abû Bakr, he thought he might have more success on the accession of 'Omar. He hurried to Madina where he was very well received by 'Omar. The latter listened with delight to his elegies, regretted that he himself had not the gift of poetry so that he might worthily celebrate his brothers, who had fallen in the war of al-Yamamah, but he refused to reverse Abû Bakr's decision and limited himself to dismissing Khâlid b. al-Walid, a step which probably owed something to the poetical exhortations of Mutanabbi.

After this, tradition says that the poet became almost blind through weeping, and that he wandered over the many routes of Arabia, uttering his complaints everywhere. He found himself abandoned by his wife, who became tired of his incapable sadness and wandering life. He left two sons Usúd and Ibrâhim, also poets. He survived 'Omar b. Khâlid b. al-Khattâiban (ed. Wustenfeld, N. 793), he is really the author of an elegy on the death of this caliph.


(H. LAMMEN)

**Al-Mutanabbi, the prophet or poet, the name by which the Arab poet Abû 'l-Tayib Ahmad b. al-Husain al-Dîjâfî is usually known (cf. Ibn Khâhilân, Wusâtân[Cairo 1310], i. 36, two genealogies, which do not agree, going back to his great-grandfather). Abû 'l-Tayib was born in Kufa in 503 (915) in the Kinda quarter whence the ethnic al-Khdîr sometimes gives him. His family in very humble circumstances claimed descent from the Yamman al-Dîjâfî and he himself all his life was convinced of the superiority of the Arabs of the south over those of the north (cf. al-Wâhsh, al-Shâb b. al-Mutanabbi, ed. Disterici, p. 48—49, A. vildâyi, al-Dîjâfî al-tayibî, p. 29 [these two books will be quoted as Wâh, and Vâd]). The boy received his early education in his native town and soon distinguished himself by his intelligence, his prodigious memory and his precocity as a poet. He now passed under Shif influences, perhaps Zaid (cf. Abî al-Kalîs al-Baghdâdî, Khâzânà, i. 384, ed.) which affected the development of his philosophy, a subject to which we shall return. Circumstances were however to accelerate the speed of Abu 'l-Tayib's religious development. Towards the end of 312 (924), undoubtedly under pressure from the Karmans (p. v.) who had just taken and sacked Kufa, Abû 'l-Tayib and his family made a first stay of two years (cf. al-Samânî, Ansâb, 506 b; al-Bardî, al-Sâbî al-munmû, i. 6) in Samân, the region lying between the Sâ'ûd of Kufa in the east and Palmyre in the west. The Banû Khalî that led a nomadic life in these desert steppes had been much cultivated by the Karmân d'âs. It is possible that the young poet at this time came into contact with some of these heretics. It is however not very probable,
in view of his youth, that this first contact had
any definite effect upon him. On the other hand, this
stay among the Beduins certainly gave Abu
l-Tayyib that profound knowledge of the Arabical-
language of which he was later very proud.
On returning to Kufa, at the beginning of 345
(927), Abu l-Tayyib seems to have decided to devote
himself entirely to poetry. At this time he more
admired the great panegyrists of the preceding
century, Abi Tammun and al-Bahhari (q.v.). Like
them and like the majority of his contemporaries,
he sees in poetry a sure means of attaining wealth
and power. He at once attached himself to a
certain Abu l-Fadl, of Kufa, to whom he dedicated
a piece (Wahb., p. 17—21; Yaz., p. 10—14).
Perhaps a l. 8. to Karmoziun, in any case a
case a complete anagram, the praises which he allows
to be offered him show this — this individual
seems to have exercised a considerable influence
on the religious and philosophical development of
al-Mutanabbi (cf. also AlUthaini, i. 382 below).
Prepared by the Shi'ite atmosphere in which he
had passed his childhood and by the relations
he had had with the Karmoziun in Samuwa, Abu
l-Tayyib in contact with this patron cast off
religious dogmas which he regarded as spiritual
instruments of oppression. He then adopted a
mystical and pessimistic philosophy, echoes of
which are found throughout his work. The world is made
up of sadness, which death destroys (cf. Wahb.,
p. 39; l. 8—13; i. 162, l. 12—13; Yaz., p. 23
and 97); stupidity and evil alone triumph there (cf.
Wahb., p. 164, l. 8—10; Yaz., p. 97); the Arabos,
representatives of a superior race, in his eyes — are
overwhelmed in it by cowardly and barbaric
foreigners (cf. Wahb., p. 148, l. 1—5; i. 160, l. 2—6;
Yaz., p. 87 and 96). In contact with this world with
which he was out of harmony, the consciousness
of his talent, which Abu l-Tayyib had,
developed rapidly; his vanity increased to a degree
which is almost inconceivable (cf. Wahb., p. 60;
Yaz., p. 31). His Arab particularism, as well as all
anti-Syriacs (cf. also AlUthaini), incited him to attack foreign
oppressors (Wahb., p. 35; l. 30—31; Yaz., p. 33).
This is why, by contradictions from which he is
hardly ever free, al-Mutanabbi expressed all his
life those riches and power which he seemed to
his heart, while he stands out from the mass of
his contemporaries by his rigid moralism and
austere (cf. AlUthaini, q.v., l. 78—81).
At first however, Abu l-Tayyib thought only of
conquering the world by his poetical gifts, and
to find a more favourable field for his activity he
left Kufa towards the end of 316 (928), probably
as result of the town being again sacked by
the Karmoziun. He was naturally attracted
to Baghdad (cf. AlUthaini, q.v., l. 82—83) and
there became a panegyrist of a compatriot of his,
Muhammad bin 'Ubayd Allah al'Alawi (cf.
Wahb., p. 6—7; Yaz., p. 3—4). From there he
got to Syria. For two years he led the life of
a wondering troubadour at the court of (cf. Mer, 
Renaissance des Iroûs, p. 256). It is impossible
to follow him in his wanderings for his Daiân
tour guide, does not present his poems in
satisfactory chronological order. Some pieces of
the period are addressed to Beduin chiefs of the region
of Almadhâb (v.v.) (cf. Wahb., p. 24—25, 38—39;
66—67; Yaz., p. 12—13, 22—23, 28—29); others
are dedicated to men of letters of Tripolis (Wahb.,
p. 88—89; Yaz., p. 19—20; al-Ladhâkîya (Latakia)
(cf. Wahb., p. 116—133; Yaz., p. 66—78). The poems
of this period are hurriedly written and undiseive
in quality, but traces of his real genius are already
apparent. With the exception of a sharâ'âd (lassen)
and some impromptu pieces they are all sharpened
on neo-classical lines. The influence of Abû Tammun
and al-Bahhari preponderates.

In the course of this period of experiment, Abu
l-Tayyib was irritated at not finding his merit recognised. Gradually he looks forward to
dreams of domination being realised by violence
(cf. Wahb., p. 82, l. 3—7; Yaz., p. 79). Finally
he abandoned the work of the panegyrist and returning
to al-Ladhâkîya he took up revolutionary
propaganda, the nature of which has hitherto
been misunderstood. According to Oriental writers,
AlUthaini, AlUthaini, q.v., 269—280), Abu l-Tayyib proclaimed himself
a prophet in al-Sanûsîa, was taken prisoner by
Abûlqindî (v.v.), and then received his epithet of al-Mutanabbi, Krasznaikovks (Mutanabbi
alAmâ'ir, St. Petersburg 1909, p. 9—11) does
justice to these traditions, without however taking
full account of some clear allusions in the Dair.
The latter contains pieces which prove beyond
all possible doubt that a rebellion was led by
al-Mutanabbi (cf. Wahb., p. 49—56; Yaz., p. 28—33,
35). This rising, as well as all his period, must have
been political as well as religious. The rebellion
began in al-Ladhâkîya and then extended to the
western borders of Samuwa where the Banat Jâbôt
constituted an element always ready to rebel.
Without adhering to Karmoziun, al-Mutanabbi
exploited its principles which found only too
ready an echo among the marauding Beduins
(cf. Wahb., p. 57, l. 23—33; Yaz., p. 32; allusion to
the massacre of pilgrims by the Karmoziun Abu Ta'bîn,
in 317 = 930). The ambiguity of the utterances
of the rebel, the opportunism of his doctrines
and his conception of the imânate on Karmoziun
lines, may have caused some misunderstanding
of his preaching, since at this time any agitator
was regarded as a Karmoziun. Like some initial
successes, al-Mutanabbi and his Beduins were
defeated; he was captured and imprisoned at
Hims (towards the end of 322 = 933). After a trial
and two years' imprisonment (Dair, Paris MS.,
N°. 3002, fol. 16v.), Abu l-Tayyib was condemned
to retract his errors and set free. From this
decision he gained only the epithet of al-Mutanabbi
and the conviction that poetry alone would lead
him to the realisation of his ambitious dreams.

The poems composed by Abu l-Tayyib immediately
before and during his rebellion are distinguished
by spontaneity of inspiration, by the liberty
which the poet takes with poetic forms, by the
vigour of the style, which has a much more personal
character than in his first manner.

As soon as al-Mutanabbi had returned to his
profession of panegyrist, he naturally resumed his
wandering life (beginning of 345 = 957). For
several years he led a precarious existence and
had to be content to sing the praises of citizens
and minor officials of Antioch, Damascus, Aleppo
etc. who paid him very badly (cf. Wahb., p. 93—
95; Yaz., p. 51—131; Hâfîd, Irisâ, v. 201). Little
by little however, his fame grew. At the
beginning of 328 (939), we find him becoming
chief poet to the emir Abd al-Kharîbîn (the
Barâb b. 'Amîr of the Dairu), governor of
Damascus for the imân al-amâ'ir Ibn Râhî (v.v.)
who had just taken possession of Syria. Of Arab origin, Radr was regarded by al-Mutanabbi as the Maecenas for whom he had been waiting so long. The panegyrics and occasional poems which are dedicated to this emir reveal a sincere admiration for him and possess a sustained inspiration (cf. Wall., p. 206–245; Yez., p. 152–168). The success of this poem, after Abu 'I-Tayyib's return to literature, constituted what might be called the third manner of the poet. With the exception of a poem on hunting in the style of Abû Nuwarâ (q.v.) (cf. Wall., p. 204–205; Yez., p. 158–159) and a number of impromptu poems of no particular interest, al-Mutanabbi wrote only őfion during this period. He would seem then to have returned to his first manner, if the work of this period did not show considerable progress in form.

The friendship between Radr and al-Mutanabbi lasted only about a year and a half and as a result of intrigues of jealous rivals (cf. Wall., p. 253, lines 13–16; Yez., p. 169), Abu 'I-Tayyib feeling no longer safe, sought refuge in the Syrian desert (cf. Wall., p. 258–259; Yez., p. 169–169). There the idea of rebelling again took possession of him (cf. Wall., p. 259–255; Yez., p. 170–171). Fortunately the departure of Radr for the 'Iraq enabled him to leave his hiding-place and resume his profession of panegyrist. He now sang the praises of several individuals of second rank (cf. Wall., p. 107–108, 284–348; Yez., p. 60–61, 194–241). Lastly he succeeded in establishing himself at the Hamdanid court in Aleppo where he became the official poet of the emir Saif al-Dawla (q.v.) at the beginning of 537 (948).

From the literary point of view, the work of this period which runs roughly from the middle of 529 (940), date of the quarrel with Radr, to the beginning of 537 (948), marks his fourth manner, to which he remained faithful till his death. It is characterized by a compromise between the pure neo-classical tradition and a freer form which the poet had adopted in the poems of the period of his rebellion. Without rejecting the framework of the neo-classical őfion, he reduces the erotic prologue to a minimum, sometimes even replacing it by a philosophical and lyrical opening which breathes his dreams, disillusionments and angers.

Al-Mutanabbi stayed nine years with Saif al-Dawla. He was genuinely attached to this patron, who was in his eyes the personification of the ideal Arab chief, brave, magnanimous and generous. Saif al-Dawla in his turn recognized the worth of his panegyrist whom he overwhelmed with gifts and never treated with arrogance. Al-Mutanabbi accompanied him on his expeditions and on returning to Aleppo sang of his exploits against the Byzantines and the Beduins of the desert. In the brief intervals of leisure between the campaigns of the Hamdanid, the poet shared in the leisure of the court of Aleppo, devoting himself to improvisation and writing panegyrics as occasion arose (cf. Wall., p. 523–537; Yez., p. 370–395) or lamentations (marâṣim) on the deaths of relatives of Saif al-Dawla (cf. Wall., p. 388–389, 406–409, 577–578; Yez., p. 271–272, 286–287, 427–438).

The difficult character of al-Mutanabbi and the repue which he enjoyed did not fail to gain him implacable enemies. A few verses directed against the poet al-Babbaghî (q.v.), tried, it is true, to defend him but their zeal could do nothing against the enmity of the hostile group led by the famous Abu'l-Fâris (q.v.). Saif al-Dawla at first paid no attention to the attacks made upon his favourite. When he grew weary and his patience was exhausted, Abu 'I-Tayyib no longer felt his life safe, and seceded from Aleppo with all his family and sought refuge in Damascus (end of 536 = 947).

Eastern critics generally are agreed that the poems composed by al-Mutanabbi during his stay with Saif al-Dawla mark the highest point in his work. Although there is a certain degree of exaggeration in this, it is certain that the poet, while continuing his fourth manner, reveals in the highest degree the mastery which he had acquired in his art during this period. Much more than Abu'l-Fâris, with whom he is often contrasted, he was able to depict the glories of Saif al-Dawla's campaigns against the Byzantines. His verse, it is true, has not the charm of that of Abu'l-Fâris; but it is laler and more epic in style.

From Damascus, Abu 'I-Tayyib went to Egypt to al-Fustâ'î (q.v.) where he obtained the patronage of the Khilâlîd Kâfûr (q.v.). Al-Mutanabbi's career now reveals the necessities to which poets in the fourth (thenth) century had to submit. Deprived of moral and material independence Abu 'I-Tayyib was forced to sing the praises of a patron for whom in his heart he felt only contempt. The panegyrics which he devoted to him barely concealed his regret at losing the favour of Saif al-Dawla. They are somewhat forced and contain points against Kâfûr (cf. al-Badrî, op. cit., i. 125–126).

The poet perhaps only agreed to celebrate this patron because the latter had promised him the governorship of Sidîr (Sidon) (cf. ibid., i. 115). When he saw that these promises were not being fulfilled, he tried to gain the favour of another Whalâhid general, Abu Sulâmî Fâlik (ibid., i. 131–132), but the latter dying in 535 (946) and relations with Kâfûr still being attained, al-Mutanabbi had once more to decide to fly. On the day of the feast of sacrifice of this year, after writing a satire on Kâfûr, he left al-Fustâ'î secretly and crossing Arabia after great trials (cf. al-Badrî, op. cit., i. 139–140), he reached the 'Iraq, spent some time in Kûfû, then settled in Baghdad. He perhaps thought of attaching himself to the famous Bîyûid viziers al-Muhallabî who had gathered a very brilliant court around him. He had however to abandon hope of this in face of the hostility of the emir on whom he was convinced by poets and scholars established at the court of the Bishballah, such as Ibn al-Hadîli (q.v.) and Abu 'I-Faradîj al-Jâshâshî, author of the Kîdî al-Aghâsîr. During his stay here, he had already begun to do in Egypt (cf. Ibn al-Faradîj, Târîkh al-Anadulûs, No. 453), al-Mutanabbi gave lectures in which he expounded to a group of friends the work he had done till that date (cf. Dhahabî, Târîkh al-Islâm, Paris, No. 1861, fol. 269). The year 533 (944) was spent in this fashion. The poet perhaps also visited Kûfû about this time (cf. E. Gabrielli, Pits al-Mutanabbi, p. 60, note 4).

At the beginning of 534 (945) in any case, he left the 'Iraq and went via al-Ahwâz to Arradût (q.v.) in Smiana where he received the patronage of the Bîyûid vizier Ibn al-'Amîn (q.v.). Al-Mutanabbi devoted some panegyrics to him (cf. Wall., p. 40–741; Yez., p. 554–565), then he left him to go to Shûtesh in Fars where he rejoined the Bîyûid Sulûk 'Aqdûd al-Dawla (q.v.) who had expressed a desire to have him at his court. After
disputations with the scholars of that city. In Husain I of 610 (1217) he died in his native town.


(ISE: LICHTENSTEIN)''

**MUTAṢĀRIF.** [See SANGAJA.]**

AL-MUṬAṢĀMIM ʿAṣ-ṢAḥh B. ʿABD Allāh MUḤAMMAD AL-BaʾṣIRI, b. ʿAbd Allāh MUḤAMMAD, al-ʿAṣṣiʾi d. 795 (1395)—e. 795 (1395), b. the son of Hārūn al-Khalīfah and a courtier named Mārida. In the reign of his brother al-Muʿānīn (q.v.) he took part in the fighting against the Byzantines in Asia Minor and received the governorship of Egypt. After the death of al-Muʿānīn in 218 (Aug. 833) he ascended the throne and was soon afterwards acknowledged by his nephew al-ʿAbbās b. al-Muʿānīn (q.v.) whom the troops had proclaimed caliph and the army also then paid him homage. An ʿAbbāsid pretender, Muḥammad b. al-ʿAbbās, was disposed of by the governor of Khurāsān ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Malik (q.v.). After concluding a truce with the Byzantine emperor Theophanes, al-Muṭāṣāmīn sent an army commanded by the Arab general ʿUmar b. ʿAbd Allāh against the Zayj (q.v.) who had revolted from the Ṣind in the Sasanian period and settled in the swamps between Bajār and ʿAṣār. They had been frequently used in their wars by the Muslims. After the death of al-Muʿānīn however, they began to ravage and lay waste the country round as it was hostile territory. They submitted after seven months' fighting at the turn of the year 219—220 (834—835) and in Muḥarram 220 (Jan. 835) they were brought in ships to Bâghdād and banished by al-Muṭāṣāmīn to ʿAin Zarb b. Bāṣīr in 795 (1395). In the same year he appointed Ḥāfiz b. ʿAbd Allāh, usually called al-ʿAbbāsī (q.v.), commander-in-chief in the war against Bābok (q.v.), but it was only after two years that he was victorious. The intolerance of the caliph against all those who would not share the opinions of the Muʿtahīs made him unpopular with the people and in addition there was the dissatisfaction of the citizens with the undisciplined Berbers and Turkish mercenaries whom al-Muṭāṣāmīn took into his service. At the end of 220 (835) he therefore resolved to move his residence to a smaller place. While his son Hārūn al-Waṣīṭī remained in Bâghdâd as governor, the caliph established himself first on the al-Kārīf canal and then in Sāmarrāʾ three days' journey up the river. Here in the course of the year 221 (836) there arose a splendid palace with numerous buildings for the troops (cf. the art. NAGHĀKH). Very soon afterwards the war with the Byzantines blazed up again. The emperor Theophanes invaded Muslim territory on the upper Tigris, captured Zabārā and wrought tremendous havoc in northern Syria and Mesopotamia. In Djuʾakūr 223 (April 838) al-Muṭāṣāmīn himself took the field, accompanied by his eldest generals. The huge force advanced in three columns: the eastern army was commanded by al-ʿAbbāsī, the two divisions of the western one by al-Muṭāṣāmīn and ʿAlīṣī. Al-ʿAlīṣī very soon put the emperor to flight and in Shawāwal (Sept.) of the same year Amurrius after 53 days' siege passed through treachery into the hands of the caliph who had the town destroyed. But the victory had no permanent results. As winter was coming on, al-Muṭāṣāmīn had to retire, particularly as a conspiracy in favour of his nephew al-ʿAbbās b. al-Muṭāṣāmīn (q.v.) demanded urgent measures. About the same time the ispahan of Ṣabābūrī ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣabābūrī retired, but the rising was suppressed by ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣabābūrī (q.v.). In 226 (840—841) or 227 troubles again broke out in Fânsîm where the Umayyads still had many supporters. The leader, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Maʾṣûrī, claimed to be a descendant of the Umayyads and everywhere preached rebellion against the caliph until ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣākir sent against him, took him prisoner and brought him to Sāmarrāʾ. Al-Muṭāṣāmīn died on 15th Rabiʾ I 227 (Jan. 5 842) in Sāmarrāʾ. By favouring the Turks and suppressing the Arab element he hastened the decline of the ʿAbdallāhīs empire. Unlike al-Muʿānīn, he was comparatively uneducated. That learning was not allowed to fall into oblivion in his reign is rather due to the chief ʿAbd Ahmad b. Abī ʿUthmān (q.v.).


AL-MUṬAṢĀMĪN, MUḤAMMAD b. ʿAṣ-ṢAḥh b. MUḤAMMAD b. ṢABĀʾĪ, al-ṬUQĪĪ, second ruler of the dynasty of the TūqīĪs (q.v.), of the kingdom of Almorava (q.v.), reigned from 443 to 484 (1051—1091). Gifted like his contemporary al-Muʿtaṣāmīn (q.v.) of Seville with a certain amount of poetic talent, he made his capital during his long reign one of the great centres of culture in the Peninsula. But like the other muṭattāʾ (q.v.) of Spain, he was for the most of his time at war with one or other of his neighbours. He was without doubt implicated in the conspiracy fomented by the Jews Ysul against his younger brother Bidas, king of Granada (cf. ELIZA). Later his forces took part with those of Ysul b. Is̄ul in the famous battle of Zallīkha (q.v.). Like the other Muslim rulers of Spain he felt in the following year the weight of the Almoravids sultan's arm. After unsuccessfully besieging the fortress of Aldo and inciting Yisul to act harshly against al-Muʿtaṣāmīn, whom he hated personally, he realised on his death-bed that his capital would be besieged by the Almoravids as Seville had been. This is why he advised his son and successor Almud al-Dawla to seek an alliance with the lords of
Bougie (q.v.). Almeria was taken very soon afterwards by the Almoravids.


AL-MUTAWAKKIL 'Ali ibn 'Abd al-Qadir, Dā'irat al-Mubâhârah, ed. Shawâl 2001 (Feb.-March 822), son of the caliph al-Mutâsim and a slave-girl from Khuzâyra named Shadhâq. He ascended the throne in Dhu'l-Hijja 232 (Aug. 847) on the death of his brother al-Walîk. His old opponent, the vizier Ibn al-Zayyât, soon fell a victim to the cruelty of the new caliph and a similar fate befall the Turkish general Râghb, although the latter along with Waqqût had helped him to the throne. The caliph dreaded his influence and had him thrown into prison where he died of thirst (Qumâlid II 233 in Dec. 849-Jan. 850). From the religious point of view al-Mutawakkil was thoroughly ortho-
dox. Soon after his accession he forbade any dis-
putation about the Qur'an. Those who had been arrested because they would not recognise the teachings of the Ma'nulis were released and in 235 (849-850) he revived and intensified the regulations for special dress for Jews and Christians which went back to the caliph 'Umar. The syna-
gogues and churches recently built in Baghda-
d were taken down and the Ma'nulis chief kâdi Abnād b. Abû Du'âd (q.v.) with his sons dismissed and the office of chief kâdi given to the Sunni Yaḥyâ b. Akîm. The 'Alids also fell under his ban. In 236 (850-851) he had the manselele of al-Hashid in Kerbelâi destroyed and pilgrimage to this place forbidden. The provinces were frequently ravaged by rebels and foreign foes. In Âshrafiâd in 234 (848-849) Muhammad b. al-Lithû re-established; he had earlier been taken prisoner and brought to Sâmarra but had escaped; he established himself in the strong town of Marand. The caliph's troops could do nothing against him until Boghâ al-Shabî (q.v.) took command. After a long siege the latter offered him a pardon; but when Ibn al-Abîth tried to escape he was seized and brought to Sâmarra where he soon died in prison. When al-Mutawakkil attempted to treat semi-independent Armenians like a conquered province, a dangerous rising broke out in 237 (851-852), which was suppressed in the following year, but only with difficulty, by Boghâ al-Khatir. About the same time (238), the Byzantines landed in Egypt and plundered Damiestra and in Asia Minor the war went on in the traditional fashion against the Byzantines. When the Palaestine sect was persecuted by the empress Theodora they went over to the Moslem in masses. The Byzantines, however, succeeded in taking many prisoners. Those who would not become converted were massacred; but when al-Mutawakkil who had moved his residence in Safar 244 (May-June 855) to Damascen but left it after only two months, sent Boghâ with the Turkish cavalry against the Byzantines, the fortune of war turned. Boghâ fought with success against the enemy and in the following year the emperor Michael I himself was defeated at Samoata. In 246 (860-861) the Muslim generals took a considerable number of prisoners; but no permanent change in the situation was produced. In Syria also trouble broke out. Two governors in succes-
sion were driven out of Hims and only with the help of the troops from Damascus and al-Ramlí was order restored (241 = 855-856). About the same time al-Mutawakkil sent an army under command of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh al-Kummi against the rebel Bejla. The latter were completely defeated but their leader 'Alî Bâbâ was pardoned. In the reign of al-Mutawakkil the dynasty of the Shaffâris (q.v.) was established in Sijjîn. To keep the people of Baghdaid in check he sent the governor of Khurâsân, Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh b. Tâhir (q.v.), and when the turbulent pastorsions made trouble he built a new residence at Daj'âwâya in 245 (859-860) outside of Sâmarra, which swallowed up enormous sums. Poets and scholars were rewarded with princely munificence by this caliph. The extravagance, capriciousness and cruelty of the caliph, however, made him hated, and finally he quarrelled with the commander of the Turkish bodyguard. In Dhu'l-Hijja 235 (July 850) he had arranged that his eldest son Muhammad al-Muntasir should succeed him and the two other sons Abû 'Abd Allâh al-Mu'azz and Ibrahim al-
Mu'aiyad were each to receive a governorship with a claim to the throne after al-Muntasir. He began to favour al-Mu'azz however, and thus aroused al-Muntasir's discontent. The latter conspired with a few others of the same sentiments and in Shawwâl 247 (Dec. 861) al-Mutawakkil was murdered. [a. AL-PATH R. KIYEM.]
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(K. V. Zetterský.)

MUTAWÂTI'IR (A.), part. act. v. from m-t, "that which comes successively." It is used as a technical term in two senses:

1. In the theory of cognition it is applied to historical knowledge (khunâr), if the latter is generally acknowledged; e.g. the knowledge that there is a city called Makkah and that there has existed a king called Alexander.

Definitions of the term show slight differences. According to al-Djurjânî knowledge is mutawâtîr, when it is supplied by so many persons that either their number or their trustworthiness excludes doubt of its truth (Tukrîf, ed. Flâgel, p. 2101; cf. Sprunger, Dictionary of Technical Terms, p. 1471).

According to Abû Hâfiz 'Umar al-Samit (f. 537 = 1142) reports are mutawâtîr when handed down without deviation by persons who cannot be supposed to have plotted a lie. Ta'fzânî in his
commentary (p. 33 sq.) mentions two objections. The first is, that Jews and Christians accept as authentic reports that are rejected by Muslims. To this objection Tafsārānī simply replies that the possibility that these reports should be mutawātir, is excluded. The second objection is, that the reports of every single reporter (qabīlat, q.v.) represent an opinion only and that an accumulation of opinions cannot be said to afford certainty. To this Tafsārānī replies that often plurality has a power of which singleness is devoid, e.g. a cord made of hair.

For the place of this source of knowledge within the theory of cognition, cf. the Supplement, s. v. 'ilm.

In prosody the term is applied to the rhyme in which one moving letter intervenes between the quiescents.


MUTAWWIF, Meccan pilgrims' guide.

The word literally means one who leads the ṣalāf [q.v.]. The task of the mutawwi is however by no means limited to assisting pilgrims from foreign lands, who entrust themselves to the guidance and protection of the ceremonies required at the circumambulation of the Ka'bah. On the contrary they act as guides at the ṣalāf also and at all other ceremonies which are prescribed or only recommended for the ṣalāf or umra [q. v.]. The mutawwi also cater very completely for the physical welfare of the pilgrims. As soon as the pilgrims arrive in Ḍa'd, their agents are ready on the arrival of the steamers to provide all the services they require from disembarkation to departure for Mecca. In Mecca the mutawwi or members of their families and servants take charge of the pilgrims. During the whole of their stay they provide the pilgrims with lodging, service, food, purchases (necessary and unnecessary), attend them if they fall ill and in case of death take charge of what they leave behind them.

The mutawwi of course do not all do this for nothing. They are appropriately paid for their trouble and see that, if the pilgrim is rich, their friends and relations also make something out of him. Of the money which they themselves receive, they have to hand over a considerable part in the form of fees, presents etc. to the šāhīr of the ṣalāf and to the treasury, — another reason for getting as much as possible out of those entrusted to their care. It is therefore no wonder that many pilgrims have complained bitterly about the covenances of these particularly prominent representatives of the Meccan pilgrim industry. Recently the fees for guides have been fixed by a legal enactment of the Hijās government (G. F., xii. 1932, 449).

Reference has already been made to the fact that the mutawwi are organised in guilds; they are divided up into separate groups who sometimes have the right to exploit the pilgrims from a definite area only (e.g. Lower Egypt). All these groups together form the guild with a chief šahīr officially recognised at their head. The guild is also very exclusive. "Wild" (i.e. independent) guides (quāʾārā) have to be content with the scanty pickings left over for them by the organised mutawwi.


AL-MUTAZILA is the name of the great theological school which created the speculative dogmatism of Islam. The meaning of the name is clear from al-Maʿāṣī al-Mutāzila, Murūj, vi. 22: the mutawwila are those who profess the doctrine of the ṣalāf, i.e. the doctrine of the manzilah bain al-mansūlatān or the state intermediate between belief and scepticism, the fundamental doctrine of the school (see below). A tradition which emanates from the akh al-ḥadīth derives the name Mutāzila from a schism which took place in the circle of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī: after laying down their doctrine of the manzilah bain al-mansūlatān, Wāsīl b. ʿAbd and ʿAmr b. ʿUbayd are said to have separated (fiṣnāla) from al-Ḥasan's circle to found an independent school or rather to have been expelled from it by the latter. These traditions are not entirely without historical foundation but the interpretation of the name deduced from them is certainly wrong. The Mutāzila were proud of their name, which they certainly would not have been if it had been a nickname invented by their enemies. We have here, as the variety of versions also shows, a tendentious invention of the akh al-ainan wa-l-ʿaqlīn aГлава, to rehabilitate al-Ḥasan and brand the Mutāzila as heretics.

Origins and political history. There are quite definite indications that the Mutāzila was of political origin and that it arose under the same constellation as the ʿAshʿarī and Khaṭṭārī movements. The accession of ʿAlī (Qubba l-Ḥājdīja 35) is the great watershed in the currents of the history of Islam. It is well known that several notable Companions of the Prophet refused to pay ʿAlī the homage which he demanded or offered it reluctantly. The most frequently mentioned were ʿAlī and al-Zubair but the names of many others have been preserved: Saʿd b. ʿAbī Waqṣās, ʿAbī ʿAlīya b. ʿUmar, Muḥammad b. Maslama, Usman b. Zaid, ʿAbd b. ʿUmar, Ibn Zaid and ʿAbd b. Ṭāhīt (al-Taʿbarī, i. 3072). Of these ʿAlī and al-Zubair openly rebelled against ʿAlī and the majority remained neutral. The Medinese in general followed the example of the latter and in Bagh ʿAlīnuf b. Kaʿb with 6,000 Qarmatians and a group of Arabs under ʿAbu Ṣaʿīd al-Shamīnā also stood aside from the quarrel (al-Taʿbarī, i. 3109, 3178). In
speaking of the latter the text uses the verb "tāmah," which still has its proper sense of "to separate from", but which is already on the way to become a political term meaning "to take up a neutral attitude in the quarrel between 'Ali and his adversaries!" Now al-Nawbakhtī mentions (Kitāb Fīrāq al-Mustaṣila, ed. Ritter, p. 5) a party which on the accession of 'Ali separated and followed ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, ʿAbd Allāh b. Omar, Muḥammad b. Maṣlama and Usāma b. Zaid. "These separated (tīṣātūn) from 'Ali and refused either to fight against him or to take his side although they had paid homage to him and had received him in worship; they were called al-Muṭṭaṣila and are the ancestors of all the later Muṭṭaṣila." The Muṭṭaṣila as a theological school must therefore have been preceded by a political Muṭṭaṣila, which determined its structure.

This hypothesis seems to be confirmed if we analyse carefully what is recorded of the founders of the theological school. According to a unanimous tradition, this school originated with two natives of Basra, Ṣuṣhān, al-Muṭṭaṣila, who is called "al-Muṭṭaṣila, "Aṭīq" [q.v.], and Amr b. Ṭālib [q.v.]. The period of their activity covers practically the reign of the caliph Hārūn and his Umayyad successors, i.e. the years 105-131 (723-48). We have no very good deal of quite early information about them, not always free from lacunae, but sufficient to enable us to grasp the leading ideas in their theological work (see Bibli.). It is clear from all these traditions that the doctrine of Ṣuṣhān formed the starting point for the creation of the school, that Ṣuṣhān was the first to formulate it and that he later won over, Amr to his teaching. This is how al-Khālidī records the origin of the idea of Ṣuṣhān, Muslims were agreed that he who committed a grave sin deserved the name of Ṣuṣhān and of Ṣuṣhān, but opinions varied as to the character of the individual who received these epithets. The Kāhidī said he was an infidel. The Muṭṭaṣila said he was a believer in spite of his Ṣuṣhān and his Ṣuṣhān; al-Ṭālib al-Basrī, and his circle, described him as a hypocrite (manṣūla). Ṣuṣhān denies that the description given in the Kurān of a believer and an infidel cannot be applied to a believer who has committed a grave sin; the latter is therefore neither believer nor infidel. Now it is impossible to regard him as a hypocrite as al-Ṭālib wants him to do, for a hypocrite must pass as a believer until his hypocrisy is brought to light. The only possible course then is to put the Ṣuṣhān in a special category of those who are in an intermediate state (manṣūla bain "lam-manṣullah"). These same ideas are found in the conversation by which Ṣuṣhān is said to have won Amr over to the doctrine of Ṣuṣhān (al-Salīḥi, al-Muṭṭaṣila, Amīra, l. 141 sq. = Ibn al-Muṭṭaṣila, al-Muṭṭaṣila, p. 22 sq.; source probably al-Khālidī).

There are political problems concealed behind these speculations. The doctrine of manṣūla bain "lam-manṣullah" is not the result of interest in pure speculation, but arose out of an clearly defined opinion on the individuals who took part in the quarrels that raged round the caliphate of 'Ali. It is striking how much space is occupied by the question of 'Ali, of Ṣuṣhān, of al-Zubair and of 'Aṭīq in the rather scanty information which we possess regarding the theology of Ṣuṣhān and 'Amr; we cannot doubt that there were dealing with a central problem. Ṣuṣhān and 'Amr took neither side in the dispute (Kitāb al-Imārāt, p. 97-98). According to them, 'Ali, Talḥa, al-Zubair and 'Aṭīq were originally true and pious believers. But the war which broke out among them divided them into two parties who could not both be right; one of these parties committed a sin but we do not know which; we must therefore leave their case to Him who knows it in its relations with one another we cannot regard them as true believers in the strict sense of the word. As a result if one of these individuals bears witness against another of the opposite party, we cannot accept this evidence; relatively to the one, the other is ḍālah in vice versa (cf. also Baghāṣī, Kitāb al-Farāj, p. 100). If we may believe the abī Ṣuṣhān, 'Amr showed himself more severe than Ṣuṣhān; he is said to have refused to accept the deposition made by any member of these parties against any member of the community on any matter whatever (Tārīkh Baghāṣī, ill. 178; al-Baghdādī, Kitāb al-Farāj, p. 100); for he declared guilty (ḍālah) per se both the parties engaged in the battle of the Camel. It is therefore not surprising that Ṣuṣhān and 'Amr have sometimes been confused with the Kāhidīs (verse of ʿIsā b. Suwād al-ʿAdwā, al-Īṣāṣ, Bayān, l. 13).

However, the opinion of the leaders of the Muṭṭaṣila on 'Ali is based on quite a different foundation. To understand the position correctly it is important to note that 1. Ṣuṣhān and the whole Muṭṭaṣila were definitely enemies of the Umayyads and that 2. Ṣuṣhān adopted a somewhat ambiguous attitude regarding 'Othman and his murderers (Kitāb al-Imārāt, p. 97-98). This tacitly implies a declaration in favour of the Alids, the first authors in the drama played at Mecca in the year 35. Indeed Ṣuṣhān was on some intimate terms with the Alids of Medina (Ibn al-Muṭṭaṣila, al-Muṭṭaṣila, p. 20); the Zaidīya revere him as one of their leaders, and Zaidī theology is essentially based on that of Ṣuṣhān. This is true not only of the speculative theology; there is agreement also on political doctrines. The Zaidīs do not say that the first caliphs Abū Bakr and Omar were usurpers as the extreme Shīʿa do; Ṣuṣhān and with him the whole Muṭṭaṣila regards the caliphate of Abū Bakr as legitimate (commentary of Ibn Abī Ṭālib on Nahj al-Balagha, Cairo 1329, l. 3); he left undecided the question of knowing who had the superior claim, Abū Bakr, Omar or 'Ali, but he credited 'Ali with a superior claim to 'Uṯmān. This attitude, a little complicated as regards 'Ali, and therefore prudent towards the extreme Shīʿa, at the same time unreservedly hostile to the Umayyads, can in my opinion only be interpreted in one way. All these apparently dissimilar lines converge on a common centre; the 'Abḥāṣīd movement. It is precisely Ṣuṣhān's attitude which we must regard as characteristic of the partisans of the 'Abḥāṣīds. The latter regarding themselves as the true alk al-bait, it was evidently in their interest to lower somewhat the prepondering position attributed to 'Ali by the extreme Shīʿa in order themselves to profit by the prestige enjoyed by the family of the Prophet; but on the other hand, they had every reason not to cut the links with the Shiʿa who were indispensable as allies to them. It is obvious that in these circumstances it was particularly important for them to win over the relatively moderate Zaidī faction to their cause. In a general
way, the teaching of Wāṣīl or al-murtadsa can only be perfectly understood if we see in it the theoretical crystallization of the political programme of the 'Abbasids before their accession to power. Everything leads us to believe that the theology of Wāṣīl and of the early Mu'tazila represents the official theology of the 'Abbasid movement. This gives an enforced explanation of the fact that it was the official doctrine of the 'Abbasid court for at least a century. It seems even probable that Wāṣīl and his disciples took direct part in the 'Abbasid propaganda. In his bayātha, mentioned before, Sa'dīn al-Anṣārī tells us that Wāṣīl had many admirers (ā'labūn) in all parts of the Muslim world. Sa'dīn describes them as ardent believers and ascetics who were distinguished from other men in physique and dress; they were the supports (wāṣīlāt) of God in all lands and centres in which his commandments were made manifest and in which the art of disputation (with the enemies of the faith) flourished. The period of this activity coincides exactly with that of the most intense 'Abbasid propaganda, in which all the forces working for the ruin of the Umayyads were cooperating; it is impossible not to believe there was a connection between the two. That Wāṣīl did actually extend his propaganda very far to the west is proved by the fact that there existed long after the fall of the Umayyads a Wāṣīl community at Tahtir (Ya'qūb, i. 315) numbering about 3,000 members who had allied themselves with the 'Abbasids. They had rebelled against Mansūr under ldrīs b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abas al-Hanfī (al-Sharāstānī, p. 31); on these happenings see 'Abasī, iii. 561; they were therefore reckoned among the enemies of the first 'Abbasid calipha. It is interesting to note that the connection between Wāṣīl and the Khāridjī, supposed by Iṣākh b. Sūwālī al-'Adwāʾī to exist (see above) was here an actuality. The quarrels of Wāṣīl and his followers with Zāhīr b. Sa'dīn [q.v.] form a difficult problem which has not yet been solved. On the one hand, Zāhīr's theology left distinct traces on that of the Mu'tazila; the doctrine of the created Kurān which was later to become a fundamental Mu'tazila thesis was probably formulated by Zāhīr and forms the basis of the divine attributes. There are coincidences on both sides which cannot be accidental. On the other hand, there are many serious differences which are probably practical and political in their nature. Zāhīr professed in the most extreme form the doctrine of predestination (dāna). All the actions of men are involuntary. Wāṣīl maintained the opposite thesis of free will. Now once again we have political problems hidden behind these theological controversies; the Umayyads in general preferred the dogma of predestination while the opposition accepted the dogma of free will in its widest interpretation; in Damascus, Ghālib b. Dīmashqī, who figures among the fathers of the Mu'tazila (Ibn al-Mu'tāzīlī, al-Mu'tāzīlī, p. 15—17), was put to death by the 'Abbasids for holding the doctrine of free will (al-Tabārī, iii. 733).

On the hypothesis of a definite connection between the Mu'tazila and the 'Abbasids is admitted, the question of the relations between the Mu'tazila founded by Wāṣīl and the early Mu'tazila of the period of 'Ali presents itself in a new aspect. It will be admitted that there is a striking resemblance between the attitude of these former companions of the Prophet and that of the 'Abbasids. It is true that 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbas entered the service of 'Ali after the death of 'Othmān but his true sentiments were somewhat ambiguous; he was a great friend of 'Othmān but a rather lukewarm partisan of 'Ali and after the latter's death he placed himself at the service of the Umayyads. His descendants did not remain at Medina; probably because the 'Alīdīs were their rivals there; after a stay in Damascus, his son went to Hims and here in a formal rapprochement took place in 98 between the 'Abbasids and the 'Alīdīs (Wellhausen, Das arabisch Reich, p. 312 sq.). Before this event, we may regard the 'Abbasids as a kind of Mu'tazila in the old sense of the word.

With 'Amr b. 'Ubayd a new element enters the Mu'tazila as founded by Wāṣīl. 'Amr originally was one of the sal al-ḥadīth; brought up in the circle of al-Hassan al-Baṣrī, he transmitted a large number of ḥadīth from his master and he is remembered as one of the muhāsabīn. His conversion to the doctrine of Wāṣīl brought about a rupture between him and these circles; but with him a considerable section of the Khāridjīs joined the Mu'tazila, thus reinforcing the more politically inclined Khāridjīs of which Wāṣīl was the inspiration. The 'Abbasids and the Mu'tazila were soon to become synonymous terms. 'Amr seems to have been decisively anti-'Alīdī (see above), in any case he preferred 'Abd Bakr to 'Ali (Ibn Abī Hādīd on Nukāyi al-Baṣrī, i. 3). This attitude implies a certain predilection for 'Othmān, which is foreign to Wāṣīl; indeed, a section of the old Barīts, among them al-Diḥḥī, is said to have belonged to the party called al-ʿOthmānīya. 'Amr's point of view was of great importance for the development of the Mu'tazila. After their final triumph, the 'Abbasids immediately dissolved the alliance with the Shi'a, which had only been a political instrument for them. As regards the extreme Shi'a, the Kāfīrīn, the Mu'tazila unreservedly followed the direction of their new masters; but it is fairly evident that some of them did not desert all at once, or break all abruptly, with the moderate Shi'a. It resulted in a schism. One section remained faithful to the alliance with the moderate Shi'a; this section was later to form a special Mu'tazila school in Bābeldīb, but the Mu'tazīlīs of Basra with 'Amr at their head seem to have attached themselves without protest to the 'Abbasid cause. 'Amr even became the intimate friend of Mansūr and so to speak his spiritual father. In the west, the Mu'tazīlīs allied with the Khāridjīs rebelled against the 'Abbasids (see above).

Let us sum up the characteristic features of the Mu'tazila at the beginning of the 'Abbasid period. The Mu'tazīlīs 1. in general derive from the cause of the 'Abbasid caliph, only a faction being opposed to them; 2. decidedly hostile to the extreme Shi'a, the Rāfiqa; 3. hostile to the 'Abbasids proper, by which however it was a little influenced; 4. hadīth in reunifying some of the old factions of this name; 5. in serious disagreement with the sal al-ḥadīth, who soon declared it heretical. This position had a decisive influence in determining the structure of the Mu'tazīlī theology. The beginnings of this theology go back to Wāṣīl and 'Amr and are connected with the fight against the Rāfiqa. The extreme Shi'a had quite early assimilated a good number of
non-Muslim beliefs; we need not doubt that Manichaeism played a part in them; in any case certain gnostic and dualist ideas had found a way into Islam through the intermediary of these Shi'is. These tendencies, very marked in Kufa, were also represented at Basra; in the house of an Ahd who was a moment or Buddhist, Wasi' and 'Amr had discussions with Abū al-Karīm b. Abī 'Amar al- wasi'ī and Shāhī b. Abī al-Mu'taṣīl, who pres- sures dualist doctrines (as-ramaṭāwa; we should probably understand by this Manichaean view) and the poet Bahrām b. Ṭūr [q. v. (Khitāb al-āghāna, ill. 24)]. A serious schism broke up this curious wāfīa. This event decided the whole future of the Mu'tazila. Henceforth the fight against saz-dah and thamāwa is a cardinal point in the programme of the Mu'tazila. Wasi' himself composed a refutation of Manichaeanism which al-Bali (c. 300 A. H.) was still able to peruse (al-Mu' at-siḥ, p. 21). But they also found themselves compelled to combat these heresies in a positive fashion; to the doctrine of fire professed by Shahām, they offered a theology of earth, so to speak, a theology based on the natural philosophy of the time. The poems of Saffān al-'Aṣārī (al-Dā'iq, Khitāb al-Bayayn, l. 16-19) and others are a specimen of this theology; here we have one of the fundamental documents for the history of Mu'tazila dogmatism. It is not yet clear whence came the philosophy put at the service of theology but its general character is apparent; it is the philosophy of the alchemists, physicists of late antiquity, a kind of summa of the scientific principles which seem to have been accepted everywhere in Asiatic Hellenism. Saffān perhaps gives us a hint as to the circles from which it came to the Mu'tazila, when he tells us that Bahrām called Wasi' and his friends Dālaṣa; this is in any case worth noting. In a general way those who handed on this natural philosophy seem to have been the school called Dāḥira by Muslims. The Mu'tazila fought these Dāhirs with a vigour which reveals the dependence on this heretical philosophy, which they were conscious. The true founder of the dogmatic system of the Mu'tazila was Abū 'l-Hudhail Muḥammad b. al-Hudhail al- 'Aliāf [q. v.]. Abū 'l-Hudhail, his friends and pupils, continued on a large scale the polemic against Manichaeism, a polemic which is certainly not unconnected with the Ahl Baydā with the open or secret adherents of this religion. On the other hand, he fought the Rāfīsīa most vigorously, then represented by the very remarkable theologian Hāshām b. al-Hakam [q. v.]; and it was through his disputes with the latter that he was led to study the books of the philosophers, which furnished him with a system of dogmatism, a little bold, but full of fertile new ideas. Alongside of him there was a crowd of important theologians at Basra: Mu'āmmar, an independent mind whose ideas have not yet been sufficiently analysed; Hāshām b. Abī al-Fuwaṭ and al-Asām, adversaries of Abū 'l-Hudhail, and several others. Among the pupils of Abū 'l-Hudhail mention must first be made of Thābit b. Sādiq al-Naqqām [q. v.]. These theologians gave Mu'tazila dogmatism its essential character. This theology is: 1. apologetic; it aims at defending the revelation of the Prophet; as a result it is 2. strictly Kurtānī; the sacred book is the only source of the theological denomina-
b. Hārb (d. 310), at a later date Muḥammad b. Șaiddād al-Miḥna'ī Zurāfī (d. in 238) and Abu l-Ḥasan 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Khāiyāt, the great authority on the history of the Muṭaẓila (d. at the end of the century). On the Muṭaẓila of Syrīa we are not well informed; and only a little better on that of Egypt. The first Muṭaẓila here was Ibn ʿUlaa (c.f. above) who had disputations with al-Shāfiʿī; with him Ḥāfīz al-Farād having come to Cairo; this last represented the official theology in Cairo during the middle period of al-Wāḥīk. Ḥāfīz was declared a heretic by al-Khāiyāt (Aḥalāl, p. 131–134). — In Spain the Muṭaẓila teaching was disseminated by dīrār Abu Bakr Fārād al-Kūrtubī who had visited the east and stayed there with al-Dżāhīrī; it was therefore al-Dżahīrīya — at bottom al-Naḍmāmīya — that was known in Spain; very soon the Muṭaẓila seems to have become indistinguishable from the Būḥārīya (Aṣīn Palacios, Aḥammasurra y su coroela, Madrid 1914, p. 21—22).

The fourth century saw the Shi'a flourishing and ʿAbbāṣid power disappearing; the favour of several Bābyl governors now to some degree made good the loss of prestige which had been suffered by the Muṭaẓila. The schools continued their work and the Muṭaẓila spread to the east. At Bāṣra, al-Dżabābī had left a large number of disciples but his school was soon surpassed by that of his son Abu Hāshim (q.v.); representatives of the latter were among others: Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusain b. ʿAlī al-Baṣri (d. 569), Abu l-Ḥasan al-Arakān (Abū Ḥāfīz b. Wāsif b. ʿAbd al-Wāsī al-Muṭtahārī (d. 731); a number of the well known al-Tanukhī family; Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAbdī b. ʿAṭīya al-Baṣri and his pupil the Kādī Abu al-Dżahāb b. Ṣāḥib al-Hamādānī. The last, the most remarkable of the Bāṣra theologians of the period, migrated in 360 to Kāṣī where he founded an influential school and died in 415. In Bāṣra dīrār the school of Abu Bakr Ṣāḥib (d. in 320) dominated the whole century. A very celebrated Bāṣrī, Abu l-ʿAskār ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥāfīz al-balḫī al-Kubūtī, a pupil of al-Khāiyātī, founded a school at Nāṣrāf, where he died in 319; among his pupils we find al-ʿAfdāl Abu l-Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Wāsī. We also find the Muṭaẓila in Iṣfāhān, where Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Ḥusayn al-Zahābarī of the school of Abu l-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Wāsī had introduced Muṭaẓila doctrines; at Kirmās (school of Abu Ḥāshim), Gurgūn, Naḥāpura and in several other towns of Khurāsān. During the fifth century it was the theology of Abu al-Dżahābī which dominated at Bāṣra; one of his pupils, Abu Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāḥib. Mattawawī, handed down the great work on dogmatics of his master, al-Muṣṭafa b. ʿIltīrī; another theologian, Abu Raḥīm al-Sādī b. Muḥammad al-Nāḥṣūbī (d. in 460), compiled a resumé of the questions disputed in the schools of Bāṣra and Bāḡdād. Several theologians of Bāḡdād are known; some of them must have belonged to the Zaidīya and generally speaking the Bāḡdād schools were abstracted and more merged in the Zaidīya. The last great theologian of the Muṭaẓila was al-Zāmān b. ʿAbd al-Malik (d. in 538) but the schools continued to exist long after him, especially in the east. It was probably the invasion of the Mongols that put an end to them; the Muṭaẓila has however survived to our day in the Zaidīya.

It was not speculative dogmatics alone that formed the subject of Muṭaẓila activity. Their part in the history of the exegesis of the Kūfīn is a very considerable one; it was they who introduced the strictly grammatical method. There is a very close connection between them and the philological school of Bāṣra, the representatives of which in general taught Muṭaẓila doctrines (e.g. al-ʿAsna'). The exegetical works of the Muṭaẓila during the most part now lost, were utilized to a large extent by their adversaries, e.g. Fāḍil al-Kăīrī. — All questions of ʿibād were very vigorously discussed in the Muṭaẓila schools; the influence of the Muṭaẓila on the ʿuṣūl al-ʿibād and the maqāṣid has still to be examined. — Lastly the science of ʿadlīya certainly received various stimuli from the Muṭaẓila criticism of the ʾaḥkām al-ḥadīth. Maqāṣid al-Muṭaẓila: theology is summed up under five principles (ʿuṣūl) or fundamental doctrines which one must accept in their integrity to be recognized as a Muṭaẓila (al-Masānī, Muṭāzilī, vi. 22). As these were probably in origin the principal points in the programme of Muṭaẓila propaganda, these ʿuṣūl later became a key framework of speculative dogmatics.

1. ʿAḥkām al-ḥadīth: the strictest profession of monotheism (against any kind of dualism); denial of all resemblance between Allāh and his creatures (against the anthropomorphisms of the muḥaddithīn on the one hand and those of the Rāfīḍ and Manṣūmah on the other); the divine attributes recognised (against the Dabārīya) but deprived of their real existence: they are not entities added to the divine being (this would be ʿagība); against the šīrāyina among the ʾaḥkām al-ḥadīth but identical with the being (Wāsī, Abu l-Ḥudjālī); allegorical interpretation of the anthropomorphisms of the Kūfīn; denial of the benific vision; vigorous affirmation of a personal God and creator (against the Dabārīya); integral affirmation of the revelation of the Prophet but distinction between a natural theology and a revealed theology. Problems discussed here: the nature of God and his attributes: a. omnipresence: God is in all places; b. omniscience: he directs everything (Abu l-Ḥudjālī al-Dżabābī); — he is not in any place (general thesis); c. perceptibility: he is not perceived by the senses (thesis generally adopted) — he is perceived by the heart (Abu l-Ḥudjālī) — he has a hidden nāhiyya which will be perceived in another world with the help of a sixth sense which God will then create (Ḥāfīz al-Farād and others; thesis declared heretical); the attributes (eternal; names of the essence): identical with the essence (Abu l-Ḥudjālī; thesis generally adopted) — inherent in the essence through ʿulūm (Muḥammad) — through aṣbāḥ (Abu Ḥāshim); expressing positive aspects (Abu l-Ḥudjālī and generally) — negative (knowledge: negation of ignorance of the Nagāmī).

2. The structure of the created world: a. starting-point anthropology treated in a positive way (exact definition of religious duties) and negative (refutation of qāmāna): man is the empirical phenomenon which we see, the body (ṣarīma) which is composed of a certain number of indivisible entities (atoms) and which supports the accidents: life, the senses, colours etc.; nafs is muḥādīn and distinct from rūḥ (Abu l-Ḥudjālī) — man is composed of body (ḥadān) and rūḥ (identical with nafs) which are mutually interpenetran (muḥādīna); the colours, senses, sensations, forms and spirits form different categories of ḥamalā (not
accidents; not atoms); all that is living: forms a single category (ma'adhūna) (al-Naẓāmūn; — man is an indivisible entity (‘awākar) characterised by ʾarādā, ʾaʾnādā, ʾaʾnākā; the body is the instrument of this ‘awākar; the accidents (movement, rest, colours and shapes) therewithin are in it through maʿādā which are inherent in other maʿādā etc. (Maʿāmarī); is the ‘awāfīn or Maʿāmarī — man is ʾaḥṣār (Abū ʿAbdāb b. Saʿlānīn) the nafs is an instrument which the body employs: the rābū is an accident (Dījār b. Hārūn); the rābū is a body and a distinct from the life: which is an accident (al-Dhūbābū); — the physical world; dead nature is distinct from that which is living in as much as nature acts through ṣādiqah while living beings act through their free will (ikhārij); for the rest, the one and the other category are of the same structure, the problems of physics being those of anthropology (substance, accidents, bodies, atoms etc.) theory of jāhūr and kamālah formulated by al-Naẓāmūn and which correspond to his theory of penetration (movekhāla); things are hidden one in the other, physical development consists in the hidden things becoming manifest (e.g. the fire hidden in the ash). 3. The relation between God and the created world: a. lais kāmil-ta'īgh shari: a rigorous distinction between kāmil and maqādā (no hād); the activities of God, expressed by his attributes, have for their objects the things of the created world. If these activities are eternal, the things ought to be so also; now these things are created i.e. put into existence after having been non-existent; several solutions of the problem: “thing” is only what exists and before the reaction the thing was not thing which implies that divine knowledge is born with the things (Dījārīs thesis adopted by Ḥiḥām al-Fuwaṭī) — before the creation those things were posited (Dījārīs) as non-existent in God’s eternal knowledge but without the accidents which characterise them in existence (al-Shāhīnī and others) — with these accidents (al-Khāṣṣīt, al-Kaʾībī and several theologians of Baghdād [school of maqādā-maṣūla]); God created all things at one time, one in the other and these things are manifested in the created world one after the other (al-Naẓāmūn); c. are the objects of divine knowledge and power limited? Yes (Abū ʿAbdul-Halīl al-Halīlī) — no (the others); d. divine power does not extend to the accidents (Maʿāmarī) — to the phenomena resulting spontaneously from human action (takwānąlī; under asʿal al-ʿadī); 4. Revelation: prophecy: a prophet is maqādū, i.e. free from grave sins; b. the Kurān: created; God creates the word in a substratum (laḥūk al-maṣāḥah: the Prophet; the bush etc.). The Kurān is miraculous in composition and style — denied by al-Naẓāmūn; distinction (which goes back to Wajīlī) between maqādū, the precepts of the Kurān which are clear and without ambiguity and maqādūshīb, the precepts which are not immediately clear and evident; distinction between naṣīḥah and maqādūshīb. 2. Aṣīl al-ʿāghāfāf: God is just; all that he does aims at what is best for his creation (āqīb); he does not desire evil and does not ordain it (āvar and ʿirādā identical). He has nothing to do with man’s evil deeds; all human actions result from man’s free will; man has a ʿāqīb and an īstāfā habīb “I’ll: man will be rewarded for his good deeds and punished for his evil ones. Problems discussed here: 1. Divine power: a. can God commit an injustice? No: al-Naẓāmūn — yes, but he does not: general thesis; b. theodicy: could God prevent evil? Yes, for he possesses a store of hidden grace (hūf) which would be sufficient to destroy evil completely at once. Bishāb al-Muʿtaṣim and several Baghdādī theologians — no, for he always does what is best and wisest for his creation; general thesis. 2. Huμan power: created by God; physical evils, diseases etc. are not subject to the human will; man’s actions are movements; distinction between al-maṣūla and al-miṣāla: problem of taʾwālib was discussed by Abū ʿAbdul-Halīl and particularly discussed in the school of Baghdād: the effects of an action are attributed to him who performs it, and even after his death he remains responsible for it. 3. Aṣīl al-waʾṣūd wa ʿl-waʾṣūd (or al-waʾṣūd wa ʿl-waḥšānā): practical theology. Problems here discussed: a. belief and unbelief: belief consists in all the acts of obedience, obligatory or supererogatory; sins (maṣāḥah) are divided into grave (jāhūr) and petty. (jāhūrī); the following are jāhūrī: taqābīl radhūkā, ḍafūn kāmā, ṣafā mīn kāmā, ṣafā kāmā, ṣafā kāmā, ṣafā ṣafā, Abū ʿAbdul-Halīl: God of his grace may forgive jāhūrī; he who is not a Muslim obeys God if he does not believe in the thing which God has commanded in the Kurān (ʿābār wa ṣawālah ʿl-hākīh); Abū ʿAbdul-Halīl (thesis rejected by al-Naẓāmūn and the Baghdād school); distinction between al-waʾṣūd and al-waʾṣūd: Abū ʿAbdul-Halīl from Ḥiḥām al-Fuwaṭī; maṣūla:Abu ʿAbdul-Halīl and Ḥiḥām al-Fuwaṭī; the taqwānī does not necessarily presuppose believers, the Muslim community can agree upon what is a good or a mistake: al-Naẓāmūn and others. 4. Aṣīl al-maṣūla: the clarification of the problems of theocracy: a. the caliphate of Abū Bakr was legitimate but not based on a divine revelation; general thesis; b. superiority of Abū Bakr over ʿAlī (Abū Bakr superior to ʿOmar, the latter to ʿOthmān, the latter to ʿAlī): the old Baṣrī and Thumāmā; superiority of ʿAlī to Abū Bakr: the Baghdādīs and some later Baṣrīs (al-Dhūbābū) towards the end of his life; Abū ʿAbdul-Halīl; neutral attitude (takwānī) on all that concerns the question of knowing who was entitled to the superiority: Abū Bakr, ʿOmar or ʿAlī; ʿAlī superior to ʿOthmān: Wāṣil, Abū ʿAbdul-Halīl, Abū Ḥiḥām. 2. The problems of jāhūrī: the old problem; being no longer a live one, petty sins (maqādūshīb) were discussed under this head. 5. Aṣīl al-ʿamr bi ʿl-ʿamoṣ uwa ʿl-náhêy ʿam ʿl-miṣālah: programme of Maʿṣūla activity before the coming of the ʿAbbaṣids; the faith must be spread by the tongue, the hand and the sword; later this subject little discussed; al-Aṣirān denies its obligatory character. Bibliography: Steiner, Die Muʿtaṣillen oder die Freidenker im Islam, Leipzig 1865; v. Kremer, Gesch. d. herrschenden Ideen des Islam, Leipzig 1868; Houtsma, De strijd over het Dogma etc., Leyden 1875; B. Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology etc.
means trigonometry (cf. Dozy, Supplements, i. 163).

*MUTHALLATH* (always with the feminine ending) is a technical term in astrology. Astrology divides the zodiacal circle (συνόγησ [q. v.]) into four major parts (Gr. τριγώνον; L. trigonum, trigonica), each of which includes three signs 120° apart. These are situated together in the trigonal plane (φασθήλθη, Gr. τρίγωνον; L. aspectus trigonum); the word *fasathēla* itself is frequently found as the synonym of *muthallath* which comes from the same root (φασ-θέ-λα) (cf. Dozy, op. cit., p. 162).

In starvation nomenclature *Kāwāb al-Muthallath* is the constellation of the (northern) Triangle (in Eratothenes Ἀλαταρ, in Ptolemy Ἀλαταρ) which is joined in the east by Piscus, in the west by Andromeda, in the west by Piscis and in the south by Ariës. According to Ptolemy (Almagest) and al-Sūfī (ed. Schillerup, p. 123 sq.), it consists of three stars of the third magnitude and one of the fifth. The star at the apex (η απριλί) is an asterolea star and is called Ṭūs al-Muthallath. The latter name is found in Libros de sidero daemonium del rec. D. Alonso X de Castilla in the corrupted form *aleciel*.


**AL-MUṬLI** [See AL-XU, II.]

AL-MUṬLI'U li 'L-EM, 'ABU 'L-KAMĀ al-FAYLI, an *Abḥāḏ al-ḥalīm, son of al-Muṭtalīq (q. v.), brother of al-Rāḍī and of al-Muṭṭāqī (q. v.). Al-Muṭtalīq was a bitter enemy of al-Mustaqīfī (q. v.) and therefore went into hiding on the latter's accession and after Muṭāiz al-Dawla (q. v.) had become the real ruler, al-Muṭliʿu is said to have taken refuge with him and incited him against al-Mustaqīfī. After the deposition of the latter in Džumādā II or Shabān 334 (Jan. or March 946) al-Muṭliʿu was recognised as caliph. His reign marks a very unfortunate period in the history of the *Abḥāḏids*. The caliph himself had not the slightest authority; the power was in the hands of Muṭāiz al-Dawla and after his death (356 = 967) in those of his son Baḥṭyṭir. The Fāṭimidīs were growing more and more powerful and the *Shāmīzids* also declined to recognize al-Muṭliʿu as the legitimate suzerain. The *Hamādānīs* were weakened by their wars with the *Biyids* and the Fāṭimidīs. In Bagdād the Sūnis and Shīʿis were fighting one another and several Nówi ṣuṣages were introduced by the *Biyids*, who had *Alī* sympathies. At last the weak and sickly caliph was forced by the Turks to abdicate in favour of his son 'Abd al-Karim al-Tāʾī (13th C., D. a. 363 = Aug. 5, 974). Al-Muṭliʿu died in Muḥarram 364 (September—October 974) in Dar al-ʿĀlkī.


**MUṬLIʿU (A.), part. pass. IV from ṣāb, "to loose the bond (ṣāb) of an animal, so as to let it free" (e.g. Muslim, Dīštān, trad. 46; Abū Dāwūd, Dīštān, bail. 100). The term is also applied to the loosening of the bowstring (Bukhārī, Dīštān, b. 170), of the garments, the hair etc. Thence the common meaning *absolute*, as opposed to restricted (muḥāṣib); and further the accusative musṭālān "absolutely", The use of the term is so widely diffused, that a few examples only cannot be given.

In grammar the term musṭālān denotes the absolute object (cognate accusative), i.e. the objectivised verb of the sentence, such as *a sitting* in the sentence: he sat a sitting.

In the doctrine of the roots of *ṣīḥ* the term is applied to the *wustāla* of the heroic age, the founders of the *wustāla* who are called *muṣṭatāla* musṭālā, an epithet which none other than them has borne (cf. al-Dīštān).

In dogmatics the term is applied to existence, so that al-muṣṭālān al-muṣṭālān denotes Allāh, as opposed to His creation, which does not possess existence in the deepest sense.

In ontology the term is also applied to existence (wustāla) in connection with the question of the nature of the latter. Here al-muṣṭālān al-muṣṭālān is opposed to al-muṣṭālān al-muṣṭālān (cf. al-Dīštān).

In other surroundings the term has the meaning "general" as opposed to *ḥājī*; cf. the definition in Dīštān (6): *muṣṭāla* denotes the one without specification. Cf. further the Dictionary of the Technical Terms.

On the meaning of *muṣṭālā* in *musīd* in *pursody*, cf. Freytag, Darstellung d. arab. Verskunft, Bonn 1830, p. 311.


(A. J. Wensmcke)

**AL-MUṬṬĀQĪ** li ʿL-EM, 'ABU ʿSAYF ʾIBRĀHĪM, an *Abḥāḏ al-ḥalīm, son of al-Muṭtalīq (q. v.) and a slave-girl named Ḥāʾith. In Rabiʾ I 329 (Dec. 940) he succeeded his brother al-Raḍī (q. v.) by this time the caliphate had sunk so low that five days passed after the death of al-Raḍī before steps were taken to choose his successor. Al-Muṭṭāqī at once confirmed the Amir al-Umār Bāḏkūm (q. v.) in office; after his death however, the Turks and Dālāms in the army began to quarrel with one another. Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṭrīdī (see al-Baṭrī) seized the capital but could only hold it a few weeks. He was driven out by the Dālāms chief Kūṭrīg who however was soon overthrown by Ibn Raʾīl (q. v.). When Abū ʿAbd Allāh sent his brother Abū l-Jamān with an army against Bagdād, the caliph and Ibn Raʾīl escaped to al-Mawṣil to the Hamādānīs (Džumādā II 330 = Feb.—March 942). After the assassination of Ibn Raʾīl the Hamādānī Abū Muḥammad al-Haṣan was appointed Amir al-Umār and received the honorić title of Nāṣir al-Dawla. The occu-
pation of Baghdad offered him no difficulty; the Turkish general Tuzun rebelled a little later and Nâşir al-Dawla had to evacuate the capital which was entered by Tuzun in Ramadân 333 (Jan 943) as Amîr al-Umarî. Al-Mutâkî soon found himself forced to seek the protection of the Hâmidîn again and at the beginning of the following year (autumn 943) he fled to Mawâli. Then he settled in al-Râkîya but when Tuzun made peace with Nâşir al-Dawla, al-Mutâkî appealed for protection to the Ilhâmidîn of Egypt; the latter came to al-Râkîya in Rajab 332 (March 944). The negotiations however were unsuccessful and finally the caliph put his trust in Tuzun, who after assuring him of his loyalty by the most sacred oaths had him blinded (Safar 333 = Oct. 944). Al-Mutâkî was then declared to be deposed. He died in Sha’bân 357 (July 695).


AL-MUTÂKÎ AL-HINDI, a author of several works in Arabic, whose real name was ‘ALI b. HUSAYN AL-DIN ‘AMR AL-MATÂKÎ b. KABBÂR AL-KURRÂ, was born in Basra and was the father of the poet Sa`d al-Mutâkî. He was the son of a well-known poet and writer, and was himself an accomplished scholar. He was the author of several works, including the following:

1. al-Burkan fî ‘Azamî Madhid Âshir al-Zamân, an account of the Mahdi and his coming to the end of the world;
2. al-Burkan al-Dawlat fî Marâdî al-Wali;
3. Tâlkhîl al-Bayt fî ‘Alâmî Madhid Âshir al-Zamân;
5. Hikayat Rabî’ biwa‘ Abū Faqâd al-Murâshî;
6. al-Hikam;
7. Kaws al-Ummâl fî Sana’ al-Âshir, a combined edition of Su‘ûtî’s Dhâlam al-Murâshî or Dîwân al-Dîwânî or al-Dîwânî al-Badr, newly arranged according to chapters (printed in Haiderabad 1347);
9. Minâkhî al-Ummâl fî Sana’ al-Âshir, an abridgement of Su‘ûtî’s well-known alphabetically arranged work al-Dhâlam al-‘Âshir containing a collection of traditions from authentic sources, newly arranged according to chapters together with a supplement;


(M. HUDEYET HOSAIN)

MUWASHISH, a means properly one born of non-Arab parents but brought up among Arabs. This is how it is usually to be translated in the Hadîth (e.g. Malik, Nâshî, ibad 42). Later it was used to distinguish from the new converts the children of converts, who were brought up in Islam. The common translation reneged was wrong as is the adopted of Pedro de Alcântara. In theory they had equal rights with the old Muslims but the caliph ‘Omar in the interest of the state’s finances ordered that they should pay the land-tax (kharîd) while the old Muslims only paid a tenth of the yield. The muwâshish were of special importance in Muslim Spain, especially from the time of ‘Abd al-Rahmân II, when conversions to Islam became more and more numerous. Some even retained their old family names (Bahîn Angelino, Bahîn Sabarico). This section of the population among whom were often crypto-christians (Christianis occulti) played the largest part in the frequent revolutions against Muslim authority in Spain.

The post-classical poets were called muwâshish to contrast to the ibtâ’iyyâh, their language was no longer considered a model of grammar, lexicography and prosody. The boundary between the two lies about the end of the first century. Among the most known muwâshish were al-Bûhîrî, al-Murmâsh, and, according to some, also al-Farazîd and Ijlâtâ.


MUWASHISHAH, MUWASHISHAHU or TAWSHIH, an ode or poem intended to be sung, is so called by comparison with the weight, which is a double belt ornamented with pearls and rubies or a band of leather stuffed with pearls which a woman wears across her body from the shoulder to the opposite hip, thus going round the body. The muwâshishah is composed of two parts the body of which contains complete lines and the other hemistiches.

The muwâshishah, which belongs to the “seven kinds or branches” (fünin) considered to be post-classical, is composed according to the rules of the parent syntax.

The muwâshishah is divided into “stanzas”, the technical name of which is not exactly settled; they are usually called âsma or hâl, in its most perfect form, it usually begins with one or two lines, a sort of prelude to the actual poem; this prelude is called muwâshsh, âsma or nafrûj; we
also sometimes find the ṭafrī; if it is a distich, the first hemistiches of each verse rhyme together and the two second hemistiches also. If A be the rhyme of the first hemistich and B that of the second, the madāḥab or ḍhūṣ is of the following form:

\[
\begin{align*}
2 \text{ lines} & : \quad A \quad B \\
1 \text{ line} & : \quad A \quad B \\
\end{align*}
\]

After the madāḥab or ḍhūṣ come the stanzas proper called: ḍjaṣ' or ḍait.

The ḍjaṣ' or ḍait contains two parts: the first consisting of a varying number of hemistiches with the same or alternate rhymes, which however are never those of the madāḥab or ḍhūṣ. This first part is called ḏawr or sīmil. The second part which is exactly like the madāḥab or ḍhūṣ, both as regards number of lines and rhymes, is called ḍafīa or ḍafšt. The stanzas therefore presents the following form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{First type} & : \quad \begin{array}{c}
C \\
C \\
A \quad B \\
\end{array} \\
\text{Second type} & : \quad \begin{array}{c}
C \\
D \\
C \\
D \\
C \\
D \\
A \quad B \\
A \quad B \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

The rhyme or rhymes of the ḏawr or sīmil vary from one stanza to another; but those of the ḍafīa are always the same as those of the madāḥab or ḍhūṣ. The ḍafīa is a sort of refrain which does not fail to make an impression on the same sounds and rhythms. These are the most usual models of the muwaššah; but the poets, not being bound by hard and inflexible rules, have, each according to his temperament, exercised their imagination considerably in this genre.

Thus Ibn Sanā’ al-Mulk composed a poem in which the first foot of each hemistich is ḍafšīn and has the same rhyme as the hemistich of which it forms part. This is the scheme:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{madāḥab or ḍhūṣ} & : \quad A \quad A \\
\text{ḥawf or ṭafrī} & : \quad B \quad B \\
\text{ḥafīa} & : \quad A \quad A \\
\text{ḥawf} & : \quad C \quad C \\
\text{ḥafīa} & : \quad A \quad A \\
\end{align*}
\]

The blind poet of Tākle shortened the hemistiches which gives a more lively rhythm:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} \quad \text{B} \\
\text{A} \quad \text{B} \\
\text{C} \quad \text{C} \\
\end{align*}
\]

It would be wearisome to give all the forms of stanzas which are found in the muwaššah. From the point of view of metre, very great variety is found. Martin Hartmann recognised 146 which may go back to the 16 classical metres. Three other types which are found do not seem to be derived from any well defined form:

- mafṣūlāt: new type
- mufṣīlāt: approaching the ḍhūṣ
- mafṣīlāt: mufṣīlāt: mafṣīlāt: a type which might be connected with ḍhūṣ.

From the historical point of view, Freytag thinks that the muwaššah belongs to an old type which has now disappeared. There is certainly no doubt that the pre-Islamic poets composed poems similar to the muwaššah; these are known as muwaššahat; we find here again the word sīmil applied to the longest part of the stanza or couplet of the muwaššah.

The muwaššah began with an opening line with ṭafrī; then came four hemistiches rhyming together on a different rhyme from the first line; next came a fifth hemistich rhyming with the first and completing the stanza. A new stanza followed with four hemistiches not rhyming with those of the first stanza; it ended with a hemistich rhyming with the opening line. Here is the scheme:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} \quad \text{B} \\
\text{B} \quad \text{B} \\
\text{C} \quad \text{C} \\
\text{C} \quad \text{C} \\
\text{A} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the “Ḳais is said to have composed a piece of this nature but it does not seem to be genuine.

The inventor of the muwaššah is said to have been Muḥammad b. Mu’aṣṣa, a poet at the court of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Mawṣūmī who ruled in Spain (275–300 = 888–913). He was followed by Ibn ʿAbd Rabḥūlī, author of al-ḥadīth al-furātī. Their muwaššah are however believed to be lost.

The first to shine in this genre was ʿUbādat al-Ḡarzā, a poet of al-Maṭāṣīm b. Ṣūrādī, prince of Almeria. Al-Aḍām al-Bāṭalaywī records that he heard Abū Bakr b. Zuhru say: “All the composers of muwaššah are simply children beside ʿUbādat al-Ḡarzā”. In the opinion of all men of letters no contemporary writer could rival ʿUbādat al-Ḡarzā in the days of the muwaššah al-ṭafrī.

After him comes Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿIrā Rūṭah, the court poet of al-Maṭīmī b. Dhu l-Nūn, prince of Toledo. In the time of the Almoravid dynasty there flourished a group of poets among whom may be mentioned the blind poet of Tākele, Ibn Bakr, Abū Bakr b. al-Abayd, Abū Bakr b. Būdja.

In the time of the Almohads the most famous
composers of muwashaḥaḥ were Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥaḍayr and Ibn Ḥāfiẓ. At a later period we have Ibrahīm b. Saḥīḥ al-Qattāl, a poet of Seville and of Ceuta, Ibn Khazzāb al-Qattāl (of Algiers), Ibn Khāsr b. Būqī, the visier and celebrated man of letters, Lūḥān b. al-Qādir b. al-Maḥsūr. Eastern poets have followed those of Spain. One of them, Ibn Sādī al-Mulk al-Maṣfīr (531-608 = 1136-1212), acquired a reputation in both east and west.

As to the subjects of the muwashaḥaḥ they are the same as those of the traditional qiṣaṣ; but as they are composed with the definite object of being sung to the accompaniment of stringed instruments they are usually love-poems.

On the musical origins of the muwashaḥaḥ see the article ṬIR."
MUZAFFAR AL-DIN, fifth šah of Persia of the Kadjar [q.v.] dynasty, was born on March 25, 1853. He was šah Nāṣir al-Dīn's second son, the eldest son Zill al-Salṭān being of lower birth by his mother. As crown prince Maʿṣūf al-Dīn had been some time governor of Alhārābdānjīn (a description of him as crown prince in Cusson, Persia and the Persian Question, p. 413). After his father's assassination Maʿṣūf al-Dīn was enthroned on June 8, 1896. With this new reign the rivalry between England and Russia for commercial and political influence in Persia became ever more apparent. The sympathy of the high officials, which was divided between the two powers, and the economic and military strength of the country was since long too weak to enable Persia to follow an independent policy. Under the relatively autocratic rule of Nāṣir al-Dīn, popular discontent with the increasing misery had been suppressed; the new šah, however, though well-intentioned, did not possess the character of a strong ruler and, besides, did nothing to check the extravagance of the court. His financial difficulties made Persia the debtor of Russia; in 1898, 1900 and 1901 considerable loans were given by Russia, guaranteed by large parts of the custom receipts, the collecting of the custom duties being administered by Belgian officials. A good deal of the borrowed money was used for the expensive journeys to Europe undertaken by the šah in 1900, 1902 and 1903. In the meantime, the condition of the people became more and more miserable; headed by some influential merchants and some high ecclesiastics they protested against the heavy taxes and the tariffs as fixed in the commercial agreements with Russia and England of 1903. The growing discontent took several forms; some wished to call in the Turkish Sultan as Caliph and at other times there were outbursts against the Bāht's in Yezd and Isfahān. Besides there were special grievances against several high officials, amongst them the chief Belgian inspector of taxes. In December 1905 a popular movement took place in Tehran, with the aim of obtaining the deposition of the then grand vizier 'Ain al-Dawla (since 1903). An ever increasing number of merchants, mulla's and citizens took refuge (baṣr) in the shrine of šah 'Abd al-'Aṣim. At last the šah promised 'Ain al-Dawla's dismissal and some reforms, but in the course of the following year none of these promises were fulfilled. So in 1906 the discontentment reached again a culminating point, directed this time by some more or less secret patriotic associations. In July large crowds of the people of the capital went with the mulla to Kûm, to take refuge in the sanctuary there; at the same time the British Legation accorded asylum to a considerable number of merchants and citizens. The results were that on July 30 'Ain al-Dawla was dismissed and that on August 3, all the demands of the protesting people were granted, including a constitution. The ecclesiastical leaders returned from Kûm. There followed some friction with the government about the elections and other matters, but at last, on October 7, 1906, the first Persian Majlis or National Assembly was opened by the šah. The new Majlis had to face immediately some difficult problems and showed from the beginning its determination not to be a mere toy in the hands of the court party. Progress was hampered, however, by discussions amongst clerical and non-clerical members of the popular party, while there were disturbances in Tabriz, owing to the tyranny of the crown prince Muhammad 'Ali. The Constitution (Kadjar-i Aṣrāf; q.v.) was ratified by the šah only on December 30, 1906. Maʿṣūf al-Dīn himself died on January 8, 1907 after a long illness, leaving his country to the eventful reign of Muhammad 'Ali šah.


(J. H. Keamey)

MUZAFFARIDS, a Persian dynasty. Their ancestors came from Arabia and had settled in Khorāsān at the time of the Muslim conquest, where they lived for several centuries. On the approach of the Mongols, the emir Ghiyāth al-Dīn Ḥalījī, with his three sons Abī Bakr, Muḥammad and Manṣūr, retired to Yazd. The two first named entered the service of the Atabeg of Yard, 'Ali al-Dawla, and when Ḥalījī [q.v.] marched on Bahgādād, Abī Bakr followed him with 300 horse. After the capture of Bahgādād he went with an army to the Egyptian frontier. Here he fell in an encounter with the Arab tribe of Khatfūnīa in which his brother Muḥammad succeeded him as a vassal of the Atabeg of Yard while Manṣūr remained with his father in the little town of Maibūd near Yazd. Manṣūr had three sons, Maḥrūz al-Dīn Muḥammad, Zain al-Dīn 'Ali and Shārāf al-Dīn Maʿṣūf, the latter of whom became the ancestor of the dynasty of the Muzaffarīds. Appointed governor of Maibūd by Yūsuf šah, 'Ali al-Dawla's son and successor, he cleared the hills of the robber bands from Shīrāz and when Yūsuf šah, who had put to death the envoy of the ʿIlghān Arghūn had to take to flight and went to Sūta, Muḥammad followed him but left him on the way and went to Kirmān where he was kindly received by Sūta. Ḵâlaḵ al-Dīn Ṣargatmash Kara Khātā (685 = 1286—1287). After some time he returned to Yazd and was presented to Arghūn who took him into his service. He was also on good terms with Arghūn's successors Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Ghazān. The latter appointed him amir-i bāzirki "commander of a thousand", and after the accession of U⟩d⟩jīsīt (703 = 1303—1304) he was given customs of the roads from Ardizān to Kirmānšāh and from Herāt and Mawī to Ābārki. Maʿṣūf died on 13th Dīn 1-5 Sa'da 713 (March 13, 1314). He was succeeded by his 13 year old son Muḥrūz al-Dīn Muḥammad who is described as brave and devout but at the same time cruel, bloodthirsty and treacherous. He continued to live at the court of U⟩d⟩jīsīt; on the latter's death in Shawwal 716 (Dec. 1316) and the accession of his son Abī Ṣafī he returned to Maibūd. Along with the lord of the southern coast of Persia, the emir Kāhārār B. Maḥmūd Šīkh Indī, he very soon fell upon the Atabeg of Yazd, Ḵādijī šah, and succeeded in taking
the town from him (718 or 719 = 1318 or 1319). A short time after this event the people of Susah, the Nikhars, arose in rebellion; Muhammad attacked them and their leader Nawrūz was defeated and slain. The rebels however gathered together again and Muhammad had to fight no less than 27 battles before they were finally suppressed. After the death of Abū Saʿīd (736 = 1335-1336), complete chaos began and pretenders arose in different parts of the wide empire. The emir Abū Isḥāq b. Māhumūd Shāh ʿIndī endeavored to take some time of the town of Yāzd but was driven back. After some this Muhammad took this province from the Mongol governor in Kirmān, Malik Kūtb al-Dīn. In the end however, Abū Isḥāq succeeded in taking Shīrāz and had the khānqāh burned and colts struck in his name. In Saʿd 745 (May—June 1347) he set out to subjugate Kirmān and laid waste Shīrāz, but returned when he heard that Muhammad was ready to offer vigorous resistance to his advance. One of the viziers of Abū Isḥāq then undertook a campaign against Kirmān but was defeated, whereupon Abū Isḥāq put himself at the head of a new army and marched on Kirmān to take vengeance on Muhammad. But this effort also failed; Abū Isḥāq was completely defeated and had to take to flight. In 751 (1350—1351) he went to Yāzd and began to besiege the town but returned, having achieved nothing. In spite of all his failures however, Abū Isḥāq never lost heart. In the following year he sent a new army under the emir Beg Dījkāz to Kirmān and when the latter met Muḥammad on the plain of Pandj Angahāt in Dījkāz or 753 (June—July 1352) a battle resulted. Dījkāz was defeated. Muhammad followed up his victory, went to Shīrāz and laid siege to it. On the 3rd Shawwāl 754 (Nov. 11, 1353), the governor had to surrender and Abū Isḥāq fled to Isfahān. In the following year Muhammad took the oath of homage to the Abbasid caliph in Egypt, Shīrāz was now besieged. But as Muhammad had also to deal with other rebels the siege was somewhat prolonged. Resistance was in the end overcome and the town had to surrender. At the same time Abū Isḥāq fell into his hands and was taken to Baghdad and executed (21st Dījkāz I. 753 or 758 = May 22, 1353 or May 11, 1357). After Muhammad had defeated all his enemies and become undisputed lord of Fārs and the ἱράκ, an envoy appeared from the ruler of the Golden Horde, Dījkāz Beg Kābūn b. Uzbe Kūni, who announced that the Khān had taken Tabrīz and wanted to appoint Muḥammad yaṣānī. "Marshall." Muḥammad gave the envoy an arrogant and unfriendly answer; but when he heard soon afterwards that Dījkāz Beg had returned home and left the emir Abū Dījkāz in Tabrīz he decided to take the town. Soon afterwards the news of Dījkāz Beg's death arrived; Muhammad at once set out and met Abū Dījkāz at Mīyāna in Adhharāwān. The latter was defeated and Muḥammad entered Tabrīz. But as a large army was approaching from Baghdad he dared not risk remaining but decided to begin to retreat. In Kāmadjān 759 (Aug. 1358) he was surprised and taken prisoner by his own son Shīh Shīrāzī. This was believed himself suppressed and ill-treated by his father, in concert with some other antagonists. Muḥammad was blinded and kept in prison for several years until his death at the end of Rašīd 1765 (Jan. 1364) at the age of 65. He was succeeded by Shīh Shīrāzī, who shortly before his death appointed his son Zain al-ʿAbīdīn as his successor in Shīrāz and gave his brother ʿImād al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad the governorship of Kirmān. As soon as Zain al-ʿAbīdīn had begun to reign his cousin Shāh Yāḥyā b. Shīrāz al-Dīn Muḥarrar set out from Isfahān to attack him. Fortunately however, the threatened war was averted by a friendly agreement; but Shāh Yāḥyā could not stay long in Isfahān; he was driven out by the turbulent and fierce inhabitants and fled to Yāzd whereupon Zain al-ʿAbīdīn appointed his maternal uncle Muḥarrar-i Kāshī governor of Isfahān. In 787 (1385—1386) an envoy from Timūr arrived in Kirmān bringing assurances of his peaceful and friendly intentions and Sultan Aḥmad hastened to offer his humble homage to the powerful conqueror. In Shīrāz with (Oct.—Nov. 1357) it was reported that Timūr had invaded the ἱράκ and that Muḥarrar-i Kāshī had given him the keys of the towns and fortresses whereupon Zain al-ʿAbīdīn left Shīrāz and went to Baghdad while Shāh Yāḥyā endeavored to procure suitable gifts to pacify Timūr and ordered that a sufficient sum should be paid out to maintain his army. But when Timūr's officials appeared in Isfahān to take the money, they were attacked and killed by the citizens. In the meantime the Mongols carried out a dreadful massacre among the people of Isfahān, in which 200,000 were said to have perished. Timūr then went to Fārs and confirmed Sultan Aḥmad as lord of Fārs, the ἱράκ and Kirmān, whereupon he returned to Sāmarqand. When Zain al-ʿAbīdīn had left Shīrāz, he met his cousin Shīh Manṣūr b. Shīrāz al-Dīn Muḥarrar at Shīrūstān and was at first welcomed, then suddenly attacked and imprisoned. Shīh Manṣūr was now able to occupy Shīrāz without opposition, while Shāh Yāḥyā retired to Yāzd. After the former had established himself securely in Shīrāz, Zain al-ʿAbīdīn was released by his jailers and brought to Isfahān where the people welcomed him. In the meanwhile he had been persuaded by Shāh Yāḥyā to combine with Sultan Aḥmad to take vengeance on Shīh Manṣūr. The plan failed however, the allies were defeated and Shīh Manṣūr seized the whole of the ἱράκ. When Zain al-ʿAbīdīn wanted to escape to Kūhūsūn, he was treacherously seized by the emir of al-Rayy and brought to Shīh Manṣūr who at once had him blinded. The latter then tried to form a coalition against Timūr. In 795 (1393) however, Timūr left his winter quarters in Māznārān and marched on Shīrūstān. After storming Kāl al-Sefīd which was considered impregnable he marched on Shīh Manṣūr's capital and a battle was fought near Shīrūstān. Although Shīh Manṣūr's chief emir abandoned him with most of his troops, the battle lasted till far into the night. The undismayed Muḥarrarīs fought with desperate courage, but finally fell in the mêlée, after fighting his way to Timūr and giving him two cuts with his sword, which however the strong helmet of the Mongol leader averted, Shīh Manṣūr's relations then submitted; nevertheless Timūr a week later (Raḥbar 795 = May 1393) had all the Muḥarrarīs executed.

MUZAWADJA, a term in rhetoric (ba’il) which means the association of two things in the relation of condition (gāfr) and result (qasāw) and then employing the same combination for two other things in the same conditions. Here is an example from the Dinām of al-Baṣṭūrī (Cairo 1349, p. 317):

"When they are masters they are one day fighting and their blood flows in profusion, they remember their bonds of kinship and their tears flow abundantly." The poet associates fighting with recalling bonds of kinship in the two parts of the conditional statement, then he completes the first by adding their blood flows in profusion and the second by saying their tears flow abundantly.


(Moh. Benchener)

al-MUZDALIFA, a place roughly halfway between Miʿād and Arḍaf as the pilgrims returning from Arḍaf spend the night between the 10th and 11th Dhu al-Ḥijjah after performing the two evening salats. On the next morning they set off before sunrise and climb up through the valley of Muḥarrar to Miʿād. Other names for this place are al-Muṣʿab al-ḥarām, from Sārā ii. 194 and Lajmā (cf. Lajmā Lajmā: Ibn Sa’d, ii/1 129, 4); but Lajmā, according to another statement, comprises the whole stretch between Arḍaf and Miʿād, both included, so that Yarum Lajmā (Kishk al-Maghārim, vi. 30, 11) is explained as the day of Arḍaf and Al Ḥiyam Lajmā as the day of Miʿād. The rites associated with the night of Muzdalifa go back to the old pagan period, when the Arabs themselves recognized when they make Kaʿbah, introduce the kindling of the sacred fire in this night and say that guiding of the departure for Miʿād is a privilege of the family of Ādawān.

The sacred place in Muzdalifa was the hill of Kuṣayn [q.v.]. Even after Muḥammad in deliberate contrast to the pagan practice had declared Muzdalifa to be musajjah [cf. NABID I, 1, c], this hill retained its ancient sanctity. According to Arḍaf, there was a thick round tower upon it on which the Muzdalifa fire was kindled; in the time of Hārūn al-Rašīd it was a fire of wood; later it was illuminated with wax-candles. In the Muslim period a mosque was built about 400 yards from the tower, of which Arḍaf gives a detailed description; while Makadda speaks of a place of prayer, a public fountain and a minaret, Burton also mentions a high isolated tower at Muzdalifa but the illumination in the night of Muzdalifa now takes place on the mosque.


(Moh. Benchener)
al-Muzzamil, title of sūra lxxiii, taken from the first verse: "O thou wrapped up!" viz. Muzzamil, who wrapped himself up in his garment or was wrapped up by others. For explanations of the allusion cf. Sale's note as well as the commentaries on the Qur'ān. Variants of al-muzzamil, which stands for al-muṣṭaṣṣam al-awwāl, al-muṣṣālī, al-muṣṣālī (Buṣārī).


N

al-Naba', title of sūra lxxviii, taken from the opening verses: "Concerning what do the unbelievers ask questions of one another? Concerning the great news!" According to the commentaries the great news alluded to is the resurrection, the subject of lively discussions among the Meccans.


Nabataeans, an Arab people who lived in ancient times in Arabia Petraea. — As early as the seventh century B.C. the Nabateans are mentioned by Assurbanipal (Kellschr. Bibl., 216 sqq.). Whether the Nebayoth of the Old Testament are to be identified with them is uncertain (against the identification: Nöldeke in Schenkels Bibellexicon, s.v. Nabataier; for it amongst others: Muhil, Arabia Deserta, New York, 1937, p. 492). The Nabataeans were never completely subjected either by the Assyrians, or the Medes, Persians or the Macedonian kings (Diodor, ii. 48). In 312 B.C. Antigonus sent two expeditions against them without success. They were then a nomadic people of shepherds and traders, with a few natural fortresses like Petra, Boyā, Sākhād, al-Hijr, which served as depots for their arms and riches. Living round the Dead Sea they exploited from time to time the remunerative asphalt deposits on its eastern shore. They were often on friendly terms with their neighbours; e.g. with the Jews under the Maccabees and especially with the Salamians (Arab. Salaim; cf. Yaḥyā, Muḥammad, ed. Wattenfeld, ii. 594, s.v. Hirna), with whom according to Stephanos Byzantios and the testimony of the Nabataean inscriptions, they were in close alliance (cf. Salām b. Maṣwiyah and B. Morit, Salamit, in Papyri-Wissens. Recktenwald, vol. ii. col. 1824 sq.). The capital of the Nabataean kingdom, called Nabāt in the inscriptions, was Petra on the Jabal Ḥarīsah, according to Nöldeke (Z.D. M.G., xxx. 259 sqq.) Hebrew Sela, Arab. Ḥāṣa Sela in the Wadi Māṣa in the hills of al-Shari (Yaḥyā, Muḥammad, iii. 117, 135; Mabṭurāt, p. 252 sqq.), while Musil (Arabia Petraea, II/1. 337, note 2; p. 318) identifies this with Kûra es-Selā. The ruins reveal a peculiar mixture of Nabataean and Hellenistic architecture while they have yielded remarkably few Nabataean inscriptions (on these see Dalman, Petra und sein Fluchttagebuch, 1908; Neun Petra-Forschungen, 1912; Bachmann, Watringer, Wigand, Petra, 1921; A. H. W. Kennedy, Petra, its History and Monumenti, 1925).

The Nabataean kingdom comprised the lands of southern and eastern Palestine as well as Hummaea and Petraea, from 88 B.C. also Hawrān; twice (56 B.C. and c. 34—62 A.D. perhaps also in the interval, cf. Mommsen, Röm. Gesch., ii. 476, note 3). Damascus also belonged to it (cf. i., p. 203). In the southwest it stretched over the ancient Midian as far as the coast of the Red Sea where 'Obodat I founded the town of Hawurā (Steph. Byz., s.v. Aqob, probably Αὔοδατος, now perhaps al-Hawrā), in the interior as far as al-Ula (Dedan) and al-Hijr (q.v.) on the frontier of the Hijāz. The Nabataeans also penetrated into the nome of Arabia in the eastern Nih. delta as an inscription from Tell el-Sughafiye in the Wadi Tāmīl shows (Clermont-Ganneau, Les Nabataéens en Égypte, in Recueil d'Arch. Or., viii. [1924], p. 229—257). A number of their kings can be dated with approximate exactness: Habībat (Areata) I 169 B.C., Habībat II c. 110—96, 'Obodat (Obodas) I c. 167, Rabībēl (Rabillos) I c. 87, Habībat III (Areatae Philadé) c. 86—64, 'Obodat II c. 62—47, Malikū (Malchus) I c. 47—30, 'Obodat II (II?) before 25—c. 8 B.C., Habībat IV iliāz-amnēs (Philadēps) c. 9 A.D.—40 A.D., Malikū II 40—70/71, Rabībēl II Zarrūg 70/71—106 A.D. (Malikū III, 106 A.D.; cf. Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil, viii. 247). The real founder of their power is said to have been king Erotimos, who is probably the same as Habībat III whose reign fell in the period of decline of the Seleucid empire (E. Täubler, in Klio, x. 251—253). As "allies", the Nabataeans were able to maintain to some extent their independence of the Romans. At a very early date, like the Palmyrans, they attained through their trade of monopolists in Nearer Asia. At the beginning of the Roman empire they dropped their nomadic life and became peacefully settled. Just as in the east they have left their inscriptions particularly on the trade-routes followed by their caravans, e.g. from Petra to Damascus and Taibur, to Forat at the mouth of the Euphrates, to Gerrha (Arab. al-Djag'a near al-Kaff), to the Sinai peninsula and Egypt and to Gaza, so we find in the Roman empire epigraphic traces of Nabataean merchants as far as Upper Egypt (Dendera), in Miletus, Rome and Parthia. In 106 A.D. the emperor Trajan conquered Petra and made the most important part of the Nabataean kingdom the Roman Province Arabia. The remainder of the territory left to the Nabataeans in the desert suffered economic ruin about 200 A.D. when the Palmyrans gradually obtained control of the remunerative carrying trade.
The king, who was assisted by a vizier, the highest official (Greek ékíropos), with the title "brother", had under him a number of šahīdīn (šahīdīn) of the separate tribes (qawāl); we also find the titles eparchos and strategos. The high social position of women is noteworthy; they could possess property independently and dispose of it as they liked (Nöldeke in Euting, Nabat. Inschr., p. 79 sq.); the coins often bear portraits of the queen (Kammerer, Petra et la Nabatène, Paris 1929, p. 377; Brit. Mus. Cat. of Greek Coins: Arabia etc., London 1922, Plates I and II).

If one refers for Nabataean laws to their epitaphs, the threats of punishment in which are based on a formula of the Grecian law of property and contract which elsewhere is only found in tomb-inscriptions in Asia Minor (R. Keil, Hermes, xliii. [1908], p. 567–572).

As nomads, simple in their customs and rarely owning slaves, the Nabataeans, as a trading people, had a great respect for wealth. The mention in inscriptions of physicians, wise men and poets, shows a certain level of intellectual culture. Whether circumcision was practised among them is uncertain (Kammerer, op. cit., p. 375 sq.).

The Nabataean pantheons is known to us mainly from tomb and votive inscriptions. The principal god was Dūshahr [cf. DVM "l-šāhār"], the principal goddess Allāt [cf. Allāt]; the goddesses Mānākhīt (= Arm. Mānakīt; cf. Mānakīt), Kaṣīqa, Muthah and Hubil [q.v.] are also mentioned. Their kings were perhaps worshipped as gods after their deaths (cf. C. F. Sch., ii. 154).

As Nöldeke was the first to emphasise, the Nabataeans were pure Arabs as their names show; but in written intercourse they used Aramaic, the usual written and business language of Nearer Asia. Many aramaismus thus entered their language in the north of the country (like hābār, mafṣīḥ, arwāl). Arab writers therefore even used the term "Nabataean" for "Aramaic"; in the southern Hijāz (al-Hijāz) on the other hand, the Nabataean Arabic retained its greatest purity; the Arabic script developed out of the Nabataean cursive at the close of the ancient period (cf. Armān, d.).

In the Muslim period the Arabs called those inhabitants of Syria and of the Trāk, who were neither shepherds nor soldiers, "Nabataeans" (īb[n al-Kalb) in Yāsdān, Miṣrābīm, iud. 614), a term also applied in a somewhat contemptuous tone to the Aramaic-speaking peasants (Nöldeke, in Z.D.M.G., xxv. 124). When then we find "Nabataean" (Naḥr, Naḥt, etc.) mentioned in Malaya as well as on the Qdiḥān, in Syria, on the Khabur and in the Trāk, in ʿOmān and Bahrān, the name is not to be taken in the ethnographical sense (Nöldeke, op. cit., p. 125). As the grammarians of the Trāk paid special attention to the "Nabataean" language of the Aramaic country people, by "Nabataeans" was frequently meant the inhabitants of the Trāk and especially of the Bāṭ[b (Nöldeke, op. cit., p. 127).

"The inhabitants of the district of Hism in the most northerm part of the Hijāz, once the Qdiḥān (q.v.), now the Hawwāf (q.v.), are regarded as the descendants of the Nabataeans (cf. Armān, a.)."

Biography: Nöldeke, in Z.D.M.G., xxv. 1871, p. 122–128; J. Euting, Nabatäische Inschriften, Berlin 1885; do., Sammlungen Inschriften, Berlin 1891; do., Tagebuch einer Reise in Arabien, Berlin 1914; do., Approches de l'Arabie, Paris 1915; do., Ḥaṣab dīlam, Leipzig 1900, p. 276–274; Dussaud and Meney, Mission dans le nord de la Syrie, Paris 1903; G. A. Cooke, A text-book of North-Semitic inscriptions, Oxford 1903, p. 214–232; do., art. Nabataeans, in J. Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ix., Edinburgh 1917, p. 121 sqq.; Dussaud, Nouvelles inscriptions du nord de la Nabatéen, in F. A., 404, p. 289–338; Brumlow and v. Domaszewsky, Provincia Arabica, i., ii., 1904–1905; E. Littmann, Nabataean Inscriptions in Public of an American Archæological Expedition to Syria in 1899–1900, part 1v., New York 1903; Semitic Inschr., p. 85–97; do., Nabat. Inschr., in Public of the Princeton Archæological Expedition to Syria in 1904–1905 and 1909, division vi., section A, Leyden 1914; Musil, Armān Petraea, 11th (Edon), Vienna 1907, p. 159–161, 337; do., Armān Deserta, New York 1927, index, p. 614; Head, Historia marum marum, Oxford 1911, p. 810 sq.; G. F. Hill, Brit. Mus. Cat., Greek Coins of Arabia, London 1922; Jannsen and Savigneas, Mission archéologique en Arabie, i., ii., Paris 1905–1922; W. W. Tarn, Pliny's History and Arabia, in Journal of Egyptian Archæology, xxvii., 1929, p. 9–25; A. Kammerer, Petra et la Nabatène, Paris 1929; J. Cantinéen, Le Nabatéen, i., ii., Paris 1930–1932; J. H. Mordtmann, Ein Nabatäer im Sahara, in Klio, xxv., 1932, p. 429 sqq.; E. Honigmann, Nabatān (A.), prophète, borrowed from Hebr. nābāt or Aram. ārūbāt, is found in the Kurān from the second Meccan period in the singular and plural nābīyūn; in the Medina period we find also the broken plural ārūbīyū. Lists of the nābīyūn are given in Sūra vi. 83–99; iii. 34; iv. 161–199; further information about them is given in several passages of Sūra xix. and in xvii. 57. The list consists exclusively of names from the old and New Testaments (if we leave out Idrīs in Sūra xia. 57, whose name Muhammad had however also learned from a Christian source; see above ii., p. 442–450; Hotovitz, Kūrān, Unters., p. 88 sq.; while messenger of God (rasūl [q.v.], plur. rasūl; murshidān) he was also sent to other peoples of the past — e.g. Hūd or Šāhīl —, according to the Kurānic idea "prophets" has appeared only among the ʿAbī al-Khīṣ [q.v.], only a minority of the individuals called prophets in the Kurān can be so described in the Bible, and Yūsuf b. Mattal [q.v.], is the only one of the nābīyūn of the Kurān who appears among the literary prophets of the Bible. Muhammad himself did not claim the name nābū until he was in Medina when he was addressed as the Prophet (yūsufa l-mālik) and as finally closing the series of prophets, is called their "soul" (khillān). When Muhammad in Sūra viii. 156 and 158 is called ʿal-mālik al-aumām, this is to distinguish him as the prophet who has arisen among the heathen: the Jews called the heathen ummah asālim ("peoples of the world") and also recognised prophets who had arisen among them: among these they included e.g. Balaam and Job. This Jewish name for the heathen became the al-ummāyīn of the Kurān (Sūra lixi. 21; iii. 19, 69); that
NABİ — NASİDIH

Nabī Yunus. [See Ninawa.]

Nabīdīh (n.) a comprehensive designation for intoxicating drinks, several kinds of which were produced in early Arabia, such as nabīdīh (from harīr) "khat" (from honey: ḥabbá, ḥabbāt: báb 60; ʿaghrība, báb 4; ʿash, báb 80), or from spell: ḥabbā b. Ḥumayd, b. 4093, nabīdīh (from different kinds of dates: ḥabbāt, ʿaghrība, báb 3, 21).

Grapes being scarce in Arabia, it is said that in al-Madīna "wine" was usually prepared from kinds of dates, exceptionally from grapes (ḥabbāt, ʿaghrība, báb 2, 3; Muslim, Ṣahīh, trad. 3, 6). This may be true. Yet even these traditions betray a tendency connected with the question whether the prohibition of wine included that of intoxicating drinks. Generally speaking ṣabīṭh favours the affirmative answer and is consequently anxious to point out that the ḥusnā which was prohibited by Muhammad included ṣabīṭh.

The question was difficult in so far as these kinds of drinks were intoxicating to degrees which partly depended upon the duration of the process of fermentation. This appears e.g. from the copious traditions in which Ḥāfaṣa relates how nabīdīh was prepared for Muhammad and at what time the beverage was done away with (cf. Ṣahīh), as well as from the traditions in which the previous prohibition of certain vessels (ḥantum, musafāt, etc.) was abrogated and all kinds of vessels deemed allowed, provided the drinks prepared in them were not intoxicating (Muslim, Ḫumāisī, trad. 165; Ṣahīh, trad. 63—65, 67—75 etc.). A series of traditions which could be adduced by the Ḥanafīs in favour of their view, according to which ṣabīṭh is not included in the prohibition of wine, is to be found in al-Nasâʾī's collection, Ṣahīh, báb 48. Cf. farther the art. Ḫumāsī.

Side by side with milk and honey ṣabīṭh was also the beverage that was offered to the pilgrims in Makka. The institution, al-ṣaḥīḥa (also the name of the building, close to Zamzam, where the distribution took place), was an office held by the ʿAbbasids (Abd b. Ḥumayd, Muṣnad, l. 372; Muslim, Ḫumāsī, trad. 347; Abī Dāwūd, Manṣūkh, báb 90). The descriptions by Ibn Saʿd († 230 = 845) and al-ʿAra ḫ († 244 = 855) give the impression of referring to the present state of things; in the time of al-Muʿaddas († about 1000 A.D.) the institution had already passed into desuetude. For details, cf. the work of Gaudfroy-Demboynes.
NÁBIKH AL-DHUBYÁNÍ, a famous poet of the pre-Muhammadan period. His real name was Ziyād b. Ma'náwya and he belonged to the tribe of Dhbyán. He probably flourished in the second century which proceeded Muhammad and died shortly before the beginning of Islam. Causean de Perereau (Histoire des Arabes, 2nd ed., ii. 502) puts the date of his birth in 535 A.D. and Father Chelchko (Poulets arabes chrétiens, p. 640) dates his death in 604 A.D.

These dates however can only be conjectural.

The surname Nábih is variously interpreted by Arabs writers. According to one, our poet was so called because in one of his verses he uses the verb nbihgha. 'She stopped among the Baní Kaín b. Qais and they felt the effects of our attacks'. But this verse is apocryphal and the process recalls that used to justify the etymologies of Muhammad and of Mutil, who, in our poet's time, had been but twelve years. According to others, he was so called because he did not write poetry until he reached manhood or more simply because in Nábih poetry 'flows from the spring'.

We know nothing about his family: his noble birth asserted by the Ktilb al-Áṣghár (ix. 162) and Ibn Kutil's (al. de Goeje, p. 74) is doubtful and we know nothing definite about his childhood and youth.

At some date which it is impossible to ascertain definitely, Nábih was admitted to the court of the Lakhund princes [cf. Lakhun] of al-Hira, vasal of Persia: in the reign of the kings of the Munbhir III and al-Munbhir IV in particular this Christian semi-Persian, semi-Arab city had become an important literary centre and the focus of a brilliant culture.

Our poet sang the praises of these two sovereigns and received gifts from them that his fortunes reached their zenith: in the reign of Nu'mán b. Khádís whose boon companion and favourite singer he became. The poet lived on intimate terms with the king in the lap of luxury and opulence. Such favour could not fail to excite the envy and jealousy of the other courtiers; hence his enemies, notably Murra b. Shád, resolved to break the king's attachment to him. The trick attempted by his enemies was a crude one and the king was not deceived by it: the attack on the poet failed.

Far from being discouraged, Murra patiently awaited another opportunity to avenge himself: this soon appeared. According to the Ktilb al-Áṣghár, Nábih, who had free access to the palace of Nu'mán, one day unexpectedly entered the apartments of queen Mutádárida, famous for her beauty. Taken by surprise, she dropped her veil, showing to the delighted eyes of the poet 'a part of her statue-like body'. By the time the king could replace it, it was too late. Struck by the beauty, Nu'mán composed in honour of this 'beauty' his famous poem which begins with the line 'Go and leave Majáy in self-baste....' (Derensbourg, Dáwen, alv.). Unfortunately he was imprudent enough to recite it to his enemy Murra who hastened to report it to Nu'mán. The latter in his anger decided on the poet's ruin.

According to another tradition, one evening when Nábih was seated beside the queen in company of the king and another poet, Munákhkhal al-Yaqhkhri, Nu'mán asked Nábih to describe Mutádárida to him. Nábih at once obeyed and recited the poem which he had composed shortly before. Munákhkhal, who was said to be the queen's lover, exclaimed: 'Sir, this description is that of an eye-witness'; and the poet's days were now numbered. Warned by his friend, the chamberlain Shírín, the poet hurriedly fled and sought refuge with the princes of Ghassán.

These stories, on the whole little probable, seem to have been invented to explain Nábih's disgrace. In his book Fi 'l-Adá’ al-Áṣghár (kairo 1927, p. 372), Hāshá Husán disputes their authenticity and acutely points out that nothing in poem viii.: 'It has reached me, sayest thou avoid the censure etc.' supports these stories. He supposes on the other hand, relying on this same the princes of Ghassán won the good graces of Nábih at some time and by their largesse and the poet showed his gratitude by singing their praises: this having come to the ears of Nu'mán, the latter took umbrage and decided on the ruin of his favourite.

Nábih was no means unknown to the Ghassánids, phylarchs of Byzantium and rivals of al-Hira. He had been very well received by the princes al-Haráth b. Abi Shámir and al-Haráth al-Mu'ashir. The former at the poet's request had released a large number of the Baní Asad taken prisoner at the battle of Háláma; the latter, also at Nábih's request, had released a number of the Baní Asad and Baní Fazhi-i after the battle of 'Alu Uhláq. This leads us to say a word about Nábih's political activity.

The poet in the course of the wars of his tribe never lost interest in his fellow tribesmen and their allies; we have mentioned his interventions on their behalf with the Ghassánids: during the celebrated war of Dábiá between 'Alu and Dhbyán, it was his constant care to maintain the alliances contracted with the Baní Asad and Baní Tamnim. In the reign of the Ghassánids Nu'mán b. Hárit b. Karith, he had once more to intercede on behalf of the Baní Dhbyán: defeated in the battle of Dúb Ukar; later, in view of his devotion to his patron and his love for his own tribe, he appealed to Nu'mán to abandon his war on the Baní Dhbyán allied with the Baní Hamm. As a result of refusing to listen to him, the king was defeated.

At the court of Ghassán, Nábih was overwhelmed with favours from the Baní Hárit and later by his successor Nu'mán. He celebrates the former's generosity in a sa'āda full of gratitude (Derensbourg, ill.) and his elegy on the death of Nu'mán (Dereubourg, xxiv.) is characterised by deep emotion.
In spite of his luxurious life, Nābirgāh felt his heart and his thoughts turning towards al-Hira and his ka'ba. Therefore on the death of Nu'mān b. Ḥārith Abī Karib he decided to return to al-Hira to attempt to regain the favour of the son of al-Mundhir.

Learning that Nu'mān was ill, he sent out accompanied by two Fādrīs, Manbūr b. Zachlama and Salīk b. 'Amr, friends of the prince; when they arrived at al-Hira, Nu'mān had recovered. Hearing of the arrival of his two friends, he had a tent of leather pitched for them and sent them a woman singer to entertain them. He himself often came to visit them. One evening at a party the singer sang Nābirgāh's poem 'O abode of Ma'ānī' (Dūrīnī, l.), the prince delightfully exclaimed, 'That is an excellent poem!' The Fādrīs thereupon seized the opportunity to intercede on behalf of Nābirgāh and the generous prince forgave the poet. A little later Nu'mān was put to death by order of the Shāhīn king Kīrār Farāwī for having refused to give him one of his relatives as a wife. Nābirgāh lamented his patron and retired to his tribe. We do not know when he died.

Before giving an estimate of Nābirgāh as a poet, we have still to discuss his religion. Durenbourg makes him a monotheist, and in support of his opinion quotes a number of verses in which the poet speaks of God, of the feast of palms, of the cross of Zawārī. On the other hand, Chelkho thinks he was a Christian. We find, he says (Christianisme en Arabie avant l'Islam, Balaffr, 1931, p. 328—430), in the poems of Nābirgāh, evidence of his belief in God, of his religion and piety, but the arguments are not numerous or of great cogency: a vague mention of God, of David and his son Solomon, of priests present at the obsequies of Mundhir, of the cross of Zawārī. As a matter of fact, Nābirgāh was a pagan and there is nothing Christian in his poems. The allusions in his poems, even if we accept them as authentic, are in reality only rather faded memories of the Christian ceremonies which the poet had witnessed at al-Hira, and Ghassān and a distant echo of the religious ideas current in the peninsula at this period. As to the word Allāh, it is undoubtedly the result of a substitution for al-Lī [q.v.] made at a later date by some Muslim priest.

Nābirgāh al-Dhubyānī holds a high position among the poets of ancient Arabia; he is unanimously placed 10th in the rank of poets.

In our opinion he possesses in a high degree the two qualities which make a great poet: sensitiveness and imagination. To sincerity of feeling, he adds splendour of imagery and freshness of expression. In him, ideas and words, feeling and turn of phrase, matter and form are in perfect harmony. His stanzas are often bitter, ironic and sarcastic.

He is also an artist who skilfully uses all resources, all effects and all allites. His verse is compact, solid and uniform and readily impresses itself on the memory with the idea which it expresses. Of course it is not without its faults: we find a few weaknesses and examples of lack of care.

The Husain (al-Shībni al-Muhammad, Cairo 1926) has recently raised the question once more of the authenticity of the poems of Nābirgāh and other pre-Islamic poets. Rejecting all that has been handed down about it he regards the old poetry as apocryphal. The discussion of this question however, as can readily be understood, lies outside the scope of this article.


Maurice Chelkho

NABOB. [See Nābirgāh.]

NABULUS, A TOWN IN CENTRAL PALESTINE, the name of which is derived from that of Flavia Neapolis built in honour of Flavius Vespasianus, his Old Testament predecessor was Shēchem, which however lay more to the east, on the site of the present village of Bāltā (the name is explained by S. Klein, in Z. D. F. V, xxix. 38 sqq.; cf. E. Hartmann, Etr., xxiii. 175 sqq., as "platanus", from the evidence of the pilgrimage of the Abūla and the Mīn bar Gen. rb., c. 81, § 3). According to Eusebius, the place where the old town stood was pointed out in a suburb of Neapolis. The correctness of this identification of the site of Shēchem has now been completely proved by Sellin's excavations; and this also explains how the old name did not as usual drive out the late Greek one. In the time of the Arab writers, the name Shēchem was long forgotten and what they tell us refers to Neapolis-Nabulūs. Nabulūs is in a long valley (running from east to west) formed by two chains of hills, on the south side Garizim, Arabic Dāljāl al-Tir or al-Kiblī (2,000 feet high), on the north side Ebal, Arabic Dāljāl al-Fāshīny or al-Shārikā (3,140 feet high). G. Hübscher (Z. D. F. V, xxviii. 98) refers the older name of Neapolis: Mabburra (Mamorrah) in Pliny and Josephus (i.e. "crossing", māburrā) to the low saddle running right across the valley. The town with its 22 springs is annually rich in water, which is heard running everywhere and produces a very luxuriant vegetation. Where the road from the south turns westwards into the valley there is a well with the ruins of a church; Unanimous tradition since the fourth century A.D. locates here Jacob's well and it is undoubtedly the same as is mentioned in John iv. 5. About a thousand yards to the north is a building where tradition locates Joseph's grave.

In the post-exilic period Shēchem belonged to the territory of the mixed people of the Samaritans whose capital it became after they had built on the hill of Garizim (the Samaritan text of Deut. xxvii. 5 has this name instead of Ebal) a temple as a rival to that of Jerusalem. They were continually at strife with the Jews and in the end John Hyrcanus
in 129 B.C. destroyed Shechem and its temple. At a later date this always turbulent people was equally hostile to the Romans, which compelled the Vespasian to attack them on Garizim when a large number were slain. Christianity gradually spread in the country and Neapolis became a bishopric. The result was that the Samaritans now turned their arms against the Christians and treated them with great cruelty. After a deadly raid by them, the Byzantine emperor Zeno (474–491) had them driven from Garizim and built a church there. They brought still greater havoc in the time of Justinian who punished them with great severity and destroyed their synagogues while he rebuilt the churches. This finally broke their spirit; many of them fled to Persia while others became Christians. Their part had been played by the time when Nabulus with many other towns fell into the hands of the Muslims.

The notices of the Arab authors about the town are very scanty. They know that it was inhabited by Samaritans [cf. Al-Sāmī] and some add that, according to the Jews, they are found nowhere else, but it should be noted that Bahādurî (ed. de Goeje, p. 135) speaks of Samaritans in Filastin and Urdana. Ya‘qūbî mentions (p. 323), Nabulus a town near two sacred hills with a population of Jews, foreigners and Samaritans. Below the town is a subterranean city, hewn out of the rock. Muḥammad ibn Ahmad says Nābulus lies in a valley between two hills, is rich in olive-trees and a stream flows through it. The houses are of stone and there are mills there; the mosque in the centre has a beautiful paved courtyard. In the Crusading period Nābulus is mentioned as unfortified. On Jan. 25, 1120, an assembly of prelates and secular notables was held here with the object of improving the morals of the Christians. Idriti mentions the well of Jacob where Christ had the conversation with the woman of Samaria; a fine church had then been built on the spot. The Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela (1160–1173) records that there were no Jews in Nābulus, but about 100 Kuttāans (Samaritans) who offered burned offerings on the altar on Garizim at the passover and on other feast-days. His contemporary Al-Uhrayn says the Samaritans are very numerous. He, as does Ya‘qūbî, always writes Garizim as Kaisirizim, a corruption which we already have in the “Agazaren” of the pilgrim of Bordeaux. A terrible earthquake in 1202 added to the miseries inflicted on the town by the continuous wars between Franks and Muslims. Under the great Mamlūk Sulṭān Baybars (1260–1277) it finally passed into possession of the Muslims. Ya‘qūbî remarks on the wealth of water and fertility of the district; here, he says, is the hill on which according to the Jews, Abraham wanted to sacrifice Isaac (not Ishmael as the Muslims say). When praying, the Samaritans turn towards Garizim. Dimashqy says that Nābulus is like a palace surrounded by gardens; he mentions the pilgrimages of the Samaritans to Garizim where they sacrificed lambs. The Muslims had a fine mosque in the town, where the Kur‘ān was recited day and night. According to Khalîl al-Zuhîr (d. 572 = 1172), the area included 500 villages.

The people of Nābulus retained their unfriendly character and fondness for rebellion so that the town was less visited by pilgrims. Only the modern period has brought order and greater security, but even now the dislike of the Samaritans to strangers as spectators during their passover sacrifices may give rise to trouble.

Bibliography: Sellin, in Z.D.P.V., xlii. 295 sq., l. 205 sqq., 265 sqq. (on the excavations in the ancient Shechem); Hulscher, ibid., xxiii. 98 sqq.; R. Hartmann, ibid., xxiii. 75; P. Thomason, Lea somet, p. 93, 100 sqq.; Robinson, Palæstina, iii. 536 sqq.; Guerin, Sources, i. 390 sqq.; Ya‘qūbî, in B.G.A., vi. 32; Isâkhâbî, Shi‘a, i. 38; Muḥammad ibn Ahmad, ibid., iii. 174; Idriti, ibid., viii. 132 (text, p. 4); Le Strange, Palæstina under the Muslims, p. 512; Sir George Adam Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, index, s.v. Nābulus; The itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, ed. A. Ascher, 1840, l. 66–68; Ya‘qūbî, Mu‘jam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 724; Dimashqy, ed. Mehran, p. 200; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Königeichs von Jerusalem, p. 146, 205, 411, 684 and passim; Fropat, Die geogr. Verhältnisse Syriens und Palästinas nach Wilhelm von Tyrus, l. 55 sqq. (Fr. Buhl).

AL-NAḤDIRI. [See 'And al-Ghânî.]

NAḤDĪR (A., plural nāḥḍūr; Sura liii. 57), used as a nomen agentis from n-hür, insinuation, meaning a whisperer; sometimes also an infinitive, Sura ixvi. 17. The plural nāḥḍūr is also found in the sense of an infinitive, e.g. Sura ixvi. 6. The term occurs frequently in the Kur‘ān; it is even said to be synonymous with rasūl; its opposite is bâṣīr, awāṣiq. Naḥdir as well as bâṣīr are applied to the prophets, the former when they are represented as whisperers, the latter as an announcer of good tidings (cf. Sura xvi. 106; xxxv. 58; xxxiii. 44; xlviii. 8; naḥḍūr as nāḥḍūr).

As an epithet it is used especially in connection with Noah, the great whisperer before the Deluge, and with Muhammad himself who thereby acquires the speech of a second Noah (cf. Sura xvi. 115; l. 51; lixxvi. 30, with Sura xxix. 49; lixiv. 37; lixxvii. 70; lixiv. 26). Sometimes Muḥammad emphasizes his being only a whisperer (Sura xvi. 32), or his being the first whisperer who was sent to his people (Sura xxvii. 46; xxxiv. 43). The term is found in bāṣīrīd apart from the common use, known from the Kur‘ān, in the curious expression naḥḍīr ʿiryan (Bukhārī, Nībās, b. 26; Ṭāḥif, b. 2; Musli, Pāyš, trad. 16) with which Muḥammad denotes himself. The tradition runs as follows: “Myself and my mission are like a man who went to some people saying: I have seen the army (of the enemy) with my eyes and I am the naked whisperer”. Several anecdotic stories are told by the commentators in explanation of this expression. It is also said by some of them, that in early Arabia a man who saw an approaching danger, stripped himself of his clothes and wound them around his head in order to warn his tribespeople. — The meaning Nazarite which in several dictionaries is given to the term naḥḍīr in the first place does not occur in the Kur‘ān, nor in bāṣīr, nor in nāḥḍūr, nor in Naḥdir, for Naḥdir is it, however, used in translations of the Bible.


NAḤDIR, v.o.w. was taken over into Islam from the pre-Muhammadan Arabs and underwent modification: by the new religion. The idea of dedication is associated with the root n-hür which is also found in South Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic and to some extent in Assyrian. An animal could
be the object of dedication among the Arabs. For example, they dedicated by *nadhur* certain of their sheep etc., for the *qalqul* feast in Radjab (Lišān al-`Arab and Dawārī, s.v.); the dedication which was expressed in solemn formulae signified that the animals were removed from the mundane world and placed in the sacred one.

As a rule, a sacrifice was dedicated in order to obtain good fortune in a particular respect. The promise to dedicate an animal when the herd had reached the number of a hundred (cf. cit.) had an effect on the prosperity of the animals because the word anticipated the fact. According to the story, Abū al-Mutajib similarly dedicated a son to be slain beside the Ka'bah if he should have ten sons and they grew up (Ibn Hīhām, p. 97 sqq.) but for his *nadhur* 100 camels were substituted,—

A childless woman could also vow if she had a son to dedicate him to the sanctuary (ibid. p. 76; perhaps this story is a literary borrowing). According to the *hadīth* of Maimūnah bint Kardām, her father promised to sacrifice 50 sheep if he had a son (Yāqīn, i. 754; Abū Dāwūd, *Mishkāt*, ḍhāb 191; Ibn Mīd, *Kāfīr, ḍhāb* 18). If a child was born, its mother could dedicate it by a vow as *āmiras* (from *āmar* if it recovered (Arāwqi, p. 123, sqq.). Escape from every difficulty was sought by a *nadhur*. During a battle a camel used to be dedicated as a sacrifice (Wākhīdī-Wellhausen, p. 39). The traveller in the desert used to make a vow on account of the danger (see the verse in Lane and Lišān al-`Arab, s.v.). In distress at sea one promised offerings to God or a saint or vowed to do something oneself, such as fasting (Sītār x. 23; xxix. 65; Abū Dāwūd, *Mishkāt*, ḍhāb 20; see also Goldziher, *Muh. Stud.*, ii. 311). During a drought *‘Omar vowed to taste neither saum, nor milk nor meat till the rain fell* (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 2573, verso).

Even if a sacrifice were promised, the vow also affected the person concerned, as we see from the fact that he had his hair shorn not only by the *ḥāddīj* but also, for example, when sacrificing after a journey (Ibn Hīhām, p. 15; 749; Wākhīdī-Wellhausen, p. 324; 384; 429 sqq.; Bawākīrī, *Hadīth*, ḍhāb 1254) for the cutting of the hair ended, as in the case of the Iṣmaʿili Nazirīte, the state of consecration. The vow therefore had always more or less the character of a self-dedication. This aspect was often quite prominent. Ordinary sacred duties such as participation in the ḥāddīj were assumed as a consecration by *nadhur* (Sītār xxii. 30) at which special obligations were assumed e.g. to go to the sanctuary on foot, or barefooted. (Bawākīrī, *Dīnār al-Salāt, ḍhāb* 27; Tirmīdzī, *Naṣīrāt ʿuṣūl ‘Abbāsī, ḍhāb* 17). The sacred condition of *fīlīs* was assumed as a *nadhur*; thus before his conversion *‘Omar vowed to make a nightly *fīlīs* in the Meccan sanctuary (Bawākīrī, *Majālis*, ḍhāb 54; *Mishkāt*, ḍhāb 29). Such a vow to separate oneself from everyday life in some special way was very frequent among the ancient Arabs. For *Labīd* (p. 17, 18) compares an antelope bunk also among the bushes to one fulfilling his vow (Bawākīrī *‘Ammār*).

This isolation had the definite object of spiritual concentration and strengthening the soul and thereby influencing the deity. Abstinence was therefore practised in preparation for great deeds, especially in war. The Arabs *touched no perfume, married no woman, drank no wine and avoided all pleasures when they were seeking vengeance, until they attained it* (Hamāmah, p. 447, v. 8) schol.): avoidance of wine (Hamāmah, p. 237, v. 4) and women (Kūfī al-Aghārī, xv. 161; 2nd ed., p. 154) is specially mentioned. These abstentions like the *ḥāddīj* rites and the *fīlīs* are also the objects of a *nadhur*. The form of this vow is for example "wine and women are ḍarras to me until I have slain 100 Asadīs" (Aghārī, viii. 68; 2nd ed., p. 65).

A definite term may be fixed, such as drinking no wine for 30 days in order to obtain vengeance (Kāsī al-Khaṭīm, ed. Kowalski, iv. 25). Forms of abstention are not to eat meat, not to wash the head, so that the *fīlīs* is not removed (Aghārī, ix. 149; 2nd ed., p. 143; xii. 69; 2nd ed., p. 66; Ibn Hīhām, p. 543, 980; *Mishkāt*, ed. Wellhausen, no. 189), not to mourn oneself (Wākhīdī-Wellhausen, p. 201). Refraining from meat, wine, ointment, washing and sexual intercourse are mentioned together (Aghārī, vi. 99; 2nd ed., p. 97; viii. 68; 2nd ed., p. 66; Ibn Hīhām, p. 543; Wākhīdī-Wellhausen, p. 73, 94). There is also evidence of complete fasting (Wākhīdī-Wellhausen, p. 105, 402). The abstentions, the offering and the deed to be done form the content of the *nadhur*. It is said: *naṣāḥārūn ʿalā ʿnāfīs wa naṣāḥārūn miʿād* (Bawākīrī and Lišān al-`Arab, s.v.), as well as *naṣāḥārūn tawwīs sulīl* (* Antar, p. 21, 84; Kāsī al-Ruṣayyāt, p. 52, 5*). After a wish has been fulfilled a vow of gratitude may also be taken (Wākhīdī, p. 290).

The consecration placed the person making the vow in connection with the divine powers. The *nadhur* was an *ʿad*l (Sītār ix. 76; xii. 67; xxvii. 10), whereby he pledged himself. A neglect of the *nadhur* was a sin against the deity (Ibn Ruṣayyāt, p. 51, 40). The sacred obligation of living made this a *nadhur* (synonymous *naṣāḥ*) which one should fulfill (*ṣafat*), instead of wandering aimlessly (Sītār xxii. 23; Wākhīdī, p. 120; Labīd, p. 47, 1; Kuṣaiṣī, *Hāshimīyya*, ed. Horovitz, p. 4, 48). The importance of the binding pledge gradually becomes more prominent (cf. Lišān al-`Arab, where *naṣāḥār* is explained by *ṣafat*, ironically *ṣafat*, p. 7, 3); the emphasis on the material dedication gradually became less. The abstentions mentioned receive their importance on the one hand from works meritorious to the deity, on the other from the unpleasant deprivations, by which the person taking the vow disciplines himself. Both points of view are seen in the examples quoted. The releasing of slaves or divorcing of wives often form the subject of a kind of vow by which a man pledges himself under certain conditions. A man many also vow to sacrifice all his camels if he is lying (Hamāmah, p. 667, v. 3). The strict obligation inherent in the *nadhur* makes it closely related to the oath (see *kaʿām*).

One can also bind one's family by a vow. A mother swears not to comb her hair or to seek shade until her son or daughter fulfils her wish (Aghārī, xviii. 205; 2nd ed., p. 205; Ibn Hīhām, p. 319; ii. 90). The strength of this kind of "conjunction" is based on the relationship between the two partners. If a dying man vows that his tribe shall slay 50 to avenge him, this binds the tribe (Hamāmah, p. 442, 5). There thus arose in Islam the problem of how far unfulfilled vows had to be fulfilled by the descendants (Musili, *Naṣāḥ*, trad. 1; Bawākīrī, *Wāṣīyā, ḍhāb* 19; cf. Goldziher, *Zibrilten*, p. 59).
In Islam the vow and the oath are treated together. In the Koran it is prescribed that unconsidered expressions (isghar) in an oath may be broken and expiated (Sura ii. 225, v. 91). The context shows that the reference is to vows of abstinence, especially relating to food and women. Sura ii. 226-227 in continuation says that those who bind themselves by isghar not to touch a woman should either break the vow after 4 months or pronounce the formula of divorce. The breach of the oath then requires the kaffara. The kaffara formula is absolutely forbidden (Sura lxxviii. 1-5; cf. xxiii. 4); it is a great sin in the eyes of the law, while the isghar is not a sin (see Juyanbool, Handbuch der islamischen Griechen, p. 259 sqq.; Sachau, Muh. Recht, p. 15, 68 sqq.). He breaks from the oath" promised in Sura lxxvi. 2 refers to a vow of continence. The same kaffara holds for a broken vow as for an oath. It is probable in this case that we have Jewish influence (cf. Mechina, Nahdirim) but the principle of releasing oneself from a vow by doing something else is certainly also originally Arab. But with Islam comes the view that mukafs are useless because they cannot induct God (Bahshir, Almun, bab 26; Kadar, bab 6; Muslim, Nahdir, trad. 2). Thus we find hadiths which urge the fulfillment of vows as well as those that forbid them. Following hints in the hadiths, we find a systematic division into vows of piety (mudaf al-taharrar), which are intended to acquire merit by a pious deed (isghar), and vows by oaths which, since they are conditioned, serve to incite, prevent or strengthen. The latter are called mudaf al-ladjud (v. 8). They are deprecated but must be treated like oaths. Their matter must be innocent; according to some, such a vow is invalid, according to others, it is valid but must be broken. Their matter must not already be an individual duty (mudaf li 'adi). The person taking the vow must, like him taking an oath, be mukafs and be acting of his own free-will.


**(John Frisendren)**

**AL-NADIM, ABU 'L-FARAJ MUHAMMAD b. ABD YAKUB IBNE AL-WARAK AL-NADIM AL-BAGHDADE, Arabisch bibliographierer, compiled the Fihrist in 377 (987-988). Little is known about his life. According to a statement which goes back to Ibn al-Nadid's (d. 643 = 1245) Dhahl Ta'rikh Baghda (see Flügel's edition, p. xii, note 2), he died in 584, according to another statement (see Ibn Nadid's Al-Asrâli, Lisan al-Muthâ, v. 171) probably 388 (the figure is damaged in the Flügel's edition). Both dates are in contradiction to the fact that in the Fihrist events of 392 (875, 6) are mentioned, unless they are additions by another hand. A clue to the date of his birth is given from his account (p. 377, 6) of a meeting with a learned man in the year 340; this suggests 325 as the latest date for his birth. Nothing is known of his family. There is no reason to connect him with Isâhak b. Ibrâhîm al-Mawall al-Nadim (d. 235 = 849) or with Vâsî b. al-Nadim, a pupil of al-Baladî (d. 279 = 892). His father was a bookseller (muqaddam) (p. 303, 41, 318, 6, 351, 12). Whether the epithet al-Nadim "table companion," i.e. a member of the circle of a calliph or other great man, refers to the father or to a remote ancestor is unknown. It is not impossible that it refers to the author of the Fihrist himself; against this however is the fact that he is usually quoted as Ibn al-Nadîm. That Baghdaedd, if not his birthplace, was at least his place of abode is evident from passages like p. 337, 96, 349, 17 (see below) and the frequent mention of Baghdaedd among his acquaintances (p. 134, 8, 219, 29, 236, 19, 266, 1). He several times mentions a stay in Mopsâl (p. 86, 171, 166, 41, 199, 18, 265, 8, cf. also p. 283, 4). We know nothing of other journeys by al-Nadîm (Dmr al-Rum, p. 349, 21, is the name of the Latin quarter in Baghdaedd as v. v. Rosen has shown). His teachers and authorities also point to Baghdaedd. He most frequently quotes the authority of the grammarians al-Sâtra (d. 368) (all the quotations can be found in the latter's Akhbâr al-Nawawiy al-Baghdaedd). Personal relations are indicated by p. 56, 13 and the mention of his sons (p. 31, 29, 40, 5, 62, 25). Al-Nadîm also studied under Ibn al-Munadidjim (p. 144, 2). He gives traditions heard from Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Nâkî (p. 24, 14, 25, 9). He also gives traditions from Abu 'l-Faraj al-Ishakî (p. 141, 19 = Kitâb al-Asrâl, i. 3 sqq.) and from Abu 'l-Fâhî b. al-Nawwâb (p. 145, 8) concerning the immortality of his transcripts (p. 145, 5). He also mentions as his teacher Abu Sulaimân al-Manjîk (p. 241, 14) whom we know from Abu Hujaylân Muhâkhafat. He was friendly also with the logician Ibn al-Djurrah (p. 244, 14, 125, 18) and with the Christian philosopher Ibn al-Khummar (p. 245, 18) and with Vâsî b. 'Abî (p. 204, 11). This circle of friends is very much in keeping with al-Nadîm's friendly nature, the breadth of his intellectual interests, his intelligent interest in other religions and his tolerance, which finds expression in Majâ'îf's 5 and 79 of his work. That he was a Shî'î and Mutâzilî did not escape his biographers (cf. Goldscher, in Z.D.M.G., xxxvi. 278 sqq.); thus he uses bâ'in and amîn in the sense of Shî'î and Sunnî respectively, calls the Sunni traditions al-Hawawisy (p. 231, 12), claims many of their leaders for the Zaidîyya (p. 178, 93, 85), says that al-Shî'î was a man of decidedly Shî'î outlook (p. 209, 12) and praises al-Wâqiy (p. 98, 52) as Shî'î. Shî'îs were numerous among his friends (p. 139, 97 and p. 154, 25) and acquaintances (p. 173, 56, p. 61, 11, 197, 11, 198, 4). Al-Nadîm like his father was a bookseller. This is nowhere expressly stated but is evident from the whole plan of his work in which he faithfully records not only scientific literature but also the numerous divans of contemporary poets and the vast mass of anonymous light literature, love stories, fairy tales and books of adventure, indeed even works of a popular nature neglected alike by scholars and bibliophiles, books on good manners, cookery books, books on poison, books dealing with hunting and sport, down to collections of fables, books on magic and on prophecy, in brief everything that was on the Baghdaedd book market in the fourth
(ninth) century. That he was a bookseller is also indicated by the frequent particulars about the size of the books dealt with (cf. especially, p. 159, 16) about copies in the hand of famous scholars, about the demand for books (p. 70, 5, 77, 19; 79, 21) and about the book trade (p. 271, 3, 359, 12). He several times mentions other booksellers (p. 264, 299, 4, 355, 1). The Fihrîst exists in two recensions (on the manuscripts, see Z.D.M.G., lxxiv, 111 sqq. and the literature there given; to these may now be added a fragment in Tonk and a private manuscript in Medina). Both were made in the year 377 (987).

The longer contains ten maf'âlî (of which the first six deal with the literature of Islam: 1. Kursân, 2. grammar; 3. history, etc., 4. poetry, 5. dogmatics, 6. law), while the last four deal with non-Islamic literature (7. philosophy and "ancient sciences," 8. light literature, 9. history of religion, 10. alchemy). The shorter version contains only the first four maf'âlî of the longer one, i.e. the Arabic translations from the Greek, Syriac, Persian and Sanskrit and the other literature based on these models. It is mentioned by Hâdidji Khalfia (Stambul, ii, 211) under the title Fawâ'id al-Ulâm. The two recensions have in common an introductory section on the various forms of writing.

A survey of the contents of the Fihrîst follows the preface (see also Flügel, in Z. D. M. G., xiii, 190 sqq.). The arrangement there given is strictly adhered to in the book. The special quality of the book and its value lies in the fact that it gives the Arabic literature of the first four centuries in a bibliographical arrangement while the biographical method is the only one used in other contemporary sources. Al-Nadîm, it is true, does not give a rule treats of his subjects in biographical sketches but it is the list of works of the author that is the main thing. Sometimes a branch of literature is treated purely bibliographically under its various branches (e.g. the literature of Kursân's exegesis, p. 35, sq. 371, 114) and also (p. 87, 88, 170, 171). This arrangement was necessary with the anonymous literature, especially in the eighth maf'âlî (p. 305 sqq.). A further step towards treatment from the point of view of the literary historian is found in the brief introductions and surveys (c.g. on the pre-Othmanic recensions of the Kursân, p. 26 sqq., on the beginnings of Arabic grammar, p. 40 sqq.). In the last four maf'âlî, such sections (e.g. on the origins of philosophy, of medicine, of alchemy, the beginning of the translated literature, the origin of the "2000 tales") are so extensive that they have the character of a regular history of literature to a much greater degree than the more bibliographical first six maf'âlî. The ninth maf'âlî occupies a special position; it is a treatise on the history of religion in which the bibliographical element is not at all prominent. The sources used by al-Nadîm are mainly of a literary nature. He prefers to use works in copies from the hand of reliable copyists. He comparatively rarely quotes personal authors. Although a younger contemporary of al-Nadîm's, al-Wâzir al-Maghribi (d. 418 = 1027), prepared an improved edition of the work, it seems at first to have had only slight influence. The earliest author to make considerable use of the first four maf'âlî (in al-Maghribi's edition) was Yaqûût (d. 626 = 1228) (see Bergsträsser, in Z.S., ii, 185). He claims to have consulted a copy in al-Nadîm's own hand, as does the lexicographer


**Johann Fücker**

**NADIM, Ahmad, an Ottoman poet,** born in Stambul, the son of a judge named Muhammad Bey who had come from Mersîfen. His grandfather (according to Gibb, H. O. P., iv, 30) was a military judge named Muṣâfa. Ahmad Râzik mentions as his great-grandfather Kâsa-Cebčii-eâ (q.v.) Mahmud Efendi who also was a military judge. The genealogy given by Ahmad Râzik is however wrong because he confuses [Kâsamî Muhammad Pasha (q.v.) with Rûm Muhammad Pasha. The statement that Ahmad Nadîm is descended from Djalâl al-Dîn is therefore simply the result of confusion. Little is known of his life. He was a wâdidari, later on intimate terms with Ahmad III and his grandson Hâmid Hürmüz Pasha [q.v.]. He probably got his taḥbî al-Nadîm from this friendship. Latterly he held the office of librarian in the library founded by his patron Dâmmâd Ibrahim Pasha. On hearing of the end of Ibrahim Pasha and the deposition of the sultan, Nadîm lost his life at the beginning of October 1750 (Rabi' I, 1143) in a horrible way; while escaping from the mob leaving the grand-vizier's palace he fell from the roof and was killed. He was buried in Ayâk Pasha in Perä beside the historian Fladîkîîlî Şâhâbî Muhammad Ağa.

Ahmed Nadîm is regarded as one of the greatest of Ottoman poets, who is still appreciated for his pure language, free from foreign additions. Many literary historians have discussed his merits as a poet (cf. the specimens collected by Gibb, H. O. P., iv, 30 sqq.). His collected poems (Dîwânu; printed Bülbûk, n.d.; a more recent critical edition with introductions by Ahmad Râzik Bey and Muhammad Fu'âd Bey appeared in 1338—1340 in Stambul; there are manuscripts of the
Nadir in S.W. Persia. Tahmāsp appealed to Nādir to complete the deliverance of the country. Leaving Shīrāz and crossing Lutistān, Nādir arrived in Bārdijerd where the Shah sent him a crown set with precious stones and a commission (nahānak) as wall of all Khūrsān along with Māzandārān, Yuvān, Kīrman and Sistan (cf. also ‘Alī Ḥāstā, p. 180). Tahmāsp also gave his sister Goharshād to Nādir and betrothed his other sister Fatimāsulṭān to Rādā-ḵānu Mīrzā.

The Ottomans who then occupied the whole of western Persia and the greater part of Transcaucasia were reluctant to leave Persia. Nādir occupied Nīhawān, defeated the Turks at Malikyr, retook Hāmadān and on the 27th Muharram 1143 (Aug. 13, 1730) Tabriz was retaken.

Nādir returned to the east. Nādir learned in Tabriz that Dūš ‘l-Fīrār Abdāli had driving Allah-yār Khān from Herāt was fighting Nādir’s brother Dara Khān under the walls of Maḥḥād. Nādir at once set out for Khūrsān, crossing the steppe of the Yomut Turkmens and towards the end of Rahlī II (Nov. 1730) was at Maḥḥād where he reviewed 56,000 families of the tribes transplanted from other provinces.

On the 4th Shawwāl (April 12, 1731) Nādir was 3. farahkhā from Herāt. In the month of August the Abdāli restored Nādir’s candidate Allah-yār Khān but the latter regaining contact with his tribe now rebelled. It was not till Ramadān 1

Nādir in Europe in Munich, London and Vienna enjoys great popularity. Nādir translated into Turkish the history of Mūsādžijīn-baši Ahmad Esfandi (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 224 sq.; cf. thereon J. L. s.s., xii. 272); he was also one of the Turkish translators of ‘Ain al’s history (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 259 sq.; the edict relating to this is in Ahmad Rāfī’s, ‘Hirī on hikayi ʿaridah ‘Isāmih khatiyi, 1100-1200, Stambul 1930, p. 84 sq.) but the MS. seems to be lost.

Nādir Shah, king of Persia (1147-1160)

Origns. Nādir b. Ḫūrāzī b. Nādir-ḵānu belonged to the Khūraḵī clan of the Turkoman tribe of the Afghāns, of which a section had settled in northern Khūraḵān, and was born on the 28th Muḥarram 1100 (Oct. 22, 1688) at Khūraḵān. Entering the service of Tahmāsp II, he was called Tahmāsp-ḵānu Khān but after his coronation his original name was improved to Nādir, “the rare one.” At an early date Nādir distinguished himself in the incessant fighting with the Turkomans of Naṣr, the Camishbash, Kurds of Khūraḵān, ‘Alī Khān, the Būzakhs, the Persians and even against his Afghān fellow tribesmen. The little nucleus around Nādir consisted of his Afghān relatives, some Kurds of Daragāz and Aisward, and 300-400 families of Djalāyir Turkomans with their chief Tahmāsp-ḵānu Wālī.

Fighting in Khūraḵān. During the Afghan invasion of Persia, Maḥḥād was occupied by Malik Mahmūd, a scion of the Sīstān family. Nādir fought against Malik Mahmūd at first on his own initiative. When the Šafawī Tahmāsp II, driven from his other lands, arrived in Khūraḵān, Nādir very cleverly supplanted the commander-in-chief Fath ‘Alī Khan Kāḏūr and on 17th Rahlī II (Dec. 22) captured Maḥḥād with the help of treachery. Henceforth it became his headquarters. There were already signs of a breach between Nādir and Tahmāsp II at this time.

The Shah urged Nādir to set out against his enemies the Ghilaḵtī Afghāns but Nādir wished first of all to dispose of the nearer enemy, the Abdāli Afghāns of Herāt, but the campaign of 1728 (against the Abdāli and the Turkomans) had no success. Nādir however was able to extend the sphere of his activities; he ousted from Astarābād and Māzandārān the governors appointed by Tahmāsp and came into conflict with the Russians and the Ghilaḵtī Afghāns.

The Abdāli. In the meanwhile trouble had broken out in Herāt between Allah-yār Khān and Dūš ‘l-Fīrār Khan. Nādir re-established Allah-yār Khān but transplanted many tribes to Khūraḵān (1144-1145).

The Ghilaḵtī. At this time Ashraf Ghilaḵtī laid siege to Sīstān while his general Sayyād had gone to Sīstān. On the 6th Rahlī (Nov. 27, 1729), Nādir defeated the Afghāns on the banks of the river Miḥmāntār. This victory he followed up by others.
to Persia via Baghshāy (Bāb-kusayy), Bayāt, Bayān and Shabdūrah. Mahāmid Bāltī. The reason of this hurried move was the rebellion raised by Mahāmid Khān Bāltī in S.W. Persia. Mahāmid Khān was quickly driven from the pass of Shabdūtan and on 27th Shāhī (Feb. 1, 1734) Nādir reoccupied Shāhī.

Campaign in Transcaucasia. In 1734 Nādir received the Turkish ambassador Abd al-Karim Efendi and informed him that the retrocession of Transcaucasia was a réve que non de paix. On the other hand, prince S.D. Golitaine was received at Isfahān on May 20–31, 1734 and thereafter by Nādir's order accompanied him everywhere (his itinerary in Lorch-Schnee). On the 12th Muharram 1147 (June 17, 1734) Nādir left Isfahān for Ardhar-dāghūn and as the Turks did not reply, Nādir began by attacking the Daghestāni chief [Ghażi-Kumūk] Surkhāy whom the Porte had appointed governor of Surkāyān. Tahmasp Kuli Khaljīr defeated the Daghestānians near Dāwi-lāhan (in the district of Kābalā) while Nādir cut off the retreat—penetrated into the heart of the extremely difficult region of Ghażi-kumūk. In spite of the exploits of the Abdālī the success gained in Daghestān was only partial for Surkhāy had escaped to the north.

On 6th Djamād-ī II (Nov. 3, 1734) Nādir was before the walls of Gandjā, which was defended by ʿAli Pāshā. The siege necessitated considerable works and prince Golitaine procured Russian engineers for Nādir. On March 21, 1735 a treaty was signed at Gandjā by which Russia and Persia became practically allies.

On 1st Muharram 1148 (May 26, 1735) Nādir went first to Kerāb but the encounter with ʿAbd Allah Pāshā Kūprūšzade took place near Erīwan on the plain of Baghshāy; on 26th Muharram (June 18, 1735) the Ottomans were defeated. Gandjā they upon capitulated on the 17th Šafar (July 8) and Tilla on 22nd Rabiʿ I (Aug. 13).

Nādir returned to Daghestān. Via Tilla [q.v.], from which 6,000 families were transferred to Khūrānān, Nādir attacked the Legt of Dār and Talā (north of the Alazan). The Khān of the Crimean ʿAbd al-Girāy, who had in the meanwhile advanced as far as Darband and had placed his nominees everywhere, withdrew to the Crimea and Nādir endeavoured to pacify Daghestān but Surkhāy still evaded capture.

Nādir proclaimed king. On 13th Ramaḍān (Jan. 27, 1736) Nādir came to Mughān [q.v.] where in the meanwhile the governors and notables of the province had assembled. It was explained to them that Nādir, having liberated Persia, wished to retire to Khūrānān and that the delegates were free to put the government in the hands of Tahmasp II or ʿAbbas III "who were alive". Nādir finally accepted the crown but on condition that the Persians abandoned the Shīa, its practices introduced by Daʿūd I which were contrary to the beliefs of Nādir's ancestors. The Persians were to form a fifth orthodoxy mahallā, placed under the patronage of the Emīm Djanṣār Shāhī. A document to this effect was sealed by the assembly. The five clauses of the treaty to be proposed to Turkey were next drawn up: 1. the Turks were to recognise the new Dījārī, 2. the latter was to be given a place of prayer (ṣānīā) at Mecca; 3. Persia was to send an amīr al-baḥrīj every year through Syria; 4. prisoners should be exchanged and 5. ambassador were to be exchanged after mutual approval of the appointments. The formal coronation of Nādir took place on Thursday, 24th Šafar 1148 (March 23, 1735). Nādir did not return to his capital before May 26, 1735 (March 23, 1737), and had a new town built on the site of his camp (Surkāyān) which was called Nādirābād.

Kandahār capitulated on the 2nd Dhu ʿl-Ḥijād 1150 (March 23, 1738). The citadel was dismantled. Expedition into Nepal. So far Nādir's military expeditions had been dictated by a desire to reestablish the old frontiers of the Safavid empire. The expedition to India was provoked solely by the attraction of ill-guarded provinces and by the desire to replenish the treasury exhausted by repeated campaigns. Ghazānī occupied the 22nd Šafar 1151 (June 11, 1738). Kābul on 12th Rabiʾ I (June 30), Džalālābād on 8th Djamād-ī II (Sept. 17). From the neighbourhood of the latter town, the prince Kūli-Kūli was sent back to Persia to act as regent; he and his brother Nāṣr Allah were given crowns.

Going via Sarṭōbā Nādir avoided the Khaibār Pass and took prisoner Naṣr-Khan, governor of Pehlīvar. On 15th Ramaḍān (Dec. 27) Nādir left this town. He: next took Lahore and reappointed the local governor Zakariyā-Khan (a Khrūrsānī). (Naṣir-Khan also was restored to his post). Leaving Lahore on 26th Shawwāl (Feb. 6, 1739) Nādir learned that Muḥammad Shāh had reached Kāmīt and was in a place between the jungle and the river. He succeeded in cutting Muḥammad Shāh off from his capital and hastened to attack the reinforcements which Saʿdūt-Khan (a Khrūrsānī) was bringing from the province of Oudh. Thus began the decisive battle of 15th Dhu ʿl-Ḥijād 1151 (Feb. 24, 1739) in which the commander-in-chief Khān Dāwīn was mortally wounded and Saʿdūt-Khan captured. Nādir and Muḥammad Shāh entered the capital where Nādir's name was inserted in the kūršā and coins struck in his name. On the 15th Dhu ʿl-Ḥijād (March 26, 1739) a rumour spread that Nādir had been assassinated and the populace massacred 3,000–7,000 of his soldiers. Next morning Nādir went to the mosque and gave the signal for the massacre of the inhabitants. On 26th Dhu ʿl-Ḥijād (April 6) Naṣir Allah Mirza was married to a Moghal princess. On 3rd Šafar 1152 (May 12, 1739) a great council was held in Dilī in the course of which Nādir replaced the crown on the head of Muḥammad Shāh but the latter had in return to cede to Nādir all the provinces north of the Indus. The amount levied by Nādir cannot be estimated. According to Anāmārī, who was attached to the vizier's office, it amounted to 6,000,000 rupees in specie and 500,000,000 in jewels and precious stones, including the Koh-i Nūr diamond and the Peacock throne. Large sums were distributed among the soldiers and the people of Persia exempted from taxation for three years.

Nādir left Dilī and reached Kābul on 15th Ramaḍān (Dec. 12). Now took place one of the most remarkable of his expeditions. He suddenly turned back to reduce the lord of Sind Khūdāy-Yār Khan ʿAbdālī (a native of Sīrī, cf. Malcolm, op. cit., ii. 88) and going via Bālgās, Lākānā and Shabdū reprehended penetrated into the desert south of
the Indians and took Khadā-yār prisoner; he had shut himself up in ‘Umarkh (north of Thar and Parkar in the province of Bombay). Having organised his Indian possessions in three provinces Nadir returned to Nadir-ābād (via Siwi and Shal) on 7th Safar (May 5, 1740).

Nadir in Turkestan. Nadir returned to Herat (July 31) and after a fortnight devoted to festivities set out for Balkh which he reached on 7th Dju’ma (Sept. 23). Nadir treated Khan Abū l-Fadl kindly and returned his investiture by crowning him with his own hands. The Oxus was proclaimed the frontier and the Khan had to supply Nadir with 20,000 Özbek and Turkomans, which indirectly left in the hands of the conqueror the control of the internal affairs of Bokhara.

On the 16th. Radjab (Oct. 7), Nadir had set out for Khwārizm. The fleet followed the army. The Khan Il-Bars of Hazarasp retired to his fortress of Khanāb which surrendered on 24th Shābān after bombardment. Finally Khiwa, the capital of the kingdom, also capitulated. By 4th Shavwāl (Dec. 23) Nadir had returned to Durjestān and entered Māhāb at the end of Shavwāl.

Nadir must again for Transcaucasia. While in India, Nadir had learned of the death of his brother Ibrahīm Khan who had been killed by the captured rebel Dājr and Tala. To punish them, Nadir left Mahāb and on his way learned that the Aḥdān troops who had been sent in advance had already ravaged Dājr, Djaschk (7) and Aqštāb, but the pacification of Dagestan was by no means complete.

An incident that followed marks the turning-point in the career of Nadir. On the 28th Safar (May 15, 1741) near Kaf’syi Aškāl (Mazarārān) an unknown man concealed in the brushwood shot at Nadir, wounding him slightly. Connecting this with events in Dagestan Mahdi Khan says the crime was committed by a slave of the son of Dilawar Khan Tāsim (2, v.) but suspicion very soon turned upon the prince Rās-Kuli who had besides not behaved well during his regency. He was sent for the time to Tihrān while Nadir continued his march via Kāzin, Karradajā, Baghda, and Kahāla.

In June 1741, for the third time, Nadir entered Dagestan and remained there a year and a half. The garrison of Tarkhā, the smesi of the Kar-Kayt and Surkhy Khan of the Ghāzi Kāmiḳ came over to Nadir but new difficulties kept cropping up. Relations with Russia became somewhat strained for the Russian representatives suspected Nadir of designs on the northern Caucasus. As a precaution the Russians in May 1742 concentrated 42,000 men at Kišlar (see, Bubbow, I, 220). Cares were undermining the health and character of Nadir. At the beginning of Dec. 1743 when the camp was at Bashlu the heir to the throne Rās-Kuli, denounced by the author of the attempt on Nadir in Mazarārān, was blinded after a formal trial. Nadir himself was thoroughly upset by this incident. Rebellion was now threatening everywhere (in Khiwān and in Balkh).

Third campaign against the Turks. In Dju’l-Ka’d 1743, the Turkish ambassador brought from Constantinople a letter from the Sultan refusing to recognise the fifth maṭbāh. Nadir then reminded the Sultan that the whole of Persian territory had not been regained from Turkey and added that he soon would take the field to make his own terms.

Nadir left Dagestan on the 16th Dhu l-Hijja (Feb. 7, 1742) and came to Khiwān (14th Dju’ma) 1742 = Aug. 5, 1742) which capitulated as did Irlīl. On the 26th Radjab (Oct. 20) Nadir arrived near Mawālī but the siege of this fortress was unsuccessful and on 2nd Ramadān (Oct. 20) he retreated to Khiwān and Khanābīn. Friendly relations were established with Ahmad Pasha of Baghdad. Nadir with his wives made the pilgrimage to the Shi’i and Sunni sanctuaries of Mesopotamia and on the 18th Shavwāl 1156 (Dec. 12, 1743) summoned a grand assembly of ecclesiastics at Najaf. The document drawn up by the emir Khan summing up the discussions confirmed the renunciation by the Persians of the 'heresy of Shi’i Islam', while the iṣlāma of Mesopotamia and Transcaucasia recognises the claims of Dja’far al-Sudjih and declared the special features (fawāʾid) of the Persian beliefs compatible with Islam. The Sunni theologian 'Abd Allāh b. Husain al-Suwa’idi, Khalīf al-Khaḍrī al-khaṣṣīyya nifṭiyya al-Furqān al-Islāmiyya, Cairo 1324, also gives a very interesting summary of this dispute; cf. Ritter, Hist. a., 5, 1026, I, 106 and the detailed account by Prof. A. E. Schmidt, ʿenfārīr muḥammadī-shāfiʿīyya ʿarkoliyya fī al-ʿUṣūl al-Qāʾima (Barthold Festschrift, Tashkent 1927, p. 69-107).

Rebellion. The strange abandonment of the campaign in Mesopotamia is to be explained by the new risings in the east. Much more important however was the rising in Fārā left by the beglerbegi Taḵī Khan, a great favourite of Nadir. He was ultimately captured and castrated. In Astarābād the Kāḏārs rose against the oppression of the governor’s son (Hanway, Hist. Account, I, 192). Nadir had to send his nephew ‘All Kuli to Khwārizm. Finally the Ottomans of Kāra disseminated in Aḏrābād and in letters from the new pretender Šāfī Mirzā (Muhammad ’Alī Rafsindī) and then refused to begin an exchange of prisoners.

Fourth campaign against the Turks. In the meanwhile the Porte equipped a new army (150,000 horse and 40,000 janissaries) which advanced on Erzerum and Kars under the command of the former vizier Yegen Muḥammad Pāšā while ‘Abd Allāh Pāshā Djebejī’s army went via Diyarbakr and Mawālī. On the 21st Radjab (Aug. 1743) came the news of the victory won by Nasr Allāh Mirzā over ‘Abd Allāh Pāshā’s army (near Mawālī) and at the same time Yegen Muḥammad Pāšā died leaving his army in complete disorder. Nadir again won a brilliant victory (on the very scene of his first victory in 1735) but then, quite unexpectedly, wrote to the Sultan saying he was abandoning the first two clauses of Mughān. Personal fatigue may explain why Nadir could not exploit his success.

On Sept. 4, 1746, peace was signed with the Turkısh envoys and on 10th Muharram 1160 (Jan. 22, 1747) the Shāh’s representatives (Muṣṭafā Khan Shāhlu and the historian Mahdi Kāna) set out for Constantinople with the zul-nāma. Nadir renounced his famous religious clauses in favour of the Sultan, "the Khalifa of the people of Islam and the glory of the Turkoman race". By the treaty the frontier was restored to that of the time of Murăd IV [cf. TAHRIR], but in a platonist fashion, Nadir expressed the wish to receive one
of the provinces which had belonged to the
Turkoman Satanss.
On the 10th Muharram, Nādir left for Kirman, marking his route by piles of skulls erected everywhere. After the Nawwis, Nādir returned to Mahshah and devoted himself to “spilling the blood of the innocents.” His conduct was now clearly abnormal. In an epilogue to his history written after the death of Nādir, Mahdi Kāhn records the denunciations, executions and tortures carried out by the agents of the treasury and the interior of the country, which had begun even before the Indian expedition (Ottar, Rāhī, Hanwāy, i. 250). The Shi’ite opposition must also have been intensified in view of the frankly Sunnite turn which Nādir’s “Kabūsanān” policy had taken.

The rising in Sitān, which brought matters to a head was provoked by the activities of the tax collectors who were demanding a contribution of 300,000 tumans from the province. ‘Alī Kuli Mirzā, nephew of Nādir, put himself at the head of the rebels. Even Tahmāsp Kuli Khān Dājalīr, the most faithful prop of the throne, wanted to proclaim one of Nādir’s sons as king. The troubles spread to Khurasan and the Kurds of Khedāshain raided the royal stables at Rāshān. Nādir marched on them but on the eve of 11th Djamād-ī 1160 (June 20, 1447) he was assassinated in his camp near Faqīhābād by the Kādjar and Afshār chief in conspiracy with the bodyguard. Father Bazīn was a witness of the disorder which broke out in the camp after the assassination. On the 27th Djamād-ī 1160 (July 5, 1522) ‘Alī Kuli Mirzā cause from Herāt and was proclaimed king. All the royal princes were massacred.
The treasure amassed by Nādir was soon scattered to the winds; the country, utterly exhausted, was in the throes of crisis. Nādir’s attempts to compose religious difficulties had failed completely, but Persian territory and its periphery were cleared of enemies. For but Nādir, Persia would probably not exist, even in its present bounds.
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NADIR (NA'IR AL-SAMT or AL-NA'IR ET LÉGER)), the bottom, the pole of the horizon (invisible) under the observer in the direction of the water, also the deepest (lowest) point in the sphere of the infinite. The nadir is the opposite pole to the zenith [q.v.].

The word *na'ir (from *nasa'iru, "to see", "to observe") originally (and generally) meant the...
point diametrically opposite a point on the circumference of a circle or the surface of a sphere; we find nuskah as a synonym of maiq in this general meaning [cf. also MUKARLA].

(Willy Hartner)

NADIR (Bantu ‘l-), one of the two main Jewish tribes of Madina, settled in Yathrib from Palestine at an unknown date, as a consequence of Roman pressure after the Jewish wars. Al-Yaḥṣib (ii. 49) says they were a section of the Ljūghām Arabs, converted to Judaism and first settled on Mount al-Nadjar, whence their name; according to the St. Ephraemi Canon (Cairo, iii. 2) they were a truly Jewish tribe, connected with the Jews of Khaibar. This seems the more probable, but a certain admixture of Arab blood is possible; like the other Jews of Madina they bore Arabic names, but kept aloof from the Arabs, spoke a peculiar dialect, and had enriched themselves with agriculture, money-lending, business in armour and jewels.

They were clients of the Aws, siding with them in their conflicts with the Khazzād, and entering with them into the compact with Muhammad known as the Constitution of Madina in A.H. Their most important chief at this time was Hayyāb b. Aḥqāf, whose daughter Safiya became Muhammad’s wife in A.H. For a list of Muhammad’s worst enemies among the Banu ‘l-Nadjar see Ibn Ḥīḍām, Sīra, p. 351—352.

Their fortresses were half a day’s march from Madina, and they owned land in Wādī Butayh and Buwaira; their dwelling places were south of the city.

The Banu ‘l-Nadjar seem to have been in (commercial) relations with Abd al-Sufyān before the battle of Uḥūd. In 4 A.H., in Rabī‘ I, owing to difficulties about the Banu ‘l-Nadjar’s contribution to certain blood-money which was being collected from the whole Muslim community in Madina, Muḥammad, who had personally negotiated the matter with their chiefs, became convinced of their enmity towards himself and suspected them of intending to kill him. He decided to get rid of such dangerous neighbours, and ordered them through Muḥammad b. Maṣlama al-Atwā to leave the city within ten days, under penalty of death, allowing them to take with them all their movable goods, and to return each year to gather the produce of their palm-groves.

The tribe, having no hope of help from the Aws, agreed to leave, but ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ubaīy al-Khazzād, chief of the nuskahs, persuaded them to resist in their fortresses, promising to send 2,000 men to their aid. Hayyāb b. Aḥqāf, hoping the Banu ‘l-Nadjar would also help them, prepared to resist, in the face of opposition from moderate elements in the tribe.

The siege lasted about a fortnight, help from the nuskahs was not forthcoming, and when the Muslims began to cut down their palms the Banu ‘l-Nadjar surrendered. Muḥammad’s conditions were much harder than formerly; their immovable property was forfeited, and nothing left them but what they could take away on camels, arms alone excepted. After two days’ bargaining the tribe departed with a caravan of 600 camels; some went to Syria, others to Khaibar.

The Banu ‘l-Nadjar’s booty Muḥammad did not divide in the usual manner; the land was distributed among the nuskahs, so as to relieve the Aṣfar of their maintenance; part of it the Prophet kept for himself.

Ṣurūr: al-Hāsh i (lx.), was revealed upon the expulsion of the Banu ‘l-Nadjar.

From Khaibar the exiles planned with the Ḥusayn the siege of Madina in 4 A.H. The treasure of the Banu ‘l-Nadjar was captured by Muḥammad in Khaibar in 7 A.H.

Bibliography: (1) Caetani, Annali dell’ Islam, i. 185, §§ 38, 58; 4 A.H., §§ 10—14; Ibn Ḥīḍām, Sīra, p. 652—651; Nöldeke, Geschichte des Korān, p. 153; Vāqūt, Muḥājan, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 662—663; 756; Wensinck, Mohammad en de Joden te Medina, p. 22, 33 sqq.; R. Lessing, Die Juden in Arabien, Berlin 1910. (V. VACC A)

AL-NADJAF (Mashhād ‘All), a town and place of pilgrimage in the ‘Irāq 6 miles west of al-Kafā. It lies on the edge of the desert on a flat barren eminence from which the name al-Nadjar has been transferred to it (A. Mual, The Middle Euphrates, p. 35).

According to the usual tradition, the Imām al-Mu‘āwiyah’s ‘All b. Abī Ṭalib [q.v.] was buried near Kafā, not far from the dam which protected the city from flooding by the Euphrates at the place where the town of al-Nadjar later arose (Vāqūt, Muḥājan, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 760), also called Nadjar al-Kafā (Zamakhihit, Lexicom geographicum, ed. Salverda de Grave, p. 153). Under the Ayyūbi rule the site of the grave near al-Kafā had to be concealed. As a result it was later sought in different places, by many in al-Kafā itself in a corner above the 'ibāda of the mosque, by others again in farahāk from al-Kafā (al-Ljākhāt, ed. de Goeje, B.G. A., i. 82 sqq.; Ibn Hawkāl, ibid., ii. 163). According to a third story, ‘All was buried in al-Madina near Fāṭima’s grave (al-Masūdī, Mu‘awīya, al-Dhahab, ed. Barbier de Meynard, viii. 289), according to a fourth, at Kays al-Imāra (Caetani, Annali dell’ Islam, x., 1926, p. 957 sqq., x. 40, § 99). Perhaps then the sanctuary of al-Nadjar is not the real burial-place but a tomb held in reverence in the pre-Islamic period, especially as the graves of Adam and Noah were also shown there (Ibn Estiyya, Tabī‘a, ed. Defrémery and Sanguineti, i. 416; G. Jacob in A. Noldeke’s Das Heiligum al-Husayn’s in Kūhail, Berlin 1909, p. 38, note 1). It was not till the time of the Hamidūn of al-Mawṣil Abu ‘l-Haḍjīj [see Anti-ALLAH K. HAMIDU] that a large ‘ibāda was built by him over ‘All’s grave, adorned with precious carvages and curtains and a citadel built there (Ibn Hawkāl, op. cit., p. 163). The Shī‘ī Bāyād ‘Aṣṣad al-Dawla [q.v.] in 269 (979-980) built a mausoleum, which was still in existence in the time of Hamd Allāh Mustawfi, and was buried there, as were his sons Shara‘f and Bāḥā‘ al-Dawla. Al-Nadjar was already a small town with a circumference of 2,500 paces (Ibn al-Adīb, ed. Tornberg, viii. 518; Hamd Allāh Mustawfi, Nushat al-Kufiyya, ed. Le Strange, p. 32; in the year 366 = 976—977). Hassan b. al-Faḍil, who died about 414 (1023-24), built the defensive walls of Mashhād ‘All (Ibn al-Adīb, ix. 154). The Maḥṣīd was burned in 443 (1051-52) by the fanatical populace of Baghdad but must have been soon rebuilt. The Shī‘ī Bāyād al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Malik who were in Baghdad in 479 (1086-1087) visited the sanctuaries of ‘All and Husain (Ibn al-Adīb, x. 103). The Ilkhān Ghānān (1295-1304),

(E. HONIGMANN)

BANI NADJÃH, a dynasty of Abyssinian Mamlûks at Zâbi'd [q.v.] from 412 to 553 A.H. (1023–1155). When the last Ziyâdi [q.v.] had been put to death in the vizierate of the Abyssinian Mardjian by one of his Mamlûk governors Nafis, the other Nadjâh came forward to avenge him. After desperate fighting, Nafis was slain and Nadji in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 412 (Feb. 1022) entered Zabid where he had the vizier built alive into a wall in exact revenge for the Ziyâdi. As his rival Nafis had already done, Nadji assumed the insignia of royalty, struck his own coins and inserted his own name in the aqâdes after that of the 'Abbasid caliph. The latter found him himself forced to recognize him under the title al-Ma'mûn Nâjîr al-Dîn. Nadji then extended over al-Tihâma, while the highlands beyond remained divided up among petty chiefs. When among the latter the Sulahis [q.v.] came to considerable power, their relationships with the Bani Nadjiâth decisively affected the history of the latter. The first Sulâhi 'Ali is said to have had this first Nadjiâ common to the year 452 (1060) through a slave girl sent him as a present. In the confusion that followed, 'Ali occupied Zabid itself and Nadji's sons fled to the island of Dahlak [q.v.]. While the eldest Mu'ârikî committed suicide, the other two resolved to regain their lands: Sa'id al-Ahwal and Abu 'l-Tami Dâjîâsh, whose last work al-Ma'sid al-Akbar in Zabid was the foundation for 'Umâra's work (in Kay, see Bibl.). Sa'id made his preparations in a place of concealment in Zabid and had Dâjîâsh come; later they both came out openly, fell upon and killed 'Ali the Sulahish, who was on a campaign against Mecca, probably in 473 (1081). Zabid at once recognised Sa'id as its lord; he had appealed less to the Sunnis against the Shi'is than to the racial feeling of the numerous Abyssinian soldier-slaves (andalu's min kuma ut zann ka: Dâjîâsh in 'Umâra, p. 63, 74;). But Asâm, the widow of 'Ali the Sulahish who was kept a prisoner by the latter, persuaded her son al-Mukarram to relieve the town (475 = 1082–1083). The Nadjiâh again escaped to Dahlak. In 479 (1086) Sa'id again returned as ruler but in 481 (1088) was put to death at the instigation of the Sulâhi queen al-Sayîda, the wife of al-Mukarram. Dâjîâsh escaped to India with his vizier Khâlîf b. Tâhir, said to have been an Umayyad, returned to Zabid disguised as an Indian, plotted with his compatriots and easily
regained power in 482 (1089). With his death in 498 or 500 (1105-1106) disruption set in. He himself had had domestic difficulties. He executed the kadi Ibn Abi 'Akkama whom his ancestor had come to the country with the first Ziyāids; his former helper Khalaif had to seek refuge in flight. A certain degree of strain in his relations with his brother Sa'd is already evident from Djiayāsh's account and there were fierce family feuds among his descendants. His son Fātik I, the son of a girl bought in India, had to defend himself against his half-brothers Irshidhī and 'Abd al-Wahid and died young in 503 (1109-1110). The latter's infant son al-Manṣūr was set aside by his uncles, who were quarrelling with one another, and fled to Saiyida, whose favourite al-Mu'allaf b. Abi 'l-Bardakāt brought him back in 504 (1110-1111) as vassal of the Sulaḥis.

On account of the new ruler's minority, events repeated their course under the Ziyāids. The Mamlūk Amīr was Manṣūr's vizier and he even assumed royal honours. When he acquired his majority Manṣūr disposed of him by murdering him with his own hand in 517 (1123) after inviting him to his palace. Manṣūr was at once poisoned at the instigation of the next vizier Mann Allāh. In the following year, the latter was stabbed under the walls of Zabīd Nadīb al-Dawla, whom the Fatimids had sent as the Sulaḥi debt was weakening to restore their suzerainty in the land. Mann Allāh had made the boy Fātik II nominal king, the son of Manṣūr and a slave girl singer 'Alam who had been purchased from Amīr's estate. This woman (d. 545 = 1150) endeavoured with great skill to preserve the rights of her house against the encroachments of the viziers and played among the Naḍīb a part similar to that of Saiyida among the Sulaḥi. In particular she equipped and led regular caravans of pilgrims and thus unconsciously furthered the rise of 'Ali b. Mahdī who was finally to drive her own family from power. Mann Allāh in 524 (1130) was killed in a barem through a plot of 'Alam's. His successors were the Mamlūks Rusaylī and then al-Maṣrawī. Against the latter 'Alam put forward her favourites Surir and Ikhāl, who were however not on good terms. In their quarrels the various parties several times brought the petty Arab princes who lived around all about Zabīd: Ikhāl had Fātik II imprisoned (531 = 1137). As he had no heirs, he was followed by his cousin Fātik III b. Muḥammad b. Fātik I b. Djiayāsh. The government had been in the hands of Surir since 520 (1135). His career of indefatigable activity was ended in a mosque in Zabīd on the 12th Nadīb 531 (Sept. 1, 1136) by an assassin, a "Khārijī" envoy of 'Ali b. Mahdī. When the Zaidī Imām al-Mutawakkil Aḥmad b. Sulātamā was summoned to help them by the Ayyubids, he made it a first condition that Fātik should be deposed and he himself recognised as lord of Zabīd. The troops agreed to this but the victory lay with 'Ali b. Mahdī (q.v. and the article MAṢRAWĪ). On 14th Nadīb 534 (Aug. 2, 1139) he entered Zabīd.

The Banī Ziyād and the Banī Nadīb, continually brought over shiploads of Ayyubid slaves to recruit their troops and thus continued that mixture of races, which already existed before Islam and is still very marked in the Yemen plains. These Mamlūks however became a great danger for the

Ziyāids and also for the Nadīb themselves. Djiayāsh had attempted to counteract them with a bodyguard of Turkish Oğuz [cf. HISS]. But they were not suited to the climate; in particular it was impossible to establish a colony of them there permanently as their children, if they did not die, remained weaklings. The Ayyubid admixture was still further increased by the many slave-girls, who, particularly when they became mothers, exerted some political influence. The enormous harem of the notables created the most complicated family relationships. For example the settlement of the estate of the vizier Rusaylī became a notoriously difficult case in the law of inheritance which occupied the ablest foundation for years until finally a very aged Ḥaṣṣāmī found a solution in accordance with the Shāfī'ī.

Bibliography: S, the article ZA'RID, esp. Kay; also Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-Āyān, Biliwāl 1290, i. 155; Hassan F. Hamdānī, The Life and Times ofQueen Saiyidah Arwa b. Sulaḥid of the Yemen (C.C.A.S., xviii, 1931, p. 505-517); E. de Zamberti, Manuel de génie et de chronologie, Hanover 1927, p. 117-118.

(R. STROTHMANN)

AL-NADĪJSHI, designation in Arabic of the king of Abyssinia. It is a loanword from Aethiopic ṣawī, "king, prince" etc. In Arabic it is sometimes used as a proper noun, sometimes as a mere appellativum. The word is also genuine Arabic, but as such it has the meaning of driver of game. It does not occur in the Kurān. In Hādīth it is the designation of the king of Abyssinia, just as Ḳaṣār [q.v.], Kīrā [q.v.] and al-Muḳāwakṣa [q.v.] are the designations of the rulers of Kūm, Fāris and Miṣr. In their totality they represent the Great Powers which in the time of Muḥammad surrounded the territory of Islam. On the fresco in the hall of the castle of Ḳaṣār 'Amra [cf. ASHRA], dating from the middle of the viiith century A.D., al-Nadījšī appears as the fourth of these Powers, the place of the Muḳāwakṣa being taken by Thamār the Visigoth. In the Sīra the Nadījšī occupies a place of some importance, chiefly in connection with the two bid'ja's to Abyssinia, with Muḥammad's letter-persuading him to embrace Islam, with his conversion from Christianity to Islam and with his equipping two ships in behalf of the return of the emigrants to Aṣīr, amongst whom was Umm Ḥabīb, who was to marry Muḥammad (a. h. 7).

These traditions have been critically examined by Grimm, Caestani and Mrs. Vacc. Grimm denied the historical foundation of the traditions concerning Muḥammad's letters to the Great Powers. Caestani submitted the question to an elaborate enquiry. Mrs. Vacc. reduces the traditions to the following historical facts: a. the return of Ḳaṣār b. Abī Ṭālīb from Abyssinia in 7 A.H., when Muḥammad was besieging Khaibar; b. the expedition of 'Amr b. Īmāyā in a. h. 6 in order to reconduct the emigrants from Aṣīr to al-Madinah; c. vague traditions concerning the emigration from Makkah to Abyssinia. To these groups several episodes agglomerated, viz. to a. the story that Umm Ḥabīb, Abī Sufyān's daughter and widow of 'Uthmān b. Ǧaḥīf, was asked at marriage by Muḥammad and promised with a marriage-gift of 400 dinars by the Nadījšī; to b. the story of Muḥammad's letter to the Nadījšī, his embracing Islam and his becoming
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the intermediary of the conversion of 'Amr b. al-As.

In Hadith the Naḍžāši is also mentioned in connection with the story that his death in Ramadān 9 a. H. was proclaimed, without previous intimation, by Muḥammad, who held on the musqīla (q.v.) a funeral service in behalf of this fellow Muslim. As his proper name is given Aḍḥams or Aḍḥam b. Aḥbar.

The title al-Naḍžāši is also given in Arabic literature to later kings of Abyssinia, as may be seen from this article.


(A. J. Wensinck)

AL-NADJĀSHI. Kād b. 'Amr al-Hārīthi, an Arab poet of the seventh century A.D., lived at first in Naḍžāt [q.v.] and quarrelled with 'Abd al-Rahmān, son of Ḥasan b. Thābit [q.v.], because the latter had addressed in song a matrilineal female relative of Naḍžā in Medina. After an exchange of lampoons with his opponent from his native place, he met him at the annual fair at Dhu 'l-Maḍāj and again in Medina when 'Abd al-Rahmān not only proved inferior as a poet but suffered bodily injury, so that his aged father had to interfere on his behalf. Naḍžāši had a second conflict with Ibn Muḥbil, the poet of the Banī 'Adālā; he was so embittered in his defence that the caliph 'Omar punished him with imprisonment after procuring an opinion on his verses from Ḥassān and al-Huṣain. After 'Omar's assassination, Naḍžāši appeared in Kūfa as one of 'Ali's poets, and for the latter exchanged political lampoons with Mu'awiyah's poets at the battle of Siffin. But his disorderly life lost him the favour of 'Ali and after a drinking-bout in Ramadān he was given the thrashing prescribed by law and put in the pillory. After a conflict with Khān notable, in which he expressed his wrath at this punishment in satirical verses, he was exiled by 'Ali and went over to Mu'awiyah. He then went back to his native country Yaman and died in Laḥij in the year 40 (660), in which year he wrote a lament on the death of Hasan.


(E. BERTHELA)

NADJĀTI BEY, properly Yassu (Nīh), also given (it is not certain), the first great Turkish lyric poet of the pre-classical period, one of the founders of the classical Ottoman poetry. Born in Adrianople (Amasia and Kaşšān are also given), the son of a slave, obviously a Christian prisoner of war for which reason he is called 'Abd Allah, the name given to every one, he was adopted by a well-to-do lady of Adrianople, received a good education and was named by the poet Sāli. In spite of the fact that his non-Turkish origin was generally known, he was regarded as their equal in every way by the Turks in keeping with their democratic ideas. He early came to Kaššān and there began his poetic career and soon gained a great reputation. His poems are said here and there to bear traces of the Kaššān dialect. Coming to Constantinople, he at once gained the favour of Sultan Muḥammed II by a ḥāṣida on winter; in 886 (1481)
he celebrated the accession of Bayazid II in a kapida and was rewarded by an appointment as secretary in the Divan. He gained such favour with the Sultan that he was appointed secretary to his eldest son 'Abd Allâh and was given the title of vezir when the prince went to Kâtib as governor (mustafâr). After the prince's early death (888 = 1483) Nadîjî returned to Constantinople with an elegy on the death of the prince which showed deep emotion. After a long interval in which he wrote a great deal but was in continual need, through the influence of Mu'ayyad-Zâde [q.v.] he became mînâqâbî to Bayazid's younger son Mahmûd when the latter went to Sârîkhân in 910 (1504). Nadîjî wrote his finest verse while on the staff of this prince; this was the happiest period of his life. Mahmûd also died prematurely in 915 (1507) in Manisa, the capital of Sârîkhân, and Nadîjî again lost his patron. He returned with a happy elogy to Constantinople and finally retired from the service of the court on a modest pension. He took a house on the Wefa Mâdâlîn where many friends gathered round him, especially his pupils, the poet and teacher ârif Edirnehi Schi and the poet Schi. Nadîjî died on the 25th Dîn 'l-Ka'da 914 (March 17, 1509). He was buried near his own house, at the monastery of Seven Weﬁs and a tombstone was put up by Schi for him.

He left a Divan which he had collected on the advice of Mu'ayyad-Zâde and dedicated to prince Mahmûd. There is also attributed to him a mesnevî, which is not otherwise known, entitled Mûnâqâbât-ı Gûl-u Khûrov, also quoted as Lâlî-u Mûnâqâbât and Mîhâr-u Mûhâr. Even more uncertain seems to be the existence of the mesnevî mentioned by Schi: Gûl-u Şahî. Nadîjî is also mentioned as a translator of Persian works but his pupil Schi says nothing of this. He is said to have translated for prince Mahmûd the Kimeyû-ı Seherî of Imâm Ghażâlî (the Persian version of the Arabic Ihwâ'î) and the Jâmî-u al-Hikâyât (properly Dânâmûl-ı Hikâyêt wa-Lâmûn-ı al-Kiwâyêt) from the Persian of Dâmî-u al-Dîn al-Àwfit.

His Divan which is still unprinted, gives Nadîjî a very prominent place in Ottoman literature; the Divan was regarded as a model for all Ottoman poets. Nadîjî, whom İdris Bilidî in his Hikâyât calls Khorrov-ı Şahâverdî Rûm and others Malik al-Shâvarâdî and Tâbi-ı Rûm (= the Farsaw of Asia Minor), was regarded as the poet of Rûm. He does not, it is true, reach the heights that Nezîmi does but he surpasses all his predecessors, of whom Ahmad Pasha and Zât were the greatest, in originality and creative power. Only Bâkî and Fûzî have surpassed him. The problem to be solved by Ahmad Pasha, Nadîjî and Zât was to incorporate completely into Turkish the matter borrowed and translated from Persian literature, which was still felt to be foreign, to adapt Turkish to Perso-Arabic metres and to domesticate fully the Arabic and Persian vocabulary. This was a great achievement for the time. Nadîjî brought about a great change in the literature as regards outlook, feeling and language. In him the age of Sultan Bayazid was most clearly reflected. Although he is not to be claimed as a very great poet, he was the king of the gild of poets of his time, who started a great literary movement. Nadîjî combined a thorough knowledge of Persian with a masterly command of Turkish. In the number of his ghazals he far surpasses Bâkî. His work as a poet of kapidas was original and stimulating. He was specially celebrated for his skill in the use of the proverb.


(Th. Mencel)
is an act of obedience (gūdā); complete faith is the sum of all gūdā. Faith may increase but unbelief can be completely removed only through unbelief. He who commits a heinous sin and dies impious is doomed to hell from which he will emerge however, unlike the complete infidel. Al-Nadjjār denied the punishment of the tomb (zāfāt al-tārār), probably as a result of his determinism. — Al-Nadjjār like his master Bihār represents the reformed and modified Dāhimiyya. The influence of the Muṭāsila theology on this school is manifest; on the other hand, the Muṭāsila itself, especially that of Bāghdād, seems to have received certain quite important stimuli from his school in spite of its opposition to it. Several of Al-Nadjjār’s doctrines are found at a later date in al-Askāri. — The Nadjjadariyya flourished in Rāyi and Gurgān. It was divided into three schools: 1. the Burghuṭthiya, the followers of Muḥammad b. ‘Isa Burghūṭ; 2. the ‘Azāfarānīya, the followers of a certain Abu ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Azāfarān; 3. the Mustadrīkā, a reforming party which taught paradoxical doctrines on the divine word.


(H. S. Nyberg)

Mu‘allim Nadjī, properly ‘Omer, an important Ottoman author, poet, critic and man of letters, who occupies a special and somewhat hybrid position in the history of the Turkish moderns and has given his name to a whole literary period. Born in 1866 (1850) in Constantinople, the third son of a master saddler ‘Ali Aga (not Bey, as some literary historians say), he lost his father at the age of seven. The widow Fāṭma al-Zehrī, who was descended from a mahājirī who had come to Constantinople from Rumelia, went to Varna to her brother, the Kalaydījī ‘Alīyūs Aga. The latter in spite of his limited means, made it possible for ‘Omer to be educated at the medreses and ‘Omer’s elder brother Sālim gave him considerable assistance. ‘Omer devoted himself at first to calligraphy and for his income used the mahājīr Khulāṣī. A certain Khlīdī Khān aroused in him a fondness for poetry and he took the mahājīr Nadjī for his poems (from a passage in the Mahājīrat al-‘Azn ‘Alī Giri). He also tried to obtain the title of ḥājī. His training in the medreses left a permanent influence on him. It was only later that he decided to put off the turban and the ḥājī. The spirit of the mukallī and a certain intolerant fanaticism however never left him.

In 1884 (1867) Nadjī received an appointment as second master in the Rūmhīyye school in Varna. At an inspection the then mutaqqarr of Varna, Kārīm Sa’īd Paša (later Foreign Minister, President of the Council of State and several times an ambassador), made the acquaintance of the intelligent young teacher. He took him into his service as secretary, when he was moved to Tullia just before the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war in 1877; thence he was moved to Tarnopol and later to ‘Osmān Paša. Nadjī accompanied the much traveled Paša on his moves and journeys. After a brief stay in Constantinople, he went to ‘Umar Sheher Fennār (= Farissa in Tuesdays) where Nadjī met the acquaintance of the poet and Mārekīlī ‘Awnī Bey, who had a very good knowledge of Persian. Nadjī who acted as secretary to the court and judge of investigation had here finally to lay aside the turban. When Sa‘īd Paša set out on a nine-months’ tour of inspection in Asia Minor, the Euphrates and Erzerum, Nadjī again accompanied him. He recorded his impressions in the poem Shāhī al-Gharāīn. He had abandoned himself with other congenial wits to a life of dissipation at Tawāk Paša, both earlier and after his return to Constantinople. The transfer of the Paša as wālī of the Aegean islands to Chios, where Nadjī acted as wānīyīs saved him from this. Here he was able fully to develop his literary leanings. Already in 1892 he had published poems and articles in Varna in the Tuna newspaper of which some were even reprinted by the Constantinople paper Baṣṣīrī, such as his Bis Mu‘allimīn Shāhī al-Gharāīn. From Chios he began his association with ‘Azīd Muḥīt Efendi who was then editing the Terciğmān-ı Haftārī; from his contributions in poetry and prose, which appeared in the Terciğmān over the pseudonym Muḥammad Maṣūd and Muḥammad l-‘Āṣīrāsī, a close friendship arose which proved of decisive influence on his future career. When Sa‘īd Paša went as ambassador to Berlin, Nadjī declined to go with him, which was much to be regretted in the interests of his literary development. He therefore resigned his post in the Foreign Ministry and devoted himself entirely to authorship. Muḥīt gave him the editorship of the newly formed literary section of his paper. At the suggestion of Muḥīt, whose son-in-law he had become, he learned French although he was now over 30. When he left the Terciğmān for literary reasons, he undertook the editorship of the Şehīd newspaper.

By his great literary and critical activity, he gained an influence which can hardly be estimated high enough on the intellectual life of Turkey in his time, not least through his position as lecturer on Turkish literature at the Mektebi ‘Ṣūlānī in Galata Sarai and in the law school. He became celebrated under the name Mu‘allim (teacher) of which he was particularly proud. In 1907 (1889) he was appointed by imperial iridd Türk literature historiographer, Turāk-himāsāt-ı A‘lī ‘Owāna, as a reward for his historical poem Ertişgärât Gāzī. But he did not live to do anything serious in this field except an introduction which survives in MS. He died on 27th Ramādān 1310 (April 14, 1893), at the age of 43 from heart failure and was buried in the garden of the türbe of Sultan Maḥmūd.

As a literary figure, Nadjī revealed two aspects. On the one hand, he was a fanatical admirer of the old literature out of which he had developed and for which he endeavoured to revive the taste of his milieu by every means, by his modest poetic talent and considerable skill in versification; on the other hand, he seemed in sympathy with the moderns but in view of his convinced belief in the decadence of western culture he had little real understanding of them.

Nadjī’s services to Turkish prose are undeniable. Over 50 years ago he was already writing the prose of the future, a model, clear, simple, style in the
language of a master who could not be surpassed. Two years before Sexký’s celebrated  
Kriech Schiller (1309) with its complicated prose, Nadji gave a  
classic specimen of simple prose, in his Osmanî  
Câgâvelâghu (1307) which was only properly  
appreciated and imitated at a much later date. In it  
we find the first suggestions of Turkish realism.  
The forms not cultivated by the old writers,  
the story and the drama, he did not use, it is true,  
entirely omit, but apart from autobiographical  
sketches and a translation from Zola, he wrote  
no stories and he was a failure as a dramatist.  
In theory, it seemed sufficient to him and his  
followers to put French stories of crime into the  
örtü evnun form in order to produce regular  
Turkish “dramas”. Here also he approximated to  
the moderns but did not reach their level or  
ability.

As a poet and artist he is weak. He lacks  
savour and creative fancy. He lacks that depth  
of feeling which carries one away; with him  
everything is trivial and superficial, and he never  
feels or expresses anything deeply. His prose style  
is simple and easy, the sentences short, the mode  
of expression concise and clear.

His main importance lies in his wide influence  
as a teacher, which he exercised not so much in  
the actual class-room as through his whole literary  
activity.

As a critic he confines himself to externals  
and goes no further.

Nadji’s prolific versatility is best shown by  
a list of his works. He wrote on many subjects  
and frequently lacked the time for adequate  
preparation.

Of his poetical works, the most celebrated is  
the collection Ateş-fârû (1300, 2nd edition 1303),  
which contains 52 poems in the new western  
manner. The best in it are: Tepkî, Kibîhâ,  
Koza, Şâm-i Gâhilân, Nisâhâ dîvûlmende hâr  
Wûth, Tawari, Şâhîzade, Avîyâ. — Next come  
two collections of ghazels in the old style: Şûrâs  
1301 and Fârûkân; then three historical poems:  
Hemîyet yahbâd Mîrûdî, Ehl-i Gâhilân, a description  
of heroic deeds in Granada in the time of the  
historian Ahi Abî Askâh al-Saghîr; Zât al-Nîbîyân,  
the heroic conduct of Esmâ’, daughter of  
Abî Bakr, at the siege of Mecca with regard to  
her son Abîd Abîl h. Zuhair; Gâhil Erzûgîl  
Bay, ef. above; first printed after his death in  
Khatim-i Fârûkân, 1310, ii., N. 11, 12. On  
the Egîrî Salâmânî-ermânîyef written in conjunction  
with A. Midhat cf. ‘Ali Emiri, in T.O.E., v., N. 27,  
1330, p. 131; other poetical works are: Tepkî  
Bend or Tûrîkî Bend, an imitation of Rûmî-  
Baghdâdî and Ziya Pesba; Tepkî yahbâd ‘Arîsî  
Nûmîhârî, Memûnî-î Mu‘allîn Nadji and a  
collection of fugitive pieces edited by Shaikh  
Wâsî after Nadji’s death: Vilâyêt-i Nadji, 1314.

Of his prose works the best known and most  
important is Siyamî (1399 and 1307). The first  
part contains poems like Kala-Tir for Miskûkî,  
which is very important for the development of  
the French Turkish poem, and translations from  
the French. The second part: Osmanî  
Câgâvelâghu, gives in unaffected style intimate memories of his  
childhood up to the age of eight and has several times  
been translated: into German by A. Merx, Aus  
Muallîn Nâdiqîs Siyamî: Die Geschichte seiner  
Kindheit, Berlin 1898; into Russian: VI. Gorgievskîj,  
Dëîtivî Omara, Afsbiographilcjskij vecherb,  
Moscow 1914; and into Czech: Jan Rybyna, Omares  
Dëittance u du jeho vela hova, in Blih, Sevobâl  
KVTâhov, Prag. — Memories of his student days  
were published in the Targumunâ-i Hâşîhît and  
entitled Mecdes Mecarii, 1302; to the same year  
belongs Şenemülîseri Şâyûthâ (Mu‘allî-î  
Etn-i Zîyâ, N. 47); also Yemâhî bâlâmûm,  
1301 (letters and verses in simple language);  
Khurârî Fârîh (verses and sayings of Arab and  
Persian men of letters, 2 parts). — A strongly  
personal note marks his Devâni (the title is  
chosen in allusion to Ekrem’s Zemâne), a criticism  
of Memûnî-î Zülhü Tahtâ’i Tahtâ’i Ehlî, but it  
is primarily directed against Ekrem and his  
pronouncements on the stupidity of writing prose;  
it was so personal that its continuation was officially  
forbidden. — Equally vigorous is the criticism of  
the newspaper Mâhû and its owner Mu‘âzîn  
Bay in Nadji’s Mecdes Mecarii, 1314. —  
Translations and commentaries are found in  
Sîrîs ânh, 1305 (first published in Mecdes el-Medâd:  
verses and sayings of the Persian poet  
Sûlîbî Tehrî with commentary); Sîrîhâ el-Arbâb  
(over 1.000 Arabic maxims with notes);  
Sîrîhâ el-Anjâm (Persian maxims).  — Religious  
in content are: İfâ-sî Karâm, 2nd ed., 1308  
(translation of the treatise by Fakîr al-Dîn al-Râzî  
on the Fârat: Essîr-i şelâyî in the Mu‘allî  
l-Gâhilân, first appeared in the Targumunân);  
Sâmîrî Karâm, Mu‘âmînî-î zîyâ (on the  
Hesâîl al-selâyî at the beginning of certain Sûtras);  
Khurâsî el-İbâhâ, 1304, the commentary on Sûrâ  
cxii. (el-İbâhî) translated from the Tepkî-i  
hebat; Esmâ‘îl ‘Ali, sayings of the calliph  
‘Ali (Khâhidî-î Etn-i Zîyâ, N. 1); Hikém el-Rıfî‘î (sayings  
of Saydî Ahmîd el-Rıfî‘î);  
Nevâdîr el-İbâhî (wise sayings  
of Muslim celebrities);  
‘Abû-lînî, 1305 (Persian  
originals and translations);  
Mecdes, 1304:  
translations from Arabic, Persian and French;  
Mu‘allî-î  
and Mu‘allî-î Mu‘allîn Mu‘allûlî, 1306: literary essays  
based on a collected volume in AS, by an otherwise  
unknown M. Masâ’llî 1279; Nûmîhârî-î  
(‘All the selection from celebrated authors).

— His correspondence:  
Mebûlîhâ, 1305 and 1311  
(correspondence with his friends and pupils);  
Mebûlîhârî-î we-Mebûlîhârî, 1311  
(correspondence with A. Midhat);  
Şîhêl böle (correspondence with  
Shaikh Wâsî);  
Ibâhâhû, 1304 (correspondence with  
Behtûr Fu‘ad on V. Hugo). — Works on literary  
criticism: Mu‘allîn: a collection of expositions of  
his critical theory which had appeared in the  
Targumunân and were regarded in their days as  
of fundamental importance; Mu‘allî-î Mu‘allîn,  
1305—1306: a collection of the literary lectures  
which he had given in the Sûhîtan and the Law  
School (58 in number, N. 1—5 even reached a third  
edition); İsfâhânî-î cibyûbî, 1307 and 1314, his  
celebrated masterpiece on literary history, really  
only concerned with style; also Mekûhî el-İbêh, 1320.  
— His important lexico graphical works include:  
Qatîr-i ‘asami, 1306, only 5 parts; first  
appeared in the Müma’unan: Lâhûtî-î Nûmîh =  
Lâhûtî-î Mürkîmî, 1317: Nâmînî-î  
Firîdûn as art. Firîdûn, the remainder p. 356—  
1426 was prepared by his friend Müstedîj-sâde  
İsmet Bay. — The biographical works:  
Qatîrîlî Şâhîlîrî, 1307, 2 parts (biographies of 15  
Ottoman poets);  
Eümî, 1308, about 850 somewhat  
arbitrarily chosen biographies in the style of  
the old Teshîrî: — His only drama Hûdî (Hûsîn  
Bay yahbâd Hadîf), 1326; Tûrî Rûhî, the  
translation of Zola’s Thérèse Raquin; a promised
transliteration of Fényon: "Türkîyî-i Büniyî never appeared.

The four parts of his much used Ta'lim-i Kirâzî, from 1300 on, were largely responsible for the development and spread of Naqdi's style in the widest circles. The first part reached the 3rd edition by 1320.

Augustus but never published were the following: Ahemî-i millî, Muhammedî-i Râghîb (on Koda Râghîb), Ferekî-i Terkîhî, Terkebendten Terkebend.

Naqdi was a contributor to a number of papers and magazines: the Terfûnî 20-23 Hejârî, the Şâkîle, Wâfigh, the periodicals Âga, Gencî Kesimler, Medâd-es-Imâmâd, Coğrafî Bahzîrî etc.

With Naqdi neo-classicism came to an end although his followers, especially 2 Alt Kemal, made several attempts to revive it again in the Iltâm against H. Djdâlî and in the Şâdî against Dendzê Shîhâb dîn. The movement did not yet get beyond these efforts, for his followers were as little able as Naqdi himself to produce works of permanent value. The present generation has advanced quite out of Naqdi's world.


(Th. Menzel)

NADJIS (A.), impure, opp. 2 badî, cf. TAHA. According to the Shi'i doctrine, as systematised by al-Nawawî (Munkhîfî, l. 35 sqq.; cf. Ghânî, al-Waqqîfî, l. 6 sqq.), the following are the things impure in themselves: wine and other spirituous drinks, dogs, swine, mudda, blood and excrements; milk of animals whose flesh is not eaten.

Regarding these groups the following may be remarked. On wine and other spirituous drinks cf. the art. XAMAR and NADJIS. — Dogs are not declared impure in the Qur'an; on the contrary, in the description of the sleepers in Surât al-xvili, the dog is included (verses 17, 21). In Âhadîth, however, the general attitude against dogs is very strong, as may be seen in the art. KALE. Goldâner considers this change due to the attitude of conscious contrast (mekûhîfî) to the estimate of dogs in Paräzim. It must not, however, be forgotten that the Jews also declared dogs impure animals, just as wine. The latter are already declared forbidden food in the Qur'an (Surât xvi. 116; vi. 146; v. 47; ii. 168). — As to mudda, cf. the article. — Blood is mentioned in the Qur'an (Surât xvi. 116; vi. 146; v. 47; ii. 168) as prohibited food. As to the religious background of this prohibition cf. the art. MATTIA. — As for excrements and several kinds of secretions of the body, the theory and practice of Jews and Christians sufficiently explain the attitude of Islam in this respect. It must also be admitted, though data are very scarce, that in early Arabic religious impurity included some of these things. — Details are to be found in the large legal works of each of the madhâbi (cf. BIBL.).

The differences of the schools regarding this subject the most important only may be mentioned. Spirituous drinks are not impure according to the Hanafî (cf. MADHÂBI). Living swine are not impure according to the Malikî. — The Shi'a adds to the things mentioned above the human corpse and the infidels. The human corpse was one of the chief sources of impurity according to Jewish ideas (cf. already NA'SUM, ch. xix.). A current in early Islam tending to follow the Jewish customs in ceremonial law was very strong; the Shi'a view regarding the human corpse may be a residue of it. — The impurity of infidels is based upon Surât iv. 28, where the polytheists are declared to be filthy (nadjîs). The Sunni schools do not follow the Shi'a in the exegesis of this verse.

The nadjîs enumerated above cannot be purified, in contradistinction to things which are defiled only (mustânâmâkîfî), with the exception of wine, which becomes pure when made into vinegar, and of hides, which are purified by tanning. On purification cf. the art. TAHA, SÜKL, WÂDÎ.


NADJIM AL-DIN KUBRÀ, the founder of the order of the Kuharwîyâ or Džâhâbî, is one of the most striking personalities among the Persian Sûfîs of the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. A large number of popular legends are associated with his name, many of which are not yet forgotten at the present day in Central Persia. His importance for the development of Sûfî is very considerable and in the long series of his pupils we find many distinguished representatives of Sûfî.
teaching. Nadjm al-Din, whose full name was Ahmad b. 'Umar Abu l-'Djamāh Nadjm al-Din al-Kuhrā of al-Khawārizm with the honorific title el-Timmat al-Sūr (the "greatest visitation"). Stru lxxix. 34) and Shāhīd al-Wali' sharīq (the Shāhīd who prepares saints) was born in the town of Khwārizm in 540 (1145), spent his youth in travel during which he met in Egypt the famous Shāhīd Rūzbihān al-Wazāzin al-Māfī. He became his murīd and under the supervision of the Shāhīd went through a course of most rigid ascetic discipline. The youth won the favor of his teacher who gave him his daughter's wife and adopted him as a son. Nadjm al-Din spent some years in Egypt where two sons were born to him. One day he heard the lectures on the sunna given by Imām Abū Najīr Ḥāḍa in Tūbārīs highly praised. He once went off to Tūbārīs and studied there under the direction of this theologian who lived in the Khwārizmī Khażānā in the Samānīd quarter. There Nadjm wrote his first theological treatise, a kind of inaugural dissertation entitled Shārīq al-Sunna wa l-Maqālīd. During a disputation which arose out of this work he made the acquaintance of the Shāhīd Bābā Faramāshī Tūbārī whose influence he decided to give up the study of theology and devote himself entirely to the contemplative life of the mystic. Bābā Faramāshī regarded all learning as something superfluous; in his view true knowledge could only be obtained through divine illumination. Nadjm al-Din soon recognized that he could hardly come any nearer his goal by this route. He turned to Shāhīd 'Abdullāh Yāsr who advised him to train as a complete Sūfī in the school of Ismā'īl Kāṣīrī. Nadjm al-Din received his second khirka at the hands of the latter, a so-called khirka sharra ("khirka of blessing"). After his return to his first teacher Shāhīd Rūzbihān he realized that the latter had found that he had thoroughly grasped all the depths of Sūfī learning and recommended him to transfer his activities to his native land of Khwārizm. Nadjm al-Din settled there with his family on a khanqāh and founded the order of the Khwārizmī Khażānā or Dhamhūrā. His teaching met with great success and he soon found himself surrounded by pupils among whom were the most distinguished Sūfīs of the xith-xiiith century such as Mājād al-Din Baghādādī (the Shāhīd of the famous poet Farīd al-Dīn Attār), Sa'd al-Dīn Hamawī, Bābā Kamāl Dāndā, Shāhīd Rādī al-Dīn 'Ali Lābī, Saif al-Dīn Bakhtāzī, Nadjm al-Dīn Rāsī and many others. Bābā al-Dīn Wāslād, the father of the great Dālāl al-Dīn Ramī, is also said to have been his pupil, but this is hardly possible. Nadjm al-Din met his death on 10th Dhumād 1 618 (July 13, 1226) at the taking of Khwārizm by the Mongols. All his biographers are agreed that the Shāhīd had gone out to meet the enemy in the open field and met a man's death with weapon in hand. The Institute for Oriental Research in Leningrad possesses a manuscript in Eastern Turkīt entitled Shāhīd Nadjm al-Dīn al-Khara'īnī. Shāhīd al-Khara'īnī al-Khara'īnī al-Khara'īnī (How Shāhīd Nadjm al-Dīn was murdered and the town of Khwārizm destroyed). It is a kind of historical novel dealing with the last days of Khwārizm and its fall. Nadjm al-Din appears in it as the protector of the city against the Mongols. By his power he makes Khwārizm invisible to the enemy and it only falls into the hands of the conquerors after the Shāhīd decides to surrender it. It is possible that this book is a version of a Persian biography of Nadjm al-Dīn called Taḥfīz al-Fīrahānī and mentioned by Ḥādhā Khaṭīb (i. 354).

Nadjm al-Din was a prolific writer and left a number of valuable treatises on different questions of Shī'ism. The greater part of his works are written in Arabic. Ḥādhā Khaṭīb gives the following list of his works: 1. al-Qaṣīd al-Sawāq (i. 353) — a brief exposition of the ten fundamental principles of Shī'ism (printed in Constantinople in 1256 with a Turkish commentary); 2. Isdālā 'l-Sūrā (iii. 410—411) — or more correctly fi Ḥim al-Sittah, described in Ahlwardt's, No. 3456; 3. Isdālā 'l-Sūrā (iii. 418) — in Ahlwardt's, No. 3727—3727 f. 'l-Sūrā (possibly identical with No. 1); 4. Niqād al-S prévu (iv. 171) — unknown to me; 5. Fathalājī al-Dīmārī in Persian — a treatise with this title is given in Flügel, Wiss. Katalog, i. 332, except that the latter is described as in Arabic; 6. Ulūmat al-Lavām — or with the full title al-Khula'f al-khāsim min Ulūmat al-Lavām in Ahlwardt's, No. 3087; 7. Hidāyah al-Tāhbīn — unknown; 8. Tafsīr — probably the great commentary on the Kurʿān entitled A'in al-Hayāt, whose first volume I discovered in the Public Library in Leningrad (see Islamica, vol. 1, fasc. 2—3, p. 272).

Nadjm al-Din is also known as a composer of Persian quatrains but it is still very difficult to decide whether the quatrains attributed to him are really his. Twenty-five of these poems were published in the Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de Russie (1924, p. 36).

The Sīfī writings of Nadjm al-Dīn form a transition from the older Sīfī of the first theorists (the Isfahānī school of the xith—xiiith centuries) to the later Sīfī of Ibn al-'Arabī and his successors (Ṣadr al-Dīn Kūsawī, Fakhr al-Dīn Ṭalārī). Like the earlier theorists Nadjm al-Dīn likes to deal especially with the practice of Sīfī, the stations, on the way to true knowledge. Metaphysical questions however are also considered by him and his works with the writings of Ibn al-'Arabī form the basis for the further development of philosophical theory in the xiiith century. This is not the place to go fully into his conception of Sīfī; but it is not to be doubted that his teaching can hardly be neglected in a careful investigation of the history of the development of Sīfī.

Bibliography: Safmat al-Awliyā (MS. Inst. Orient., No. 384, fol. 1069); Khazmat al-Asīrī, Bombay, ii. 258; Nasbat al-Uni, ed. Lees, p. 520; Tarikh-i Gūci, ed. Browne, p. 789; Rūfi'Tulim (MS. Inst. Orient., No. 603, fol. 462); Maṣāfīr al-Dīn Shahrābakh, Bombay, p. 84; Rūfi'Tulim, i. 143; Aḥmadī, p. 103; Tarikh-i-Haḍāzī, ii. 48, 149; Maṣāfīr al-Mulūm, fol. 130v; Roverty, Tābahāt-Nāṣirī, p. 1100; Massignon, al-Hallādī, Bibliography, No. 391; Brockleman, G. A., i. 400; Tafsīr al-Mu'ākāri, ed. Browne, p. 135—136; Browne, Literary History of Persia, ii. 438, 489, 491—495, 508 510. (E. BEKTHEL)

NADJRĀN, a district (Wūdī) and town in northern Yemen, according to others (Ibn Khurda'bbih, B. G. A., vi. 133, 248) in southern Nadjrān or in the Ḥadās (Bakri, Maṣūfī, p. 575). The position and course of the Wūdī has not been exactly ascertained. It rises on the eastern slopes of the Yemen highlands, probably between 43°
and 44° East Long., and runs, perhaps turning north at first, mainly in a southeasterly direction behind 18° and 17° N. Lat. finally disappearing in the great sand desert. The distance from ‘Amāh [q.v.] is put at 6–7 days’ journey (E. Glaser, *Die Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, ii. 50); according to Philybi’s investigations (*The Heart of Arabia*, ii. 166 sq.), it is seven days’ reasonable journey south of Sulaqiyah. The older idea that the course of the Wādī Nadjaran ran N.E. (or that there was a more northerly twin Wādī Habūrā) arose out of the erroneous idea first finally corrected by Philybi (op. cit., p. 165, 222) that the Wādī Dawaisīt, with which the Wādī Nadjaran was wrongly thought to be connected, runs from S.W. to N.E.

The Wādī Nadjaran drains a wide area of northern Yemen and ‘Arab (Hamdān, *Fr. Drasat al-Arab*, p. 83, 110, 114, 247). It is, and was in antiquity, celebrated for its fertility. Of European travellers only Joseph Halévy visited it, in the spring of 1830. He describes (*Bull. de la Soc. de Géogr.*, series vi., vol. xiii., p. 478) the valley, some 2 miles broad, as exceedingly fertile and well-cultivated with villages concealed in thick palm-proves. Starkey (xvi. 281) calls it a peaceful and rich country. To Muslim writers it is a miracle of fertility and wealth, even more so than the Yemen in general; its corn, vegetables, and fruits were unrivalled (Hamdān, p. 190 sq.); there were also mines there (Baldhurst, *Kiṣā‘ Khurāṣ al-Balṭān*, p. 14) and the staple products of the Yemen, leather and cloth, were also made there.

To this day in less favoured parts of Arabia they talk of the prosperity of this Wādī (Philybi, op. cit., ii. 226).

The population of the Wādī Nadjaran, according to Philybi, is comparatively large; the majority belong to the tribe of Yam. But several unrelated tribes, often at enmity with one another, share in the possession of this rich country. It was so in the early Muslim period. The Banu ‘Harith b. Kalb, who appear in Hadīth as lords of Nadjaran, were not really such. They belong to the largest group of tribes Madāḥ, which was represented by other tribes also. Their rivals were and are Hamdān tribes (Hamdān, p. 115, 9) among them Hadhīq, important for the present day, (subdivisions Yam etc.) and Bakr (subdivisions Ḥāshir etc.); other tribes like al-Ad, al-A’r etc. should also be mentioned. We have no reliable information about places with a settled population. In the eastern part of the Wādī, Halévy visited a village of Makhlaf which was afterwards put on the maps at hazard. In the immediate vicinity was another village Ridjāf, and an hour to the west Madnāt al-Khdhādīf (see below). The Arab geographers mention villages (*fuṣūr*) of Nadjaran and the names of some of them are given as well as those of districts, tributary wāds, hills and springs.

Through Nadjaran runs the very old caravan road from Hadramawt through the Hījāz to the eastern Mediterranean [cf. **Mar‘ib**]. Nadjaran was of some importance as the last station in the Yemen on a caravan route from the Yemen to al-Yamān and thence to Bahrain and the *Jībāl*. During Persian rule in the Yemen and later in the *Abāsids* period this road must have been of no less importance than the one just mentioned to Syria, which latter however owing to its importance in

the early period of Islam is almost alone mentioned in Muslim literature (A. M. Hoer, *The Book of the Himyarites*, p. lxxii.; cf. also M. Hartmann, *Die Sudan*, Fragm. p. 496, 505). On the stations on the road see Ibn Khuradhdhu (B. G. A., vi. p. 152 sq. and 193; A. Spruner, *Post- und Reiterpfäte*, p. 134–139); a series of forts served to keep it safe (Spruner, op. cit., p. 138; Hamdān, B. G. A., p. 28; Vāqū, *Majma‘ al-Balṭān*, iv. p. 541 sq.) built on the present importance of the road axis of Nadjaran, see Philybi, op. cit., ii. 226. The road from those days probably went several days’ journey across the desert to the Wādī Dawaisīt, which was the first station on the other side; at the present day Sulaqiyah [q.v.] corresponds to it. The road via Nadjaran was certainly that which connected the Yemen at different times with the ancient Babylonia in the east, with Syriac Christian as well as with Jewish culture.

Little is known of the town of Nadjaran. Ploemey mentions it as a metropolis. Adelin Gallus attacked and destroyed it (Strabo, loc. cit., Pliny, vii. 28 [32]). From this Glaser (loc. cit., ii. 50; cf. p. 224) concludes that there was no town of Nadjaran after this: but the existence of the town is proved in many ways for various later periods (see below). Now however, no town seems to be the name. Halévy thought he had found the ruins of the old town in Madnāt al-Khdhādīf (see below), which he describes as considerable ruins on the south bank of the river bed. Of the city wall roughly built of granite the south and west sides were less destroyed than the others. A mosque, which still stood among the ruins, belonged, according to local traditions, to the early Muslim or even pre-Islamic period (*Jāzirat al-Khdhādīf*, see iv. 50 and 40). In remarkable agreement with this, Bakrī, *Majma‘* p. 80 says: al-Ukhūdūd, which is mentioned in the *Kurān*, was in one of the towns of Nadjaran. This city however is now in ruins and nothing is left of it but the mosque which ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb built’.

On the history of Nadjaran we have only scanty and mainly legendary notes. The name occurs several times in the South Arabian inscriptions: there is one (C. S. L., iv. No. 363) reference to the ‘towns’ of Nadjaran (nāṣir N., cf. above *fuṣūr N.*). This means the Wādī. In the oldest inscription of north Arabia, the Namāra inscription of the year 328, the name is also found.

In the tradition of the introduction of Christianity into the Yemen, Nadjaran plays a part in keeping with its importance for the communications between Yemen and Mesopotamia (see above). According to one reference (*Histoire Néerominien*, ed. Adelchi Scher, i. 218 sq.) called *Patrol. Orient.*, lxiii. 350), it was a merchant of Nadjaran who first spread Christianity there after he had been converted in al-Hira. Christianity is said to have received a further impetus in the time of Justinian from monophysite Christians who, expelled from Byzantine territory, came to al-Nadjaran also via Hira (op. cit., ii. 51 sq.).

The Christian tradition of later persecutions of the Christians in South Arabia connected with Abyssinian invasions of the Yemen is widely disseminated; Nadjaran was the principal scene of these, first perhaps under Sharaḥ ibn Yakkuf in the last third of the 5th century, notably under Dhl Nuwadh, who died in 525. On this tradition
which exists in many forms, Greek, Syriac and Ethiopic, see A. Moberg, *The Book of the Hymnaries*, p. xxiv.—Isiš, where the sources and other literature to be consulted are given.

Arabic literature has also something to say about these happenings, especially in the annotations of the Kūrān exegists on Sūra lxxv. 4 sqq. on the Ḥāsh al-Ukhḍūl. But what there is of historical value in this Muslim tradition comes from Christian sources; only it is usually so distorted as to be almost unrecognizable. What it records regarding the introduction of Christianity into Najdrān by a certain Faimiyya or Abū Allāh b. al-Thamīr is on the other hand a distortion of certain episodes in a Syrian Christian cycle of legends about the Persian martyr Pethion and Vasilius and has really nothing to do with Najdrān or Arabia (A. Moberg, *Über einige christliche Legenden in der arabischen Tradition*, p. 213). The name Madinsat al-Khudūl from the last published in Najdrān. Hambūr (op. cit., p. 67, 169) mentions in the same region a Balad or town of al-Ukhḍūl; C. van Arendt mentions a hill Ukhḍūl (*De opsmant van het sentimentele Ismaïrisme in Yemen*, p. 168).

It is not till the time of Muhammad and the early Caliphs that we have really historical references to the Yaman and even these have to be critically used. We are told that Khălid was sent with 400 horsemen to the Banū l-Ḥadr b. Kaʿb (and the Banū `Abd al-Mādīn: Ibn Sād, n.l. 112, 3) in Najdrān and made them adopt Islam and send an embassy in homage to the Prophet (Ibn Hīshām, p. 958; Ibn Sād, n.l. 72). `Amr b. Ḥazm was appointed ḥāmil in Najdrān and `Ali was ordered to collect the subūṣ there (Wāṣīl=Wellhausen, p. 417 sqq.; Ibn Sād, n.l. 122). In addition to pagans and Jews there were many Christians who formed, it seems, an autonomous community. Muhammad received an embassy from them also and concluded a treaty with them which guaranteed possession of their property and the free exercise of their religion in return for a fixed contribution on their part (Ibn Hīshām, p. 401 sqq.; Ibn Sād, n.l. 84 sqq., 35 sqq.). This treaty was confirmed by Abū Bakr and `Omar. `Omar however, at a later datedrove the Christians and Jews out of the Arabian peninsula whereupon the Christians founded a new Najdrān in the Irāq, two days' journey south of Kūsa. The details are variously recorded and it is not quite clear to what extent `Omar's orders were actually enforced. Bakr (op. cit.) says that the Jews and Christians in Najdrān were not at all affected by the measure.

In any case, at a much later date (see just below), there were not a few Christians in Najdrān and there are of course still many Jews in the Yaman. In the year 40 a. H. Najdrān was burned by Djamra, `Alt's general (Tabari, l. 3452). The soantness of the historical tradition, fantastic accounts, wealth of the region and the remarkable liberty enjoyed by Christians in Najdrān gave rise to legends and inspired poets. The "material" which these stories are very fully detailed and utilised in H. Lammens, *Le Califat de Yashīr le 1er* (M. F. O. B., n.l. 347—369).

In the end we find Najdrān an important fortified town, often simply called al-Najdrān (cf. Hambūr, p. 85), mentioned in the accounts of the fighting which led to the creation of the `Zalād imamate in the Yaman in the third century A.H. At this period there were still Christians and Jews there, who were obviously still an important element and enjoyed considerable consideration from their Muslim neighbours (van Arendt, op. cit., p. 128 sqq.). On bishops of the Najdrānians or in the Yaman in the ixth and xth century from Syrian sources see Moberg, *The Book of the Hymnaries*, p. liv.

The tribes of Najdrān submitted to Turkish rule as late as those of eastern and northern Yaman generally. Najdrān now belongs to the kingdom of Ibn Saʿūd.

On other places Najdrān see Yāṣīr, iv. 751, 757 sqq.; Hambūr, p. 85.

*Biography:* First in the article and in some of the works quoted there; on the history of, especially Baladītarī, Fātīhī, p. 64—68; Catanī, *Annali dell'Islam*, ii. 312, 317 sqq., 321 sqq., 349—353; iv. 359—350.

(An. Moberg)

**Nafaka.** [See Nickīr Talik.]

**Nafā.** [See Allāh, ii.]

**Nāfī b. al-Azraḥ al-Hanafi al-Ḥanāli.** Abū Rāshid, according to some sources, the son of a freed blacksmith of Greek origin (Baladītarī, ed. de Goeje, p. 56), chief of the extreme Khāridjītes [q.v.], who after him are called Azraḥītes [q.v.]. At first, after his succession to Ahwāz, Nāfī joined Abū Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] in Makka. Soon, however, he and his followers turned their backs on the holy city and arrived before Basra, where they spread terror among the inhabitants, who left the town in multitudes. Al-Muhallab, however, succeeded in driving them back to Persia. They made a halt in Ahwāz, where they practised istīrāf, in accord with their doctrines. The bloody battle of Dūlāb, fought against Muslim b. `Ubaīs, put an end to his life (64 or 65 = 683—684). His special doctrine comprised the following points: 1. reception (ḥurūd) from the quietists (al-faḍāa); 2. examination (miṣrāj) of those who wanted to join his encampment; 3. declaring infidels those who did not perform hajj to him; 4. declaring it allowed to kill the wives and children of opponents. This is al-Ash'āri's enumeration, which differs slightly from that of al-Shahrastānī (p. 90).

Further it must be observed that in theological terminology *naffles* is often applied to those works which are supererogatory in the plain sense, in contradistinction to other works which have become a regular practice. The latter are called *amnun mu'akkada*, the former *naffles* or *unna awida* (cf. infra, sub 2). The place of supererogatory works in theology is further accurately defined in the *Wāṣiyat Abī Ḥanīfah*, art. 7: "We confess that works are of three kinds, obligatory, supererogatory and sinful. The first category is in accordance with Allāh's will, desire, good pleasure, decision, decree, creation, judgment, knowledge, guidance and writing on the preserved tablets. The second category is not in accordance with Allāh's commandment yet according to His will, desire" etc.

The term for supererogatory works used here is not *naffles*, but *fašīla*. 2. *Naffles* is used in *ḥadīth* especially as a designation of the supererogatory *qalas* (Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 11; Tuhfah al-Jadīd, bāb 5, 27). Sometimes it appears in the combinations *qalas al-naffles* (Ibn Maḍja, Ḥasanī, bāb 203) and *qalas al-nawafīl* (Bukhārī, Tuhfah al-Jadīd, bāb 36).

In *ḥads* this terminology is often, but not always followed, the other term for the supererogatory *qalas* being *qalas al-taṣawwūn* (e.g. Abū ʿIyāb al-Shrāzī, Ḥalīl al-Tamīmī, ed. A. W. T. Juyboll, p. 267), a term that goes back to the *Kūrān* (Sūra ii. 155, 180; Is. 80), and which occurs also in canonical *ḥadīth* (Abū Dāwūd has a *qalas al-taṣawwūn* in his *Sunan*). The whole class of supererogatory *qalas* is called *mawṣūlī* as well as *nawafīl*. *Naffles*, as a general designation of supererogatory *qalas*, covers three subdivisions. The following juxtapositions may give a survey of the terminology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>nawafīl</em></th>
<th><em>amnun</em></th>
<th><em>mu'akkada</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Nawafīl</em> (Khalīl, transl., Gudī, p. 95, Mālik)</td>
<td><em>mandābha</em></td>
<td><em>tāṣwūn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nawafīl</em> (Ghāzīl, Iḥyā', l. 174, Shāfiʿī)</td>
<td><em>muṣṭahbha</em></td>
<td><em>tāṣwūn</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be added that the term *rawāṭib* is used especially for the supererogatory *qalas* preceding or following the *nawafīl*; they belong to the first subdivision.

In Shīʿī *ṣuḥ al-nawafīl* is the widest term; by *muṣāraqah kāły* the daily and non-daily supererogatory prayers are designated.


*Al-Saharan Nāfīsah*: a mausoleum outside Cairo, south of the Mosque of Abū Ḥanīfah b. Tūlaṁ
Nafi'a — Nafi'a

Nafi'a (nafs) is a central concept in the early Islamic poetry, often understood as a struggle between the self and the angelic beings, reflecting the dual nature of human existence. It symbolizes the struggle between the human soul and the divine. In this context, it is often used to represent the idea of breath and wind, signifying life and movement.

The term "Nafi'a" appears in the works of early Islamic poets, such as Al-Hariri, where it is used to describe the internal strife within a person. The concept of "Nafi'a" is closely related to the idea of "zuhut" (self-awareness) and "zuhurat" (self-revelation), signifying a transformative experience within the self.

In the context of the early Islamic poetry, "Nafi'a" is often used to symbolize the struggle between the soul and the angelic messengers, reflecting the dual nature of human existence. The term is often used to describe the struggle between the self and the divine, signifying the struggle between life and death, good and evil.

The concept of "Nafi'a" is a significant aspect of the early Islamic poetry, reflecting the struggle between the self and the divine, signifying the struggle between life and death, good and evil. The term is often used to describe the transformative experience within the self, reflecting the dual nature of human existence.
Muslim’s al-Saḥīḥ (Constantinople 1331), viii. 44, 162 sq. and al-Bukhārī’s al-Saḥīḥ, Cairo 1314, iv. 133, both use nafs and arwāḥ for the human spirit.

IV. The Tadhār al-Arūḍī (iv. 260) lists 15 meanings for nafs and adds two others from the Liḍūn al-'Arah, as follows: spirit, blood, body, evil eye, presence, specific reality, self, tan, haughtiness, self-magnification, purpose, disdain, the absent, desire, punishment, brother, man. It states that most of these meanings are metaphorical. The Liḍūn (viii. 119–126) finds examples of these meanings in the poetry and the Kur’ān. Lane’s Lexicon faithfully reproduces the material (p. 28278).

The lexical treatments of nafs disclose these facts: 1. Any attribution to Allāh of nafs as “soul” or “spirit” is avoided. 2. If man, a. nafs and arwāḥ are identified, or b. nafs applies to the mind and arwāḥ to life, or c. man has nafsān, two souls, one vital and the other discriminating, or d. the discriminating soul is double, sometimes commanding and sometimes forbidding.

V. The influences that affected the post-Kur’ānic uses of both nafs and arwāḥ were the Christian and Neo-Platonic ideas of rūḥ with human, angelic and divine applications, and the more specifically Aristotelian psychological analysis of nafs. These influences are clearly shown in the records of the religious controversies.

A. Al-Ashʿarī [q. v.] (H. Ritter, Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam von Abu l-Hasan ‘Alī bin Imām al-Ashʿārī, Istanbul 1929) reports the Rāfiḍa doctrines of the incarnation of rūḥ Allāh in Ḥabīb ibn Mūsā ibn-Abī-l-‘Arab, and his transmission through the prophet and the Jews (p. 6, 46), as well as the eschatological positions that man is body (ḏarūm) only, body and spirit, and spirit (ḏarūm) only (p. 61, 329 sqq.). His creed of the orthodox (p. 290–297) omits any statement about the nature of man.

B. Al-Baghḍādī [q. v.] (al-Farār bīn al-Firāq, Cairo 1328) records the same heretical doctrines about man’s nature (p. 28, 117 sqq., 241 sqq.), says the transmission theories were held by Plato and the Jews (p. 254) and describes the heretical beliefs of the Mu‘ayyid sects [cf. hulul] among whom he includes the Ḥallā‘iyya (p. 247). His position is “The life of Allāh is without rūḥ and nourishment and all the arwāḥ are created, in opposition to the Christian doctrine of the eternity of the Father, Son and Spirit” (p. 325).

C. Ibn Ḥazin [q. v.] uses nafs and rūḥ interchangeably of man’s soul (Kitāb al-Fīqīl, b. l-Mīlād, 5 parts, Cairo 1317–1321; v. 66). He excludes from Islam all who hold metaphysical views, among whom he includes the physician-philosopher Mubārak and Zaka‘iyya al-Ra‘īsī (l. 90 sqq.; iv. 187 sq.). He restricts absolutely the doctrine of some of the Ash’arīyya of the continual re-creation of the rūḥ (iv. 69). He taught that Allāh created the spirits of all Adam’s progeny before the angels were commanded to prostrate to him (Ṣūrā vii. 171), and that these spirits exist in al-Barrakh [q. v.] in the nearest heaven until the angel blows them into embryos (iv. 70).

D. Al-Shahrastānī [q. v.] (Kitāb Hīlī‘ al-Ma‘āṣi wa-l-Niḥāl, ed. Caturel, part 1, London 1842) in his description of the belief of the pagan Arabs concerning survival after death does not use the terms nafs or rūḥ, but says the blood becomes a rich bird that visits the grave every hundred years. One of his most important sections (p. 203–240) deals with the orthodox and heterodox doctrines of al-rūḥ. Al-Humāfī, or true believers, debate with al-Sā‘ī (q. v.), who are dualists, emanationists and gnostics. His account of the views of the Sā‘ī faithfully reflects the doctrines of the Būyān al-Sa‘fī (Rāsīl, 4 vols., Bombay 1305), who taught that man is a whole compounded of a corporeal body and a spiritual nafs (t/tl. 14), and that the substance (dīnawār) of the nafs descended from the spheres (al-rūḥ). But al-Shahrastānī rejects the Neo-Platonic idea that human souls (māfsūr) are dependent upon the souls of the superhuman spirit world (al-ma‘āṣi wa-l-rūḥyāt) (p. 210, 224 sq.), and the Hermetic doctrines that the nafs is essentially evil (p. 236) and that salvation consists in the release of the rūḥ from material bodies (p. 226 sq.). He applies the term rūḥānī to all spirits, good and evil (p. 213). His description of the nature of man (p. 210 sqq.) with three souls, vegetal, animal and human, each with its own source, need, place and powers, resembles the views of the Būyān al-Sa‘fī (Rāsīl, t/tl. 48 sqq.). Indeed, the Muslim analysis of the human soul as given in the Shah%%%%%%'s, was written on by Alexander of Aphrodisias and Porphyry, had been adopted with little modification by the Muslim philosophers, such as al-Kindī [q. v.], al-Fārābī [q. v.] each of whom wrote a Kitāb al-Nafs, Ibn Sīnā [q. v.] who wrote two, and Ibn Miskawayh [q. v.], whose Tahdīth al-Akhbār has the same immaterial (p. 1) and functional (p. 7) psychology for its ethical basis. Al-Shahrastānī achieved the long needed interpretation of the conflicting stages of nafs and rūḥ in the Greek and Christian heritage, and in the Kur’ān and Muslim tradition. But the philosophers, even with his support, were not able to force the Greek psychology upon orthodox Islam. The Muḥaddithīn (s. art. šākīl) and the great majority of Muslims broadened the Kur‘ānic terminology, but retained the traditional views of the nature of the soul as a direct creation of Allāh having various qualities.

VI. Aristotle’s principle of the incorporeal character of spirit had nevertheless found a permanent place in Muslim doctrine through the influence of Islam’s greatest theologian, al-Ghazālī [q. v.]. In Al-Tahānawī’s Dictionary of the Technical Terms (ed. Spranger, Calcutta 1862) are extracts of the doctrines of al-Ghazālī on man’s rūḥ and nafs. He defines man as a spiritual substance (dīnawār rūḥānī), not confined in a body, nor imprinted on it, nor joined to it, nor separated from it, just as Allāh is neither without nor within the world, and likewise the angels. It possesses knowledge and perception, and is therefore not an accident (p. 547 at top; cf. Tahānah al-Falāsīf, Cairo 1302, p. 72). He devotes the second section of Al-Risāla al-Laduniyya (Cairo 1327, p. 7–14) to explain the words nafs, rūḥ and gūl (heart), which are names for this simple substance that is the seat of the intellectual processes. It differs from the animal rūḥ, a refined but mortal body whose death removes the senses. It identifies the incorporeal rūḥ with al-nafs al-muḥimmāna and al-rūḥ al-amīrī of the Kur‘ān. He then uses the term nafs also for the “animal” lower nature, which must be disciplined in the interests of ethics.

VII. This position of al-Ghazālī’s was that of the theistic philosophers in general, as well as some of the Muṭa‘alla and the Sā‘ī, but it has never dominated Islam. The great analytical philosopher
and theologian, Fakhru al-Din al-Razi, could not bring himself to accept it. In his Majastār al-Ghazzā, v. 435, commenting on Surah xvii. 85, he quotes as the opinion of al-Ghazzā the statement that is in the latter's Tawārikh (p. 72; cf. also al-Razi's Muhājir, Cairo 1323, p. 164), but on p. 434 (l. 8 and 9 from below) of the Majastār he acknowledges the strength of the opposing argument, and in his al-Muṣāfra, on the margin of the Muhājir, p. 117, he definitely rejects as baseless (bāhār) the view of the philosophers that the nafs is a substance (āqām) and not corporeal.

VIII. Al-Balādhuri's [q.v.] system of cosmogony and psychology is given in his Tawārikh al-Anwār (litograph ed. with commentary by Abu Tānā al-Iyafānāt and gloss by al-Djundjānī, Stambul 1305, p. 285 sqq.; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 418, ii. 111, printed Cairo 1325). He discusses 1. The classes of incorporeal substances, 2. the heavenly intelligences, 3. the souls of the spheres, 4. the incorporeality of human souls, 5. their creation, 6. their connection with bodies and 7. their survival. His cosmogony follows: Allāh, because of his unity, created only one Intelligence ('āʾā). This Second Intelligence, that remained first (al-fāṭār) from Allāh, is the cause ('illa) of all other potentialities and is not body (āqīm), nor original matter (kawālīf) nor form (sūra). It is the secondary cause (nafṣ) of another Intelligence with soul (naṣf) and sphere (falsāḥ). There emanates from the second a third intelligence and so on to the tenth (p. 288) who is the rūh of Surah lixviii. 58 (cf. al-Balādhuri's Ahrūr al-Tawārikh, ed. Fliescher, ii. 383, l. 4) whose effective influence is in the world of the elements and who is the producer of the spirits (awrāḥ) of mankind. Below these intelligences are the high or heavenly angels, which the philosophers call al-nafṣ al-falsāḥ, controlling particular persons. In addition (p. 282) there are the incorporeal substances, without effect or control, who are angels, some good (al-kariš-šīyān) and some evil (al-kāhūyān) and the qinā (qinā), who are ready for both good and evil. This is the classification he refers to in his comments on Surah ii. 28 (ed. Fliescher, i. 47, 29). His psychology resembles that of al-Ghazzā, whom he mentions (p. 294). For the incorporeality of the soul (shujārau al-nafṣ) he presents five arguments from reason, four Qurān verses and one tradition. His commentator remarks (p. 300) that these prove only that the soul differs from the body. He then argues that all nafṣs are created when their bodies are completed. The nafs (p. 303) is not embodied in and is not close to the body, but is attached as the lover to the beloved. It is connected with that rūh which comes from the heart and is generated of the finest nutritive particles. The reasoning nafs produces a force that flows with that rūh through the body, producing in every organ its proper functions. These functional powers are perceptive, which are the five external senses, and the five internal faculties of the sensory communes, imagination, apprehension, memory, reason, and the sense (al-kariš-šīyāt), which are voluntary (lāțiqāt-šīyā) and natural (lāțiqāt, p. 308).

IX. The dominant Muslim doctrine concerning the origin, nature and future of al-rūḥ and al-nafs is most fully given in the Kitāb al-Rūh of Ibn Kāyīm (q.v.) (Haidarābād, 2nd ed., 1324). Of his 21 chapters Ibn Kāyīm devotes the 19th to the problem of the specific nature of the nafs (p. 279-342). He quotes the summaries given by al-Askārī (op. cit., p. 334-335), and by al-ʿArīf (Majastār al-Ghazzā, v. 431-434). He denies al-Razi's statement that the Muṣāilikiyya consider man to be simply the sensible body, and says all intelligent people hold man to be both body and spirit. The rūḥ is identified with the nafs, and is itself a body, different in quiddity (al-māhiyya) from this sensible body, of the nature of light, high, light in weight, living, moving, interpenetrating the bodily members as water in the rose. It is created, but everlasting; it departs temporarily from the body in sleep; when the body dies it departs for the first judgement, returns to the body for the questioning of Munkar and Nakir, and, except in the cases of prophets and martyrs, remains in the grave foretasting bliss or punishment until the Resurrection. He rejects (p. 256) Ibn Ḥazm's doctrine that Adam's progeny are in al-Brāzālī waiting their time to be blown into embryos. He presents 116 evidences for the incorporeality of the rūḥ, 22 refutations of opposing arguments and 22 reductions of objections. He represents traditional Islām.

X. The earlier Sūfīs had accepted the materiality of the rūḥ. Both al-Kharāṣi (q.v.) (al-Rūhā, with commentary by Zakariyya al-Anṣāri and gloss of al-ʿArūsi, Bulāk 1310, ii. 105 sqq.) and al-Hudwīt (q.v.) (Kāfī al-Maḥdījī, ed. Nicholson, London 1911, p. 196, 262) call the rūḥ a fūs, created substance (āsim) or body (āqīm), placed in the sensible body like sap in green wood. The nafs (al-Rūhā, p. 103 sqq.; Kāfī al-Maḥdījī, p. 196) is the seat of the blameworthy characteristics. All together make the man.

In addition to the philosophical position of the immateriality of al-nafs that al-Ghazzā had made orthodox, another interpretation of spirit developed which is essentially theosophical. Ibn al-ʿArabi (q.v.) (H. S. Nyberg, Kleine Schriften des Ibn al-ʿArabi, Leyden 1919, p. 15, 117, sqq.) divides "things" into three classes: Allāh, Who is Absolute Existence and Creator, the absolutely unfathomable substān (pl. substānāt) of contingent existence that is joined to the Eternal Reality and is the source of the substance and the specific nature of the world. It is the universal and common reality of all realities. Man likewise is an intermediate creation, a karāzād (p. 22, 42) between Allāh and the world, bringing together the Divine Reality and the created world (p. 21, 42) and a vicegerent connecting the eternal names and the originated forms (p. 96). His animal spirit (rūḥ) is from the blowing of the divine breath (p. 95) and his reasoning soul (nafs māhiyyā) is from the universal soul (al-nafs al-kullīyya), while his body is from the earthly elements (p. 95 sqq.). Man's position as vicegerent (p. 45 sqq.) and his resemblance to the divine presence (p. 21) come from this universal soul, who has various other names, holy spirit (rūḥ al-kharīd), the first intelligence (p. 51), vicegerent (kullīyya), the perfect man (p. 45) and the rūḥ of the world of command (Daʿwāw al-abār), which al-Ghazzā held to be Allāh's direct creation (p. 121, 179). In his Fīqīh (litograph ed. with commentary by al-Kāshāni, Cairo 1309, p. 12 sqq.) he says that Allāh appears to Himself in a form which thus becomes the place of
manifestation of the Divine essence. This place receives a rūḥ, who is Adam, the khāuls and the perfect man. He discusses (Nyberg, pp. 129 sqq.) the essence and properties of the rūḥ, quoting among others the view he says is "attributed" to al-Ghazālī which is in al-Tuhafut (as above). He finds the differences of doctrine harmless since all agree that the rūḥ is originated. In his treatate on the nafs and rūḥ (M. Asim Jalilos, Tratado Acería del Conocimiento del Alma y del Espíritu, in Actes du XIVe Congrès international des Orientalistes, Prag 1909, iii. 167–191) he describes how men may reach the distinction of the "perfect man" through the cultivation of the qualities of the nafs and the suppression of the nafs.

Ibn al-Arabi’s contemporary, the poet Ibn al-Fārūq (Nicholson, Sti der Islamic Mysticism, Cambridge 1921, chap. iii.), at times identifies his own rūḥ with that from which all good emanates (al-Tūf al-aḥrār, on margin of Duḥaḥ Ibn al-Fārūq, Cairo 1314, ii. 4 sq.) and with the "poele" (fath) upon which the heavens rest (p. 112, 113). A-Kasbih, the commentator of al-Tūf, explains that this identity is with the greatest spirit (rūḥ al-aṭrāf) and the greatest "poele". The comments of the commentators on the Duḥaḥ states (li. 156) that incarnation (famūl) and union (iṭtiḥād) with Allah are impossible, but there is real "passing away" (fals) and attainment (waṣīl) of the rūḥ and nafs in the nafs of Allah, for His nafs is their nafs.

'Abd al-Karim al-Dūlānī carries this position of existential monism on to straight anti-pantheism. In al-Inān al-ḥallīl (q.v.) (Cairo 1334) the terms rūḥ al-ḥullū, rūḥ al-ārāfī and rūḥ Allāh stand for a special one of the aspects of the Divine Reality (al-żāfī), not to be embraced under the command "be" nor created. This spirit is the divine aspect in which stand the created spirits of all existences, sensible and intelligible (p. 94). Existence itself abides in the nafs of Allah, and His nafs is His Essence (dā'ār). Moreover, every sensible thing has a created spirit (rūḥ) (p. 94). One of the aspects of the angel of Sura xliv. 52, who is named the command (amr) of Allāh, and who is an aspect of Allāh as above, is given to the rūḥ of Muhammad, which is identified as the rūḥ mentioned in the verse. That angelic and divine rūḥ thereby becomes the Idea (ḥaṣif) of Muhammad (p. 95 sq.) and he thereby becomes the "perfect man" (p. 95, 133 sqq.). The rūḥ which is the specific nature of the human nafs has five names: animal, commanding to evil, instinctive (al-mu-halma), evoking, and tranquil. When the divine qualities actually describe the nafs, then the names, qualities and essences of the gnostic (ṣufī) are those of the One Known (Maʿrūf) (p. 130 sq.)

p. 7). In geomancy (Imam al-ramūlī) the first "house" (bait) of the nimrūd (cf. Madāj̤is̤, ymra, iii. 73b) is called nafs because it guides people to those problems concerning the soul and spirit of the inquirer. In the beginning of al-nafs (Muhammad al- Ḥasanī, Kithb al-yaqīn fī lam al-Raml, Cairo n.d., p. 7; cf. Hein. Com. Agrippae, Opera, Leyden, n.d., but early xvii cent., p. 428: Nam primus demum personam vestrem tue restituit). Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article see especially D. B. Macdonald, The Development of the Idea of Spirit in Islam, in Acta Orientalis, Oslo 1931, ix. 307–354 (reprinted in M. W. xxii. 1932, 25–42, 153–168) upon which much of the present article is based; Moslem philosophical psychology goes back to Aristotle’s De Anima (best ed. by R. D. Hicks, Cambridge 1907); for the early metaphysical beliefs see W. Landauer, Die Theodizee der Scholasten etc. in Fontes O.S., xxviii. 1–80; xxix. 1–183; for the relation of Aristotle and Ibn Sīnā see S. Lamarder, Die Psychologie des Ibn Sīnā, in Z.D.M.G. xxxix. (1875), 335–418; English translation by A. E. van Dyck, Avicenna’s Offering to the King, Verona 1906; M. Huret, Die philosophischen Systeme im Islam, Bonn K. J. de Boer, The History of Philosophy in Islam, London 1903.

E. E. Calverley

AL-NAFUSA, in Berber Infeq, name of a Berber tribe. According to the common genealogical scheme (cf. Ibn Kallādh, Kitāb al-burh, i. 107–117 of the text), the Nafusa are one of the four branches of the large body of the Ber, whose name derives from their chief Mādghīl al-Abtar. At present the dwelling place of the Nafusa is south-west of Tripoli, on the western plateau of the same name which from the frontier between Tripolitania and Tripolitania tends eastward, and, if taken in the largest sense, comprises the regions of Nālīt, Fassima, and Yefren. The inhabitants of these regions are generally called Naftus, although, in a genealogical sense, this name can be applied to some groups only. Probably the name Lijaḥ Nafusa (in Berber Djar n-Infus, which originally belonged to a part of the plateau, was extended to the large area between Wāxe and Yefren on account of the fact, that of the tribes inhabiting it, the Nafṣas were of prominent importance. This use of the name in its widest sense is also to be found in the book by Ibrahim b. Sliham al-Shamīnī, Castles and Ways of the Naftas plateau" (1302 = 1884–1885), in which all the territories of Yefren, Fassima and Nalit are described.

The second date on the history of the Naftas, which we possess, are to be found, for the largest part, in Arabic sources. In the Greek and Latin authors of pre-Islamic times there is no single assurance to them. The name occurring in Corippus’ Ḥummas (second sang., l. 146: Queneq nefanda colunt tristis montana Navus), does not refer, in all probability, to a place or a tribe of Tripolitania, but rather of the Aurès (Auwīs), its plateau or its neighbourhood. The fact that Navus represents a form closely connected with Naftas, proves only that the name was widely spread among the Berbers, that it is old and may be probably connected with such words as nemfīs, fem. temfīs "right, to the right hand" in Aquitanian.

In Islamic times the name is recorded for the first time in connection with the capture of the town of Tripoli by Amr b. al-As (22 or 23). According to Ibn Dīrāsh (i. 2 sqq., text) during the siege the inhabitants called to their aid the Nafts, who came to their aid. At that time they were residing also in the vast plain of Lijaah, situated between the Djebel and the sea, and were the chief towns, if not their capital, was Sabe on the coast (Roman Sabratha, formerly Phoenician), west of Tripoli, which by Ibn Kallādh (Burh, i. 181, l. 8, text) is called "the city of the Naftas". This town was taken
by surprise and plundered by a body of cavalry sent by 'Amr. This raid was probably undertaken not only to continue the conquest farther westward, but also to punish the Nafusa, whose territory 'Amr had invaded in order to conquer it (cf. al-Bakri, p. 9, 16, text), and which he had to abandon by order of the Caliph.

According to some sources, the Nafusa at that time were Christian; according to other reports, however, they were Jews. Our latest local information makes it probable that Christianity had spread widely among them; though the conversion of single groups to Judaism is not excluded. In fact traces of Byzantine basilicas have been found on the plateau, e.g. at Temerdha, Itarimse, etc., which are also mentioned in some sources and which must have been used by large numbers of the indigenous population.

When the Arab had conquered North Africa, the Nafusa of Sabra and of the coastal region retired, according to the common opinion, to the plateau, where they remained hostile towards the conquerors. A fresh study of the Tripolitanian population, however, makes it clear that a part of them must have stayed in their old dwelling-places where they intermarried with other tribes and, in course of time, became arabised. In fact there are tribes in the Western Djasfar and in Tripoli, the town and its surroundings (the regions of al-Sabli, Tagjara, etc.), that, according to the local genealogy, derive from the Nafusa. Apart from this ethnic tradition, there is the fact, recorded in several sources, that after the first case of intervention of the Nafusa in the affairs of the town of Tripoli — which may have been partly due to a Christian opposition to the Muhammadan invasion — they wanted, under successive dominations, to make their presence felt and their influence preponderant in the northwestern region of Tripolitania, so that the outlines of the history of the small, but strong and civilised Berber city may be supposed to be following. Having its centre on the plateau, it intended to make felt, as often as possible, its dominion in the coastal region and thus keep the control of the main way of communication between Egypt and Irrijiya, which ran along the coast and which was followed by the various expeditions to the Maghrib. Even at present such aspirations may be stirred in the minds of the most civilized of these populations, to such an extent that even some of them have reckoned with an eventual reoccupation of their old territories in Western Djasfar.

The period in which the Nafusa, according to the sources available to us, was at its most active and took part in the events happening in North Africa, was that of the great Kharidji (q.v.) revolts, which began in 122 (739—740) and did not cease before the 7th (9th) century, i.e. before the era of the Fatimids. When the Wahidi doctrines began to spread among the North African populations in the second century A. H., they embraced them and so joined the rebellious movement of the Berbers against the Arab conquerors, a movement which, prepared by several other causes, found also some support in the Kharidji heterodoxy. The Nafusa embraced the Badi'i, i.e. the more moderate form of the Kharidji doctrine, and remained ever faithful to it with heroic attachment. In alliance with other Berber tribes, either Ibadis or other branches of the sect, they repeatedly made war upon the Arab governors of Irrijiya.

In 140 (757—758), they elected as their imam, probably with the intention of founding an Ibadite principality — an intention which manifests itself also at other times — an Arab called Abu 'Ishqashub 'Abd al-Alit b. al-San'ah al-Mu'tawfiq [q.v.], one of the missionaries of Ibadism in North Africa. Under his command and in conjunction with other Berber groups, they occupied Tripoli, fought against the Sufrit [cf. al-Sufrija] Wafargiijuma, who had sacked Khairan where they had settled, and against the armies sent by the 'Abbasids to reconquer Irrijiya. Finally, in 144 (761—762), Abu 'Ishqashub and a large number of his followers perished near Tamuga (Tawurgah) in a great battle against the general Muhammed b. al-Ash'ab al-Khurasani, the governor of Irrijiya.

Another notoriety of the Nafusa was a Berber Abu Hatim Vaqshub [q.v.], whose enterprises sur vive in oral tradition on the plateau, who speaks of his 375 encounters with the Arabs. He was killed in battle in 155 (771—772).

When the Ibadi kingdom of the Kustamids [cf. Kustam], which had Tahert as its centre, had been founded, the Nafusa did not elect an imam of their own any more, but formed a part of this kingdom under a governor who depended upon it. Some of these governors, e.g. Abu 'Ubaidah 'Abd al-Hamid al-Djanawuni (of Igganawun), Abu Manju lipiy (of Tendemmira), are often praised by the Berbers of the Ljubat, for their importance and ability in maintaining the interests of Ibadism, and also for their learning and piety.

The Nafusa were a valuable support of the kingdom of the Kustamids, of which they formed the eastern bulwark. Being near the territory of the Aghlabides [q.v.], they shared the vicissitudes of the state which had arisen in Irrijiya in the beginning of the 9th century. The town of Tripoli was in the possession of those princes; Western Djasfar, on the other hand, till near the Sea, and probably also part of Eastern Djasfar, was in the power of the Muslims. When Tripoli was bequeathed to the Umayyads, who, having revolted against his father in Usir, took over the castle of the Ibadis in the province of Irrijiya, his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invited by the inhabitants of Laiba). This fact, which reminds of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslim, proves clearly the influence the Nafusa possessed in northwestern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 286 (896—897) by the Fatimid prince al-'Abbasa, who, having revolted against his father, sought to conquer Irrijiya at his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invited by the inhabitants of Laiba). This fact, which reminds of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslim, proves clearly the influence the Nafusa possessed in northwestern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 286 (896—897) by the Fatimid prince al-'Abbasa, who, having revolted against his father, sought to conquer Irrijiya at his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invited by the inhabitants of Laiba). This fact, which reminds of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslim, proves clearly the influence the Nafusa possessed in northwestern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 286 (896—897) by the Fatimid prince al-'Abbasa, who, having revolted against his father, sought to conquer Irrijiya at his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invited by the inhabitants of Laiba). This fact, which reminds of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslim, proves clearly the influence the Nafusa possessed in northwestern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 286 (896—897) by the Fatimid prince al-'Abbasa, who, having revolted against his father, sought to conquer Irrijiya at his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invited by the inhabitants of Laiba). This fact, which reminds of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslim, proves clearly the influence the Nafusa possessed in northwestern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 286 (896—897) by the Fatimid prince al-'Abbasa, who, having revolted against his father, sought to conquer Irrijiya at his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (acc...
In the nineteenth century, the Turks, after having retaken in 1251 (1835-1850) the direct administration of Tripoli, had to fight long and bitterly for the conquest of the plateau of the Naffas also. The struggle lasted, with varying success, till 1274 (1857-1858); in this period the sheikh Ghamma b. Khaliifa distinguished himself by courage and endurance; he is usually represented as the hero of Berber independence defended against the Turks. In reality, however, he was an Arab and the Arab tribe of the Mahajim had the largest share in the wars, while the Berbers, according to all appearance, did not take part in them on a large scale. During the Italian occupation of Tripolitania, which began in 1911, the Naffas were at first hostile in accordance with their old aspiration to found an independent Ba'asti kingdom which should extend up to the Sea and include the region of Sabratha. Defeated in 1913 by the valiant general Luqui near al-Ashba'a, they offered their submission to the Italian authorities and ever since have proved very faithful subjects. When inner Tripolitania, in consequence of the effects of the Great War, was troubled by rebels, they showed an heroic attachment to Italy, fighting its enemies under great privations. When in 1923 the reconquest of the inland had begun, they voluntarily took part in it, side by side, with the regular troops, with perfect loyalty.


In works which the Naffas are mentioned, the Arabic chronicles referring to the conquest of the Magrib, as well as the
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p. 495, l. 9, to be added. He has been buried at the base of the poet Night's Mourn at Kastoria (Thessaly), where his tomb was still shown in 1916 (cf. L. Massingale, Revue, p. 155).
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Gond kingdom: the northern kingdom of Gohi-Manilà; two central kingdoms with their capitals at Dégorg and Khera respectively; and a southern state with its capital at Chand. In the reign of Akbar the imperial forces overran the northern kingdom forcing it to pay tribute, despite the heroic efforts of the Dowager Rani Durgavat. After this the political predominance of the Gohi chiefs shifted to Dégorg which in its turn also suffered from the aggressive schemes of the Moghal emperors. Early in the reign of Awaransah a punitive force under Dilr Khan entered both Chand and Dégorg, with the result that, in 1670, the ruler of Dégorg embraced Islam as the price of the restoration of his kingdom (Awaransah-nâma, p. 1022—27). Both these states paid tribute to the emperor through a Muslim agent stationed at Nagpur. This however is not the earliest reference to Nagpur in the Muhammadan period, for the Lâhâbâh-nâma of Lâhârî describes its capture by Khan Darwan, in 1657 (for a still earlier identification see Hîr Lal, p. 10).

The most famous ruler of Dégorg was the converted Gond chief, Bâjâh Bihâl, who visited the court of Awaransah (Mâzâkîr-i Awaransah, p. 273). Because of his continuous attitude he was replaced by another Muslim Gond named Dinsair (ibid., p. 340). For some years after this Bâjâh Bihâl remained in service, until, escaping from imperial control, he once more raised the standard of revolt in Dégorg (Mâzâkîr-i Awaransah of Khan Darwan, 1657, p. 467). Although Dégorg was recaptured for a time by Awaransah’s forces, Bâjâh Bihâl remained in open rebellion and was never really subdued. Eventually under this able ruler the Dégorg state comprised the modern districts of Chandwara and Bêthâ, together with portions of Nagpur, Sontot, Bhando, and Pahâl. The last important Gond ruler was Bânsâr Bâhâ who died in 1739. It was he who fixed the capital of Nagpur which he converted into a walled town.

Internal divisions led to the intervention of Râhgadh Bhumisâ, who was governing Bârâk on behalf of the Marathâ Pâshâ. Eventually, in 1743, the Marathâ leader took over the administration of the country. By granting a nominal authority to the Gond Râdja, Bâharâ Shâh, and his descendants, the Bhumisâ possessed a useful pretext for disallowing, when expedient, the rights of the Pâshã, but in practice reference was usually made to Finsa on important matters, such as the succession. Bâharâ Shâh’s descendants have continued to occupy the position of state pensioners, and the representative of the family resides at Nagpur with the title of Râdja or Sonâthân. Râhgadh Bhumisâ was a great friend of the Îlamî and other Marathas into Nagpur. It was the treacherous attitude of his successor Dâng đôdios led to his defeat by the combined forces of the Nâgh and the Pâshâ, and to his acknowledgement of the latter’s supremacy.

It was under Râhgadh II that the Nagpur kingdom attained its greatest extent and included practically the whole of the modern Central Provinces and Berar, together with Orissa and certain of the Câtî Nagpur states. Unfortunately for the perpetuity of his kingdom he joined forces with Snâtâh against the British, and, in 1803, after the battles of Amaye and Aràjion, was compelled to subscribe to the treaty of Dégorg, by which he was deprived of a third of his dominions (Aitchison, i. 415—417). He was succeeded in 1816 by his son, Parsodji, an imbecile, who was murdered the following year by the notorious Âppâ{s Shâh. On the outbreak of war between the British and the Pâshâ, in 1817, Âppâ{s Shâh attacked the British Residency but his troops were defeated in the brilliant action at Sutlalût. This resulted in the deposition of Âppâ{s Shâh, who was succeeded by Râhgadh III, on whose death, in 1853, without heirs, natural or adopted, this dependent principality was declared by Dalhausin to haveapsed to the Paramont Power.

The British administered Nagpur by means of a Commission until the formation of the Central Provinces in 1861. Today, the city of Nagpur supports a flourishing Muhammadan community, in the suburb of Mehdiâbâh, the members of which are Lâhâbâh Bohrias of the Shîr sect [see Nâhim]. The members of this community live together in the buildings of the institution, where their children are educated and their women taught suitable accomplishments.


NAHIKI, an administrative district in the Ottoman empire which corresponds somewhat to the Swiss canton or French commune. It is a subdivision of the jâlî (jâlî-r, q.v.), which may be compared with the French arrondissement and is governed by a hâmîn-mešîr (q.v.) while the nâhîye is under a mukâli. This official who used to be appointed by the wâli, the governor of the province, received his instructions from the hâmîn-mešîr, to whom he was subordinate. The subdivision of the nâhîye are called jârû, i.e. village. The term nâhîye for an administrative district is of recent origin. For an earlier provincial administration which did not know this name, cf. A. D. Morâtsmann sen., Sûretîh und das moderne Türkentum, N., Leipzig 1878, p. 149.


NAHIKI, name from the pre-Islamic divine name Nâhidh noted by Wellhausen and Nöldeke among the Tanit, the Nakha (of Madhûjî), and in Mecca before Islam. — In Kûfa and Sûmâr it was the name of the Al Nakhi, a family of Shî’i scholars of the tribe of Nakha1; descendants of Nakhi, grandfather of Khunayz b. Zîyâr, a partisan of ‘Ali, also celebrated as the founder of the Kûmilîyûn sect (or Khumilîyûn): the ‘Usâfi, the jâlî-r of Mî’dîn Samîyû in Djâmm (Hoyasî, lo. 5). Two of its members settled in Sûmâr (Tâj, Fâbrîc, p. 205; cf. p. 179, 196): the first, ‘Abd Allah b. Muhammad (Kahî, p. 6) was the herald-writer of the Mûriyya sect mentioned by Mâ’ûnî and Ibn Harm whose name Friedländer, following Bârììe de Meynard, had read “Ibhâni” (sic in
Al-Nahr, the constellation of the River (Eridanus). It corresponds to the ητερασς, Φευνιος, Άμαντος of the ancients (cf. Aratos, Phainomena, I. 359; Genibus, Ελευσιως; Ptolemy, Almagest). Aratos observes (I. 360) — probably one of the first to do so — that the river of heaven represents Eridanus (Ηαρδανος, river of the morning) or river of darkness, of the west? turned into stars, into which Phaeton, son of Helios, fell, struck by the thunderbolt of Zeus, after his unsuccessful attempt to ride to heaven. [The opinions of the Greek authors vary regarding the identity of the earthly Eridanus. It is often identified as the Po (Padus), in later times however sometimes with the Rhone (Rhodanis, probably on account of the similarity of sound with “Eridanus”) or even with the Rhine (Rhuma) while Strabo denies there was such a river for he calls it τον ρυμας γεωνον “the nowhere existing”]. According to another view (Kempenhans, c. 37), the constellation of the river represents Achernar (cf. below), etc., ητερασς, the position of which however he gives incorrectly as he could not himself observe it in Alexandria on account of its great southern declination (θ 37° = 57° 45').

Al-Nahr is one of the constellations of the southern heavens. In the north it is adjoined by the Bull (al-Σαλου), in the east by Orion (al-Δικαστήρ, the Giant, or al-Δίκαιος, the Judge), the Hare (al-Arabiya) and the most western subsidiary stars (al-Δραγας, al-Durar) of the Great Dog (al-Καθαρ), which are now included in the constellation of the Dove and the Sculptor's Tool, in the west by the Whale (έλεφαντς or ζεύκος). The constellation of al-Nahr contains, according to Abd al-Rahman al-Sufi (1076-1131), primary stars (i.e., those which form the figure, ηταρας αιν αινας) there are no subsidiary stars included in it. It begins with η Αρίνα, the left foot of Orion (β Orionis, Rigel, = 248), towards western η Α ερδανας, then southwards to about y αινας and eastwards, as far as α ΁ρδανας, or η Σκιούρος, or η Ρόδων, and finally in a south-westerly direction via δ, γ, δ Αερινας to η Ερδανας.

The fresco in the dome of Kusceva Amurs shows in the surviving portion the constellation of Al-Nahr as a narrow ribbon, which runs directly westwards from the raised foot of Orion, a little below the equator and parallel with the latter in the direction of the Whale.

The Arabs give to the inverted quadrilateral formed by η, ι, ι, ι, η Α ερδανας, or the same “fore throne (foot-stool) of Orion”, (κερας Αλ-Δικαστήρ, in contrast to his “back throne”, κερας Αλ-Δικαστήρ οι μεταλκακος, or η Δικαστήρ, or η Δικαστήρ οι μεταλκακος, or η Δικαστήρ, or η Δικαστήρ οι μεταλκακος, or η Δικαστήρ, or η Δικαστήρ), the stars τατ, ι, ι, ι, η Ηέρδανας together with ι ι, η Ηέρδανας, which encloses an area with very few stars in it, are called ἱλιόδοτοι Al-Nadir, “Ostrich Nest”, the numerous small stars surrounding it are called η Δικαστήρ, the eggs”, or κερας Αλ-Δικαστήρ, the egg-shells”, The most southerly star in Eridanus, also the brightest (a Eridani, first magnitude), is called al-Zamam, the “male ostrich”, or, η, γ, άλ-να, the “last of the river” (in the Alfonsoa Tables) whence comes the name still used at the present day Achernar or Asward. Between Achernar and Po (Padus) (i.e. Fau Faw) Al-Abdu, “moon of the fish”, Al-Azhar (Ezra), in the region of the present Phoenix are a considerable number of stars which the Arabs called Al-Riyad, “the ostrich’s chick”, Al-Sufi states that in Shiraz he observed a series of stars near the horizon which had the shape of a ship (σκάφος) (α, ο, ο, ο, γ, γ, γ Θωνιας). The brightest among them (according to Al-Sufi), third in reality of second magnitude) forms with a Pisces Atatur and β Ceti (Demok Rhina) Καλας, “tail of the whale”) an approximately right-angled isosceles triangle with a line from a Pisces Atatur to β Eridani as base, the stars within which according to Al-Sufi are also to be included in Al-Nadir. The star γ Phoenix is called Al-Difasa, al-Difasa, or al-Difasa, or the Second Frog”, in contrast to the “First Frog”, or, al-Difasa, al-Difasa, which is represented by a Pisces.

began under his father, he went in 943 (1530) to Cairo, where he was taught by al-Sayyid al-ibadi, and to Stambul. In his return home he received a teaching appointment in the Madrasa al-Aghrafiyya. In 965 (1557) he again went to Stambul via Aza Minor, and afterwards was appointed to the Kanbaitiya in Mecca. When in 975 (1567) the al-Sulamiyya Madrasa was founded for all four orthodox sects, he went to it and later became Mufid of Mecca. He died in 990 (1582); according to others in 1088 or 991.

His first literary effort seems to have been a description of his second journey to Stambul, which has not survived. His other works cannot be chronologically arranged with certainty. These are the poetical anthology, intended to supply quotations for letter-writers, which in the Leyden (Cat. cod. ar. 2, i. 356) MS. is called Tazhîb al-Aṣma'â al-islâmiyya fi l-ṣayyâb 'al-furūd al-nâzira, in the Cairo (Fihris 1, iv. 210; iii. 68) al-Tazhîb wa l-Mu'âfata fi l-ṣayyâb wa l-wafadra al-nâzira, and a collection of riddles entitled Künt al-Asma' fi Dumn al-Munâqara (Leyden, 1734; in the Escorial, Cat. Derenberg, No. 20; and Cairo (Aghir, iii. 107, 296) and in Cairo (Fihris 2, ii. 294) of which is quoted by 'Abd al-Kadir al-Baghda'dî (Kâsnî al-Asâfî, iii. 139), and on which Mu'in al-Din 'Abd al-Munîf b. Ahmad al-Baqî'î in 992 (1585) wrote a commentary entitled Ti'âr al-Asma' (MSS. in Upsala, No. 813; Paris, No. 3417; and Escorial, op. cit., No. 522; extracts in Leyden, op. cit., No. 523). It is not possible also to date his collection of biographical matter of which there only survives the synopsis Munâqada al-Târîkh in Leyden (op. cit., No. 1045).

His two principal historical works date from the last decade of his life. On 1st Ramadan 981 (May 3, 1572) he finished his history of Turkish rule in the Yaman entitled al-Burh al-Yamaniyyi fi l-Faṣl al-Muhammadi; it begins with the year 900 (1494), describes the first Turkish conquest under the vizier Sulaiman Pasha, the return of the Zaidids and the second conquest by the grand vizier Sinan Pasha, to whom the work is dedicated; an appendix describes his conquest of Tunis and Golettia. He prepared a second edition after the accession of Sulayman Murad III in 982 (1574); cf. S. de Sacy, in M. E., iv. (1878), p. 412-521; and to the MSS., in G.A.L., ii. 382 add Leyden, op. cit., No. 944; Paris (Büchel, Cat. de l'îv M. Ar. de nouveau acquisition, No. 5927); Escorial (Livi-Provengal, No. 1720; Cairo, Fihris 1, v. 56), also D. Lopes, Extrait de la histoire de la conquête de l'Yaman par les Turcs sous le Sultan Sulaiman testa ar. con trad. e notas, Lisbon 1892. In 985 (1577) he finished his history of Mecca dedicated to Sulayman Murad, entitled al-Tázir bi-Allâh Balad (Ha'il) Allâh al-banîn, which Würtzfeld published in the Chronicon der Stadt Mecca, vol. i, Leipzig 1857; and is printed Cairo 1303, 1305 (on the margin of Ahmad b. Zainal Dâhân's Khatâqa al-Kadîm fi Hayâ'at Umarî al-Balad bi-Allâh), 1316; to the MSS. given in G. A. L., ii. 382 may be added Tüürlân, No. 23; Paris, No. 1637-1644, 4924, 5934, 5999; Leyden (Cat. cod. a. i. 3, No. 928-930); Cambridge (Brown, No. 8-9); Ambrosian, No. 116 (Z. D. M. G., ixx. 77); Vienna, No. 254; Sulaimanîyya, Stambul No. 815; Nitriy 'Ummânîyya, No. 3047; Cairo (Fihris 3, p. 52); Cat. Bancroft, xv. 1085; Apalîyas, p. 175. This work was translated into Turkish by the famous poet Bâlî (q. v.) (MSS. in Gotth., No. 158; Vienna, No. 895; Or. Ak., Kralî, No. 266; Cambridge, Suppl., No. 72; ed. by Gottwald, Kassel 1286). A synopsis entitled Fihrist al-'Ulamâ' al-Aṣma' bi-Bina' al-Muqaddim al-'Arabî, MSS. Leyden, op. cit., No. 931; Cairo, Fihris 2, v. 32; Bankiopoe, xv. 1089. It was made by his nephew Bahîr al-Din 'Abd al-Karim b. Modhir al-Din b. 'Abd al-Din b. Shawqaw 961 (Sept. 26, 1554) at Ahmadibad in Gudjarat, brought up in Mecca by his uncle, then teacher in the Madrasa al-Mu'āšiya, 982 (1575) Mufid of Mecca, 990 (1582) Imam al-Haram, 9. 12th Dhu 'l-Hijja 1014 (April 24, 1606) (al-Muhabba, Khatâqa al-'Arabî, ii. 3). His son Mu'âdh in 1005 (1596) wrote a history of Mecca and Medina and of the exploits of Hasan Paşa, who became well of Yaman, entitled Misâ')l al-'Imam wa 'l-Qâma al-fida'at b. al-Mu'âshî min wa l-Mu'âshî min 'l-Qâma wa l-Bâgh al-Khalîfa, 3, Leyden, op. cit., No. 937; Cairo, Fihris 1, v. 2, 3. Bibliography: Dânîl al-Shâhkâl, al-Nu'mânîyya, p. 368 (quoted from Sarkh, Mu'âshî al-Mağhâbî, p. 1871); al-Nu'mânî, al-Rawî al-firdos, vol. Berlin, No. 9588, fol. 227; Ibn al-Aridârî, al-Nu' cîd al-meṣâbî (coll. Bankiopoe), fol. 194; al-Rawî, 'Aṣma' bi-l-Ma'qâl, Leyden, op. cit., 1024, p. 152-157, Wustenfeld, Geschichts- schreibung, p. 3; Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 182.

Nahrawân (a. s., III. direction, path, also intention, but gradually acquired the special meaning of grammar. The Arab philologists divide it into two branches: a. accentuació, 'ilm al-qaf or 'ilm al-qaf, comprising the theory of verbal stems and their conjugation, the formation of nouns and adjectives, the formation of the plural and of the feminine, etc., i.e. with individual word-forms only, and syntax, 'ilm al-naṣîb in the narrow sense. The fundamental grammatical conceptions of the Arab philologists are taken from Aristotelian logic, which came via Persian scholars to the Arabs (on the dependence of the Arabic phonetic system on the Indian, cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 97). As the beginnings of Arabic learning in general are lost in obscurity, so also is the origin of the appellative naṣîb uncertain even to the Arabs themselves. The caliph 'Ali is said to have instructed Abu 'l-Awsâ'id al-Dansa'il, who is regarded as the founder of 'ilm al-naṣîb, how he should divide up the subject and to have said by saying: 'naṣîb, "take this path", whence the new science received the name of naṣîb. According to another story, Abu 'l-Awsâ'id laid down the principles of Arabic grammar and said to the people: waṣîhâ, "follow this", from this the name naṣîb is said to be derived. The stimulus to deal with the problems of language is said to have come from the caliph 'Ali; he, the story goes, taught Abu 'l-Awsâ'id the fundamental principles of naṣîb and expounded to him the division of all language into three categories: res, fâl and bâs. Another explanation as to how Abu 'l-Awsâ'id came to lay down the principles of Arabic grammar seems to
be nearer the actual facts. Ziyâd b. Abîth [q.v.] asked him to put on record the principles of grammar which 'Abî had taught him; but he was reluctant to do this and asked the governor to excuse him this task. When however on one occasion he heard a 'Kurîn reader make a mistake, which destroyed the sense, in reading the sacred book, he declared himself ready to carry out the task. He therefore had a clerk come to him, to whom he dictated and said: When you see me in pronouncing a letter open the mouth completely (fatâsâ), put a point above the letter; when I close the mouth (famâ), put a point in front of it, and when I half close it (basa), put the point below the letter. In this way the invention of vowel signs is traced back to Abî 'l-Awsâd.

Another story, which deals with the same question, tells how a newly converted mawlâ made a grammatical error in the hearing of Abî 'l-Awsâd; one of the latter's household laughed at this but Abî 'l-Awsâd said: These are mawillîs who long for Islam, who accepted it and thereby have become our brethren. How would it do if we were to draw up the laws of language for them? He thereupon prepared the chapter on subject and object. There must certainly be an element of at least probability in these anecdotes. By the accession of nomads to Islam, the language of the Arabic language might be corrupted by foreign elements; there was further the demand that the sacred text of the 'Kurîn should be read aloud without error and its meaning accurately interpreted; these thus arose the necessity for a systematic investigation of the language of the sacred book and the laying down of the rules of its language, so that those ignorant of the language could guide themselves. Other anecdotes which relate to the problem of the origin of mawillî and all of which, of course, like those already given, are to be regarded as mawillî, also describe Abî 'l-Awsâd as its founder, so that he may with justice be called the earliest Arabic philologist (mawillî). None of his writings has come down to us. He is regarded as the founder of the philological school of Basra, the origin of which must therefore go back to a very early period (Abî 'l-Awsâd died about the end of the first century A.H.). Only to mention one of the most important, this school also belonged Abû 'Amr b. 'Alî b. Ubâda and Abî-'Azmâ', to whom we owe much of our knowledge of the 'Uthâfiyya, Stobawîth, whose great work on grammar became "the book" par excellence, Khaîîl, who is regarded as the inventor of the system of prosody, and many others. Very early there was rivalry between the schools of the scholars of Basra. There also learned men began to deal with linguistic problems. While at first ideas were exchanged between the two schools, and students went from Kûfa to Basra to study, and well known Basra scholars came to Kûfa; gradually a considerable rivalry arose between the two. The Basra laid greater stress on grammatical principles than the Kûfâns and were in general regarded as more faithful and more accurate transmitters. The questions disputed and the differences between the two schools are dealt with in a work by 'Abîl-rahmân b. Muhammad b. Umâma b. Abî 'Alî, Abu Sa'id b. Abî Anbar; it is called mawillî of al-Ka'î and al-Mufaddal al-Jabîbili. After the third century the centre of Arab learning was transferred to the capital of the Islamic empire, Baghda'd. In the new Baghda'd school which arose there the differences in point of view between the Kûfâns and Basra schools gradually disappeared.


(LIKE LICHTSTÄDTER)

Nâîb (A.), literally "substitute, delegate" (qen agenti from e-w-a-d to take the place of another); the term was generally applied to any person appointed as deputy of another in an official position, and more especially, in the Mamlîk and Dîhil Sultânates, to designate a deputy or lieutenant of the Sultán and the governors of the chief provinces (see also the article Sûfi, above, vol. III., p. 161). In the Mamlîk system the former, entitled nâîb al-ṣâlûf (or nâîb 'alîquama mawillî al-mamlûk al-ṣâlûf) or al-nâîb al-mamlûk, was charged with the administration of the territories and affairs of the empire on behalf of the Sultán. This was, however, only an occasional office, and its holder is to be distinguished from the nâîb al-ṣâlûf, the temporary governor of Cairo (or Egypt) during the absence of the Sultán or of Damascus during the absence of the nâîb al-ṣâlûf. The six nâîbîs of Syria which replaced the Ayyûbî mandalâkis—Damascus, Halâb, Tripoli, Hamâ, Sa'ad and al-Karak (their number was from time to time increased by the erection of Ghaza and other districts into separate provinces)—were each administered by a nâîb al-ṣâlûf (also entitled nâîb al-mandalâk), who was an "amir of a thousand," the nâîb of Damascus being superior to the others. At the end of the ninth (eighth) century Egypt also was divided into three similar nâîbîs: Alexandria (from 769); Upper Egypt (al-wâqîf al-ahkâm or al-ṣâlûf) and Lower Egypt (al-wâqîf al-ḥâkarî). The plain title of nâîb was held by the commandants of the citadels of Cairo, Damascus, Halâb, etc., who were not under the jurisdiction of their respective governors, and by various amirs of lesser rank holding subordinate commands. (For an instance of more recent use, see art. Hâkîm.)

In the Dîhil Sultânate the nâîb was the powerful minister who was the deputy of the king himself. The earliest recorded instance of this is the appointment of 'Utsâhîr al-Dîn at-Tâbilî as deputy on the occasion of Sultan Mū'izz al-Dîn Barâhîn at-Shâh in 635 (1240) ( Minhâj al-Dîn at-Tâbilî, Taḥâfûṣul Naṣîrî, in Bibl. Ind., p. 191). In fact, the support of the nobles was conditional upon the appointment of this person to the deputyship. Although this was a separate office from that of the wazîr, nevertheless under powerful nâîbîs, like Malik al-Kâfîrî in the reign of 'Alî al-Dîn Khaîîlî and Khanaâwî in the reign of Mubârak Shîbî, its existence was not conducive to the growth of the powers of the wazîr.

In its most common acceptance, in Persian and Turkish as well as in later Arabic, nâîb signified a judge-substitute, or delegate of the hâkî in the administration of law. In modern Arabic it...
Nāţīl[^1] ([C. COLLIN DAVIES])

Nāţīl, properly YENİ-ZEKE MUSTAFĂ ÇELİK, called after his father Pfef KHALİFA also Pfef-ZEKE, a celebrated Ottoman poet. He is usually described as Nēfīl-i KADİR, "old Nēfīl," to distinguish him from Yiṇī Nāţīli, young Nāţīli, the poet and nawewli Nāţīlī Sāḥib Efendi of Mevlâna, author of severalŞef works who died in 1595 (1576) in Cairo.

Nēfīl was one of the greatest Ottoman poets of the post-classical period, the period of the weak sultan (Murād IV, Ibrahim and Mehmed IV, 1555-1683), of rule by women and emirs (Küşem Şafit, Bekāş Ağa and Murād Ağa) and of the grand vizier of the Köprülü. He is a link between Nēfīl and Yahlī and Nāţīl and Nēfīl. He and Yahlī are the best poets between Nēfīl and Nāţīl, the reviver of Ottoman literature.

Born in Constantinople, on the conclusion of his education he became secretary in the Divān-i Kāmil and was ultimately a khōfi in the office of the Department of Minas (wa‘āf al-inām). As his Divān shows, he belonged to the Khalwet order. He was a weak, delicate man of feeble constitution who died in 1677 (1657-1668) in exile, it is said, into which he had been sent by Fâṣil Ahmâd Pasha Köprülü. Brusiloff Mehmed Tāhir's statement that his tomb was in the cemetery of the Sünbulât monastery in Fındoğull and that his remains were removed to the cemetery of Persia when the road was widened, cannot be quite reconciled with the story of his banishment.

Nēfīl is one of the most interesting figures in the history of Turkish poetry. He did not, it is true, contribute anything essential to the actual development of Ottoman literature and gave it no new inspiration. He was an innovator but only in the field of style and language. He steadily worked to break down the rigidity and monotony of the post-classical school. His style is extremely artificial. His language is full of Persianisms but not in quite the same way as in the preceding periods. His diction is full of unusual Persian images and expressions with which he enriched the Turkish language in brilliant verses, somewhat exhausting however through the obscurity of their allusions. The fine new phrases and expressions are however not his own but are simply borrowings. Nāţīl succeeded in clearing away the stagnation of the literary language of the time by dropping the trite and hackneyed metaphors and phrases, which had been found in all divans since Bâbi and borrowed new phrases and constructions from the Persian.

Although he wrote in Turkish his dictation is purely Persian. He follows his Persian models so slavishly that his language is unintelligible to a Turk who does not know Persian. But the Ottoman poets wrote only for themselves and their equals and not for the people whom they ignored.

Nāţīl is the chief representative of the highly developed and marvellously elaborated literary language in which, as Gibb says, a rich and delicate Persian embroidery is harmoniously sewn upon the Turkish background, while the two languages remain sharply distinguished from one another.

Nēfīl's characteristics are a charming freshness of phrasing, subtlety of imagination, an artificial, individual style, gracefulness, clarity and purity of language, succinctness of expression and polished style such as no poet of his time possessed. According to Mu'allim Nāţīlī, no Turk can read him without enthusiastically trying to imitate him, which is however hardly possible. His language is so finished and free from all superfluity that the meaning is often obscure and unintelligible. There is however a great deal that charms the reader, especially as his language is so melodious.

As a poet he has not the same powers as he has as a master of language and style. It is his language and not his poetic conception that is his strong point. He did not seek inspiration from his surroundings, like Yahlī, but from his Persian model.

Nēfīl's literary work consists only of a Divān, which was printed in Bālik in 1255 (1837) (only about a third of the MSS., was printed however). It consists of four very fine hymns in honour of the Prophet (na's), some 20 kâşfas the language of which resembles that of Nēfīl and shows the same exaggeration. The kâşfas are dedicated to Murūd IV and Mehmed IV, to the grand vizier Kāra Muṣṭafā Pasha (1048-1055), Mehmed Pasha (1055-1055), Sāhib Pasha (1055-1055), Sāhib Mehmed Pasha (1055-1059), to the Shāhī al-Salām Bahā Efendi, Yahlī Efendi, Hāfiz Mehmed Efendi, the Deltēf and others. The Divān also contains a touching vērēbē (elegy) written in the tābūr-i bāld manner on the death of his brother who died young, which is almost too extravagant with its effective refrain; also a tābūn and some māzālā in the tābūr and tābūr-i bārd manners and a tābūr-i bārd.

His most important and most characteristic work
It is however over 200 gazelles in which he imitates Fatul. In them he continually produces new impressions, new ideas and images, new significances of words. Besides a passion kept within natural bounds and a tenderness of feeling, which reminds one of Nâdîm and makes a deep impression on any lover, there is an undeniably reminiscent of Nâdîm, in his outlook on life, probably as the result of political conditions and his poor health. Occasionally, there is something cold and forced about him. One feels that his spirit is ill and troubled.

Nâdîl especially influenced Thâbit and Nâdîm. His principal successors as poets were Heresgi 'Arif Ilkiket and Venîçhegelî 'Awnî.


Thâbit Negiûn, Ta'rîkh-i Estâfatî 'Abdîler Mezîr İstanbul 1338, i, 157-159; Şerifî, Sûfîî-Îsmâîlî, iv, 529; Bandîlî Mehmed 'Ârif, 'Öomezli Mezîrî Estâfatî, ii, 443-445; Serât-i Fatihî, save, 71; Hammer-Purgstall, G.O.W., iii, 497-499; Kûnos, Osmanî fethî âmilî, Budapest 1895, p. 80; Gibb, H.O.P., iii, 304-311; Basmaqânî, Eceâî 'Elmûnî-i ichterî, Istanbul 1916, p. 118; the catalogues of MSS. by Flügel and Rieu. (Menêl)

NÂMA, Muflîk, a Turkish historian. Maşafî Nâmî known as Nâmî was born in 1065 (1655) in Aleppo. After becoming a tezkârî (halberdier) in 1100 (beg. Oct. 26, 1688) in the imperial palace, he was promoted to be a secretary in the Dîwan under the grand vizier Kâzî-îksen Ahmîd Pasha. On the 28th Dîwânî-i 1110 (Nov. 28, 1704) he became the constant secretary (amir) and in 1709 succeeded 'Umar as master of ceremonies and imperial historian (sevânî-sâmîrî, q.v.). He later filled several other offices (cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 245) and during the campaigns in the Morea was assistant to the commander-in-chief (şerîfverî). He died at the beginning of 1128 (Jan. 1716) at Old Patras, where he was buried in the outer court of the mosque which has now disappeared. On his tombstone cf. Brusâlî Mehmed Ahsû, 'Öomezli Mezîrî, i, 151, below, and on his death the first of the middle of the Sultan, 1128 in Ahmîd Pasha, Hicri on Şebîb xavvûl Istanbul hayâtî (1100-1200), Istanbul 1930, p. 52 sq.

The candid and accurate history of the Ottoman empire, which he wrote in his official capacity and which he based upon earlier histories like the works of Kars. Celebi-Îsik (q.v.), 'Udârî (q.v.), Ahmad Şarîk al-Mas'ûdî, Hâdîdî Kâlih (q.v.) and the imperial Ottoman history mentioned at the end of his work as begun but not finished by a certain 'Ismet (cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., iii, 326), covers the years 1000 (beg. Oct. 9, 1591) to 1170 (beg. Sept. 8, 1659). The full title of this much esteemed and largely used work is:

Ravâs at-şifânî wa-kašîlît, Ahhîb at-kašîlît, in Hâdîdî Kâlih, No. 1349, called simply Ta'rîkh-i 'Abdîl.

Maşafî Nâmî also wrote several political treatises (Kudîlî-i nûmânedîlî), which have survived in a collected volume.

Nâmî interpreted his duties as a historian very seriously and his incorrigible love of the truth secured his work a superiority over those of all other Ottoman historians of the time. On Nâmî's view of the "duties of the historian" cf. his own words in A. W. Dahn, Türkische Forschungen, 1928, p. 2. The original MS. of his Ta'rîkh is in Istanbul in the collection of the Erivan-Kânî. On the four editions and their variations cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 256, on the third edition see also J. A. 1868, i, 468.

A French translation (still in MS.) was prepared by Antoine Galland (Fonds Français, No. 42,197 in the Bibliothèque Nationale); specimens of it were published by N. Jorga in the Actes et fragments de l'historien des Roumains, i (Bucharest 1885) p. 55.

Biography: Cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 246 and particularly Yehe Miafsînî, Istanbul 1918, No. 55, p. 49 sqq.; Ahmad Râfîq, Alâverde ve-eunátârâr, Istanbul 1924, p. 256 sqq.; Selâm, Ta'kûr, p. 681 sqq. (according to whom he also studied chemistry and other arts and sciences and was a carefree lolly pop companion) and 'Ali Dînîbî, Nâmî Ta'rîkhî, Istanbul 1937. (Franz Babinger)

NAKÇIÇÜVAN (NAKCIUSIAN), a town to the north of the Araxes.

The town Nâşûzus is mentioned in Ptolomy, v, ch. 7. 12. The Armenians explain the name of Nakçewan (Nakçian) by a popular etymology as nakç-çewan ("Nakçah's first stopping-place") (although the name is apparently compounded with -çewa "place") and locate the town in the province of Vaspurakan (cf. Yehe, i, 122), or in that of Shemik. According to Moses of Chorev, i, ch. 30, Nakçiewan was in the area populated by Median prisoners (mer) in whom we should see the ancestors of the town of Nazdivan of the region, (cf. Balâqchî, p. 200, muflîk-âbalâq). In the early Arab sources we find the form Naghâwâ, Balâdîhâr, p. 105, 200; Ibn Miskâwî, i, 145; Simâtî, p. 560; Nakçâwî. In the Sassanian and Mongol period the predominant form is Nakçüwan (as early as Ibn Khûrdâbbîhî, p. 122).

The town was conquered under Yehebâm by Hâshb b. Manlana. It was rebuilt under Mu'awiya by 'Atsb h. Hittim. In 87 (705) the Arabs hanged a large number of Armenian notables, whereupon the town acquired a Muslim character. For a short time (about 900) the power was in the hands of the Baqtrinî, but the town was reconquered by the Shbûlûq (q.v.) and belonged henceforth to the domain of their vassal, the emir of Golbud (Orcundî); cf. Markv, Südarmonî, Vienna 1939, p. 79, 99, 101, 115; test, p. 300, 352, 567. It figures in the wars of the Baglam period (Ibn Miskawî, ii, 148) and in the events of the Saljuq period (cf. Ibn al-Atîr under 514 a. h.).

Nâşûzus is more particularly associated with the family of Tâgûxî at-taghûxî of Abladeh-Abd (531-632 = 1136-1225), cf. Mîhrâbî, Râvâs at-şifânî, Lucknow 1894, p. 875-876) whose main centre it was, as is shown by the fine buildings: a tomb (maqâsîd) of al-ârif al-aflâf Kâbe al-Din Djami, etc.
NAKHCHUBAN — NAKHSHAB.

In the valley of the Ashk-Abad, cf. Ilm Hawkal, p. 376: Kasgh-ninah, which runs southwards parallel to the Zarafshân (river of Sarmakand) and runs towards the Amul-Darya [q. v.]; but before joining it disappears in the sands. Nakhshab lies on the road joining Bukhara to Balik 4 days' journey from the former and eight from the latter (cf. Muqaddas, p. 344). In the time of Isâkhârî (p. 335) the town consisted only of one quarter (rabat) and a ruined citadel (kundan). The river ran through the centre of the town (Ibn Hawkal, p. 578).

The Mongols from the time of Cîngî-Khan (1219) used the region of Nakhshab for their summer encampments. The Genghiz-khan Kûkî (1218-1236) and Kızan (killed in 1247) had palaces built there, as a result of which the whole district was called Karshî ("palace") in Mongol [q. v.]. Karshî is often mentioned in the time of Timûr (Qafar-nûma, i. 111, 244, 259 etc.) but it was eclipsed by Kish (Shahr-i Sabz, q. v.), the birthplace of Timûr, 3 days' journey above Kâshî. The citadel of Karshî was of considerable strength and valiantly resisted Shâhâbî Kânî (cf. Shâhâbî-nûma, ed. Mîlonnovsky, p. 29) and 'Abd Allah Kânî of Bukhârâ (in 965 = 1558). From the xviiiith century onwards Karshî began to rise at the expense of Kish and from 1920 was the second town of the khâne of Bukhârâ with a population of 60,000.

The problem of identifying the ruins in the district of Karshî has been studied on the spot by L. A. Zimin, who formulates his conclusions as follows: 1. The ruins of the ancient city of Nakhshab are around the hill of Shâkâk-tâp (cf. Mahdî Kânî, Turâkhi-nâdîrî on the events of 1199) which marks the site of the old citadel, already in ruins in the xivth century. 2. As a result of the erection of the Mongol palaces somewhere to the south of the river, the town began to shift southwards, and at the end of the xivth century when Timûr built a citadel there it must have occupied in part the site of the modern Karshî. 3. The remains of this citadel (which Shamshîbî Kân and 'Abd Allah Kân besieged in vain) ought to be sought near the ruins of Kallâ-yi Zâhîr-i Mârân (about 2 miles S.W. from Karshî).

NAKSHABDJ SHAHSH AH Diva al-Din (d. 751 =1350), a famous Persian author (not to be confused with the famous Sufi Shahsh Ahb Turab Nakshabdj, d. 245 = 860). Very little is known of his career.

His nisba suggests that he came from Nakshabdj [q.v.], but he went to India where he became a murid of Shihsh Fadl, a descendant of the celebrated Shahsh Hamid al-Din Nangar. The Akhbar al-Akhbar of 'Abd al-Hajj Diliwli (Diliwli 1309, p. 104-107) says that he died in Baha‘u‘in after a long and contemplative life and that his tomb is there.

Nakshabdj was a prolific writer who used his knowledge of Indian languages to translate Indian books into Persian. His best-known work is the Tufi-i-nama ("Book of the Parrot") very popular in India and Central Asia, based on the Sanskrit Cukhamadhi (partly translated into Greek by D. Galanos, Athens 1851). In the preface to this book Nakshabdj tells us that one of his patrons showed him an old Persian translation of this work and persuaded him to do it again as the language of the old translation was too simple and artless. Nakshabdj set to work and made a book of 52 chapters (called "nights") replacing some stories which did not seem to him sufficiently interesting by better ones.

The book, completed in 730 (1330), is in the usual form of a framework with inset stories and is characterised by unusually fine language and bold metaphors and similes. Nakshabdj’s language however seems to have been too difficult and precious for later generations as by command of the Emperor Akbar, Ann l-Fadal b. Munbarak rewrote the book in a simplified version (Rieu, p. 753). This version was completely supplanted by Muhammad Kadiri (xviii century) who reduced it to 35 chapters. Kadiri’s version became the foundation of a large number of translations into Hindi (Awari and Ghauswala), Bengali (Caciquara Munshi), Turkish (Safii ‘Abd Allah Efendi, ed. Bu’lluk 1254 and Constantinople 1256) and Kashmiri. There is also a metrical version in Persian by Hammid Lehiyri (Bland, in J. R. A. S. i. 165). The same theme is taken by a number of popular versions which were disseminated in Persia in cheap lithographs under the title Cil (dilh) Tufi (*40 parrots*). The text of one of these was published by V. Zimkovski (St. Petersburg 1901).

Nakshabdj’s work was known in Europe as early as 1792 when M. Germain published a free English translation of 12 nights. Kadiri’s version was translated into German by C. L. I. Iken (Stuttgart 1829); this edition contains an essay on Nakshabdj and specimens of his Tufii-nama by Kosegarten. The Turkish version was translated into German by L. Rosen (Leipzig 1858). So far no complete translation of the original work of Nakshabdj has been published although there is a French translation in MSS. in Munich. E. Berteils has translated the book into Russian but this version is also still in manuscript. The eighth night was published in original text and German translation by H. Brockhaus (Leipzig 1843 and in Bütter für literarische Unterhaltung, 1843, No. 242, 243, p. 969 sqq.). Nakshabdj’s other works never attained anything like the popularity of the Tufii-nama but have almost all come down to us. Among them are: Cilare (*Scattered Roses*), a novel dealing with the loves of Ma‘yam-ahab and Nakshabdj (pr. by Agha Mahmud Kazi Muhammad Shirazi and K. F.

Aoe, Calcutta 1912, in Bibil. Ind.); Dastur-i-nahab-i-safa ("Particulars and Generals") also called Cil Ahmar (Rieu, p. 740), an allegory which deals with the descriptions of the various parts of the human body considered as the noblest work of God and as proof of His greatness; Ladkah-nahab-i-nahab, a Persian version of the Kasa-Satira, an Indian work on different temperaments and sexual intercourse; Silk al-Sulhik, a collection of sayings of celebrated mystics (lit. Diliwli 1893), and Na‘ib-i-m-Mawari, a brief treatise of a Sufi nature (Rieu, p. 736). His treatise Ashara Muqablah is only known from its mention in the Akhbar al-Akhbar (see above). All the mute processes of Nakshabdj are embellished with ‘fam’ scattered through them, which show that he was also an excellent poet.


(E. Berthels)

NAKIR. [See MUNKAR.]

NAKSHABDJ, MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD BA’I al-Din al-Bukhari (717-791 = 1317-1389), founder of the Nakshabdj Order. His name, which signifies "painter," is interpreted as "drawing incomparable pictures of the Divine Science" (J. F. Brown, The Darmstatts, 2nd ed., p. 143) or more mystically as "holding the form of real perfection in the heart" (Miekh al-Ma‘ya quoted by Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 2188). The title al-Sa‘id which is given him in a dirge cited in the Naqshabdj means "spiritual leader". The nisba al-Uwaist implies that his system resembled that of Uways al-Karani. His Acia were collected by one of his adherents, Salih b. Mu‘mbarak. In a work called Maksikkat Sayyidin al-Sa‘id Naqshabdj, which furnished material to the author of Cilare al-Hayat (893 = 1488), and from which large citations, apparently in the words of Nakshabdj himself, but translated from Persian into Arabic, are given in the modern work al-Haddi al-arwa‘i fi Haddi al-Adil al-Na‘aband they by ‘Abd al-Majid b. Mu‘ammad al-Kashi (Cairo 1306). He was born in a village at the distance of one faranak from Bukhara, called Kusht Hinduwa, but afterwards Kusht ‘Arisan. At the age of 18 he was sent to Samara, a village one mile from Ramthana and three from Bukhara, to learn Sufism from Muhammad Bihis al-Samtar. In this person’s system the qi’ah was recited aloud; Nakshabdj preferred that of ‘Ali al-Daula ‘Abd al-Kaji, al-Ghadiwar (d. 575 a.h.), to recite it to himself; and this led to ill-feeling between him and the other adherents of al-Samtar, who however, it is stated, ultimately confessed that Nakshabdj was right, and on his deathbed appointed him his bhaiyya. After this person’s death he went to Samarkand, and thence
to Bukhārā, where he married, and whence he returned to his native village; thence he went to Nasaf, where he continued his studies under a khalīfa of al-Sammāt, Amīr Kulāf. He then lived for a time in villages near Bukhārā given as Zawartūn and Ahsikta, then studied with a khalīfa of Amīr Kulāf named ʿArif al-Dīk-kirānī for seven years; after this he spent twelve years in the service of the Sultan Shahsūrd, whose rise to sovereignty is described by Ibn Battūta (iii. 49), and whose capital appears to have been Samarkand. After this monarch's fall (747 - 757) he returned to Zawartūn, where he practised philanthropy and the care of animals for seven years, and read- mending for another seven. The last years of his life appear to have been spent in his native village, where according to the Rāgābātī he was buried. Vāmhīrā (Travels in Central Asia, 1864) gives Bavadīnī, two leagues from Bukhārā, as the name of the village which contains his tomb; whether pilgrimages are made even from the most remote parts of China, while it was the practice in Bukhārā to go thither every week, intercourse with the metropolis being maintained by means of some 300 asses plying for hire.

The biographies bring him into connection with various places and persons. At Herāt a banquet was given in his honour by the Amīr Husain (b. Ghīyāth al-Dīn al-Aqīfī; cf. Ibn Battūta, loc. cit.), where in spite of the Amīr's assurance that the food had been honestly obtained, Naḵšbandī refused it, and it had to be given away in charity. He was with this prince also at Serkhānī. Two or three pilgrimages and visits to Baghdād, Nisābūr and Tabrīz are mentioned. His sayings were collected by Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Hāfīz al-Bukhārī at the request of Abī Ḥafs al-Dīn ʿĀṭar al-Bukhārī (d. 802 Ḥ.). (Brit. Mus. Add. 26.294). Persian writings by him are mentioned in the Hāflābī.


(D. S. Margoliouth)

NĀKŪS (A.), pl. nāwābān, a kind of rattle used and in some places still used by Christians in the east to summon the community to divine service. It is a hollow pierced with holes which is beaten with a rod. The name, which comes from the Syrian nāqūsh, is not infrequently found with the verbs šasra or pāša in the old Arabic poets, especially when early morning is to be indicated, e.g. Ṭartura, app.; Laḥid, No. 19, 6; Z.D.M.G., xxxii. 215; Mutalammīs, ed. Völlers, p. 178, v. 6; al-ʿĀṣh in Nößeler's Diction., p. 26; Kūḥāl al-Aqīfīn, xix. 92. According to tradition, Muḥammad hesitated between this instrument and the Jewish trumpet before deciding on the call to prayer by the muḥdhdhīn (s. Āʾīlān).


(F. Buhl)

AL-NAMĀRA, a place in Syria. It is situated in the karra of al-Ṣafī on an eminence in the Wādī Ḥalūrā, which runs from the Djebel al-Dīta (Djebel al-Haswan) to the plain of Ṭubba, at the spot where it joins the Wādī Ḥalūrā. It corresponds to the Roman military post of Namara (Waddington, Inscriptions, No. 2275). Less than a mile S. E. of al-Namāra, Dussaud found the Nabatāean-Arab tomb inscription of the "King of all the Arabs", Maru ʿl-Kais bar ʿAmur, i.e. the Lakhmid Iruru ʿl-Kais b. ʿAmur, of the 7th-9th centuries, of the era of Ḫusayn (dec. 7, 328 A. H.), (cf. vol. i, p. 3829).


Three other places bore the same name in ancient times:

1. Namara (Waddington, No. 2172-2185), the modern Druze village of Nimra in the Djebel al-Hamān northwest of al-Mashhaf.


2. Namara, a village in Banatia, probably the modern Namir al-Hawa, N. E. of Dor.

Bibliography: Schamacher, in Z.D.P.V., xii. 291; xx. 211; Dussaud, Topographie, p. 341, 359 sq.

3. Namara, a village in Banatia, probably the modern Nāmir al-Hawa, N. E. of Dor.

Bibliography: Schamacher, in Z.D.P.V., xii. 291; xx. 211; Dussaud, Topographie, p. 341, 359 sq.

NĀMIK KAMĀL BEY. [See KEMAL MEKhED NAMIK]

AL-NAML, the Ants, the title of Sūra xxvii. of the Kurʾān, the whole of which was revealed at Mecca. Nōldeke puts it among the Sūras of the second period. It contains 95 verses. Its title is taken from verse 18: "When the armies reached the valley of the Ants, one of them said, 'O ye ants, return to your homes lest Solomon and his armies crush you without noticing it'." It contains one verse that was abrogated (verse 94 annulled by lx. 2).

Bibliography: cf. AL-NAML.

(Maurice Clermont-Ganneau)

NAMURD, also NAMRUDDH, NAMRUD, the Nimrod of the Bible, is associated in Muslim legend, as in Haggada, with the story of the childhood of Abraham. The Kurʾān, it is true, does not mention him but probably, as in many other cases, only from dislike of mentioning names. That Muhammad was acquainted with the legend
of Namrud is evident from the following verse:

"Do you not see how he disputed with Ibrāhīm about the Lord who had granted him dominion? When Ibrāhīm said: It is My Lord who gives life and death, the other replied: I give life and I slay. When Ibrāhīm said: God makes the sun rise in the east; do you make it rise in the west; then the liar was humbled" (II. 260). The Kurān exegists are probably right when they see Namrud here disputing with Ibrāhīm and also when they refer to Namrud the verse: "What did Ibrāhīm's people answer? They only said: Kill him, burn him; but God saved him from the fire" (xxix. 23).

The legend is already richly developed in Tabari, but it is at the beginning of the romance of 'Antar in the Abūmīrīn that we find its most elaborate development.

Tabari already numbers Namrud among the three or (with Nebuchadnezzer) four kings who, like Sūlaimān b. Dāwūd and Dhu 'l-Karmān, ruled the whole world. His astrologers told him that a child would be born who would overthrow his kingdom and destroy his idols. Ibrāhīm thus becomes one of those heroes of legend who are persecuted from the moment of birth by a tyrant, to whom they are destined to prove fatal, like Moses, Gilgamiš, Semiramis, Sargon, Karna (in the Mahābhārata), Trakhan (King of Gilgit), Cyrus, Perseus, Telephus, Aegisthus, Oedipus, Romulus and Remus, Jesus (see Frazer, Folklore in the Old Testament, ii. 437-455). Uša, the wife of 'Azār or of Tārikh (Teraib), is able to deceive Namrud and his searchers. Ibrāhīm is born in concealment; maturing rapidly, he engages in a religious dispute with Namrud; Namrud cannot be God for God gives life and death. Namrud replies that he can do this also for he can execute or pardon a man condemned to death. Namrud has Ibrāhīm thrown into the fire; it becomes a cool health-resort. An angel keeps Ibrāhīm cool at which Namrud reveals his identity: Nebuchadnezzer at the preservation of the three young men in the fiery furnace (Daniel iii. 24 sq.). Namrud resolves to attack the God of Ibrāhīm in his heaven. He feeds four young eagles on meat and wine till they are of a great size, ties them to the four corners of a chest, fastens a spear at each corner with a piece of meat on the point and sits in the chest; the eagles, trying to reach the meat, fly higher and higher. The mountains appear like antheans and later the whole world looks like a ship in the water. It is in vain however for he falls to earth. Next he builds a tower in order to reach the god of Ibrāhīm, then the tongues are confused; in place of one Syriac tongue, 73 arose. God's angels admonish Namrud. But he equips his armies against God. God envies an army of gnats against him, who eat the flesh of the blood of Namrud and his men. A gnat enters Namrud's brain through his nose. For 400 years he had exercised his tyrannical rule and for 400 years he was tortured by the gnats until he died.

Muslim legend derives the name Namrud from namrudaka: he who rebelled (against God). But there is another derivation, viz. from namraa "tigress" in that version of the Namrud legend in which Namrud is snatched by a tigress. This version resembles the Romulus and Remus story (Jean de l'Ours) and culminates in the Oedipus story for Namrud, brought up unknown, kills his father and marries his mother. Al-Kīšī has preserved this version and it is given at greater length in the introduction to the romance of 'Antar.

Namrud's father Kanān b. Kūsh has a dream which troubles him; it is interpreted to mean that his son will kill him. The child is born, a snake enters his nose, which is an ominous sign. Kanān wants to kill the child, but his mother Sulkuh'na entrusts him secretly to a herdsman; the latter's flock scatters at the sight of the black flat-nosed infant. The shepherd's wife throws the child into the water; the waves wash him to the bank where he is awoke by a tigress. Already dangerous when quite a boy, as a young man he becomes a robber leader, attacks Kanān with his band, kills him (without knowing that he is killing his father), marries his own mother and becomes king of the country and later lord of the world. 'Azār (already in the Kurān the father of Ibrāhīm) builds him a marvellous palace flowing with milk, oil and honey, with mechanical singing birds — in the medieval epic the wonderful feature of the Chrysolirion in Byzantium. The lore of astrology, the inheritance of Idris and Hermes he acquires by force from the pupils of Idris. Ibīs teaches him magic. He has himself worshipped as a god. Then dreams, voices and omens frighten him. In spite of all Namrud's cruel orders, Ibrāhīm is born, brought up and soon shatters the belief in Namrud. Namrud throws those who believe in God to the wild animals but they do not touch them. He denies them food; the sand of the desert becomes corn for them; on every grain of it is written: "gift of God". Namrud throws Ibrāhīm into the fire but he is unharmed. Namrud builds up a pile of fuel, the flames of which burn the birds for miles round — it is impossible to approach it. Ibīs then designs a ballista which hurls Ibrāhīm on to the flaming pile. Ibrāhīm spends the finest time of his life there under blooming trees and amid rippling brooks. Namrud then decides to attack the god of Ibrāhīm in heaven. Starved eagles fly up with his litter; until he is about to say the first heaven is 500 years in width, it is 500 years between heaven and heaven, then comes infinity. Namrud shoots an arrow against God; the arrow comes back stained with blood. Namrud suddenly becomes grey and old and falls to the ground. But he plumes himself on having slain God. Then a gnat puts an end to his life.

The history of the Namrud legend. Very little can have been taken from the Bible. Kurān expositors and collectors of legends call Namrud asbūr (tyrant) no doubt after the gībbur applied to Namrud in the Bible (Gen. x. 6); Geiger also sees in asbur 'umād (xi. 62) an allusion to Namrud. Tabari (l. 217) also describes Namrud as a muhrajābīrī. Muslim legends and Haggada describes: Aswāl, in Pers. Sīrān on Esther l. 1; Midr. Habadol, ed. Schechter, p. 180-181; Gaster, Examples of the Rhages, N. 1) make Namrud ruler of the world. From Haggada comes the association of Namrud with the Tower of Babel and in particular with the childhood of Abraham and in particular with their escape from the fire (Gen. Kabbah, xlix. l.). The death of Namrud caused by the gnat is also based on Haggada, which makes Titus, the destroyer of the Temple, die in this way. Nebuchadnezzer comes to a similar end (see Grünbaum, Neue Briefer, p. 97-99). The flight to heaven especially in the romance of 'Antar with the intervals of 500 years recall the ascent of Nebuchadnezzer in
As the personal interpretation is not sufficiently explained by meanings, known to be really old, of the true Arabic word nāṣūh (root n-s-m) which exists alongside of the Greek loanword, and meanings like “the trusted one, confidant of a secret” seem rather to come from the Greek loanword already known in its reference to Ḥijri (against Doey, Supplement, s.v.), it was natural to look for a specific use of the word nāṣūh which admitted of a personal interpretation and could at the same time have been known to the Arabs. Nyberg was reminded by the nāṣūh doctrine of the Jewish (al-Safaf, see below) of the pseudo-Clementine writings, and T. Andrus desires the nāṣūh of the Waraka tradition from the nāṣūh nāsūh of the pseudo-Clementine, which according to the book Ḥajjīma Ẓāygī was revealed to Adam and afterwards again appeared to all prophets worthy of such an honour, lastly to Moses and to Jesus. However startling the agreement of the conception of nāṣūh nāsūh with the later forms of the Waraka tradition, the question still remains open, by what way a personal conception of nāṣūh could have entered Islam. Bandunark quoted a passage from the Iturgy of St. James of Jerusalem: κύριε ἀγαθέ, ἰδίῶν δέ νασοῦ, ἐπιθυμηθείσας δέ τινι προφητείᾳ, and observes that the Iturgy was the authoritative formulary in the region, in the east it is already expanded in an Arabic translation. It is really quite natural to understand ἰδίῳ personally here. No explanation of our Waraka tradition can on the other hand be obtained from Mandanian writings as Libsharseh has already pointed out in his translation of the Iturgy, p. 247 sq.

There is a true Arabic word nāsūh which has already been mentioned. The dictionaries give such varied meanings for it, that we can only consider as old and original those that are confirmed by quotations. This holds for the meanings “hiding place, hunter’s hut, monk’s cell” probably also for “hunger, mide” as women agents from nāsūh to “beast”. On the other hand, not only the meaning “cunning” and its derivatives must be secondary, but also the already mentioned meanings referred to persons, the latter especially because the word so far as we know, is used also in the later literature predominantly in the material sense and the person connected with the idea is called shēkh al-nāsūh etc. (counter-example: Doey, s.v.). Just as the material meanings predominate generally, so also does the meaning of the Greek loanword predominate, apart of course from the old poetry, from which the meaning “midgo” and particularly the word nāṣūh “mosquito net” have survived into the modern vernacular. Below we shall therefore deal only with the development of meaning of the Greek loanword.

The favourite meaning is ásívne law, with or without the addition of lišī. This law is revealed through the prophets, and only men of prophetic spirit can be nāsūhu nāsūh in this sense. The double character, political and religious, of the Muslim constitution naturally very much favoured this conception. Thus, for example, al-Kaljīaskandari, Shēkh al-Aḥṣa’, 1, Cairo 1903, p. 280 gives as the first among the “law shah’s, shēkh al-nāsūh al-so’aḥza” N. Bandunark. Ibn Ṣina expressly observes in his encyclopaedia Aṣām al-ʿilm al-aḥṣā’ (in Mardīf al-Rāsī, Cairo 1938, p. 250 sq.) in treating of politics that the pertinent works of Plato and Aristotle understand
by apoc "cunning" and "inscr", corresponding to the usage of the vernacular, but sense, revelation, etc., for the laws of the community are dependent on prophecy and the divine laws; similarly Surengeur, Dict. of Technical Terms, I. 40. Allah al-Malakûl al-Tawhidî devotes the fourth of his 1437.lâlîk to the nūmâs al-tâlî (new ed., Cairo 1929).

Here we may mention Miskawî's (Ibn Miskawî's) definition which is also of literary interest. In connection with his discussion of the function of the dinâr as a measure of the equivalence (kârîq) of service and reward (Tabâkh al-Ashâb, ma'âsî, i.e., e.g., Cairo, Khairiya, 1322, p. 39), he quotes an alleged saying of Aristotle according to which the dinâr is a just nūmâs: Nūmâs, he adds, in striking contrast to Ibn Sina, means in Greek, sykôs and pollûs [q.v.]; Aristotle says in the Eth. Nic., the greatest nūmâs proceeds from God, the second is the judge, the third the dinâr; the first, as a condition for just settlement between the claims of men, is the example which the two others follow. The well-known situation of the Musliun books on Hellenic ethics has resulted in this explanation finding a place in late derivatives from Miskawî, e.g., in Naqîr al-Din al-Nishâ, 'Ali b. Mâlik al-Khâlidî, al-Gharîb al-Mutâlibî, al-Istikhârî, Tahâ b. al-Mu'ayyad, Tahâ b. al-Mu'ayyad, Tahâ b. al-Mu'ayyad, Tahâ b. al-Mu'ayyad, Tahâ b. al-Mu'ayyad, Tahâ b. al-Mu'ayyad (1322, p. 151), also in Kinhâhî, All b. 'Abî al-Mâlik al-Hâmînî (al'Alî, 1348, i. 7, p. 78) and each more fully than the preceding. As a result of these explanations al-Miskawî in the economic part of his book (ii. 2, p. 234) calls gold briefly the smallest nūmâs (translation in Fihrist, Der Schatzkasten des Neuplatonikers Bryson, 1928, p. 63), and Kinhâshî also follows him (ii. 2, p. 7).

The nūmâs doctrine of the lkhwân al-Safā can only be briefly outlined here. In part ii, p. 56 (Bombay ed.), the nūmâs is defined as a spiritual kingdom (nâma iskâla, 'abâb) which is upheld by 8 kinds of men. God appears as the diwâ al-nūmâs. Ŝâbîl al-nūmâs is from the context of Muhammad, as far as one can identify from the context any individuals in the pages of the lkhwân al-Safâ. A few pages later Muhammad is described as the maîl al-nūmâs. In part iv, p. 57, the angels appear as teachers of the ašâb al-nâma iskâla. Any one who does not guide his life according to the commandments and prohibitions of the latter, has no share in divine nūmâs (iv. 147). This spiritual kingdom is the element of the lkhwân al-Safâ; they start in the cave of their father Adam [q.v.], for a long period until the fore-ordained time (maîl al-nūmâs) came under the rule of the Lord of the greatest nūmâs (Muhammad), and they perceived their spiritual state (nâma iskâla) which was raised in the air and from which Adam and his wife had been banished (iv. 107). If the lkhwân al-Safâ by common effort and uniform self-instruction succeed in building a perfect spiritual state (fâhîsh, cf. al-Fâhîsh), this state will belong to the kingdom of the Lord of the greatest nūmâs, who has dominion over souls and bodies (iv. 211). The nūmâs: thus even becomes a kind of divine being, where there is a discussion of the "philosophic service of God", which represents the highest stage of humans in comparison with that of the Muslim teaching regarding obligations and duties. This philosophic service of God had been, they say, practised by the ancient Greeks on the first, middle, and last day of the month. The night of the first day was divided into three parts. The first was spent in worship of the nūmâs, the second, in meditation on the maîl al-nūmâs, the third in humble prostration before the Creator, confession of sins and repetition of prayers by Plato, Idris and Aristotle until the break of day (iv. 273 sqq.). Nevertheless, the author here has not exactly taken the place of God. But in several passages of the encyclopedia he is represented as giving names. Thus he calls the ruler of the planets angels (ii. 97); cf. iv. 244); he does the same with the natural forces (ii. 102) and (iii. 10) with the nature of origin and decay. Above the spheres (nâma iskâla) of the three kingdoms of nature and of man is the sphere of the divine nūmâs, whose members deal with the affairs of the nâma iskâla and the divine revelations and which corresponds to the "surrounding" (šîhk) sphere of the astronomers (iv. 251). As the nūmâs and the ability to become creative in him involves a special organization of man, he has found an allegorical place in the physiology and psychology of the lkhwân al-Safâ; here indeed the conception changes from page to page. Thus in the first part of the work (2nd half, p. 48) five kinds of soul are described, two above and two below that of man. The former two are the soul of the angels and the divine (šâhîd) soul, one of which is the stage of the soul of wisdom, the second that of nūmâs-prophethood. On the very next page the one is the intellectual soul of wisdom and the other the nūmâs-like angel soul. On p. 54 we find the following gradation: nature, soul, intellect, nūmâs. Nature receives through the soul free-will, through the intellect the power of thought and through the nūmâs command over actions and prohibitions. The parts of the soul are as follows: vegetable, animal, logical (human), intellectual (wise), nūmâs-iyya, angels, which latter serves the nūmâs. Here again there is the tendency to pantheism. It is in keeping with this when in lv. 119 (cf. also lv. 146) the story of Socrates in prison (in agreement with the Greek tradition and mentioning the Phãrûs) it is related that Socrates will not escape from prison: for fear of the nūmâs; he justifies his attitude with the words: "He who does not respect the nūmâs is slain by it". Then immediately afterwards the nūmâs is identified with the shâfr, it is difficult to say whether this is serious or only done out of caution. It is nevertheless remarkable that the sixth essay of the fourth part which treats of the nature of divine nūmâs, of the qualifications for prophethood and the qualities of a prophet, does not contain the word nūmâs at all but instead of it always has shâfr. The lkhwân have spiritual powers of their own; these form a series of four stages, the third of which is the furmân nūmâsîyya; man attains it at 40 and it is the special characteristic of kings and rulers. Possessors of this power are called the distinguished and noble (futâsh, kîrâm) brethren. Above it is only the furmân malâhîyya (lv. 134 sqq.).

The origin of the meaning "cunning" cannot be given with certainty; it probably comes from the Arabic meaning "place of concealment". The term that it was particularly common in the spoken language is evident from the quotation given above from Ibn Sina. In any case this meaning has undergone a remarkable amalgamation with the Greek *law* in the literature of magic for the word is there used for magical formulas, particularly those which are based on illusions of the senses. The pupil of al-Anîshî [q.v.] in his
Dhulon the latter’s Tefkhirâ, s.v. sâniyât (III, Cairo 1924, p. 56), gives the mushroom as the first section of the science. But the meaning of the word is not limited to this kind of magical formulæ.

Through translations from the Arabic the word entered the Hebrew literature of the middle ages with the meaning “law, religious law (of other peoples), morality, propriety?” In the latter meaning it has survived in the modern Hebrew vernacular. It is interesting to note that in the modern dialect of Macc a similar change of meaning is found; according to Snouck Hurgronje, Mekhanische Sprichwörter, No. 16, mânulu means the “sportless, honourable name” which one has among men; its opposite is der “shame.”

The word mânulu also plays a considerable part in the title of books. The “greatest mânulu” also occurs as the title of a book; cf. Ivanov, Catalogue, l. 335 sq.


On the Arabic poetry: the dictionaries; Fleischer, in Z.D.M.G., xii. (1858), p. 221 sqq.; some other meanings in Dovy, s.v.


On titles of books: Steinschneider, Hebr. Übers., p. 527; Cat. Litt., iii. 306.

(M. Flessner)

NÄR. [See DIAMHANAM.]

NARSHAKI, Abû Bakr Muhammad b. Zafar (d. 348/959), author of the “History of Bukhara,” the original Arabic version of which he presented to the Khlanid Nuh b. Nasr in 332/943–444). In 332 (1138–1139) the book was translated into Persian by Abû Nasr Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Kuhâbî who omitted several “fodious” passages. Then in 574 (1178–1179) Muhammad b. Zafar prepared a new abbreviated edition of the book which he presented to Abî ‘Abd al-Azîz b. Barhân al-Din, governor of Bukhara. Finally an unknown author continued it down to the Mongol conquest. It was in the last form that the book was published by Scheler. The book contains many interesting notes on the situation in Central Asia before and after the siege and details not found elsewhere of the Arab conquests (from Muhammad b. Zafar). The Persian translator added further details on the works of Abu 1-Hasan, Abû al-Kalâmâ b. Mahsâmad al-Nâshâpî and probably from Abu 1-Ishak ibn al-Sulî, d. in 243 (857). The information about the townships of the district of Bukhâr’s, their monuments, their products, their old customs (such as litanies for Sîwâlsh, p. 21) is very interesting.


§ 2. Nâsâ in Hamadân perhaps cor-
responds to the Nisāyat placed by the inscription of Darius (Behistun, i. 13) in Media. It is possible that the reference is to the plains of northern Luristan [q.v.] (Alishtar, Khabā), where the well-known bronzes of Luristan were found; cf. Minorsky, in Apollo, London, Feb. 1931.

(\textit{V. Minorsky})

\textbf{NASAFI, [See NĀṢABN̄I]. AL-NASAFI, nāba (cf. \textit{NASAF}) of several eminent persons of whom the following may be mentioned:

1. Abu 'l-Muqīn Mālikī b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Abū 'l-Makki Al-Hanafi Al-Nasafi (d. 1183 = 1764), one of the four scholastic positions in that between the of the period, as represented by 'Abd al-Ḳāhir al-Baghdādī [q.v.], who is still endeavouring to found a convenient arrangement and an adequate formulation of the contents of \textit{Jāmī'a}, and the younger mutakallim who use at hand the necessary mutannabbīs for ready use. Of his works the following are known to me:

1. \textit{Tanjīḥ il-Kawā'ib al-Tawābūn} (Cairo, MS. 2417, fol. 1–30; cf. Fikrist ... Mīrji, ii. 51), a treatise in which the contents of the creed are proved according to the scholastic method. The first chapter consists of an exposition of the doctrine of the existence of the concept of the existence of the immanent. The work closes with a brief introduction to the Doctrines in an abridged form;

2. \textit{Tajjīrāt al-Affāla} (Cairo, MSS. 2287, 6673; cf. Fikrist ... Mīrji, ii. 8), an elaborate work on dogmatists of nearly the same scheme as the \textit{Tanjīḥ}; 3. \textit{Bahār al-Kulūm}, printed at Cairo 1129 (1911), differs from the two foregoing works in so far as it deals with heresies and is polemical. It is identical with \textit{Maḥbūbat al-Sarwa wa 'l-Qamṣa wa l-İfāq al-Dalāl wa l-Mukhšas (Leyden, cod. or. 882) also as well as with 'Aṣīr (Berlin, No. 1941); cf. Ashwardi, \textit{Verzeichnis}, ii. 400). The work is preserved in several libraries under one of these titles (Broedkellmann, G. A. L., i. 426, where the number of five works must be reduced to three).

\textbf{Bibliography:} in the art.; cf. also Hājjīj Khalīfat, ed. Flügel, index, No. 6453.

II. Abu Ḥanīfā 'Umar Nāṣaj al-Dīn (d. 537 = 1142), jurist and theologian. Of his works the only one edited is the \textit{Aṣīr}, which has the form of a catechism. It became popular and was much commented, probably because it was the first abridged form of the creed according to the scholastic method of the new orthodoxy. In Europe it became known as early as 1433 through the edition by Careton (The \textit{Pillar of the Creed}, No. 2). For editions of and commentaries on this work as well as for the other works of this scholar that have come down to us, cf. G. A. L., i. 427 et al.

\textbf{Bibliography:} Broedkellmann, G. A. L., i. 428 and the references given there.

(\textit{A. W. Wensink})

\textbf{AL-NASAFI, ḤĀFIZ AL-DĪN ABU 'L-BARGĀT ABU 'AL-'ĀKHĀR B. 'ĀHMAD B. MAḤMŪD}, an important Hānafī legislator and theologian, born in Nasaf in Sogdiana, was a pupil of šūr al-'Ālim al-Kardāri (d. 642 = 1244–1245), Hamid al-Dīn al-Darāzi (d. 656 = 1256–1258), and Bādī al-Dīn K̄hwāshāzī (d. 651 = 1253). He taught in the Madrasa d̄aṣ'ītha al-S̄ālihīya in Kirmān, came in 710 to Baghdad and died in Kāfīr 1710 (August 1350); according to Karājā and Ibn Tāhirībird (70) apparently on his way back to Ḥādjīl (in K̄hūzestān), where he was buried. His pupils were Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn al-Ṣaltān, author of the \textit{Maḥfūz al-Ṭabī'ān} (d. 694 = 1294–1295), and Ḥājjī al-Dīn al-S̄īghānī, a commentator on the \textit{Mujāhid} (d. 714 = 1314–1315) (cf. \textit{al-Maqāmmīn}).

The best of his works is thought to be the \textit{K̄hūṭ al-Mahānī fi 'Uṣūl al-Fīlā}, a concise account of the foundations of law (Dehīl 1780, Constam 1326 and often later); there are numerous later commentaries but he himself wrote two, one of which is entitled \textit{K̄hūṭ al-Ṭārīq} (2 vols., Bābāk 1316). Out of his original plan of writing a commentary on the \textit{Mujāhid} of al-Margīhīnī [q.v.], there came the lawbook modelled on it \textit{K̄hūṭ al-Wāṣfī, on which he composed in 684 a special commentary, the \textit{K̄hūṭ al-K̄afī} (delivered in lectures in Kirmān in 689). He had previously prepared a synopsis of the \textit{Wāṣfī} entitled \textit{K̄hūṭ al-Dālibī} (Cairo 1311, Lucknow 1294, 1312, etc.) which Ibn al-Ṣaltān in 683 (this is no doubt the correct reading for 633 in Kāfīrī) told him to deliver in Kirmān. This synopsis was used as late as the sixteenth century in Damascus and at the later in Cairo (v. Krüger, \textit{Mittelt-Syrisch u. Damascius}, Vienna 1853, p. 136; do., \textit{Egyptian}, Leipzig 1863, ii. 51). The best known printed commentaries on the Kasān are: a. \textit{Tujābīn al-Maḥfūz of al-Zahrawi} (d. 742 = 1342–1343) in 6 vols., Bābāk 1315–1315; b. \textit{K̄hūṭ al-Maḥfūz} of al-A Ḥāini (d. 833 = 1451) in 2 vols., Bābāk 1285 and 1299; c. \textit{Tujābīn al-Maḥfūz} of Muḥāfa Miskīn al-Murawī (written in 811 = 1408–1409), Cairo 1294, 1305, 1312, 1318, \textit{Tanjīḥ al-Maḥfūz} of al-Tālī (d. 1192 = 1778), Cairo 1307 etc.; c. the most important: \textit{Aṣīr al-Maḥfūz} of Ibn Nūgānī (d. 970 = 1562–1563) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g.: two on the \textit{K̄hūṭ al-Naṣāf} of Najīr al-Dīn al-S̄āraqī (d. 656 = 1258) entitled \textit{Makānīn} and \textit{al-Makānīn}; on the \textit{Manṣūrah of Nāṣaj al-Dīn Abu Ḥanīfā al-N̄as̄afi (d. 537 = 1142–1143) on the differences of opinion between Abu Ḥanīfā, his two pupils, and al-Shāfi'ī and Mālik entitled \textit{Mustaṣ̄affī} as well as a synopsis entitled \textit{al-Maṣāfā} (finished on 20th Shabān 670); cf. Broedkellmann, G. A. L., i. 428; also on the \textit{Mustaṣ̄affī al-Dīn al-Dabball̄i of Ahmadī (d. 644 = 1249–1249; Ibn Taghribīrdī, Hājjīj Khalīfat, No. 13095). On the other hand, he did not write a commentary on the \textit{Mujāhid}, as Ibn Kuṭūlūhī and Ḥājjī Khalīfat, ed. 484 say (cf. the story of the origin of his \textit{Wāṣfī} according to al-İkṣāṇī [d. 758 = 1357]) in Ḥājjī Khalīfat, ed. 419). He also wrote a commentary on the \textit{Mujāhid}, \textit{Aṣīr al-Maḥfūz} of \textit{al-Tawābī} (printed in 2 vols., Bābāk 1279, Cairo 1308, 1326).

His confession of faith \textit{al-'Umda fi 'Uṣūl al-Dīn} (apparently also called \textit{al-Manāhī fi 'Uṣūl al-Dīn}: Karājā, Ibn Duṣ Ṣmād) became known quite early in Europe from Careton's edition (\textit{Pillar of the Creed}, London 1843). In it he closely follows the \textit{Aṣīr} of Nāṣaj al-Dīn al-N̄as̄afi (see above) and also wrote a special commentary on it: \textit{al-Firādāt bi-\textit{Aṣīr}}

A. Before Islam.

A complete investigation of the materials for the history of Christianity in Arabia and among the Nabataeans has not yet been made, and only the principal facts can be summarily given here.

Christianity naturally spread into Arabia from Syria and al-Tisht though no date can be given for the earliest infiltration. Bishops of the encampments are early mentioned but they should probably be assigned to Syria. Arab Christian history may be said to begin with the conversion of Ghasan [q. v.]; the chief al-Harith b. Djabāl was an ardent monophysite and in A.D. 542 or 543 he persuaded the empress Theodora to appoint Jacob Baradaza as bishop of Edessa with a wardening commission, and Theodore as bishop of Bostra in the monophysite cause. Nestorian Christianity came to Ibrahīm [q. v.] at an early date. Its bishops are often mentioned from A.D. 410 till 518 B.C. and a monastery was built there by 510. Three Nestorian patriarchs were buried there. Al-Mundhir III (d. 534) [cf. LAKHM] was a pagan though he had a Christian wife, who built the convent called after her Dar Irī, while some of the notables were also Christian. Theological controversy in the Greek empire drove many monophysites into exile in Ibrahīm; in 518 a monophysite monastery existed, and from 557 monophysite bishops are recorded. Na'mān III was converted c. 593 by the Nestorians.

Nestorian missions followed the trade routes, one of which followed the coast. Bishops in the district of Bahrayn are recorded in 575 and 676, in the island of Samāhā in 410, and in Uman in 444. Another route was across the peninsula. One story says that Nadjar was evangelised by a native who was converted in Ibrahīm; another sends monophysite exiles thither from Ibrahīm, while a third brings the evangelist from Syria. Christianity had probably reached Nadjar before 400. The Abyssinians invaded south Arabia in the beginning of the sixth century and conquered the country. As soon as they had withdrawn, a chieftain Mārib or Dhū Nuwās, who was a Jew by religion, attacked and persecuted the Christians not only in Nadjar but also in Hadramawt in 525. A second Abyssinian expedition defeated Mārib, who was slain or drowned, and Abyssinian rule was firmly established. Probably these expeditions were part of Greek policy to set up an obstacle to Persia and crusading motives were secondary. The invaders would have introduced the monophysite faith if it was not already present. When the Persians conquered south Arabia they naturally then favoured the Nestorians. The great church of San'ā's seems to have been built on the site of a pagan sanctuary and a Nestorian bishop was appointed c. 590 A.D. [cf. ABRAHĀ, ĪMAYAR, San'ā'].

From the borders Christianity penetrated into the interior. Bishops are recorded at Alla [q. v.], Dūma [cf. DAWI] and Ta'imā, and most of the tribes in the north had some knowledge of the faith even if the saying attributed to Alla, "All they know of Christianity is wine-bibbing," is exaggerated. The tribes most affected were, in the west Salīb, Ghasan, Djuddrām and Lakhm, in the east Ta'ilāb, Bakr with Iḍālī, Ṣanīfa, Rabī'ah, Tamīm and Ta'ilāb, and in the centre Ta'īr with Thalāt and part of Ta'ilāb.
treaties, the best known of which is that concluded with the Christians of Nadrān [q.v.]. By the terms of this treaty, the latter were allowed to keep their religion and manage their own affairs, if they paid a fixed tribute, entertained the Prophet's representatives for a month, gave certain supplies in the event of a war in the Yemen, and abstained from usury. To the same period belongs the generous act of mercy command given in the Kunān (ix. 29) to fight against those who had received a book until they pay tribute (here called al-dā'iyu, q.v.) and are humbled.

The conquests of Khalid b. al-Walid suddenly made the problem acute. During the reign of 'Umar it was solved, like all the problems of the state, in a hand to mouth way, usually by applying the precedent of the Nadrān treaty. Hira, the cities of Syria and Mesopotamia made individual treaties with the Muslim commanders; the terms differ in detail, but all include a fixed tribute. Muslim governors were set over the provinces and big towns, but the minor officials were not changed. The people paid much the same taxes as before and there was little interference with their social and religious life. Sometimes a church or part of one was taken and turned into a mosque; more often, probably, churches and monasteries were respected, as also were existing property rights. Thus in the occupation of al-Irāq there was a movement among the tribes to seize the conquered lands, and it would seem that a district was for a time assigned to the tribe Badīja (cf. Baladḥūrī, p. 257 sq.; Kihāb al-Umān, iv. 192), but in the end 'Umar applied the precedent established by Muhammad on the conquest of Khaibar and left the conquered lands to their owners, to be administered as a trust for the benefit of the conquerors [see art. KAI]. On the other hand, he exiled the Christians of Nadrān to al-Irāq so that "there might be but one slave in Arabia," though isolated Christians lived in al-Ma’mūn itself. 'Umar had a Christian slave who was set free at his death (Ibn Sa‘d, vi. 110), and Abū Mīsā had a Christian secretary who accompanied him to al-Ma’mūn. 'Umar is represented, even in Christian sources, as friendly towards Christians, and in his last charge he recommended the dhimmī to the care of his successor as "the support of your families."

During the following decades the treatment and status of Christians shows many contradictions, and was often determined apparently by individual caprice. While new churches were built even in towns founded by the Arabs, such as Fustāṭ and Baṣra, and the caliph even helped to restore the church at Edessa (Corp. Script. Chr. Ori., ser. iii., xiv. 288), in many other places churches were destroyed, and both Mu‘āwiyah and 'Abd al-Malik tried to seize the cathedral at Damascus before al-Walid finally incorporated it in the mosque. Christians continued to hold high offices in the administration. Mu‘āwiyah had a Christian secretary, Sarāqīn, who was succeeded by his son, and 'Abd al-Aswāh had as his treasurer a wealthy Christian, Anatassius, though 'Abd al-Malik despised him of much of his wealth. State accounts in Syria and Egypt were kept in Greek until the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, and local accounts in Egypt were still kept in Greek for long afterwards. There were Christians in the Muslim armies, and some gave military service instead of tribute. When the Djārūdīm of Mount Lebanon were defeated, a clause in the treaty stipulated that they should wear Arab dress (Baladḥūrī, p. 161). Yet there was some persecution as well as cases of forced conversion. Jews were settled in some of the conquered towns because they were enemies of the Christians (Baladḥūrī, p. 127). The Jacobites paid a special tax to Mu‘āwiyah (Corp. Script. Chr. Ori., ser. iii., 70), and the government sometimes prevented the election of a patriarch. The Christian Arabs of Mesopotamia formed a special category; these paid double sa‘ād instead of tribute, but a chief of Taghlib was savagely tortured because he would not renounce his faith. Personal relations between Muslims and Christians were often friendly. It is said of a poet that "he never made love poems about the wife of a Muslim or a dhimmī" (Kihāb al-Arūf, iii. 291). 'Abū Tābah showed great honour to Abū Zubayd, and the relations of 'Abd al-Malik with the poet al-Āḏīyīr are notorious [see art. AL-ĀŜĪT].

From this time, however, the condition of the subject Christians began to deteriorate. 'Abd al-Malik changed the system of taxation in Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia (Dionysius of Tell Maḥrēr, ed. Chabot, p. 10; Abū Yūsuf, p. 23 sq.), and introduced the personal tax on non-Muslims. In many districts the form of receipt was a leaden seal fastened round the neck or wrist. 'Umar II gave orders to dismiss all dhimmīs from government service, but such confusion resulted that the order was soon afterwards ignored. He was also the author of the famous "ordinances", in later times attributed to 'Umar I (cf. Abū Yūsuf, p. 73), which prescribed the restrictions to be placed on dhimmīs and the wearing of the sunnār [q.v.] as their distinctive badge. According to the Nestorian Chronicle [Patr. Ori., xiii. 650], this had earlier been the badge of Christian scholars.

By the end of the second century, as may be seen from the works of Abū Yūsuf and al-Shārīf, the customs governing the dhimmī were more or less fixed, but insistence on them depended on the whim of the governor and the temper of the populace. It was now accepted that no new churches might be built in towns where Muslims lived, though the old might be repaired. A governor's fancy or a riot might destroy churches and there was no redress; the cathedral at Ṣan‘a, for example, was destroyed for its wealth. At least six rebellions of the Copts took place during the century. Ḥarrān al-Ra‘īṣī renounced the "ordinances" forbidding Christians to be like Muslims in dress and style of riding; but during the reign of Ma‘mūn, the Christian headman of Birā in Egypt wore black on a Friday and rode in state to the door of the mosque, when his deputy entered and led the prayers. Their use of horses and riding saddles began to raise objection, and restrictions were placed on religious processions; crosses were sometimes tolerated though banners were forbidden. Taxation became heavier and cases of extortion are recorded. The caliph kept a careful eye on the Church and a patriarch had to get his approval and do him homage, often at a price. A discontented Christian found it easy to get government help in making trouble for his opponents. At this time Christian doctors became prominent as favourites of the caliph and they did not always use their influence in a Christian interest. Discussions on religion took place; at one, when Ma‘mūn was present, the Catholics, the Head
of the Dispersion, the heads of the Sibians, the chief priest of the fire temple and Muslim theologians took part. Many Christians were in government service or were secretaries to public men, and even the fanatical al-Mutawakkil had a Christian secretary. In 236 (850) this caliph intensified the repressive laws. A Christian had to wear a yellow palas and the same dress and a woman had to wear a yellow wrap out of doors. If he rode he must have wooden stirrups and two balls on the back of the saddle. Men (or slaves) had to wear the ghirof [q.v.]. They were to be dismissed from the civil service. All new churches were to be pulled down and the cross might not be displayed at festivals. Their graves had to be flush with the ground. Then they were to be deprived of their houses and wooden doors fixed to them. Four years later they were forbidden to ride horses and were told to wear two yellow dura. These laws are the limit of legal persecution and continued to govern in theory though not always observed in practice.

Christians were always to be found in the civil service; some even were connected with the army. In Egypt it was enacted that they should be present on Fridays when the Muslims were absent (Ma'rizi, Khattat, ii. 227). One was called wazir in the time of al-Mu'tamid; it seems, however, that the title had become cheap and he was only a high official (Yādū, Sīrah, ii. 136, 259). The first rulers to encourage Christians to the highest rank were the Būyids [see 'ΑΧΩΝ ΑΛ-ΔΙΑΛΔΑ] and the Fatimids. This was quite exceptional, but their strength and influence in the administration at all times can be seen from the constant complaints of the dishonesty of Christians in secretaries. More especially in the finance department they possessed a quasi-monopoly, which lasted in Egypt down to the nineteenth century.

That Muslim intolerance did grow more bitter is shown by comparing the accounts of al-Akkhāl in the Khut al-اذ-اذ with the remarks of Ibn Rashīd (Cīmda, i. 21). In later times the rulers were often more tolerant or far-sighted than the populace; nevertheless, additional taxes were sometimes laid on the ḍhimma. In Egypt an extra dinar was exacted from them between 1250 and 1256, in addition to the poll-tax, which was then called ḍiṭiyya (Ma'rizi, i. 106). At intervals fresh attempts were made to impose a distinctive dress upon them. Their request to wear white turbans with a badge was refused at the instance of Ibn Ta'imiya [q.v.] and in Egypt blue became their distinctive colour. On the whole, they were worse off than their Muslim fellow-subjects, for, while both suffered from oppression by the ruler, they were liable in addition to be attacked by their fellow citizens. Cases of mass conversion still occurred, but the disappearance of the large Christian population of northern Mesopotamia, which continued down to the late middle ages to be the chief centre of Christianity in the Muslim dominions, is probably to be connected with the general decay of agriculture there.

2. Legal Status. Here as elsewhere the facts of history do not fit the systems of the theorists, who condemned the laxity of the people on the one hand and the high-handedness of the rulers on the other. The general legal position and the legal view of taxation are outlined in the articles DHIMMA, ETVAVA and KHASAQ. To this outline some details may be added from the system of Malik, which is less liberal than that of Abū Hanifa. Malik taught that a treaty once made with ḍhimma cannot be changed. They may not enter mosques or Mecca and the blood money for them is half that for a Muslim. New churches may not be built in or near the towns of Islam though the old may be repaired. Malik, when consulted, said that a Christian, who had blasphemed the Prophet, should be put to death, and this was done. A Muslim may not borrow from them, nor become a partner with them in business unless he is present at all transactions. Another opinion would let them be sleeping partners. A Muslim should not rent land from them as a suqer, but it is not illegal, and one who is part owner of a house with a Muslim has the right of pre-emption. One, who is trading in his own town, pays no tax beyond the general tribute; if he goes to another town and buys goods with money brought with him, he pays the trade tax (litha), but there is no tax on the sale of these goods. ḍhimma must not kill sacrifices for Muslims; if they do, the sacrifices must be repeated. A Muslim woman should kill a beast rather than ask them to do so. If one marries a Muslim woman with the consent of her guardians, they shall all be punished, but if he pretended to be a Muslim, the marriage is invalid. They may not arrange a marriage for a Muslim woman nor a Muslim that of his ḍhimmī sister. Married ḍhimmīs are divorced by the conversion of the woman. Malik did not approve of the ḍhimmī foster-mothers for Muslim children. If a Muslim commits adultery with a ḍhimmī woman, he is punished according to his law and in the event his marriage or her co-religionists to be dealt with according to their law. The evidence of a ḍhimmī is not accepted. Should he be turned Muslim, his evidence is still not accepted (i.e. about things that happened while he was a ḍhimmī), consequently ḍhimmī women cannot give evidence about a birth. If a Christian buys or is given a Muslim slave, the transaction is valid, but the slave must be sold to a Muslim. Muslim law applies to all business dealings between ḍhimmīs, except marriage, though they may practise this among themselves. They may not be taught the Qur'an. A Muslim may not prevent his Christian slave from drinking wine, eating pork and going to church. It may be noted that Mawardi admits the possibility of a ḍhimmī becoming wazir (wazir al-tasfiq).

One authority says that eight acts put a ḍhimmī outside the law: an agreement to fight the Muslims, fornication with a Muslim woman, an attempt to marry one, an attempt to turn a Muslim from his religion, robbery of a Muslim on the highway, acting as a spy or guide for unbelievers, or the killing of any Muslim.

3. Social Status. The fact that Christians, like other ḍhimmīs, were citizens as it were at second remove, was of course reflected in their social position. The full consequences of this disability were to some extent mitigated by their numbers and influence in the public administration, and by their monopoly or quasi-monopoly of important professions. Christians were distinguished more especially as doctors (the family of Bukhtāshīh; Ibn Butlīn [q.v.], etc.) and druggists. A Muslim complained that he could get no patients in an unhealthy year because he spoke good Arabic and not the dialect of Dündaşbur [q.v.] and
were cotton instead of silk (Dhikhr, Nishā al-Hikahāt, p. 83) and al-Ghazâlî says that in many towns the only doctor was a dhîmiy. Some were rich, and it was often their impudent display which provoked the mob to violence. The prohibition of usury in Muslim law operated in favour of the dhîmiy as merchants and money-changers, and gave them the monopoly of such trades as those of goldsmiths and jewelers.

Apart from numerous instances of friendly personal relations between individuals, the generally good relations between the Muslims and Christians is shown by the universal celebration of the great festivals of the Christian year, and the holidays and fairs which accompanied the feasts of the patron saints at the principal monasteries (cf. A. Fischer, in Berichte über d. Verb. d. Schlöss. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1929). Christians took part in the intellectual life of the community, and the books they wrote are named with approval by the Muslim historians. The strict letter of the law regarding non-Muslims was not always applied. While marriage to a Muslim was always forbidden, fornication with one was not always punished with death. At times the Muslim murderer of a dhîmiy was executed. Even the apostate sometime found mercy, on the ground that forced conversions were not valid. Christians kept Muslim slaves, both male and female, and acted for Muslims in business.

In spite of all this, the stigma of inferiority remained. The humiliating regulations, the need for constant watchfulness, the constant recourse to intrigue and influence to circumvent the law, the segregation of dhîmiy in many cities, all evitably sapped their morale. Still more serious were their legal disabilities; there could be no true justice for the dhîmiy when his evidence was excluded from the Muslim courts, even though jâlat were enjoined not to discriminate against them in other respects, nor could there be any permanent social relationship in the absence of intermarriage. It is not surprising therefore that the Christian communities of the East gradually dwindled not only in numbers, but also in vitality and moral tone.


The Ottoman Empire.

Since the period of the Tanzêmâr [q. v.] the Ottoman Empire has gradually abandoned the governmental traditions of Muhammadan states, and this change has fundamentally affected the treatment of its Christian subjects. On the other hand, this change was actually brought about by the very problems with which the Ottoman government became confronted through the existence of a large Christian population in its territory.

Up to the beginning of the 19th century the treatment of Christians in the Empire was, on the whole, in accordance with the prescriptions of the sharî'ah after the Hanafi madhab as to the treatment of dhîmiy, the chief authority on these questions being the Muftî Muhammad ibn Ibrahim al-Halabi (cf. the Constantinople edition of 1599, p. 90). Christians were subject to the payment of the jâlat-i gerân, more often called kharâf in Turkey (cf. these two articles), whence the expression kharâf-gerân. This tax was levied in three classes, according to the financial capacity of the payers. D'Ossian (Tableaux, iii. 494) says that in his time (about 1800) each year 1,500,000 tax-forms were issued for the non-Muslims, of which 60,000 were in the capital. The regulations as to the building and restoration of Christian churches were observed in principle; the Hanafi madhab allows the restoration of decayed churches but not of churches deliberately demolished; Sheikh Zâde, however, in his commentary on the Muftî (Madîm al-Anwar, printed Constantinople 1779, p. 415) complains that this distinction was not duly observed in his time (1666). From the 18th century, indeed, the building and rebuilding of churches was a subject of frequent intervention by the representatives of foreign Christian powers. The turning of churches into mosques by the Ottoman conquerors—such as the case of the Aya Sofia—was generally in accordance with Islamic laws of war. Likewise the prescriptions about clothing were observed and from time to time reinforced; as late as the 18th century certain sultans such as 'Othâmân III and Müs'tafâ III are known to have given special attention to this point.

We also find in the fâwânî-nâma—the contents of which were declared in accordance with the sharî'ah by the Sheikh al-Islâm—some special clauses about non-Muslims (jâlat). A fâwânî-nama of the time of 'ulema Sinân I prescribes that, in the case of certain crimes that are punished by fines, the fines of non-Muslims shall amount to only half the sum inflicted on a Muslim in each case (cf. the second fâwânî-nama, published as an appendix to T. P. E., iii. 3, 4, 6). The same fâwânî-nama gives directions with regard to the inheritance of non-Muslims.

The Christians thus constituted in the Ottoman Empire, just as in other Muhammadan states, a section of the population which, so far as their relations with the Government went, had minor rights compared to Muhammadans and to which the high functionaries of the state never belonged. They were improperly designated by the term roya, which word originally means all subjects of a Muhammadan ruler, in allusion to a well-known tradition which compares the ruler with a shepherd and his subjects with a flock (roya, cf. al-Bukhârî, Sunan's, lâb 11). Hence the use of the term roya in European works when speaking of the Christian subjects of the sultan. Glaser [q. v.] was more or less contemptuous in the phrase of Muslim circles. There had been, however, since the coming into existence of the Ottoman Empire, several circumstances that presented the problem of the Christian subjects in forms quite different from those prevailing in contemporary Muhammadan states. The
beginnings of the Ottoman state itself had been anything but orthodox. Eristic, according to most sources, was only a converted Muslim and 'Othman and Orkhan, the founders of the state, had many dealings with the Christian aristocracy of Byzantium, of whom joined readily the cause and the creed of the new conquerors. Christianity was at that time still widely spread in Asia Minor and was at first adapted to the rather unorthodox mystic form in which the Turcomans of Rum had made acquaintance with Islam. Large parts of the population adhered for centuries to a Christian-Islamic mixture of religious convictions, such as appeared in the derwisch revolt under Sultan Qayalal Din oglu Badr al-Din (cf. Babinger, in J., xi.), and as survived in the beliefs and practices of the Bektashis and the mixed worship of certain saints by both the Islamic and the Christian population. Survivals of this mixed creed were also observed among the so-called Crypto-Christians of Trebizond (cf. Hasluck, in Journal of Hellenic Studies, xli. 199 sqq.). It was only after the restoration of the Empire in the xvth century that the orthodox Islamic attitude prevailed in the government of the sultans, who repeatedly had to take strong measures against the heterodox elements.

During this same period it was of no less importance that the Ottoman Empire came to incorporate more and more territories in Europe exclusively inhabited by Christians. With the exception of eastern Thrace, northern Macedonia, Bosnia and Crete, the new subjects were never Islamized in great numbers; in the Empire they came to form a very considerable minority, which was counterbalanced only by the large Muhammedan population of the Asiatic territories. So long as the government and the Muhammedan ruling class were strong, this did not affect the political system. But this ruling class itself, as well as their powerful military instrument, the Janissaries, were recruited in a large measure from the Greek and Slavonic Christian population of the European provinces and often kept up friendly relations with their non-converted kindred. (One of the many instances is that of Djandari Khalil Paşa under Muhammed II.) Accordingly much consideration was shown to large parts of the Christian population, and the more so as many Christians served on minor posts in the state chanceries, where they performed important administrative duties (Gracius, Turcogracia, p. 14). Besides, many high-placed persons, including the sultans themselves, had, through their harems, many Christian relations without and within the Empire. So the domestic and foreign policy of the state often brought about measures of toleration, which were not altogether in accordance with the strict demands of Muhammedan law. An outstanding example is the way in which Constantino-ple and its Christian inhabitants were treated after the excesses of the first days of the conquest were over. Muhammed II did all that he could to re-populate his new capital, even with Greeks, when the Muhammedan element proved insufficient; he even had a new Oecumenical Patriarch chosen not long after the conquest (cf. Fr. Gieser, Die Stellung der christlichen Untertanen im Osmanischen Reich, in J., xix., 1931, p. 264 sqq.). Only afterwards, in the first half of the xvth century, when Muhammedan fanaticism had increased, there was a party which invoking the fact that the town had been taken by force ("annihilation"), claimed the destruction of all churches that were left to the Christians, and only with great difficulty was evidence constructed to prove that Constantinople was really taken by capitulation (cf. J. H. Mordtmann, Die Kapitulation von Konstantinopel im Jahre 1453, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, xxi. 1912, p. 129 sqq.). Other signs of fanaticism in the same period are i. e. the intention, attributed to Selim I to convert all Christians to Islam, the wish of Murad III to turn all churches into mosques and the alleged oath of Murad IV to exterminate all Christians. Still, apart from these occasional outbursts, tolerance prevailed. In the capital a Greek Christian aristocracy and photocracy was permitted to live in the quarter of Fanari; from their midst came influential persons such as Michael Kantakouzenos, the "pillar of the Christians" (Jorga, iii. 211) in the xvth century, and the well-known Phanariote families who later supplied dragomans to the Porte and the princes of the Danube principalities.

The official attitude towards the Christians was complete abstinence from their domestic religious and secular affairs so long as this did not affect the public order. This explains also the tolerance towards the activities of the Roman Catholic missionaries who were sent from the xvi th century onwards to convert the eastern Christians. The government took no interest in the different denominations of Christians, while their internal divisions reinforced its authority. R. Gragger in his article Türkisch-Ungarische Kulturbeziehungen (Literaturdenkmaler und Ungarns Türkenkultur, in Ungarishe Bibliothek, i. N°. 14, Berlin 1927) depicts the tolerant attitude and the sometimes amused state of the Turkish Paşas in Hungary in the religious disputes between Roman Catholics and Protestants. On the other hand, the serious domestic troubles amongst the Greeks belonging to the much decayed Oecumenical Patriarchate, as the result of which the party of the patriarch Cyrilis Lucaris took, in the first half of the xvi th century, a definite anti-Roman Catholic attitude, could not be wholly indifferent to the Porte, because from that time on the only political protector of the Greeks was the Ottoman government. Arbitrary measures, such as occasional executions of the patriarch (for the first time in 1657; v. Hammer, G. O. A. Z., iii. 474) and excesses in war time are not sufficient to refute the statement that the attitude of the government was on the whole tolerant.

What, at length, came to influence most deeply this attitude was the interest shown in the lot of the Christians by the governments of the Christian powers with whom the Porte began to enter into peaceful relations. In the first centuries those foreign Christians who were allowed to reside in the support towns fell within the category of mucdismini. Legal conceptions of that time did not distinguish sharply between religious denomination and nationality, both being designated by the word millef; therefore a foreigner who embraced Islam was entirely assimilated to the Muhammedan subjects of the sultan. In course of time millef came to be used also for the different "national" denominations of the Christians within the Empire. The first foreign power to be interested in the Christians of Turkey was the Vatican, as was manifested several times by the inevitable participation of the Pope in the preparation of anti-Turkish crusades. The Cardinal Protisatore di Levante in Rome exercised, through his vicar, considerable influence
on the Latin Roman Catholic community of Pera, which, since the conquest of Constantinople, had enjoyed, like the other Christian communities, administrative independence. This "religious protection" was not altogether in conformity with the wishes of the Christians themselves (G. Young, *Corps de Droit Ottoman*, Oxford 1905, ii. 124.), but at those times the Porte followed a policy of non-intervention and did not seize the opportunity of placing these Christian inhabitants of her territory under her more direct control. The same policy made her accept without difficulty the remonstrances of a second, more powerful, protector, the King of France, who already before the conclusion of the treaty of 1555 had begun to act as intermediary between the Catholics in Jerusalem and other places in the Levant and the Porte. This intervention of France—which, in the eyes of Christian Europe, served her as an excuse for her entering into diplomatic relations with the Porte—was tolerated equally in favour of other than French ecclesiastics and missionaries, and of non-French Christian prisoners. Occasionally France's protection was also invoked by other than Roman Catholics; in 1639, the Oecumenical Patriarch himself asked the French King to declare himself protector of the Eastern Church. The French capitulation of 1673 recognized at last the protectory of the King of France over the Roman Catholic foreign Christians, though a general protectorate over all the Christians in the Empire had been demanded originally; the famous capitulation of 1740 confirmed the dispositions of that of 1673 (cf. G. Pellissié du Rausas, *Le Régime des Capitulations dans l'Empire Ottoman*, Paris 1911, i. 80 sqq.).

A third powerful protector of Christian interests was this time of the Greek Orthodox Christians, arose in the xviiiith century in the person of the Russian Czar. Shortly after the fall of Constantinople Ivan the Great had begun to regard himself as successor of the Byzantine Emperors and, as the power of Russia increased, the Greek orthodox Christians in the western and eastern parts of the Empire came to look upon the Czar as their natural protector. Especially the Christian institutions in Jerusalem and the much impoverished patriarchate of that town benefited by the Russian religious interest. On the other hand, Russia learnt to use her influence with the Orthodox Christians as a powerful political instrument. The peace treaty of Küttük Kaindrje (1776) recognized at last the right of the Russian diplomatic representatives to interfere in favour of the Christians in the Empire.

With the weakening of the Empire in the xviiiith century the so-called "religious protection" became a heavy burden on Turkey's inner political conditions. Especially after the disastrous happenings under Mahmut III's reign, it became clear that the old Muḥammatan conception of the state, which left the non-Muslims entirely to themselves, or to others, could no longer be maintained. It was one of the chief stimuli to the introduction of the Tānyaş. In order to retain as much control as possible over her Christian subjects the Porte now had to apply her governmental activity equally to non-Muslims and Muslims. Accordingly the Ḳâhīt-i Sherif of Ulū-Khâne (1845) declared that perfect security was guaranteed to all subjects, Muslims or raṣūy, as to their lives, their honour and their possessions. Still in the following years no important administrative measures were taken, while on the other hand the intervention of foreign powers in Christian affairs continued and led amongst other incidents to the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853. An incident of 1843, in the meantime, had made the Porte give a formal assurance to the French and English ambassadors with regard to the non-application of capital punishment to persons who had denounced the Muḥammatan creed (Young, *op. cit.*, ii. 11 sqq.).

The law of May 10, 1855 is an important landmark in the history of Ottoman policy towards the Christian subjects; this law abolished the capitulation tax for non-Muslims and envisaged the possibility of their service in the army (cf. *Diya* and the *Bibliography* of this art.). This legislative measure was completed by the Ḳâhīt-i Humâyûn of February 18, 1856, which may be regarded as the Magna Charta of the rights of the non-Muslim subjects of the Empire; in this memorable edict the rights and privileges of the different religious denominations and their members were proclaimed with more detail; as to their military service the edict laid down the principle that it could be replaced by the payment of an exemption tax, which, under the name of *bedel*, came to be regularly applied to all non-Muslims. In accordance with the contents of the Ḳâhīt-i Humâyûn, the Ottoman legislation now began for the first time to take notice officially of the existence of the great number of Christian communities existing in the Empire. Organic statutes were elaborated for the more important of these communities (called *millet*); in 1860 for the Armenian Gregorian community and in 1862 for the Greek Orthodox community. In 1870 followed the institution, with the cooperation of the Porte, of the Bulgarian Exarchate, while in course of time a host of laws, decrees and regulations were issued, containing more detailed provisions with regard to these and the minor communities—Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, Mount Athos, the Serbian Church, the Neoturcians, the Latin communities, and the different churches united with Rome (Armenians, Chaldeans, Maronites, Melchites). This highly complicated legislation aimed at making these Christian Ottoman subjects in the full sense of the word, but met with great difficulties created by the existence of an age-old system of autonomy and by the frequent inter- 

vention of the foreign powers. The leading principle of the government was to divest the purely religious authorities as much as possible of their power and to reinforce the power of the lay institutions. This policy led to endless troubles in which new regulations continually tried to restore order. In the constitution of Miḥdat Paşa (1876) Islam was proclaimed as the State religion, but immediately afterwards there follows the declaration that the profession of all recognized religions in the Empire is free and that all privileges granted to the different religious communities shall be maintained (art. 11). Art. 9 guarantees the personal freedom of all Ottoman subjects and art. 17 their complete equality before the law.

All the time during the period of reforms the Turkish government had to reckon with reactionary feelings against the giants in large sections of the Muḥammatan population, which at many instances made the application of equal treatment, before the law and elsewhere, illusory. This justified to a certain extent the never ending remonstrances
of the European powers, who lost no opportunity of insisting on new reforms in favour of the Christians. Art. 62 of the treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878) stipulated again for the equal treatment by the Ottoman government of all non-Muslim subjects, amongst others that every one, without difference of religion, should be admitted as a witness before the law courts.

The effect of the foreign intervention in their favour encouraged on the other hand large sections of the Christian population to disloyal feelings and actions against their legal government. While the latter did what it could to assimilate the different groups of the population, the factors of dissolution became at the same time ever stronger. Even the peaceable relations that had hitherto characterized on the whole the intercourse between Muhammadans and Christians — especially in the cities — began to make way for religious hatred between group and group, in which the government officials were often unable to observe the required neutral attitude. Amongst many other symptoms the Armenian troubles which began in 1859 in the Armenian wilayets — where a racial antagonism between Muhammadan Kurds and Christian Armenians had existed for centuries — were the most disastrous. They led to repeated Armenian attempts at revolt and to the notorious massacres in Constantinople of 1897.

By this development the treatment of the Christian subjects ceased to be a religious problem; it became a problem of nationality (millet in the new acception of the word) and of race, and at the same time one of the vital problems for the Empire. After the revolution of 1908 and the re-establishment of Mahomet's constitution, these facts were not yet fully recognized. The Ottomanization of all subjects of the Empire was seriously attempted; the new representative bodies included a number of Christian members; occasionally there were Christian ministers. Then the world war precipitated the inevitable course of events. This time non-Muslims were for the first time incorporated in the Turkish army, but only for service behind the front. At the same time, the democratic policy of the Young Turks took a pan-Turkish turn, from which religious motives were quite absent. National Turkish feeling prevailed. The measures of deportation of Christian inhabitants from the frontier zones — measures from which the Armenians especially suffered teribly — were inspired by fear of disloyalty towards Turkey, though in their execution remnants of religious fanaticism, notably on the side of the Kurds, certainly played a large part.

The events after the armistice of Mudros have proved that a great part of the Christian population preferred independence or incorporation into a Christian state to remaining with Turkey. And the Turks themselves also were ready to part with their Christian subjects. Under these circumstances were concluded at Lausanne, in 1923, the agreements with Greece for the exchange of the Greek population of the new Turkish state against Turks established in Hellenic territory; only Constantinople and some islands were excluded from this measure. Since by the events of the war the number of Armenians and other Christians in Asiatic Turkey had already been reduced to a very small minority, the result was that the present Turkish republic has only to deal with a Christian population of no numerical importance, most of whom live in Constantinople. The Lausanne Treaty of 1923 contains in its articles 37-45 only the obligation for Turkey to treat the minorities on an equal basis with the Turkish subjects; it provides for their right to live after a personal legal statute of their own. Finally the treatment of Christians in Turkey has definitely ceased to be a legal problem in the old sense of the word; since, by the alteration of the Constitution on April 5, 1928 the state has been completely secularized (cf. Türkiye, Istanbul 1931, iv. 215) by cancelling the article declaring that the state religion is Islam.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

AL-NASAWI, MUHAMMAD b. AJAMAD b. 'ALLI b. MUHAMMAD, an Arabic historian, biographer of the last Khwarizmshah Djâlî al-Din Mangubîrî [q. v.], was born in Khurâsân (Tâhirî, ii. 415), an estate in the district of Nāsî [q. v.] in Khurâsân where his family was reputed to have been already settled in the pre-Muhammadan period (Hîdât, ed. Houdas, p. 53). During his father's lifetime he represented him when the vizier Nîgân al-Mulk, dismissed from office by Sulṭân Muhammad, visited the family estates on his journey to Khvârizm and was received by him (ibid., p. 50). He only mentions incidentally that he had stayed in youth with Inanîkhirîn in Məzârdârân before the latter had risen to power. When the Mongols invaded Khûrâsân in 1221 he had already succeeded his father in his ancestral citadel, which he saved from sacking by payment of 10,000 ell of cloth. Nîgân al-Dîn al-Samâ'înî was his guest at this time; he enabled him to escape to Khvârizm before the arrival of the enemy and in gratitude Nîgân al-Dîn procured him a rich grant of land from Oghârîshâh, son of Muhammad (p. 57 sqq.). When in Nâsî the capital of his district, Nûrat al-Dîn Hâzim b. Muhammad, the representative of a local royal family, came to power as successor to his nephew Ikhîyây al-Dîn (p. 99), he appointed him his wâli (p. 104) and in this capacity he took part in a battle fought by Inanîkhirîn, as governor of Khûrâsân, at Nakhджûf near Nâsî against the Mongols; according to the full story of the battle (p. 66), this was the only occasion on which he personally took part in a battle. When after the death of Sulṭân Muhammad (1220) his eldest son Qâhîyâh al-Dîn ascended the throne, Nûrat al-Dîn took the side of his younger brother Djâlî al-Dîn, and for this an expedition was sent against him under Yûlak, son of Inanîkhirîn. To save himself he sent Nasawi with 1,000 dinârs to Qâhîyâh al-Dîn. After long wanderings and a two months' sojourn in Iṣfâhan, he succeeded in giving the money to Djâlî al-Dîn's minister Sharâf al-Mulk, who then wrote a despatch to Yûlak ordering him to abandon the siege of Nâsî; but this arrived too late and Nûrat al-Dîn had already been slain (p. 109). Nasawi did not now dare to return home but went to Djâlî al-Dîn when the latter had entered Marâgâh. He was appointed by him Kâfîb al-Insârî (p. 110) and henceforth accompanied his master on all his campaigns. When Diyâ al-Mulk 'Ali al-Dîn to escape the jealousy of the vizier Sharâf al-Mulk had himself appointed governor of Nâsî he aroused much discontent there by his misgovernment that he was dismissed. Nasawi was appointed in his stead governor of his native town with the title of vizier but had to stay with Djâlî al-Dîn and sent a deputy to his governorship (p. 149).
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NASHWÂN — NASHĪ

NASHĪ (A.), intercalary month, intercalation, or man on whose authority an intercalation is undertaken, a word of uncertain meaning in Sūra ix. 37 and in Muhammad's sermon at the farewell pilgrimage (Hijāḥ, p. 98b; cf. the article ḤAJĪJ). Nashī, nasi, and nasr are variants and the word is connected with nāsrān to “postpone” or “add” or with nariya to “forget.” In any case, it is given in Muslim tradition a meaning which brings it into connection with the method of reckoning time among the pagan Arabs. The Qur’ānic verse describes nasi as “a further expression of unbelief” and is therefore forbidden to the believers.

For the meaning of the word in the calendar we have the context of the above mentioned passages where sometimes the number of months in the year is put at twelve and sometimes the number of “holy” months at four. Qur’ānic exegesis as a rule connects nasi with the “holy” months and explains it sometimes, it is true, as the postponement of the Ḥajājī from the month fixed by God for it, but sometimes, and preferably, as the transference of the sanctity of one holy month to another, in itself not holy. The expositions are also able to give the reasons for such a postponement in full detail. As a rule however, these are pure inceptions which suggestions and perhaps memories of old traditions are freely expanded. A collection of such expositions in the form of regular Ḥajājīs is given in Tāfīr, 2nd ed., x. 91–93.

The critical examination of these expositions reveals however traces of an older conception not quite unknown to Tradition, even in the form in which we have it, according to which nasi means either the intercalation of an intercalary month or the month itself. This interpretation of the word is the only one really acceptable in the circumstances. The association of the pre-Islamic Ḥajājī with annual markets made it necessary to fix the Ḥajājī in a suitable season of the year. For that purpose a prolongation of the lunar year in some way was necessary and nothing contradicts that older tradition according to which it was obtained by the intercalation of an intercalary month. The lunar month was the only unit of time available for the purpose because it was the only one which the Bedouins, the customers at the markets, could observe directly. Thus one had only to let them know at the Ḥajājī of a year whether they had to reckon to the next Ḥajājī of twelve or thirteen months.

Definite evidence of this intercalation of a month is found in the astronomer Abū Ma‘ṣūr al-Bīrūnī (d. 272) in his Kitāb al-Uṯaf (sec. P. A., ser. 1, vol. xi. [1838], p. 168 sqq.) and continuing him in al-Bīrūnī who also deals at length with this intercalation in his Chronology (ed. Sachau, 2v., 62 sqq.). According to him, the Arabs took this intercalation from the Jews. How much in what these scholars tell us is really historical knowledge and how much intelligent reconstruction can hardly be decided. It is remarkable however that al-Bīrūnī when dealing fully with the Jewish intercalation (cf. ibid., p. 52–77) connects the Hebrew word for intercalary year, ḥāšār, with nashārīn “pregnant woman” and observes: “they compare the addition of a superfluous month to the year to the woman carrying something which does not belong to her body.” In this connection we may recall that Tāfīr (cf. ibid., p. 91, 4) explains the Arabic nasi as “nasi pregnant woman” among other interpretations, saying nasi “at the Ḥajājī, a. on account of the increase which the child in her means.” This agreement in the two explanations, which can hardly be accidental, might very likely indicate that nasi in the sense of intercalation or intercalary month is modelled on the Jewish ḥāšār and thus support al-Bīrūnī’s statement which is in itself not impossible. Caesar de Perceval ( J. A., ser. iv., vol. i. p. 249) even quotes the Hebrew nasi (prince) as a title of honour of the leader of the Sanhedrin, to whom fell the duty of dealing with the intercalation (cf. Ral. Talmud, Sanhedrin, p. 118: “the intercalation of the year may only be done with the approval of the nasi”). According to one of the meanings of the Arabic nasi given in Tradition, it was really the “name of a man” (see above), a meaning which is all the more remarkable in this connection, as it does not suit the Qur’ānic passage. There is a definite agreement in the fact that in the Jewish intercalation only the month following Adar was an intercalary month while in the Arab system, as the critical examination of Tradition — contradicting the literal interpretation of its text — shows, only the month following Dhu l-Hijāja i.e., the intercalated month in both cases was inserted between the normal last month and the normal first of the year, Nisāḥ or al-Muharram.

Nothing certain is known about the process of intercalation among the Arabs. It can only have been periodic and irregular attempts at correction based on observation of nature, particularly vegetation. The technical part must have been exceedingly simple and primitive. The same is true of the Jewish intercalation in the older period (see Ral. Talmud, op. cit., p. 108–113). As the Jewish system served to move the feast of Pesah to a suitable season of the year, the Arab system can only have been intended to do the same for the Ḥajājī and the fairs associated with it in the vicinity of Mecca. It was not intended to establish a fixed calendar to be generally observed. The Bedouins had never had one and they have no use for one. According to Tradition, the management of the nasi was a prerogative of the Banū Kinās and indeed fairs were held on the lands of the Kinās.

Bibliography: A. Moberg, An-nasi in der talmudischen Tradition, where the most important references are given.

NASHĪ (A.), the introductory lines of the Arabic ḡāṣida (q.v.), which are devoted to recalling the memory of a woman whom the poet loved long years before. The nashi is, so far as we know, the only kind of love-poem which has survived to us from the Arabic literature of the pre and early Muhammadan period and is almost the only place where women are the subject in the poetry of the Arabs. The essential feature is that the subject of the nashi is always the lament of a man for a lost beloved. Even in the earliest ḡāṣidas that have survived the nashi is already
in the stereotyped form. It treats its subject again and again in the same way with only the slightest variations. We can distinguish three constantly recurring principal motives:

I. A Beduin on his wandering through the desert passes a spot where there are the traces of a tent-trench which has fallen in, dried camel dung, sooty stones, which once formed a cooking place, and tent-pens. From these things he sees that this spot has been the resting-place of wandering Beduins. After some reflection he recalls that his tribe encamped here long before, jointly with another tribe, during the spring grazing and that he himself spent a happy time with his beloved. The poet usually then gives a description of the deserted camping place, the _ṣaṭṭū,_ it can only be traced with difficulty as the wind and the rain which has fallen upon it have obliterated it and made it almost unrecognizable. The rain has produced a rich vegetation and gazelles and antelopes with their young have found shelter there. The poet then recalls the day when the two tribes, his own and that of his beloved, struck camp. There had been various signs of the approaching departure. The camels were brought back from the pastures and loaded; the raven, the bird of ill omen, also foretold the separation to the poet. In his mind he again sees the camels with their litters before him and compares them to ships. The women sit in the litters, among them, his beloved. They go off and he follows them in spirit.

II. While grief for his lost beloved is keeping the poet awake, she sends him from far away her _khayyāl,_ a vision of herself. He is surprised that his delicate beloved has been able to travel so far, as she was never a good walker. The vision arouses painful memories in him and he weeps copiously as he recalls the beauty of his beloved.

Each of these three themes may be followed by a full description of the personality and journey of his beloved; she is a distinguished and modest lady, one of the noblest of her tribe; she is frequently married and sometimes even has children. Her husband is held up to ridicule. She is coquettish and likes to torment her lover. Her physical charms are described very fully and the woman her body is calculated in fine similes (in the style of the _nāṭib,_ cf. the Song of Solomon and the All-egypt'schcn Liebeslieder, ed. W. Max Müller). Her dress, her perfumes and her jewellery are described in laudatory terms. The feelings of the lover are then detailed. Grief has made him old and grey; he is ill with longing for his beloved and after all these years his tears still flow at the thought of her.

Like all early Arabic poetry the _nāṭib_ in matter and structure follows with considerable strictness a definite chain of ideas so that there is a certain uniformity about it. We constantly find the same or similar comparisons; the ideas of the different poets do not differ essentially from one another but only the form and method of expressing them. The traces of the _ṣaṭṭū_ look like writing made by the _ḥalam_ on parchment. The girl is like a gazelle or an antelope, a simile which continuously recurs with new variations. The tears of the poet run like water from a leaky skin or fall like pearls from a necklace when the string is broken and so on. In consequence of the wealth of the Arabic language in synonyms these similes have an ever-new charm in spite of the many repetitions. Stereotyped metonymies, such as we find in all branches of Arabic poetry, are also common in the _nāṭib._ Thus the beloved, the _ṣaṭṭū,_ the showers of rain, and parts of the body etc. are designated by metonymy. The _nāṭib_ usually begins (in so far as it has survived in its entirety) with formal phrases: _hūna-_ or _al-dīyażw_ etc. frequently it ends with _dāj_d ā _‘ašlī_ _‘ašlī ‘leave this’, whereupon the poet turns to the description of the camel.

The _nāṭib_ had already become fixed in form in the pre-Muhammadan period, and no poet could break away from it. Gradually its contents became more and more colourless; it became more and more stereotyped and stiff. In the old Arab poetry there is already no difference between the _nāṭib_ of a Beduin and that of a townman. _Kāṣī b. al-Khāṣīm, Ḥāṣān b. Thālib_ and _‘Adi b. ‘Azīd_ describe the beauty of their beloved in the same way as, for example, _‘Imra_ al-Kāṣī, and lament their separation from her just like a Beduin poet. We must remember however that in the pre-Muhammadan period even a small town knew Beduin life (cf. _‘Adi b. ‘Azīd_ we know that he spent a part of the year in the desert; cf. _Kitāb_ al-‘Agāhīn, Cairo 1928, ii. 105). In later times however, the poets no longer knew the life of the desert from their own experience, the _nāṭib_ thus became more and more stereotyped. In the end it became a matter of ridicule that every _kāṣīd_ began with the lament at the _ṣaṭṭū,_ a critic of the _Abū’l-Durā_ period (cf. Goldziher, Akhandaingen, p. 144) asks whether every man with a command of language who would write a good poem must of necessity be lovesick.

From the _nāṭib_ we learn of amatory relations of a kind which probably played a considerable part in pre-Islamic Arabia. These were unrestricted relations, not contracted in the forms which were already used in pre-Islamic Arabia at a marriage. They were based on natural inclination and spontaneous devotion and ended with this. As is evident from the _nāṭib_ such unions were usually concluded in the spring grazing season when different tribes were encamping peacefully side by side. When the end of this fine season of the year came these love affairs also came to an end as a rule. The position and the reputation of the _kāṣīd_ (as the beloved is often called) were not affected by this illegitimate relation; she remained in her tribe and went off with them, while a _hāgī_ did not live with her tribe.

As is the case with all Arab poetry, the question what is oldest _nāṭib_ and its origin cannot be answered. Arab tradition records that Mahalhil was the first to put a _nāṭib_ in front of a _kāṣīd_; this does not mean however that he was the first to compose one. In the _Kitāb_ al-‘Agāhīn (Cairo 1928, ii. 123 sq.) we find a parallel to the _nāṭib_ _Al-‘Ur_ ‘ūni sent to King Anushkrān a girl with an accompanying letter which described her merits of mind and body. In the tales of the 1911 Nights and _nāṭib_ like poems are inserted but these are all of a comparatively late period. Many parallels may be found in the _Song of Solomon_, and old Egyptian love-poems resemble in spirit and conception and frequently often in phrase the Arabic _nāṭib_.

_Bibliography:_ cf. the references in the article _Kāṣīd_; I. Guidi, Il _Nāṭib_ nella _Kāṣīd_ Araba, in Acta du XIV° Congrèss International
NAṢĪB, a town in Mesopotamia. The name is certainly of Semitic origin and to be derived with Phyllon Byblos in Steph. Byz.; Müller, F. H. G. ii. 571, fig. 8) from ṢNb (nasib). The idol of Naṣīb is said to have been called Abīl (Assemani, Bibl. Orient., i. Rome 1719, p. 27). i.e. "home of El" (according to W. Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, London 1927, p. 210, note 1). On coins the usual form of the place-name is NEṢĪB (Usurios in Steph. Byz.). Nәṣib: Pliny, Nat. hist., vi. 42: Nesebria; in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae and elsewhere we find the forms Nisibis, Nisibene, Nisibiti etc. (J. Markwart, Südrasien u. d. Tigriquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 259 sq., note 1). In Armenia the town is usually called Melbin (on the form see Markwart, op. cit., p. 166 sq., note 3); Mattews of Edessa (ed. Warshaqat, 2nd ed., 1898, p. 245 = Duhurier's transl., p. 206) calls it "Nasbi", also called Melbin or 

"Naspin" (also on p. 62, Naspin). But also mentions a "Naspin", which is the town of Silan (p. 187 = p. 158, 2nd ed. of Duhurier's translation which (p. 413) wrongly connects these with our Naṣīb and Sippa) which lies on the left bank of the Euphrates on the road from Sevrān or Sevārans (Arabic Sauwān) to Naṣīb. The Naṣīb corresponds to the "town of Naṣīb in the bank of the Frat, called Naṣībo al-Rūm, 3-4 days journey from each of Āmid and Harrān on the road from Harrān to the land of Rūm" (Vāghj, Maqāmāt, iv. 780), in Pseudo-Wākīlī (Fudūh Dīyār Rabiwa-Dīyār Bahā, transl. by B. G. Niebuhr, in Schriften der Akademie von Hamb., vol. i, Hamb., 1847, p. 30, 175 sq.) mentioned along with Šawāda, also Sīverek, as Naṣīb-ah-Šaghīr, the name of which is marked on the Turkish General Staff's map of 1333 (1917-1918), scale 1:200,000, sheet Sīverek-Khārīn, 20 miles almost due west of Sīverek and 1½ miles from Kanṣara at a bend of the Euphrates. The Sīverek map usually identifies Naṣīb with the Sibah of the Bible and say that Nimrod founded the town (Michael Syr., Chron. transl. Chabot, i. 20; Barbebaeus, Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 8). The town lay in the plain below the Maṣūr ābāt [see too ARA'B] on the river Šuyûd, (Theophyl. Simok., ed. de Boor, v. 5, 7: Melkon), the Hirmās of the Arabs, Nehar Masār al-Maṣāb of the Syrians (Asyr. Kharmq; Nöldeke, in Z. d. M. G. xxvii. 326), the modern Daghjibāh, the country between Naṣīb and the Tigris was called Dīrašāya by the Syrians (Theophyl. Simok., l. 13; Rennel, iii. 16, 17: 7, 2; 2: 7, 2: Aqabila; G. Hoffmann, Anm. u. s. a., Chron. ass. Marṭ., p. 83, note 170), by the Armenians Arwastan (cf. Arwastan, in J., 4, 1869, p. 168; Arwastan-
of Mesopotamia. Odenatus of Palmyra in 261 again took Nisibis from the Persians and destroyed it (H procrast. Aug., Trebellia Pollio, Triginta tyranni, p. 14, 3). Diocletian made the town, which had become Roman again at the peace of 297 A.D. (Marquart, Erfahrung, p. 169), the sole centre of trade between Persia and the Roman Empire (Petr. Patrie, fig. 14, in P.H.G., iv. 1895; Cod. Just., iv. 65, 4; Expositio totius mundi et gentium, p. 22 in Riese, Geogr. lat. niter, p. 168) and one of the principal fortresses on the Mesopotamia lines (on the lines see Poibeck, Syria, 1839, p. 33-42). In the Persian wars of Constantine the Great, Nisibis, Oriens fortissimum et immortal (Amnian, Marcell. xxxv, 8, 14), was thrice besieged (332, 346 and 350 A.D.) (Peeters, Acad. Belg. xxxvii, 1920, p. 285-372). During the first siege died the monk Jacob of Nisibis, the teacher of Ephraim, who had built the great church in his native town in 313 A.D.; perhaps he is to be regarded as the founder of the "Persian school" of Nisibis, which Ephraim transferred from there to Edessa in 363 as a result of the persecutions by Shapur II (on it see L. Guidi, Gli stromenti della scuola di Nisibis, in Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana, iv. 1890, p. 195-195; J.-B. Chabot, L'école de Nisibis, in T. Att., ser. 1st, viii, 1896, p. 43-93; Bauernark, Gesch. d. syr. Litteratur, Bonn 1924, p. 113 sqq.; Th. Hermann, Die Schule von Nisibis vom 5.-7. Jhahr., in Zeitschr. f. neusotem. Wiss., 1926, p. 89 sqq.).

In the war of 359 Shapur II at first passed by Nisibis on his way to Telia and Amida, while the Roman army was stationed at Nisibis (Amnian, Marc., xx, 7, 1-3). After the death of Julian, Jovian had to come among other things the great fortress of Nisibis by the peace of 363 (Amnian, Marc., xxv, 7, 91). The inhabitants were allowed to migrate to Amida (Amnian, Marc., xxv, 8, 9-9; Zosim., ill. 33 sqq.; Ps.-Dionys. of Tellhum, Chron., under the year 674; Syr. Vitas Ephraemi, ed. Lamy, p. 24 sqq.; Fanostis Byz., Venet. 1832, p. 26; Nau, in R. C. C., ii, 1897, p. 38). They were perhaps sent out from and settled in the area mentioned as "Little Nisibis." From this time the fortress on the lines was Sargashon, 70 stadia west of Nisibis, the modern Seriye-Khân (Honigmann, Syria, x, 1929, p. 283 sqq.). The Romans made frequent attacks on the lost town but always without success, for example in 421-422 A.D. after their victory at Sargashon (Socrat. Hist. Estl., vii, 15), in 505 under their general Atrobinos (Jos. Styl., ch. 51, p. 44, ed. Wright; Mitch. Syr., transl. Chabot, ii, 159), in 526-527 under the Dux and Stratelates Timostroctos (Zach. Rhei., i, 1, p. 256) and in 542 under Patriicus Marcianus (John of Ephesus, ill. 6, 3). In the sixth century the inhabitants were still inclined to be friendly to the Romans (Ps.-Zach. Rhei., v, 7, p. 211, ed. Land). After the Nestorian academy of Edessa had been transferred to Nisibis in 489 by the Metropolitan Barawmâ as a result of the persecutions of the Nestorians in the Byzantine empire, the town remained for centuries the intellectual centre of Nestorianism (cf. also Mowaffle, Kutha al-Tambî, ed. de Goeje, 190). In the reign of Chosroes II the Church of St. Sergius in Nisibis was built (Theophyl. Simok., v, 7, 7). Sergius Stratelates was held in particular estimation by the nomad tribes of this region (Noldau's Täbsat, p. 284, note 1; Peeters, in Husgarden, Vienna 1911, p. 187; Hersfeld-Sarre, Archäol. Reise im Euphrat-u. Tigrisgebeit, i, 1911, p. 138, note 2).


Halab in 1171 took the town without opposition and dealt rigorously with the Nestorian Christians there. All their new buildings were destroyed and about 1,000 volumes of their writings burned (Mich. Syr., iii. 339 sq.). After his death, his nephew Saif al-Din of al-Mawṣil seized the town (Mich. Syr., iii. 360). It surrendered to Saif al-Din in 1182 (Barhebenaus, Chron. Syr., p. 360). In the following year the latter gave to ʿImād al-Dīn Sīnḏīr, Naṣīḥīn and other towns in exchange for Halab (Barhebenaus, p. 362) and he ruled there till his death in 594 (1198) (Barhebenaus, p. 398, 402). In the region of Naṣīḥīn there was fighting in 582 (1186–1187) between Kuraḍ and Turkomans (Barhebenaus, p. 370). ʿImād al-Dīn was succeeded in 1198 by his son Kūth al-Dīn but Nūr al-Dīn Arāl-Kān of Mawṣil immediately took the town from him. But when a severe epidemic wrought great havoc in his army, he abandoned it and Kūth al-Dīn returned thither (Barhebenaus, p. 402). Nūr al-Dīn in 600 (1203–1204) had to break off the second siege of Naṣīḥīn prematurely (Barhebenaus, p. 416 sq.). Malik al-ʿĀdīd took the town in 606 (1209–1210) from Kūth al-Dīn (Barhebenaus, p. 424). After his death (615 = 1218–1219) it passed to Malik al-ʾAṣḥaf of Ūrin (Barhebenaus, p. 424, 439).

The Arab geographers placed Naṣīḥīn in the fourth clime, the southern boundary of which ran about 12 farsakh south of the town on the direction of Sīnḏīr (al-Maʾṣūdī, ʿAbbāb al-Tamīmī, p. 32 sq.; 35; 44). According to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥawālī, who in 538 (968–969) visited the town which lay at the foot of Djabal Bākhīt, speaks of the pleasant life in it, apart from the dangerous scorpions found there. Al-ʾAṯṭirī describes the fine houses and baths, the market, the Friday mosque and the citadel. Ibn Djbair also visited it in 580 (1184–1185) and mentions its gardens, the bridge over the Hīrmaš inside the town, the hospital (mārizīn), several schools and other places of interest. In the viii (xvii) century it was already for the most part in ruins; but the Friday mosque was still in existence and the gardens around it from which rose-water was exported (Ibn Ṭuṣūṭī). Ḥamid ʿAlī Mustawfī, according to whom the walls had a circumference of 6,500 paces, praises its fruits and wine but laments the unhealthy moistness of the climate, the large number of scorpions and the plague of midges.

Hūlāt in 567 (1129) occupied al-Rūba, Naṣīḥīn and Ḥarrān (Weil, Gesch. der Christen in Orientalien, iv. 10). The Mongol Khān Mangūš Ṭimūr (q.v.) died, poisoned in Dīnārat b. ʿOmar, on his way from there to Naṣīḥīn on the 16th Muharram 681 (April 26, 1282; Barhebenaus, p. 546 sq.). When Ṭimūr Khān in 1395 was on his way to TūrʿAbdīn, the people of Naṣīḥīn and Māʿarrān hid in caves from the Mongols but were suffocated in them when smoke arose (App. to Barhebenaus, Chronography, ed. Wallis Budge, ii., p. xxiv.). The Ḥasanāyīn Kūrds in 1403 pillaged Naṣīḥīn and the country around (ibid., p. xxxvi).

The town passed in the hands of the Ottomans in 1515 (v., Hammer, G. O. R., ii., Post 1828, p. 449 sq.). It became the capital of a sandjak in the pashalik of Āmid (Hasanī Khānī, Dījanāmīn, Istanbul 1732, p. 438). Later it was placed in the sandjak of Māʾruš in the pashalik of Bagdād (St. Martin, Mémoires sur l'Arménie, i., Paris 1818, p. 161 sq.). To its position on the southern border of the highlands and on the road from al-Mawṣil to Syria it owes its great strategic and commercial importance. The building of the Bagdād railway has brought it new life; it is said now to have about 50,000 inhabitants.


(E. Hönigmann)

Naṣīḥ al-Yaṣīdī [See al-Yaṣīdī].

Nasīk. [See Nasīk].

Dayr Shānqīr Kālū Nasīm (1811–1843) was a Kāshānī pānīdī who studied poetics under Atīb. His fame rests entirely on one poem, a romance called Gulār-ī Naṣīm, composed when he was 25. It greatly resembles Mār Ḥasan’s Sīr al-ʾAyūn, and is generally awarded the second place among Urdu poetic romances. Naṣīm also translated the Arabic Nights into Urdu, Nasīm is among the great Urdu matnawī (matnawī in the sense of poetic romances) writers, and is one of the very few Urdu authors who were Hindus.

the son of a Turkish slave-girl named Zumurrud.

He was the only caliph of the later period of the caliphate who was able to pursue a consistent policy. This was entirely directed towards restoring the temporal power of the caliphate. The caliph was assisted by the fact that the Saljuq empire which had previously held the secular power had begun to collapse. In the confusion which brought about its final downfall, the caliph did all he could to hasten its end and did not hesitate to support the Kharizmshah Takash as the strongest rival of the dying Saljuq empire in his fight against the last Saljuq Sultan Tughril II. This struggle finally ended in the defeat of the Saljuqs at Kaiy where Tughril died fighting (Reh. T. 590 = March 1194).

As a result of the diversity of the political aims of the two allies a quarrel broke out between the caliph and the Kharizmshah as soon as negotiations for the partition of the Saljuq territory were begun. The caliph wished to seize the opportunity to extend his personal power by incorporating the Persian provinces while the Kharizmshah in the exercise of the temporal power wished to succeed to the whole inheritance of the Saljuqs. While Takash was involved in war in the east, Ibn al-Kasht, the caliph's vizier, was able to conquer Khusistan and other Persian provinces (beg. of 591 = 1195). His troops were however completely routed by Takash on his return (Shahb. 592 = July 1196) so that the caliph had to abandon his conquests. Only Khusistan was left to him.

In the years following, the caliph had a hand in the intrigues of local rulers in Persian Iraq, usually against the Kharizmshah (from 596 = 1200 'Ala' al-Din Muhammad). The disputes with the latter culminated in 613 (1216) when the caliph had a supporter of the Kharizmshah, Oghulshah, vizier of the governor of Persian Iraq, assassinated by Isma'il's envoys. The Kharizmshah now began to prepare for the decisive struggle against the caliph; he prepared for war and in 614 (1217) invaded Persian Iraq. Here, in order to destroy the caliph as a political force also, he had his 'ulama' in a fetwa declare the caliph al-Nasir unworthy of the caliphate and appointed an 'Ali named 'Ali al-Mulk from Turkhah as imam. The caliph in vain attempted through negotiations to persuade the Kharizmshah to retreat. Instead he advanced on Baghdad from Husainabad. But he was unable to deal his blow at the caliph owing to an unexpected circumstance; for in consequence of the early coming of a severe winter, which destroyed his army, the Kharizmshah was forced to abandon his march and return home with the intention of advancing on Baghdad next year.

In order to meet the danger threatening him, the caliph however in the meanwhile began negotiations with the Mongol Cingis Khan in order to persuade him to attack the Kharizmshah. In 616 (1219) the latter was attacked and decisively defeated by Cingis Khan before he could resume his intended campaign against Baghdad. He died while fleeing from the Mongols on an island in the Caspian Sea (617 = 1220).

The caliph had thus achieved his immediate aim and rid himself of his most dangerous opponent for the moment. But the Mongols were approaching perilously near him, especially after the conquest of Maraghe (618 = 1221) had established them in Ughbat al-Jabala. At first however, there were only minor complications with the Mongols.

On the other hand, after the temporary withdrawal of the Mongols, the young Kharizmshah Djalal al-Din Mangubarti, Muhammad's son and successor, attacked al-Nasir and took Khusistan from him.

As al-Nasir had concentrated his whole attention on the east where he was fighting to strengthen and increase his private domains, he took no interest in the west where Saladin was waging his great struggle with the Crusaders and gave Saladin very insufficient help in spite of several appeals from him.

Al-Nasir's policy seems also to have aimed at the restoration of the internal unity of Islam in addition to restoring the temporal power of the caliphate. He himself had a leaning to the Shi'a of the Imami sect (Twelve-Shi'a) and invited Alids to his court; he seems to have wished to reconcile with his person the claims of 'Abbasids and 'Alids. He also established an agreement with the extreme Isma'il sect of the Assassins. In 608 (1211-1212) the Grand Master of the Assassins, Hasan III, abandoned his claims to the Imamate and paid homage to the 'Abbasid caliph.

Al-Nasir's efforts to centralise round his person the order of chivalry known as the Fatwawaa in a reorganised form are also perhaps connected with his political plans; in 578 (1182-1183) he had himself been admitted by the Shiah 'Abd al-Djalal b. Salih into the Fatwawa order. He then only allowed those of the organisations of the order to remain in existence which acknowledged his personal control. By admission into the order he was then able to establish connections with the princes of the Muslim world, who now regarded him as the head of their order (the chroniclers tell of this in the year 607 = 1210). Ibn al-Farri gives us a description of the robing of a prince as an external sign of his admission into the order in the presence of the caliph's envoy (the story is reproduced in v. Hammer, in F. A., 34th ser., vi. 1855, p. 285 sq.). The strict regulations introduced by Cingis Khan into the Fatwawa order are well illustrated in the edict of 9th Safar 604 (Sept. 4, 1207), published by P. Kuhle in the Ottoheinrichschriften, which the caliph had issued on the occasion of the murder of a member of the order.

Al-Nasir died on the last night of Ramadhan 622 (Oct. 6, 1225) at the age of about 70. Ibn al-Athir describes him as tyrannical towards his subjects and inconsistent in his measures; his fondness for the Fatwawa and its sporting activities (cross-bow shooting, training carrier pigeons) seems to him a strange caprice. Ibn al-Tika judges him more favourably; he describes him as unceasingly engaged in the duties of a ruler and lays stress on his rich endowments, although he also mentions his fondness for money. When a feudal Muslim ruler is reproached with covetousness it usually only means that he was endeavouring to carry through a sound and cautious financial policy. Al-Nasir is further reproached with having allied himself with the Mongols and thus being the cause of the great disaster which the Mongol hordes later inflicted on the lands of Islam.

Among buildings known from inscriptions to have been built by al-Nasir are the Talisman Gates in Baghdad (619 = 1223; blown up in March 1917 on the retreat of the Turks from Baghdad) and
the sanctuary of the Mahdi (Ghazal al-Mahdi) in San‘ar. Both are interesting and suggestive for his political aims, the latter as a distinctly Shi‘i sanctuary for his Shi‘i tendencies and the Ta‘ limb Gate for the remarkable pictorial representation once visible upon it; the caliph seated between two dragons, the jaws of which he is tearing apart and grasping their tongues. According to M. van Berchem's brilliant interpretation, we have here the caliph represented as victorious over two enemies, who had disputed his spiritual power: the Grand Master of the Assassins Hasan III as for a time the representative of the most radical opposition to the orthodox ‘Abbâsid Caliphate, who had finally paid homage to the caliph in 608 and died in 618; the other, the Kur‘î b. Mardîsh who had dared in 614 to set up an anti-caliph but was overcome in 617 and died a fugitive. In this connection the inscription also is interesting; in it the caliph uses the expression al-dar al-khâlîfâ, which is a name of the Assassins gave themselves (cf. M. van Berchem, in J. As., ser. 9, vol. ix., 1897, p. 456 and 457), for his own caliphate.


AL-NAṣîr IBN ‘AL-‘LEMâNÎS (the last name is also written Alâ-‘Alâm, ‘Alâma and even GHallâs by Ibn ‘Idhârî), fifth ruler of the Hammaðid dynasty, succeeded his cousin Bulûkkin b. Muhammad in 545 (1056). His reign marks the apogee of the little Berber kingdom founded by Hammaðîd [q.v.]. The ephemeral rise of the Hammaðids was the immediate result of the downfall of their relations and neighbours, the Zirid of Ifrisiya, the first victims of the Hilfis invasion. On his accession, al-Nâṣîr, who lived in the Kâl‘at Bani Hammaðîd, was already ruler of a little kingdom, the chief towns of which were Aşgîr [q.v.], Millâna, Aqilgares, Hammm (Büra), Ngeus and Constantine. Shortly afterwards, he regained Bi‘ka whose governor had rebelled against Bulûkkin; but his chief hope of extending his territory lay in the decline of the kingdom of Qairûwân.

The abandonment of the old capital of the Zirid al-Mâ’rîn and his flight to al-Mahdiyya (1057) had left Ifrisiya a prey to anarchy. The country districts were in the hands of the Arabs and the towns had chosen their own rulers; on all sides governors were in rebellion; leaders of the tribes imposed their authority on the threatened citizens; some towns turned to the Hammaðîds who were able to protect them. The people of Kasîtiyya [q.v.] for example sent a deputation to al-Nâṣîr to convey their homage; the people of Tunisia did the same. At their request the Hammaðîd sent them as governor Abd al-Hajj al-Shandjî family of the Banî Khusrân. The latter worked wonders; he negotiated agreements with the surrounding Arabs which secured the safety of the city. Later, after casting off Hammaðîd suzerainty, he made Tunisia the capital of a kingdom.

If the arrival of the invading nomads had meant an immediate accession of strength to al-Nâṣîr and an increase of population and economic activity to his capital, they were not without danger as neighbours. The Arabs soon involved him in a dangerous adventure. In 557 (1064) the Alhajjî, one of their tribes, asked him to help them against their enemies, their brethren the Riyâb, who had joined the Zirid ruler Tamûs [q.v.]. Al-Nâṣîr agreed, seeing an opportunity to invade and perhaps annex Ifrisiya. He put himself at the head of a large army which included Arabs, Shandjîs, and even Zenîs, led by the king of Fâa, al-Mu‘âz b. ‘Ayîa. The Riyâb in their turn received subsidies and arms from al-Mahdiyya. The armies met at Si‘ba, near the ancient Sufs. From the first the Zenîs of Fâa, won over by the enemy, gave way, which resulted in the rout of al-Nâṣîr. With great difficulty he reached Constantine with 200 men, then the Kal‘a the outskirts of which were systematically sacked by the Arabs.

After this disaster al-Nâṣîr tried to make terms with the prince of al-Mahdiyya; the negotiations failed, perhaps through the death of al-Mahdi, and al-Nâṣîr invited again by the Alhajjî resumed hostilities against the unfortunate Zirid kingdom. He entered ‘Aqurb and Qairûwân (460 = 1067) but these successes led to nothing; he had to abandon them again as he could not hold his conquests. These adventures, into which he was dragged by the Arabs and which brought him no lasting advantage, lasted for some ten years. In 570 (1077) al-Nâṣîr made peace with the Zirid Tamûs and gave him his daughter in marriage.

The Arab scourge which had ruined the kingdom of Ifrisiya began now to threaten seriously the Hammaðîd kingdom. The Zenîs, hereditary enemies of the Shandjîs, the lords of the Kal‘ûn, found among the immigrant nomads allies always ready to resume the conflict. In 468 (1075), the Zenîs chief Ibn Bja‘zînî, supported by the Arab Banî ‘Adî of Tripolitania seized Melîa and Aqîrî. Al-‘Masîr succeeded in driving him back to the desert where, drawing him into a trap, he had him murdered. He sent his son al-Mansûr against the Zenîs Banî Tadjîn, who had joined the Banî ‘Adî and were laying waste the country districts of the Central Maghrib. The rebels were caught and tortured.

The Alhajjî Arabs themselves, of whom al-Nâṣîr had hoped to make valuable auxiliaries, proved most undesirable neighbours. Although he seems to have put down — not without cruelty — the majority of the revolts, life in his ancestral capital became more and more difficult from year to year. This decided him to select another. Occupying the lands of the Bidjûya Berber, he founded there, on the site of the ancient port of Sallûs, a town which was first called al-Nâṣîrîya and later became known as Bougie. There he built the splendid Palace of the Pearl (‘Aqîr al-Lu‘ulu‘). “Having completed his new capital he exempted the inhabitants from the haraât and in 465 (1068) he settled there himself” (Ibn Khaldûn). The exodus of the Hammaðîd royal family to the coast was caused by the same event as had led the Zirids of Qairûwân to move to al-Mahdiyya: the settlement of the nomad Arabs in Barbary and the insecurity which resulted in the interior. This exodus was only completed under al-Nâṣîr’s successor, his son al-
Maʿṣūr [q.v.]. The latter assumed power at his father's death in 481 (1008).


(GEORGES MARÇAIS)

AL-NAṢİR, THE NAME OF TWO AYYUBIDS.

I. AL-MALIK AL-NAṢİR SALAH AL-DIN DAWŪD B. AL-MALIK AL-MUʿĀẓZAM, BORN IN DJUMĀDA I 603 (DEC. 1205) IN DAMASCUS. After the death of his father at the end of Dhu l-Ḵaḍa 624 (Nov. 1227) Dāwūd succeeded him on the throne of Damascus and the Mamlūk ʿAzīz al-Dīn Aḥsān acted as regent. Dāwūd's uncle however, covetous of territory, did not leave him long in peace. Al-Malik-al-Kāmil [q.v.] first of all claimed the powers of al-Shawbak [q.v.] and when it was refused him he occupied Jerusalem, Nābulus and other places (625 = 1226). In this perilous position, Dāwūd appealed to another uncle al-Malik-al-Asfar, who administered the Ayyūbīd possessions in Mesopotamia. The latter came to Damascus but then took al-Kāmil's side and arranged with him a formal division of the whole kingdom. By the arrangement between the two brothers al-Asfar was to receive Damascus and Dāwūd Ḥarrān, al-Raʾṣūl and Ḥims, while al-Kāmil took southern Syria with Palestine, and Ḥamāt was left to Dāwūd's brother al-Malik al-Muṣafār. But when Dāwūd would not consent to this, al-Asfar began to besiege Damascus. After al-Kāmil had concluded peace with the Emperor Frederick II he joined al-Asfar and after three months' siege, forced his nephew to yield (Ṣaḥābān 626 = June–July 1229) whereupon al-Asfar was recognised as lord of Damascus under al-Kāmil's suzerainty while Dāwūd had to be content with al-Kerak [q.v.], al-Shawbak and several other places. In spite of this unfriendly treatment, Dāwūd remained loyal to al-Kāmil when the other Ayyūbīds [q.v.] combined against him, and entered his service in Egypt. Soon after al-Kāmil accompanied by Dāwūd had taken Damascus, he died in Radjāb 935 (March 1238) and Dāwūd whom al-Kāmil had appointed governor of Damascus had to return to al-Kerak. In Egypt al-Kāmil's son al-Malik al-ʿAdīl was recognised as his successor and appointed his cousin al-Malik al-Djūlūd Vūnūs governor of Damascus. When Dāwūd tried to assert his claims to Damascus he was defeated at Nābulus. In the following year Vūnūs, who did not feel secure against Sulṭān al-ʿAdīl, exchanged Damascus with his cousin al-Malik al-Sāliḥ Ayyūb for Sindjār, al-Raʾṣūl and Ḥamāt. This pleased neither al-ʿAdīl nor Dāwūd so they joined forces for an attack on Ayyūb. The events that followed have already been fully related in the article AL-MALIK AL-SĀLĪḤ NĀDIM AL-DIN AL-AYṬĪN so that the reader may be referred to it. After Dāwūd had lost all his possessions except al-Kerak he appointed his youngest son al-Malik al-Muʿāẓzam ʿIzz as his deputy and fled to Ḩalab (647 = 1250) where he was kindly received by al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yūsūf (see below). His private fortune in the form of valuable jewels, valued at least 100,000 dinars, he entrusted to the care of the caliph al-Mustaʿṣim, who acknowledged the receipt of them but never could bring himself to restore the treasure entrusted him. Soon afterwards Dāwūd's two older sons, who had felt themselves neglected, turned to Sulṭān al-Malik al-Sāliḥ Ayyūb and offered him al-Kerak in return for land in Egypt which offer the latter gladly accepted. Alleging unfavourable reports about Dāwūd, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yūsūf had him brought to Ḩimṣ in the beginning of Shuʿbān 648 (Oct. 1250) and put under arrest. In 651 (1253–1254) he was released on the intercession of the caliph on condition that he was not to stay in any lands under the rule of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yūsūf. He therefore decided to go to Baghdad but was not admitted into the city. He lived for a time very wretchedly in the region of 'Ānā and al-Adaḥūtah until he found a place of refuge in al-Anābār. His appeals to the caliph were not answered; finally however, the caliph obtained permission to settle in Damascus. After several unsuccessful efforts to get back his property in Baghdad which had been confiscated, he was in the desert when he was taken prisoner by al-Malik al-Muẓaffar, lord of al-Kerak and al-Shawbak and brought to al-Shawbak. As the caliph thought he could be of use to him in the impending fight with the Mongols, he sent an envoy to al-Shawbak to fetch him; the envoy was bringing him back to Damascus when he heard of Hülegü's capture of Baghdad; he therefore left Dāwūd who went to al-Buwaṭjā, a village near Damascus. Here he died of the plague on 27th DJUMĀDA I, 657 (May 12, 1259). Abu ʿl-Fīṭrī speaks highly of Dāwūd's eloquence and oratorical gifts.


II. AL-MALIK AL-NAṢİR SALAH AL-DIN ABU ʿL-MUṢAFFAR YŪṢŪF, BORN IN ḤALAB ON 19TH RAMADAṬ 607 (Aug. 1, 1209). His father was al-Malik al-ʿAzīz, lord of Ḥalab, his mother Fāṭima, daughter of Sulṭān al-Kāmil. On 4th Rabīʿ I (Nov. 5, 1230) Yūsūf succeeded his father under the guardianship of his paternal grandmother Dhiʿāfa Khāṭṭūn bint al-Malik al-ʿAdīl [see ḤALAB]. After her death in DJUMĀDA I 640 (Nov. 1242) Yūsūf himself assumed the reins of government and soon extended his power over most of Syria. When Ayyūb, the Sultan of Egypt, with the help of the Khārīzimians who had conquered Palestine and also Damascus Yūṣūf became ultimately involved in the conflict. The Khārīzimians were dissatisfied with Ayyūb, went over to al-Malik al-Sāliḥ Ismāʿīl, lord of Ḥaṣābī and Ḫurayj, and laid siege to Damascus on his behalf. The lords of Ḥimṣ and Ḥalab then appeared on the scene. The Khārīzimians were completely
routed (644 = 1245) and Isma'il had to flee to Halab and take refuge with Yüsuf [see AL-MALIK AL-ḲAṢĪṣ AḤDĀM AL-DIN AYUB]. In 645 (1248—1249) the latter's general Shams al-Din Luṭ’ in al-Armaŋ attacked Ḥimṣ [q. v.] and after two months' siege forced the emir al-Malik al-Aḥsaf to capitulate and code the town to Yüsuf in return for Tell Bāṣîr [q. v.]. Two years later, the latter conquered Naṣīr, Dīrās and Karkīshā from the Ṭabāqī of al-Maṣqil Bāḍr al-Din Luṭ’ [see Luṭ’].

After the assassination of Tūrāngān [see AYUBID], in 648 (1250), Yüsuf was made emir by the Dārmūs and in Rabī‘ II (July 1250) he entered Damascus. To avenge the murder of Tūrāngān he prepared for war against Egypt and proposed an alliance with Louis IX of France; but these negotiations came to nothing. In Raḍāb of this year (Oct. 1250) the Syrians were defeated by the Egyptian emir Fāris al-Din ʿAṯajī near Ghazza. Yüsuf did not lose courage however but prepared for a new attack on Egypt. In the vicinity of al-ʿAbbāsīa [q. v.] he met the Egyptian army (Dhu ḫ-Ḥaḍa’ 648 = Heg. of Feb. 1251); victory was within Yüsuf's grasp when the treachery of his Turkish mamluks turned the scale in favour of Egypt. Yüsuf had to take to flight; several Syrian princes were taken prisoners and ʿAṯajī invaded Syria where he occupied Nablus and several other important towns until a strong Syrian force finally checked his further advance. After long negotiations, peace was finally concluded at the beginning of the year 651 (1253) by which Yüsuf had to give up any claims on Egypt, but a year or two later he was eventually made the viceroy. On the advance of the Mongols under Hūlāqū [q. v.], Yüsuf endeavoured to avert the danger by showing a humble frame of mind and sent envoys with presents to the Mongol camp; but when he began to calculate on getting support from other Muslim rulers and answered a threatening message from Hūlāqū in a challenging fashion, the latter laid siege to Halab. Yüsuf seems at first to have thought of advancing against him to raise the siege. He encamped in front of Damascus and sent messengers with appeals for help in all directions but as neither Syrians nor Egyptians answered him and Halab fell into the hands of the Mongols (658 = 1260), there was nothing left for him but to abandon Damascus and go south. Ḥamāṭ, Baʿalbek and Damascus were taken and Yüsuf had finally to surrender to Hūlāqū. The latter had him executed, probably after the defeat of the Mongols at Ḥimṣ towards the end of the year 659 (1261; see also the article HALAB). According to Abū l-Fida', Yüsuf was distinguished for his scholarship and poetical gifts; he was further kindly and good mannered, and fond of good living and so lacked the strength to maintain his lordship in the kingdom.


AL-NAṢIR, the name of two Mamluk sulṭāns.

I. AL-MALIK AL-NAṢIR NĀṢIR AL-DIN MUḤAM-
of Baibars al-Djahangir entered Damascus. On 27th Ramadán (April 20), a battle was fought on the plain of Marj al-Sufär after the rest of the Egyptian troops under Sulajn al-Násir and the caliph al-Mustakür had joined Baibars. Nightfall put a stop to the desperate fighting but it was renewed the next day and ended with the total defeat of the Mongols; 16,000 prisoners are said to have fallen into the hands of the victors. Ghiżān died soon afterwards and his successor Uldjátüdi did not dare to measure his strength with his formidable opponent. For the rest al-Násir’s second reign was a fairly peaceful one apart from a few military enterprises of slight importance.

At the beginning of the year 702 (1302), an expedition was sent against the Templars who had established themselves in the island of Arwāḍ on the Syrian coast and harassed the mainland opposite [see 795]. The district of plast [q.v.] was also invaded; its ruler had made common cause with the Ikhān and did not send Egypt the usual tribute promptly. The Egyptian authorities were on the whole on good terms with foreign powers; on the other hand, home affairs gave cause for anxiety. After the defeat at Hīmā, the Beduins in Upper Egypt rebelled against the authorities and levied taxes on their own account. A large army was therefore equipped to punish the rebels. At the same time, the governor of Ḭūtjus advanced from the south and cut off their access to the southern desert. The rebellion was put down with ruthless vigour, the men massacred without mercy, the women and children taken prisoners and property carried off. Many took refuge in caves, all but suffered from lack of food and water in them. The large Christians and Jewish elements in the population had also to suffer a great deal.

Several of the Umayyad, Abūṣaid and Fāṭimid caliphs had already issued special regulations affecting non-Muslims and the Abūṣaid al-Mutawakkil had gone furthest in this direction; in general, however, such measures were only enforced for a short period and were therefore usually repeated after a time; at least this is true of Egypt. In al-Násir’s reign many Christians were holding honoured positions as officials when suddenly from some insignificant cause the secret jealousy of the Muslims flared up and in 701 (1300–1301) an edict was issued which ordered among other things that in future Christians should wear blue and Jews yellow turbans in order to be at once distinguishable from the true believers nor were they to be allowed to carry arms or ride horses. Very soon a prohibition was issued against the appointment of Christians and Jews to the offices of the sultan or of the emirs. The immediate consequence of this measure was that several churches were destroyed by the fanatical mob and the others remained closed until the authorities allowed them to be reopened at the demand of the Byzantine emperor and other Christian rulers.

On the 23rd Dhu‘l-Hijja 703 (Aug. 8, 1303) the whole of Egypt was affected by a terrible earthquake in which not only many private houses but also palaces and mosques were destroyed and large numbers of people perished. All traces of the catastrophe were however obliterated with the greatest energy and the emirs and well-to-do citizens vied with one another in spending lavishly to restore the shattered buildings. After an unsuccessful attempt to escape from the tutelage of the two emirs Sallār and Baibars, both of whom aimed at the sole power and regarded each other with suspicion, the sultan, who was prevented from exerting any influence in the government, left the capital on the 44th Ramadán 708 (March 7, 1309) under the pretext that he wished to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca but went instead to al-Karakh. On reaching the capital, he told the emirs who accompanied him that he was abandoning the pilgrimage and abdicating in order to live in peace in al-Karakh. Baibars was proclaimed his successor under the title al-Malik al-Muṣaffar on the 23rd Shawwāl (April 5, 1309) while Sallār remained in office as adminstrator. Baibars however enjoyed no real popularity; an oppressive rise in prices made him hated among the people who without justice blamed him for the difficult times. Sallār was intriguing secretly and al-Násir was vigorously adding to the number of his followers in Syria. When Baibars heard that al-Násir had entered Damascus and the Syrian emirs had gone over to him, there was nothing left for him but to abdicate and appeal for mercy to his rival. The latter pardoned him and even offered him the lordship of Syria [q.v.]. But after he had made his entry to Cairo al-Násir had Baibars arrested (beg of Shawwāl 709 = March 1310). Very soon afterwards, Sallār was also disposed of; he died of starvation in prison. The Mongols not long after this resumed hostilities. Two emirs who did not feel safe with the sultan went to the Ikhān Uldjátüdi and urged him to invade Syria. The Mongol expedition did not however go beyond the siege of the town of al-Rahba (Ramadán 712 = Jan. 1313). When the Mongols saw that their efforts were unavailing, they abandoned their plan of campaign and retired.

At the beginning of the year 715 (1315) a campaign was undertaken against Malayza, on the course of which see the article MALAYΩA. At the same time, the lord of plast had to cede several strongholds and increase his annual tribute. Little Armenia was several times invaded by the Mamluks who wrought great havoc there. In Mecca the sons of the Sharif Abū Numaıy [q.v.] were engaged in a prolonged struggle for supremacy; as the Mamluk sultān claimed to exercise a kind of suzerainty over the two holy cities, al-Násir intervened without however playing any very effective part. His authority was recognised in Madīna in 717 (1317) and when he intervened in the domestic quarrels of the Yaman and sent troops thither to support al-Mudjāhīd, one of the pretenders to the South Arabian throne, he was assisted by the Meccans (725 = 1325). In the meanwhile, the situation had improved in favour of al-Mudjāhīd so that the troops sent to his help by al-Násir had to return amid great hardships after achieving nothing. Al-Násir also tried to extend his power into Nubia. For this purpose he sent in 716 (1316–1317) a Nubian prince named Abd Al-Allah, who had been converted to Islam and brought up in Egypt, with an army to put him on the throne. He succeeded in driving out the legitimate heir but the latter was able after a time to return and expel the intruder Abd Allah whose tyrannical rule had made him generally hated. Al-Násir was more successful in N. W. Africa; in 717 (1317) he was mentioned as sultan in the khutba in the pulpits of Tunisia, whose ruler, the Ḥafṣid Abū Zakariya Yahya, owed his throne to him. In 723 (1323) he finally concluded peace with the Ikhān.
Abd al-Salāh. After the latter's death in Rabī' II 736 (Nov. 1335), Hassan Buzurg pleaded himself to Al-Nasir's favor but the latter would support him with an armed force. Al-Nasir, who was a better diplomat than soldier and had not the courage to intervene at the decisive moment, did not fulfil the condition. Al-Nasir had diplomatic relations with most of the rest of the known world and at his court appeared embassies not only from the Golden Horde, the Ilkhānids, the Rasūlid of Yaman, the king of Abyssinia, and the Ḥafsids of Tunisia, but also from the Emperor of Byzantium, the Crr of Bulgaria, the Pope, the King of Aragon, Philip VI of France and Sultan Muhammed b. Tughluq of Dihl. Al-Nasir died in the 3rd of Dhu l-Hijjah 741 (June 1341); he left eight sons, who reigned one after the other but were themselves ruled by the emirs who were usually quarrelling among themselves. His immediate successor on the throne was al-Malik al-Manṣūr Safīd al-Dīn Abū Bakr, who was deposed after only two months in favour of another son of the late sultan.

In al-Nasir's third reign the position of the Christians improved, and he frequently tried to alleviate their hard lot, although his efforts sometimes failed against the stubborn opposition of the Muslim clergy. The ordinances of the period when Sallar and Baibars were the real rulers were at least not enforced to the full extent and we even find that the sultan put Christians, i.e. Copts, into the government offices, presumably simply because they were cleverer and more witty than the Muslims. Men of learning were treated with a benevolent interest, and the Ayyubid Abu'l-Fidāʾ (q.v.), celebrated as a historian and geographer, was the sultan's trusted friend "perhaps the only one among all the nobles whom al-Nasir treated till his death with equal love and respect" (Weil, iv. 400). Al-Nasir further abolished many taxes which oppressed the people. He built canals and roads and carried out other public works for the improvement of means of transport. Architecture in particular flourished exceedingly; among the splendid buildings which date from his reign special mention may be made of al-Kasr al-Aḥlāf, al-Mudawara al-Nasiriyya, and Dūmāt al-Nasirī. These works however cost large sums of money and there were really no bounds to his extravagance. He was able through his long reign to maintain the Mamluk state in its place among the great powers, and he was also able to make his authority felt at home. In some respects he reminds one of Sultan Baibars 1; like the latter he was little scrupulous in his choice of means. To undeniable gifts he added suspicion, covetousness and an extremely digressive nature, and it has been observed, undoubtedly with justice, that al-Nasir inspired more awe than respect.

Bibliography: Abu l-Fidāʾ, Annals, ed. Reiske, v. 85, 147, 133, 155, 496; Makrizi, transal. by Quatremère, Histoire des sultans Mamelouks de l'Égypte, ii. 2; Ibn Khaldūn, al-Tārīkh, v. 406, 494; Ibn līyā, Taʾrīkh Misr, i. 129, 499; Zettersten, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamlukensultanate, see index; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, iv. 101, 499; Stanley Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 248, 276, 284, 286, 289, 282, 271, 342, 444; see also the article MAMLUKI.

II. AL-MALIK AL-NAṢIR NAṢIR AL-DīN ḤĀṢAN, the nineteenth sultan of the Bahri Mamluks, son of the preceding. After the murder of his brother al-Malik al-Muṣaffar Saif al-Dīn Ḥāḍidjī, Ḥasan who was then only eleven, or, according to others, thirteen years old was proclaimed sultan on the 28th Ramadān 748 (Dec. 1347). Another son of the sultan al-Malik al-Naṣir Muḥammad b. Kālūn, called Ḥusayn, was also put forward but this plan fell through and he never attained the throne at a later date. More important than the elevation of this minor prince to the throne was of course the distribution of the high offices of state among the emirs; the emir Baiboghā Arwas became administrator of the kingdom, his brother Menqāl al-ʿUṣūfī vizier, and the chief emir Shāhābī, Abū Bekr of al-Malik al-Ṣalāḥ al-Salih al-Dīn Ṣalih, q.v. i., afterwards sultan. Thanks to Baiboghā's adroit policy, al-Nasir was able to survive for four years, although, except for the last few months, he exercised no influence worth mentioning on affairs of state. His reign was filled with unsettling quarrels among the ruling emirs and systematic raiding by the Beduins. The most noteworthy event of the period was however the devastation of a great part of the world by the devastating pestilence which swept through Europe as the "Black Death", spread from Asia through Egypt and over almost all Europe to England and Scandinavia. In Egypt the plague raged in the second half of the year 749 (1348-1349) being accompanied by a no less fatal cattle-plague. In Syria it had appeared a few months earlier. Everywhere countless men fell victims to the angel of death and it is not surprising that the political and economic life of the state was crippled. The plague only died down in the following year. In Shawwāl 751 (Dec. 1350) the sultan succeeded in getting rid of the most powerful emirs and taking the reins of government into his own hands, but after a very few months he was deposed and his brother al-Malik al-Ṣalāḥ al-Salih al-Dīn Ṣalih, the eighth of the sons of Sultan Muḥammad b. Kālūn, was placed on the throne (Djumādā II 752 = Aug. 1351). He ruled only for three years; on the 29th Shawwāl 755 (Oct. 20, 1354) he was derowned and his brother al-Nasir restored. The real ruler at first was Shaikhīt but in 758 (1357) the latter was waylaid and so severely wounded that he died a few months later. His successor ʿUṯmān b. Saḥmashīr, was of possessing himself of the murder, did not allow the sultan the slightest independence, but was however arrested in Ramadān 759 (Aug.-Sept. 1358). In Muharram 761 (Nov.-Dec. 1359) the governor of Ḥalab undertook an expedition against Ṣūr and established Muslim garrisons in Adana and Tarus. About the same time, the troops who had been sent to Mecca by the Egyptian government to settle the endless family feuds there were defeated by the Meccans and those taken prisoners sold in Vanbō as slaves. On hearing this the sultan is said to have sworn to exterminate the sharifs completely; but before he could carry out the plan, he himself deposed. For, as he wished to preserve his independence, he quarrelled with the powerful emir Yalbugha, who had reproached him with his extravagance. The latter combined with several other dissatisfied emirs and prepared to fight. Al-Nasir was defeated and had to abandon his plan of escape secretly to Syria. Instead he was taken prisoner and handed over to his enemy Yalbugha (Djumādā 1 763 = March 1361). His ultimate fate is unknown; according to one, in
itself quite credible, story he was strangled and his body thrown into the Nile. His mosque (Qibla Salāṭ in Ḥusayn) built in Cairo in the years 1356–1363 is considered the most important example of Egyptian-African architecture.


(K. V. Zottersteer)

**AL-NAṢIR**, honorary of the fourth sovereign of the Mamluk dynasty of the Muṣrīnids or Al-Maḥdah [q. v.]. Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammād b. Yaḥyā, b. Ἀλ-Μαςί.by Ἀβέ ʿΑδρ Αλ-Μου.’Min. He was proclaimed on the death of his father on the 22nd Rabī’ I 595 (Jan. 25, 1199). The beginning of his reign was marked by a suppression of the rising led by an agitator in the mountains of the Gharār and a long stay at Fās during which he rebuilt a part of the wall of the ʿamṣa of this city. Hearing of the rising of Yaḥyā b. Ḥašāk Ibn Ḥašāk in Ifriqiyah, he set out for the eastern part of his empire and laid siege to the town of Mahṣīya, which was taken on the 6th of Dhuḷ-Qa’dah I 602 (Jan. 9, 1206). He returned to Morocco in the following year leaving as his deputy in Ifriqiyah the shakīb Abū Muḥammad Abū Ṭāhir Abū Ṣaḥābur Abū Ḥasān, ancestor of the Ḥassābīs [q. v.]. At the same time, he sent from Algiers against Majorca [cf. RABEŠEKS; ISLANDS], which had belonged to the Banū Ḥārīya since the period of the last Almoravīda, a fleet which took the island: this remained in Muslim hands till 637 (1239). In 607 (1211) al-Ṭāhir sent an expedition to Spain which ended in a disaster to the Muslim troops: in front of Ḥijāz al-Ṭāhir or the Nasīm of the Caliph [q. v.] on 15th Ṣafar 609 (July 16, 1212). This severe reverse deeply affected al-Ṭāhir, who returned to Morocco and made his subjects take the oath of allegiance to his son ʿUthayn. He then retired to his palace. He died in Ribāṭ al-Fāṭih (Kabat, q. v.) on 10th Shabān 610 (Dec. 25, 1213). According to some chroniclers, he died a violent death on the same day in Marrakush, his capital, the victim of a conspiracy hatched by his visiers.

**Bibliography:** cf. the article AL-MU’ABBĀD.

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

**AL-NAṢIR.** [See ‘Uṭrūrīh.]

**AL-NAṢIR AL-DIN ALLĀH,** official name of several Zāhid imāms.

i. Among the Caspian Zāhid this title was borne by 1. AL-NAṢIR AL-KĀHIR AL-ḌURR [q. v.] and his great-grandson 2. AL-NSHIR AL-ṢARĪN AL-ḤUSAIN B. AL-HASAN B. AL-HASAN B. AL-LĀspender. Abū. The latter gained for himself a dominion beginning in Ḥawṣam, where he could find associations with the earlier period of Zāhid rule. He laid great emphasis on the religious character of Zāhidism; he gave out the state treasury funds to support people who gave up the Kurʾān by heart. He was also a poet. After his death (676 = 1083), his tomb in Ḥawṣam was a much visited place of pilgrimage.

II. Among the Yaman imāms this title was borne by 1. AL-NAṢIR AHMAD, son of al-Ḥādī Vahṣī and his brother’s daughter Fātima. In the heavy fighting which the father had to wage in order to found the new state, Ahmad had been more distinguished than his elder full brother Muḥammad. Homage was, it is true, paid first to the latter as al-Murtajj shortly after the death of al-Ḥādī (289 = 911); but after 6 months he abdicated and he could make no progress against the Ḥaḍrān ‘Ali b. Ṣadīq, and suggested as his successor the vigorous Ḥaḍrān, whom the Banū Ḥašāk especially favoured. As a poem composed when allegiance was sworn to him in Sāhar 301 (Aug.–Sept. 913) he made war on the Ḥaḍrān’s his first duty and played a considerable part at least in damping back the threatened Ḥaḍrānisation of the Yaman. He died at Sāḥa, probably in 315 (927); his tomb is there. All succeeding bearers of the title except the next one: 2. ABU ‘L-FATH AL-NAṢIR AL-DAILAM, so-called from his first Caspian sphere of activity, were of his family although of different lines. In the Yaman, in contrast to his predecessor, he began operations south of ‘Anṣār’ fell in 447 (1055) fighting ‘Ali al-Salāḥī there and was buried near Ḥāmār. The life of 3. AL-NSHIR SALAWH AL-DIN was marked by internal strife which ultimately caused his death. In the first half of the xvith (xvith) century, several imāms had disputed the succession. About the middle of the century, his father al-Mahdī ‘Alī b. Muḥammad attained considerable influence, which was however much reduced in the period before his death at Ḥāmār in 774 (1372). Salāḥ al-Dīn became sole imām and advanced as far as the Tihmā against the Rastīlis [q. v.]. But when in 792 (1391) he died at Tīlān, his death was concealed for two months on account of the insecurity and his body was concealed in the castle in a coffin covered with plaster. It was only when rumours of his death reached the Kāhi al-Dawwār in Sāda that the latter arranged for his burial in Tīlān. The son ‘Ali b. Salāḥ al-Dīn could only obtain recognition as ‘Imām of the Dihādī and fell in 840 (1336), one of the many victims of the great plague. In spite of opposition the Zāhid power was once more built up, it was destroyed by the young dynasty of the Tihmās from the Tihmās (850–923 = 1446–1517), especially by its second member ‘Abd al-Wāḥāb b. Dāwūd, from 855 (1458), until at the end of the xith (xvith) century Al-Ḥādī ‘Isa al-Dīn b. al-Ḥasan again re-established and extended their power. His son 4. AL-NAṢIR AL-ḤASAN I. “IZZ AL-DIN (b. 900–929 = 1494–1523) who had primarily inherited from his father a love of learning, could only maintain a limited power in the north. He had to put up for a long time with an anti-imām al-Muṣṭafī Muhammad b. ‘Ali al-Sarāf in ‘Anṣār. 5. AL-NAṢIR AL-ḤASAN II. “ALI b. DĀWŪD at the end of the xth (xvith) century organised in the north one of the centres of resistance to the Turks who had been penetrating into the country since 927 (1521) and 943 (1536) but was taken prisoner by them in 1004 (1598). Among the pretenders within the family al-Muṣṭafī al-Kāsīm (d. 1029 = 1620), the liberator from the first Turkish conquest, was 6. AL-NAṢIR MUḤAMMAD. ‘Isa b. Ἀλ-Μαदī Ἀḥμαd; he set up first in 1136 (1723–1724) in the north in the hills of Sufyān among the Banū Bakīl, then in 1139 (1726–1727) away in the south at Ṣāḥīf but had finally to submit to his cousin’s son al-Muṣṭafī al-Ḥusain b. al-Kāsīm b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muḥammad Ḥaḍrān and died in 1167 (1753) as a private individual in Ṣāḥīf. In 1251 (1836) the dissatisfied troops who had been discharged by the very extravagant imām al-Muṣṭafī ‘Alī b. al-Mahdī ‘Abd Allāh
the early part of this period of expansion al-Hasan was much occupied in the suppression of local rebellions. He was anxious also to remain in the caliph's good graces, and for this reason declined to assist the general Mu'taz [q.v.] in his quarrel with al-Muktafi, which ended in the latter's death. In 323 (935), however, the caliph al-Ra'id attempted to displace him in the governorship of al-Mawālī in favour of his uncle Sa'id, al-Hasan thereupon had Sa'id murdered; and though al-Ra'id at first sought to impose his will by force of arms, he was in the end obliged to agree to al-Hasan's restoration.

The reign of al-Ra'id saw the final collapse of the traditional 'Abbāsid system of government with the appointment of Ibn Ra'id as amir al-muwār [q.v.]. This development resulted in a still greater weakening of the caliph's power; and in 327 (938-939) al-Hasan made an attempt to hold his dais, which, however, were promptly exacted by Ibn Ra'id's successor, Badkān [q.v.]. In 330 (941-942), again, when the caliph al-Muttaqī [q.v.] and Ibn Ra'id (who had meanwhile been restored) fled to al-Mawālī from Baghdad on its occupation by the brothers al-Bardī [q.v.], al-Hasan had Ibn Ra'id assassinated, forced the caliph to give him the amirate together with the šāfī Nāṣir al-Dawla, and later married his daughter to the caliph's son. But though he and his more celebrated brother 'Ali, who was at the same time entitled al-Muttaqī al-Dawla [q.v.], were able to restore al-Muttaqī to his capital and drive the Bardīs back to al-Basra, they were almost immediately obliged by a revolt of the Turkish troops under Tūṣn[q.v.] to retire again to al-Mawālī. Al-Muttaqī now appointed Tūṣn amīr in Nāṣir al-Dawla's place. But his evident helplessness encouraged Tūṣn to abuse his power; and in 332 (945-946) the caliph again sought refuge with the Ḥamdānīs. Saif al-Dawla now tried, though without success, to defeat Tūṣn in battle, while al-Hasan removed the caliph for greater safety from al-Mawālī to Raṣīla. After some months, however, al-Muttaqī was persuaded by Tūṣn's professions of loyalty into returning to Baghdad, only to be met on the way by the amir, who blinded and deposed him. On this Nāṣir again withheld his dais. But Tūṣn and al-Muttaqī [q.v.], the new caliph, came against him and forced him to pay. Tūṣn, however, died in 334 (945-946), whereupon Nāṣir made a bid to recover the amirate. But later in this same year Baghdad was occupied by Ahmad b. Ruych Mu'īn al-Dawla [q.v.]; and henceforward Nāṣir's career hinged chiefly upon the maintenance of his power against that of the Buṣānīs.

The struggle began immediately. As soon as he was established in Baghdad Mu'īn al-Dawla led an expedition against the Ḥamdānīs, and though Nāṣir al-Dawla forced him to return to the capital by himself occupying the east bank and blockading the Round City, in the end he drove the Ḥamdānī forces out. Nāṣir retired to 'Ukhārī, and from there sued for a peace that should grant him the tributary lordship of all the country north of Takrit, as well as Syria and Egypt. But a revolt among his Turkish troops forced him to flee before this was concluded, and it was only by the aid of a force sent by Mu'īn that he succeeded in suppressing it. Mu'īn's object in helping him was no doubt to preserve some order in the Ḥamdānīs, but he was opposed by the so-called 'Hamādānīs, approaching the city of Tūṣn[q.v.].
dominions until he should be ready to absorb them. For he now took one of Nāṣir's sons as a hostage for his obedience, and two years later led another expedition against al-Mawill. This again came to nothing, however, since Mu'izz was obliged to make peace before attaining his object, owing to the outbreak of trouble in Persia, where his brother required his assistance. Nāṣir now agreed to pay tribute for Dīyār Rābī'a, the Basra, and Syria, and to have the names of the three Byzants pronounced in the Masjid after that of the caliph throughout this territory.

It was not till 345 (956–957) that further trouble arose between the rival potentates. In that year Mu'izz was called away from Baghdad to deal with a revolt, whereupon Nāṣir sent two of his sons to occupy the capital. Mu'izz, however, succeeded in overcoming the rebel; and on his return the Hamānīs decamped. Yet in spite of this provocation Mu'izz contented himself with exacting an indemnity and a renewal of Nāṣir's contract to pay tribute, and it was only when Nāṣir withheld the second year's payment that he took further steps against him. He then advanced into his territory, took al-Mawill and Nīshībūr, and finally sent a force to al-Raḥja. Nāṣir, who had fled first to Ma'ṣūfīn and then to Alep, which was now held independently by Saif, attempted to make peace. But Mu'izz rejected his advances, and came to an agreement only when Saif offered to take his brother's place as tributary for al-Mawill, Dīyār Rābī'a and al-Raḥja.

Five years later, in 353 (964), Nāṣir opened negotiations to recover his position as tributary for these territories. But he included in his demands one, for the recognition of his son Abū Taqī al-Qādīnāfār [q.v.] as his successor, which Mu'izz was unwilling to grant. He again attacked the Hamānīs, occupying both al-Mawill and Nīshībūr. But they were more successful in withstanding him on this occasion, and an agreement was arrived at whereby Abū Taqī undertook the payment of tribute for his father's former holdings.

In 356 (967) both Mu'izz and Saif died. Almost the last action recorded of Nāṣir is the advice he then gave his sons to refrain from attacking Mu'izz's son and successor Bakhtīyār till they should have exhausted the resources bequeathed to him. For on the death of Saif, to whom he had been nabi and attached, Nāṣir lost all interest in life, and so antagonized his family by his aversion that they resolved to take the control of affairs into their own hands. Abū Taqī, who had in any case taken his place as tributary, and his mother, Nāṣir's Kurdish wife Fatimā bint Aḥmad, contrived to gain possession of all his property and fortresses; and when Nāṣir attempted to enlist the help of another son, they imprisoned him in the castle of al-Salāma in the fortress of Ardīmān. He died, still in confinement, either the next year, 357 (968), or the year after.

Nāṣir al-Dawla's rule was disastrous for the territory over which he had control. The contemporary Ibn Ḥawšal [q.v.] refers in several passages to his ruinous exactions and tyrannical seizures of land (see his descriptions of al-Mawill, Basra, and Nīshībūr). And Miskawāh notes that by bringing fictitious claims against landowners he would force them to sell to him at low rates, till he became not only the lord, but also the owner, of most of the region of al-Mawill.


NĀṢIR AL-DAWLA. [See Ibn Bāṣīya.]

NĀṢIR AL-DĪN. [See Maḥmūd I, Maḥmūd II, Maḥmūd, Maḥmūd III.]

NĀṢIR AL-DĪN. [See Hūṣaynīn.]

NĀṢIR DĪN ALLĀH. [See Maḥmūd, Maḥmūd III.]

NĀṢIR AL-DĪN KUBĀCA. [See Sīdīr.]

NĀṢIR AL-DĪN AL-TŪṢI. [See Al-Tūṣī.]

NĀṢIR-I KHSRAW, whose full name was Abū Muḥammad Nāṣir b. Kṣārwān b. Ḥālīfī, one of the most important Persian poets of the 11th century.

Life. Nāṣir was born in 904 (1003) in Kāhā, in the district of Balkh. The Persian historians usually call him Alawī which in this case can hardly mean descent from the caliph 'Alī but simply indicates his adherence to the Shi'a. His father was probably a small landowner in the vicinity of Balkh. Nāṣir received a good education and was early acquainted with almost all branches of the learning of his day. In the forties of the 11th century we find him as an official in Marw where, according to his own confession, he led a rather dissolute life. In 1045 however, a sudden change came over him, the real reasons for which are unknown, but which Nāṣir himself explained by a prophetic dream. He decided to give up his position and all his pleasures and went on pilgrimage to Mecca on which he visited the Ka'ba four times. This journey had important results for Nāṣir. He left Persia at a difficult period, when the country was being laid waste by the continued wars between the various princes. He found the same wretched picture in all the other Muslim countries which he had to traverse on his journey. Only Egypt proved a pleasing exception; there he saw prosperity, rich bazaars, harmony and tranquility. As the Ismā'īlī dynasty of the Fāṭimids was ruling in Egypt at this time, Nāṣir concluded that Isfahān had diverged from the true path and that only Ismā'īlism could save the true believers from inevitable ruin. Nāṣir made the acquaintance of several Ismā'īlī dignitaries, joined their sect and finally received the blessing of the caliph al-Mustansir (1036–1044) in order to spread the new teaching in his native Khorāsān. He was consecrated as a ṣaqqāhī, a fairly high official in the complicated Ismā'īlī hierarchy. Returning to Balkh he devoted himself with the greatest zeal to his new task. But the Sadjīlīs who ruled the land soon became convinced that Nāṣir's activity was a serious threat to them. He was persecuted and had to flee from Balkh. He went first to Mizrandānī but found that this also was not safe enough and was finally forced as a last resort to take refuge in the Yungān valley among the inaccessible mountains of Badašāhān. There in these poor and inhospitable highlands the aged poet spent his last years; there his most important works were written and there he died in 1060 or 1061 (452–453). Down to the present
day there has survived in this region a little sect known as the Nāṣīrya, which owes its origin to the “saint Shō Nusir” and tells fantastic stories about its founder.

Works. Nāṣir’s works were probably very numerous but have survived only in very imperfect and corrupt form. The most important is the great philosophical Dīvān, which was composed in the miserable years of his exile. The artistic value of his poems is not especially high, the style is often clumsy and awkward but the philosophical matter which still awaits its investigator is of great importance for the history of Persian literature. It is a complete encyclopedia of Ismā‘īlī teaching but of course unsystematic and disconnected. From the linguistic standpoint also the work is of extraordinary interest. A good edition of the Persian text appeared in Teherān in 1928. Two very long didactic poems are appended to the Dīvān: Rūghānī-nāma, which presents a whole philosophical system having an undeniable similarity with the teaching of Avicenna, and Sādāh-nāma which sharply criticises the aristocracy of the kingdom and praises the peasant, “the nourisher of every living creature”.

The best known of Nāṣir’s prose works is the Sāfar-nāma, a description of his pilgrimage to Mecca which is an exceedingly valuable source of the most varied information. Unfortunately this work has come down to us only in a very mutilated form and has probably been edited by a Sunnite hand. The other works of Nāṣir are mainly Ismā‘īlī textbooks. Among them first place should be given to the Zād al-Maṣūrīn. It is an encyclopedia of a special character which deals with the most varied questions of a metaphysical and cosmographical nature. A good edition of the Persian text was published in Berlin in 1923 (Kaviani). No less important is the Waḥţih Dīn, an introduction to Ismā‘īlism which gradually initiates the reader into Ismā‘īlī beliefs by a systematic exposition of questions from the Ḥanīfī cleverly put together. A number of other similar pamphlets like Umm al-Kitāb, which were quite recently fairly widely disseminated among Ismā‘īlīs of the Pamir are credited to our author but so far nothing definite has been ascertained about their authenticity.

Although a considerable portion of Nāṣir’s works is now available in good editions, one cannot yet assert that sufficient light has been thrown upon his striking personality. It would be particularly valuable if his philosophical system could be studied as it is of far reaching importance for the history of thought in Persia.

Bibliography: H. Ethé, G. F. Ph, ii. 278–283; do., Nāṣir Chavus Khāshabandeh, Persian and German (Z. d. M. G., xxxvii. 645–665; xxxiv. 428–431); do., Nāṣir bin Khusraw bin Ḥusayn, a poet and prose writer (M. d. M. G., xxxvi. 478–508); do., Nāṣir bin Khusraw’s Ehren, Denken und Dichter, Leyden 1884; E. Fargan, La vie de la filiști, Persian and French (Z. d. M. G., xxxvi. 643–674); emendations by F. Tefnel, (Z. d. M. G., xxxvi. 96–114); Ch. Schelte, Sofer Naimen (text and transl. with introduction), Paris 1881; this ed. is now somewhat obsolete and it is advisable to use for the text the new edition, Berlin 1923 (Kaviani), which also gives as an appendix the text of the Kāshānī-nāma.

and of the Sādāh-nāma. — Translations: Guy Le Strange, Nāṣir-i Khusraw, Diary of a Journey through Syria and Palestine, London 1888; A. F. Fuller, Account of Jerusalem (J.E.A.S., 1872, p. 142–164); E. Berthold, Safar-nāma (Russian), Leningrad 1933. — In addition to the new edition of the Dīvān, already mentioned there is also the oldest lithographed text, Tabriz 1280. A Turāzī’s hand, the authenticity of which is doubtful, has been published with Russian transl. by V. Zhukovski, in Zapiski (iv. 350–393). Text of the Waḥţih Dīn pr. Berlin 1925 (Kaviani).

(E. Berthold)

AL-NĀṢIRA, Nazareth, the home of Jesus, lies in a depression sloping to the south surrounded by hills in a fertile district. While the hills to the north and northeast are not very high, in the northwest the Djebel al-Sahh rises to 1,600 feet above sea-level. The name of the town, which does not occur in the Old Testament, is found in the New and in the Greek fathers of the Church in the meaning forms Ναζαρή, Ναζαράς and Ναζαρέα with ζ, but according to Liddel and Scott in Hebrew a ze‘re, which is confirmed by the Syrian Ṣirā and the Arabic Nāṣira as well as by the Talmudic derivative form ⼦ ⽀ Yōẏ, pl. ⼦ ⽰ Yōẏ with the Christian Arabic has ⲁ. All these forms as well as Ναζαρέα (Mark i. 24) have in the first syllable an obscure e accented by e in Talmudic. In Christian Arabic there is a subsidiary form ⲁ Yōẏ with Ⲍ in the second syllable with which is connected the derivative ⼦ ⽀ Yōẏ (Matt. xxvi. 71; John xviii. 5), cf. the Ναζαρηνοί nízor (Acts xxiv. 5). The Mandean term Naṣura (e.g. Dalman, Arab. Gramm., p. 178; Gressmann, in Z. A. T. W., iii. 20 sqq.) is usually connected with this but Liddel and Scott (Mandäische Liturgien, p. xi. 124; Z. S., i. 350 sqq.) wants to explain it as an “observer”, while Zimmermann (E.D.M.G., lxiv, p. 429 sqq., 75, 46) seeks its origin in the Babylonian Nāṣirā. That the Arabic maṣir, Christians, Nazarīs and Nazārūs is not the name of the town is known to the Arab writers.

Nazareth, which in the time of Jesus was a little town of no importance (cf. John i. 47: “what good can come out of Nazareth”); it is not even mentioned by Josephus), was not in the early Christian period one of the places of the New Testament to which large numbers of pilgrims went. According to Epiphanius, it was inhabited exclusively by Jews till the time of Constantine the Great. The number of Christians however gradually increased and was maintained after the Muslim conquest (636). In the time of Arculf (c. 670) it had two churches, and in 352 (943) Masūdī mentions a church held in great veneration there, no doubt the church of St. Mary. Before Galilee was conquered by Tancred and the Crusaders, Nazareth was destroyed by the Saracens; it revived under Christian rule, especially after the bishopric of Scythopolis was transferred thither. The Russian abbot Daniel (1115–1115) has given us a very good picture of the Church of the Annunciation and of the Well of Mary there in this period. In 1187, Saladin took Nazareth and at the peace between him and Richard (1192) it remained in his hands. In 1251, during the last unsuccessful crusade, Louis IX undertook a pilgrimage from Akka to Nazareth. Yaḥkī (623 = 1225) who relies on the Gospel story instead of Muslim legend mentions Nāṣira as a village 13 miles from Tābūriyā. In 601 (1203) the Mamluk
Nährabād. See Sīstān.

Nāshk (n.), inm. I from n-škk, with the technical sense of "abrogation (of a sacred text)."

See Kūšān, 3.

Nāshki. See Arabia, 4.

Al-Nāšr, the vulture. It gets its name from the fact that it tears the dead animals on which it feeds to pieces with its beak and devours them. It eats till it can no longer fly. It is said to attain the age of 1,000 years. Its eyes are so sharp that it can see its prey at a distance of 400 farsakh; its sense of smell is equally sharp, but fragrant scents are so deadly to it that they destroy it. It shows great endurance in flying and follows armies and pilgrims, sometimes in order to fall upon the corpse of man and beast. It also follows flocks because it is particularly fond of stillborn lambs, a statement which is confirmed by Biruni who says it attacks lambing sheep. It lays its eggs on high cliffs and is said not to sit on them but to leave them to the heat of the sun. It is however very anxious lest its eggs or young be eaten by hawks and therefore covers them with the leaves of the plane-tree. The use of the gall, brain, flesh and bones in medieval times corresponds to the usage in ancient medicine.

al-Nāšr, was also the name of a deity in pre-Islamic Arabia (see Wellhausen, Keit, p. 23).

Bibliography: Zitzenriß, ed. Wüstefeld, i. 424; Damirri, ii. 476; Ibn al-Baljārī, ii. 370. (J. Reuss.)

Al-Nāṣir, the title of Sūra cxxv., taken from its first verse. The word means "help, assistance" and is often used of God's help in war and then with the meaning of "victory." Sūra lxvi. 13 is also associated with al-fath, cf. xviii. 15. The Sūra clearly belongs to a later period and verse 2 in particular recalls the year 9, the Year of the Embassies. It is therefore natural to refer al-fath (verse 1) in keeping with the frequent use of the word to the capture of Mecca, except that it is not mentioned as a fact (as Well, Ibn Histīn, p. 933 translates it) but is represented as an assumption, which is also true of verse 2. This is perhaps only a rhetorical figure intended to emphasise the general prevalence of the idea and does not exclude reference to a particular event.

Bibliography: Noëdeke-Schwenk, Geschichte des Qurans, i. 219 sq. (Fr. Bühl.)

Nāṣir b. ʿAḥmad b. Ismāʿīl called al-Sādīq, a Sāmānid. After the murder of his father in Djamād al-ʿĀṣir, the fourth year of the caliphate of Abd al-Malik, 91 (606), the people of Sīstān rebelled against the Sāmānids and placed themselves under the rule of the governor Badr al-Khair appointed by the caliph al-Muktafar. At the same time the caliph's generals al-Fāqī b. Ḥumayd and Khalīf b. Ḥumayd al-Mawār过渡 the towns of Ghurān and Baṣt which were in the possession of the Sāmānids. When al-Fāqī fell ill, Khalīf rebelled against al-Muktafar, routed the troops sent against him and went to Kirman where he encountered a force sent against him by Badr. The battle ended in Khalīf's defeat; he was himself wounded and taken prisoner; he died soon afterwards of his wounds. In the same year, the uncle of Nasr's father Iṣār b. ʿAḥmad b. Aṣad rebelled in Sāmān and marched on Bukhāra, accompanied by his son (Ramādān 301 = April 914) but was driven back by Ḥamīyya (Hamīyya) b. ʿAli. A second attempt also failed; Iṣār took to flight again and Sāmān fell into the hands of the government troops. He then tried to hide himself but had finally to come out of his place of concealment and throw himself on Ḥamīyya's mercy. The latter took him to Bukhāra where he remained till his death, while his son Hyād went to Fargāna. In the year 302 (915) another son of Iṣār's, Abd Ṣalāḥ Ṣanṣur, stirred up trouble in Nāṣirīs in combination with Ḥusayn b. ʿAli al-Mawārī (al-Mawwarṣūf), who had rendered great service to the Sāmānids but felt he had been neglected by them. After Ṣanṣur's sudden death Ḥusayn, who was suspected of having poisoned him, went to Nāṣirīs and seized the town. In Rabīʾ I 306 (Aug.-Sept. 918) he was taken prisoner by ʿAḥmad b. Sahl, a tried general, who had been long in the service of the Sāmānids, and brought to Bukhāra, while ʿAḥmad took up his residence in Nāṣirīs. Ḥusayn was after some time released and given a position at
the court of Naṣr; for some unknown reason he was again thrown into prison and ended his days there; in the following year, Abū sa‘īd deserted the Sāmānid because Naṣr had not kept his promise to him, and recognized only the caliph's authority. He went from Naṣībūr to Djudjān and drove out its governor Karageyn. He then returned to Khurāsān and entrenched himself in Marv; in Rajab 307 (Dec. 919) however, he shared the fate of Hūsain. Hamṣija cunningly managed to distinguish him out of the town. Abū sa‘īd was defeated and taken prisoner and died a few months later in BUKHĀRĀ prison. In Tabariānān also there was fighting. After the death of the Za‘idī imām al-URFI, [q.v.], al-Hasan b. al-Kāsim, called al-Dā‘i al-Saghīr, was recognized as his successor. In 308 (920–921) the latter sent his general La’ilā b. al-‘Uqma‘n al-Dūlāmī to Djudjān. From there he went first to Dağmāghān and then to Naṣībūr where he had the khurja read for al-Hasan b. al-Kāsim (Dhu ‘l-Hijja 308 = April–May 921), after Karageyn had been put to flight. In the neighbourhood of Tīlis he encountered Hamṣija b. ‘Abī whom the government of BUKHĀRĀ had sent against him. At first a considerable part of the Sāmānid army took to flight but Hamṣija himself stood firm and La’ilā had no further success; he had to take to flight, was captured and beheaded by Hamṣija's orders (Rabi‘ I 309 = July–Aug. 921). Karageyn then returned; but when he left Djudjān the army of Abū ‘l-Husayn b. al-Hasan b. Abī al-URFI seized the town, Naṣr sent 4,000 horsemen there, led by Simdrjlī al-Dawwātī, who at once laid siege to Abī ‘l-Husayn. When the latter made a sortie with a force twice this size, he fell into an ambush but escaped to Astarābād and then to Sūrīya. Simdrjlī then went to Astarābād; but when his efforts came to naught he bribed Abī ‘l-Husayn's deputy Mākkā b. Kākī and persuaded him to pretend to vacate the town for a time and then to reoccupy it. This was done as arranged; Simdrjlī occupied Astarābād but soon returned to Naṣībūr where upon his subordinate, only left there as a feint, was driven by Mākkā first out of Astarābād and soon afterwards out of Djudjān. In 310 (921–922) Ilyās b. Isḥāq rebelled in Farghāna and went to Samarkand; this enterprise came to nothing through the ability of Abī ‘Amr Muhāmmad b. ‘Asad, who with 250,000 men prepared an ambush and scattered Ilyās's army, said to have numbered 30,000 men. After some time, the latter joined the governor of al-Shāh, Abū ‘l-Fa‘ṣāl b. Abī Yusuf, but had again to take to flight and went to Kāshqār where he joined the Dīkhtānī Ṭoghihtīn. After failing in an attempt to invade Farghāna he returned to Kāshqār. He was finally pardoned by Naṣr and settled in BUKHĀRĀ. About the same time Abī ‘l-Fa‘ṣāl Muhāmmad b. ‘Ubadah Allāh al-Bal‘almī [cf. BAL‘AMĪ] was appointed vizier in place of Abī ‘Abd Allāh Muhāmmad b. Abū al-Dajhālī. In the year 314 (926) Naṣr at the instigation of the caliph al-Mu‘taḍid undertook an expedition against al-Ra‘y where Fātik, a freedman of the rebel governor Yusuf b. Abī ‘l-Sā‘īd, was ruling. He took the town in Djamāṣī I (Aug.–Sept. 926) and returned to BUKHĀRĀ after two months' stay there. al-Ra‘y remained in possession of the Sīmānids till the beginning of Sha‘bān 315 (Sept. 928) when the governor appointed by Naṣr fell ill and surrendered the town to the ‘Alīd al-Hassan al-Dī‘ī and his general Mākkā b. Kākī. In 317 (929–930) or 318 (930–931) Naṣr’s brothers, ‘Abbās, ‘Abbās, and ‘Ibrāhīm, whom he had imprisoned in the citadel of BUKHĀRĀ, succeeded in regaining their freedom with the help of their followers among the dissatisfied elements of the citizens and seized the town. When ‘Abbās claimed the throne, ‘Abbās who had gone to Naṣībūr at the head of a large army to assist the caliph against the rebel ‘Abbās b. Shīrāzī had to return as quickly as possible and after several encounters with ‘Abbās he was able to restore order. ‘Abbās was pardoned and the governorship of Khorāsān given to the emir of Şaghāniyān Abū Bakr Muhāmmad b. al-Mu‘tāfār. On the fighting in Djudjān and Kirmān see the article ‘MĀ‘AN IN KĀKĪ.

The last year of Naṣr’s reign was marked by a great revival of the Shi‘a propaganda, which had never been encouraged in Khorāsān and had been particularly encouraged just at this time by the rise of the Fatimid caliphate. When the people of Naṣībūr paid homage to an ‘Alīd named Abū ‘l-Husayn Muhāmmad b. Yaḥyā as caliph, Naṣr invited him to BUKHĀRĀ and when he left not only gave him a robe of honour but also granted him an annual allowance from the treasury. Hūsain b. ‘Abbās al-Mu‘tadād had been converted to the Shi‘a by the Fatimid emissaries in Khorāsān. He was followed by Muhāmmad b. Abī al-Nakhabī (al-Nasāfī) who transferred his activities to BUKHĀRĀ and gained a number of proselytes among the high officials. He finally succeeded in winning Naṣr himself over to his party and in inducing him to pay the Fatimid caliph al-Kā‘īm [q.v.] a considerable sum to stoke the fire of Hūsain b. ‘Abbās who had pinned away in a BUKHĀRĀ prison. The naturally aroused the wrath of the orthodox clergy, who were joined by the Turkish guards and provoked a powerful reaction. Naṣr regretted his complaisance and is said to have abdicated in favour of his son ‘Abbās, who had not been guilty of any heresy. Naṣr’s ill-health may have contributed to this decision. The details are variously recorded; in any case, the Shi‘a in BUKHĀRĀ and Khorāsān were persecuted and al-Nakhabī with several followers executed.

According to the usual statement, Naṣr died after thirteen months illness of pulmonary consumption on 27th Rajab 331 (April 6, 943); others say he was murdered like his father. According to some reports, he died earlier, on 12th Rajab 330 (May 31, 942). This latter date perhaps refers not to his death but to his abdication. ‘Abbās’s formal accession in any case only took place after his father’s death.

If we may believe Ibn al-‘Athir, Naṣr was distinguished by a singular gentleness of character; according to other sources however, this was not the case. He was also celebrated as an enlightened patron of poets and scholars and is particularly held in honour for encouraging the poet Rhdg- [q.v.] in every way.

a judicial decision given. These measures, it is true, provoked not only the displeasure of the Arab emirs in Khorasan but also the dissatisfaction of the caliph Hāshim; nevertheless Naṣr succeeded in carrying out his plans. As regards domestic politics he regulated the relations between the Muslims and those under their protection by an important reform in the system of taxation, by which he ordained that all landowners, including Muslims, should pay the land-tax (kharṣa), while the poll-tax (dīya) should be imposed on non-Muslims exclusively. But the deep rooted cliannishness of the Arab caused him continual difficulties. In the first four years of his tenure of office he chose his subordinates exclusively from the tribe of Muṣāra; then he began to be little more broad-minded in this respect and to pay some attention to the Yamanis and thus gradually to pave the way to a reconciliation of the tribes at feud with one another. In the year 125 (740—741) the governor of the Irāq, Yūsuf b. 'Omar al-Thāqafī, endeavoured to arouse the caliph's suspicions of him; Hāshim however saw through his plan and left Naṣr in his post. When al-Walīd II ascended the throne in Rabi‘a II 125 (Feb. 743) he confirmed Naṣr in office but soon afterwards allowed himself to be persuaded by Yūsuf b. 'Omar to recall him and therefore ordered him to come to Damascus and to bring with him all kinds of hunting-birds and musical instruments. Naṣr however did not hurry and before he reached the frontier of al-Irāq, the news of the caliph’s assurances reached him and he at once turned back. When al-Walīd's successor, Yazid III, appointed Mansūr b. Djamāh governor of al-Irāq and Khorāsān, Naṣr refused to recognise him. In 126 (743—744) trouble broke out among the Azd and Rabi‘a in Merw. When Naṣr wanted to pay the troops not in money but with the gold and silver instruments procured for the caliph al-Walīd they mutinied; Djamāh b. 'Ali al-Kirmānī put himself at their head and appealed to their feelings by demanding vengeance for the Banu 1-Muhallab who had been mercilessly persecuted by the Umayyads, a course which he knew would appeal to them. When the Muṣāra appealed to Naṣr to render al-Kirmānī innocuous, he declined at first but later yielded to them and had him arrested (end of Ramadan 126 = middle of July 744); but a month afterwards he escaped from prison. Negotiations were then opened between Naṣr and al-Kirmānī but they led to no real decision. A much more dangerous opponent was al-Hārīth b. Surārid who at the end of Djamāh II 127 (beginning of April 745) again appeared in Merw after a many years' sojourn among the Turks. In order to be safe from this rival, Naṣr had unfortunately secured a pardon for Hārīth and his followers from the caliph Yazid III and after his arrival in Merw he endeavoured to win al-Hārīth over by the greatest indulgence and friendliness. He even went so far as to confer on him the governorship of Transoxiana; but all his efforts were in vain; al-Hārīth adhered firmly to his Marjdīi conceptions and stubbornly refused to recognise Naṣr as governor. As his following was steadily growing, he finally demanded that Naṣr should resign his office and leave the choice of his successor to a court of arbitration. Naṣr said he would agree to this, but when he declined to obey the judgment of the court insisting on his
resignation, open fighting broke out. Al-Harith tried to take the city by surprise but was driven back (end of Dżumāt III 123 = end of March 746). He then joined forces with al-Kirmānī and they attacked Nasr with their combined strength. After several days' fighting, the latter had to abandon Merw and retire to Naisābūr; it was not long however before the two rebels fell out. Among other things al-Kirmānī's cruelty made him hated; in addition there were the endless feuds among the various Arab tribes. After Al-Harith's most influential follower Bīghr b. Dżumāt al-Dabīb had left al-Kirmānī with 5,000 men, Al-Harith soon followed his example but was killed in the fighting that ensued (end of Radjab II 124 = April 746). Al-Kirmānī was now lord of Merw. The Yamānīs stood by him while the Muṭjar sought refuge with Nasr in Naisābūr. Nasr's position was by no means an enviable one. So long as al-Ṭrāk was in the hands of the Khāridjīs and the 'Alīdī rebel 'Abd Allāh b. Muʿawiyah [q. v.], Nasr's communications with the caliphate were cut off and even after Yazīd b. 'Omar had regained al-Ṭrāk for Marwān II, he could not reckon on any very considerable help. There was therefore nothing left for him but to concentrate his efforts on the reconquest of the city of Merw. After repeated encounters between his troops and those of al-Kirmānī, he went there in person and pitched his camp opposite that of his opponent. The two rivals continued to fight with varying fortunes without being able to bring about a decision. Nasr's appeals to Marwān and Ibn Hubayra for reinforcements remained unheeded; in view however of the danger that threatened from Abū Muslim [q. v.], the leader of the 'Abbasīd propaganda, negotiations were begun between Nasr and al-Kirmānī. After a son of Harith b. Suraydā had killed al-Kirmānī to avenge the death of his father, the Khāridjī Shāhīlāt b. Salama took his place and in the name of the Azd concluded a truce for one year. Abū Muslim was able however to bring this agreement to nothing by persuading 'Alī b. Djaḍāl b. Kirmānī that Nasr had instigated the murder of his father and the Azd who were devoted to him broke the truce just concluded and resumed hostilities against Nasr. When Abū Muslim was approached for assistance by the two combatant parties he was able to come forward as an arbiter and decided in favour of the Azd against the Munṣār. He then entered Merw, according to the most probable statement in Rāfī II 132 (Dec. 747), and made the inhabitants swear allegiance in general terms to a caliph of the family of the Prophet without a name being mentioned. For Nasr there was nothing left but to seek safety in flight. From Merw he fled via Sardāb and Tūs to Naisābūr, where the same day reached him that his son Tamīm, whom he had sent against Abū Muslim's general Shahbāz b. Shahbāz [q. v.] had been defeated and slain at Tūs. From Naisābūr he went to Khūzāis and thence to Džurjān. Nebāt b. Hānsalā al-Killābī was here with a large army which Ibn Hubayra had at last sent him by the caliph's orders. But Nasr and Nebāt did not cooperate and in addition the Khāris went over from the former to the latter. On the 12th Dhūl-Hijārā 130 (Aug. 1, 748) Nebāt was defeated by Khāris and fell in the battle. After his defeat Nasr could no longer stay in Khūzāis but fled, pursued by Shahbāz's son Hasan, to al-Ra'y, without receiving any support from the Umayyad officials. Reaching al-Ra'y, he fell ill; nevertheless he wished to continue his journey to Hamadhān but was no longer able to move without assistance; he had to be carried and died in 12th Rāfī I 131 (Nov. 9, 748) in Sāwā [q. v.] at the age of 85. Nasr combined with his eminent qualities as a statesman considerable grace as a poet.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

ṣAṣR AllāH b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd AllāH Abū ʿAbd AllāH Abū ʾl-Maʾalī of Shīrāz, a Periṣian author and statesman, vizier of the Ghassanid Khusraw Mālik (1160–1186) by whose orders he was arrested and executed. Nasr was the first Persian to succeed in giving a satisfactory Persian version of the celebrated Khūṭāta u-Dimna. His version is based on the Arabic of Abū Allāh b. Makaṣārī and was completed about 1144, i.e. in the time of Bahlawūnī (1148–1153). For a long time his translation was regarded as a model of elegant Persian style which could not be surpassed and served as the basis for the metrical version by Khūṭāta (1260) and for a series of Turkish translations. It was only in the 15th century when even Nasr Allāh's language appeared too homely and archaic that his translation was superseded by the celebrated Amurār-i Ṣuhalt of Huṣain Wāsī al-Kāshī (q. v.), d. 1353 (1352–1353).


(E. BERKHELÄ)

ṣAṣR al-Dawla Abū Ṣaḥr Ahmad b. Markhan, third and most important prince of the Marwānid dynastī [q. v.] of Diyar Bakr. He succeeded to the provincial sovereignty on the death of his elder brother, Mumshīd al-Dawla Abū Manṣūr Saḥhā, in 401 (1010–1011), after a struggle with the latter's murderer, and was in the same year formally recognized by the 'Abbasīd al-Kādir, from whom at the same time he received his 'ibad and by the Ḵāridjī Saʿūd al-Dawla. Though now established in the capital, Māṣjād-i Rāyi, he was unable to obtain effective control of Ḵāridjī, the next most considerable city of the province, until 415 (1024–1025). On his tributary, Ibn Dama, who had hitherto ruled it, was assassinated; and during his reign of over fifty years, he suffered several ineffective attacks on his territory from the ʿUqailids of Diyar Rābiʾa, to whom he appears, at one period at all events, to have paid tribute (see Ibn al-Aṭīr, ix. 121).
and to whom, in order to compose a quarrel arising out of his divorce of a lady of that family, he was obliged, in 421 (1030), to cede Nisibin. In 433 (1041–1042) Dīyār Bakr was invaded from Adharbāījān by the bands of Ghuz Turkmen who had pushed northwestwards on the advance of the Seljūkids leaders into the Dījal; and for two years parts of it were subjected to their depredations. Otherwise the province enjoyed, throughout his reign, a tranquillity remarkable in this troubled age.

The ruler of Dīyār Bakr was regarded as a principal guardian of the frontier of Islam, and as such was expected to harass the Christians whenever opportunity offered, (see the letter addressed to Naṣr al-Dawla by the Seljūkīd Tughhrībeg; Ibn al-ʿAlīh, i. 275). Nevertheless Ibn Marwān's relations with the Byzantine Empire were for the most part amicable, being based on a pact of mutual non-aggression, to which both parties appealed when it was infringed. The only important breach of this agreement occurred in 417 (1027), when Naṣr al-Dawla seized Rūhī (Edessa), which, however, was recovered by the Greeks four years later, and in 426 (1034–1035), when an attempt was made by the Christian inhabitants of that city, in league with Arabs of the Numāzī tribe, to invade his territories. Later their good relations were of use to the Emperor—Constantine X—, who in 441 (1049–1050) obtained Ibn Marwān's help in securing from Tughhrī beg the release of the Georgian general Līpurītī with whom he had been in league against the Georgian king, and who had been captured the year before by Tughhrī's half-brother İbrahim Īnālī up to 436 (1045) Armenia, which also marched in part with Dīyār Bakr, was still independent of the Empire; and in 433 (1032) a Marwānid commander led a successful raid into this country. In 427 (1035–1036), on the other hand, a hājīd caravan from northern Persia was attacked and looted near Anī by Armenians of the Sunnīs tribe, upon which Ibn Marwān forced the aggressors to give up their prisoners and booty.

Early in Naṣr al-Dawla's reign the north of Syria and parts of the Dījāriyya con tinous to Dīyār Bakr were obliged to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Fatimid caliphs, though their hold on these parts remained somewhat precarious. And his own territories were menaced by Fatimid pretensions, when in 430 (1038–1039) the governor of Damascus, Anīṣīgīnī al-Dījārī, who was then reasserting his rule in northern Syria, projected an attack on Dīyār Bakr. This, however, came to nothing.

The reign of Naṣr al-Dawla saw the rise of the Seljūkīds from complete obscurity to the empire of Persia and the Iṭrāk. His first communication with them occurred as early as 435 (1043–1044), on the Ghuz invasion of Dīyār Bakr, when he addressed a letter of protest to Tughhrī, who, though he was scarcely in a position to do so, undertook to restrain the marauders. (It may be noted, nevertheless, that Ibn al-ʿArājk describes this Ghuz invasion as having been actually instigated by Tughhrī, who, he says, granted the province as a fief to its two leaders in advance; cf. Amedro, The Marwānid Dynasty of Mayyāfārīrīn, in T.R.A.S., 1903, p. 137. Surely this author is mistaken in considering the date 434 as wrong, since it agrees exactly with those given by Ibn al-ʿAlīh). Eight years later Naṣr al-Dawla acceded to Tughhrī's demand for recognition as suzerain; and this subservience, which was renewed in 446 (1054–1055), when Tughhrī made a triumphal tour through Adharbāījān and Muslim Armenia, spared Dīyār Bakr the experience of a Seljūkīd visitation. In the following year, however, Tughhrī's attention was drawn to the murder of a Kurdish chief by Naṣr al-Dawla's son Sulaymān, his lieutenant in the Dījāra; and in 448 (1056–1057), when the sultan was obliged to visit al-Mawīli in order to oppose a combination of Shīʿī leaders headed by al-Bāṣīṭī [q. v.], he forced an indemnity from Ibn Marwān by laying siege to Dījārat Ibn ʿUmar.

Naṣr al-Dawla was sagacious, or fortunate, in his choice of the three waizār who served him in turn, namely Abu ʿl-Kāsim al-Iṣḥāfīnī, to whom he owed his throne (in office 401–415 = 1010–1025), Abu ʿl-Kāsim al-Maqirī [q. v.] (in office 415–428 = 1025–1037), and Abū Naṣr Ibn Dījārī (afterwards entitled Fakhr al-Dawla) [q. v.] (in office 430–453 = 1033–1061). It was no doubt owing in part to their abilities that the remarkable tranquillity enjoyed by Dīyār Bakr during his reign was turned to advantage and resulted in an equally remarkable prosperity. This Naṣr al-Dawla fostered by a reduction of taxation and by renouncing the practice of fining the rich in order to augment the revenues. Nevertheless his court is said to have surpassed those of all his contemporaries in luxury, and many instances are quoted of his profusion and generosity. Mayyāfārīrīn became during his reign a centre for men of learning, poets and ascetics, as also a refuge for political fugitives. Among the latter were the Buṣṣid prince al-Malik al-Āzīz [q. v.], who was ousted from the amirate in 436 (1044–1045) by his uncle Abū Kahlīfu [q. v.], and the infant heir of the Abūṣīfīd al-Kāsim—afterwards al-Maṣṭūlī [q. v.],—who was removed with his mother from Baghdad on the occasion of its occupation in 450 (1058) by al-Bāṣīṭī.

Naṣr al-Dawla is described as being reserved, just, high-minded and methodical, and though much addicted to sensuality, he was strict in his observance of religious injunctions. He died, aged about eighty, on 24th Shawwal 453 (November 1061), leaving Fakhr al-Dawla still in office to secure the succession to his second son, Abu ʿl-Kāsim Naṣr, Nisābīr al-Din.


(HAROLD BOWEN)

NAṢR AL-DIN (pron. Naṣḥədīm) ḤOJDE, the hero of the stories of wit and stupidity among the Turks, who bears a strong resemblance to the German Till Eulenspiegel, the English Joe Miller, the Italian Bertoldo, the Russian Balikew, etc. Various opinions are current about his life. One tradition for example makes him a learned man of the line of Hārūn al-Raṣīl, but another makes him a contemporary of the Khwarizmshah Abī ʿl-Ḥasan Taṣ“līhī, who perished 6172–1200). The two traditions are not to be taken seriously; most they might be regarded as an indication that many of the jests of the Ḥoja date from the period of the caliphate or that some of them came through a Persian intermediary.
The other versions of the life of Nasreddin can be divided into two groups, of which the first puts him in the ixth and beginning of the xth century (the period of Bayzad I, Timur, and the eighth Karamanid ‘Ala’ al-Din), and the second in the xiith century (the period of the Seldjuk ‘Ala’ al-Din).

The first view appears to come from the Travels of Evliya Celebi (ii. 16—17). There, for example, the story of Timur’s meeting with the Khodja in the baths is told, when the Khodja said that he would give 40 akce for Timur’s shirt but nothing for him himself. In spite of all the improbability of such an utterance and in spite of the fact that the older tekhabers put this answer in Ayymad’s [q.v.] mouth (cf. also E. J. W. Gibb, Ottoman Poems, 1884, p. 160—167) Evliya’s story, was given currency in Europe by Cantimir, Diex, Goethe, von Hammer, etc. When Mehemd Tewfiq accepted this story of Evliya’s in his editions of the jests of Nasreddin and Badam (since 1853) which were later translated into German (about 1890), it was given renewed life and became almost the predominant opinion in Europe.

The second group of traditions champions the xiith century as the period of Nasreddin and relies on the following facts. Firstly the poet Lami (d. 1533—1533) asserted in his Lala’if, that Nasreddin was a contemporary of Shihydk Hamza who lived in the xiith century; secondly in modern manuscripts the Khodja is associated with the Sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Koprulu Zade (see Bibliotheca) therefore inclines to the view that he was a contemporary of the Seldjuk ‘Ala’ al-Din, (xiith century), Sh. Siami Bey (“Xamsi al-Ahmad”, vi, 4577) and P. Horn (see Bibliotheca) had already decided for the Seldjuk and the latter definitely for ‘Ala’ al-Din, but Koprulu Zade supported his view by evidence, partly new, which we proceed to quote: 1. the inscription on the tomb of Nasreddin in Akshahr bears the date 386, which on the superscription that it is reversed would indicate that the Khodja died in 685 (1284—1285); 2. on two authentic charters of enslavement (wa’fa’iyyah) of the year 655 (1257) and 665 (1266/7) respectively, a certain “Nasreddin Khodja” appears before the kadi as a witness, and 3. the statement which the famous mufti of Siwi-Hisar, Hasan Efendi, made about 45 years ago in the Majalla‘i‘-al Mawarif about Nasreddin, agrees with this assumption. According to Hasan Efendi, Nasreddin was born in the village of Kharto, near Siwi-Hisar, in the year 605 (1208—1209), held there the office of Imam in which he succeeded his father, and moved in 615 (1216—1217) to Akshehir where he died in 628 (1229—1229).

Although this evidence is by no means to be rejected off hand, it seems to have been completely neglected by other scholars (Krymski in 1927 [see Bibliotheca] does not even mention Koprulu’s book) except for my article entitled “H Nasreddin-hodja Livre i” (Did Nasreddin Khodja really live?) in the Christmas supplement to the Belgrade Politics (Jan. 6, 1932), where it was described as worthy of consideration, if not yet absolutely convincing.

After all these traditions and opinions, it is not a matter for surprise that some scholars (H. Ehrh. R. Basset, M. Hartmann, A. Wesselski [see Bibliotheca] have been more or less sceptical about the historicity of the Khodja.

These doubts are to some extent closely connected with the question of the origin of Nasreddin’s jests. Basset, for example, thinks (in Recherches sur Sidi Djebh... that they are a translation of the old Arabic droll stories which were current in large numbers at the end of the fourth tenth century about a certain Dju’ha (Djuha) of the tribe of Fazira in Kafsa. Djuha’s stupidity became proverbial among the Arabs, as is already evident from Madijd (d. 1124) (cf. Arabum proverbias, ed. G. Freytag, i, 403, No. 175), and a Book of Anecdotes of Djuha (کتاب ندای‌سیواک) is expressly mentioned as early as the Fihrist of al-Nadim (d. 995) (cf. Flügel’s edition, i, 255). This collection, which had previously reached the west through oral transmission, was translated into Turkish in the xth and xivth century and the hero identified with a certain Nasreddin Khodja, whose existence Basset thinks is at least doubtful.

This thesis of Basset’s was not everywhere accepted without demur. Horn and Christensen (see Bibliotheca), for example, do not believe in a translation from the old book of Djuha’s jests and Wesselski holds the view that there is no evidence of the existence of any story of Djuha in the period before that of Nasreddin’s alleged or actual life, which could with certainty be assumed to be the source of one of the jests of Nasreddin”. M. Hartmann describes Nasreddin’s jests as the common property of the literature of the world, expressed to some extent in a specifically Turkish guise and therefore regards any question as to whether there ever was such a person as of little importance. Horn and Krymski also regard the Khodja’s jests and other folk stories found almost everywhere. Christensen thinks similarly but admits that these jests form an independent collection “into which probably very many stories from the old book (of Djuha) have been incorporated”.

Whatever the truth may be, one thing seems to be certain: the immediate source for most of the stories of Nasreddin is to be sought, as Basset and Hartmann say, in the world of Arabic culture and Islam where Djuha certainly is often the hero of such anecdotes. In other words, Djuha might be regarded as the ultimate prototype of many of the adventures of Nasreddin. While Basset’s theory, then may not be correct in all details, it seems to be right in its main features, especially in the respect that it has directed the student of Nasreddin to the influence of the rich Arabic literature of humorous anecdotes. That many of these stories are originally not Arabic but Persian, Syriac, Indian, Greek, etc. is quite natural, especially when we remember that they are common to many literatures, but in this case it must often be the Arabic version that was the source upon which the Turkish drew.

For the problem of Nasreddin it is also important to put on record that stories of Djuha are very early mentioned by Persian poets and authors (Mintchiri, d. 1040—1041) or transmitted (a story in Anwar [d. c. 1190], three stories in Djahl al-Din Rumi [d. 1273] and a dozen stories in ’Ubaid-i Zaki [d. 1370—1371]). When we remember the part played by Persian scholars among the Seldjuk of Rüm and their Ottoman successors, we cannot consider it impossible that some stories of Djuha may have come to the Turks through Persian literature.
This is all the more probable as Djalal al-Din, himself spent the greater part of his life in Anatolia (especially in Konya) and used Djuh's (as Djuh is called among the Persians) popularity to illustrate his mystic ideas (cf. Mathnumi, ed. Nicholson, ii. 3116 sqq.).

Particularly in view of this popularity and the fact of oral transmission, it is not impossible that the common people altered the name Djuh (Djouh), which was strange to them, into Khōja, as Basset repeatedly insists (Mélanges africains et orientaux, Paris 1915, p. 49). On the other hand, there may have been a droll Khōja named Nasreddin among the Ottomans (or Seljuk's), around whom gathered humorous stories of others, in addition to his own jests, and thus became the typical representative of wit and stupidity.

For this reason he was probably also credited with the tales of the simplicity of Karakūñ (q.v.), Saladin's steward, who had been dead since 1201.

Other jests attributed to Nasreddin go back several centuries further which is proof that they cannot originate with him. The fact that most of the jests are not original is obvious (see Wesselski's parallels), in spite of all the changes and transformations they have undergone among the Turks.

One of the Turkish versions (with additions) was, according to Basset, translated in the middle of the xixth century into Arabic and thus the Turks returned to the Arabs part of what they had formerly borrowed from them. Nasreddin and Djuh, being similar types, later became amalgamated in such a way that the Arabic editions identify the two in the title: Nawādir al-Khōja Najar al-Din Efendi Djuh. Sometimes however, the Arabs distinguish between the two by calling Nasreddin the "Rumelian Djuh" (Djuh al-Rūmī). This Djuh of the Nawādir easily reached the Berbers through the Arabs as Sī Djuh (Djouf). In a similar way the Nubians procured their Djuha and the Maltese their Djihan: Whether the fool of Sicilian popular story, Giufa or Giuca also comes from Djuh is a further question.

On the other hand, the Turkish version of the jests of Nasreddin (under his or another name or anonymously) became known not only to the Rumanians, Bulgars, Greeks, Albanians, and Jugoslavs but also in Armenia, Georgia, the Caucasus, the Crimea, the Ukraine, Russia, Turkish, etc. On these long travels, Nasreddin naturally underwent many changes; distortions and additions were made which are quite foreign to the Turkish text; thus the number of his (or Djuh's) stories increased to several hundreds (in Wesselski to 515 or 525). The oldest manuscript (Leyden, No. 2715), which was already in the possession of a European in 1625, only contains 76 jests.

The first edition of the chapbook on Nasreddin, which was the foundation of many later editions, appeared in 1837 (133 jests). Mehemet Tewfik's edition (1899 = 1883) in which the coarse stories of the chapbook are omitted only contains 71 but a few months later Tewfik published a further 130 under the name Bu Adam ("This Man", i.e. the same Nasreddin) (in the final edition of 1302 Bu Adam only contains 96 stories). Anecdotes of Nasreddin were later collected by I. Kano from the lips of the people between Aydın and Konya and separately published (Budapest 1899, with 166 stories and introduction, and in
Hasset, Contribution à l'histoire du sultanat de Nasser Eddin Hoja, in Khalil Steine, l. 219—
106, with full bibliography; Kemaledine Chakri, Vie de Nasreddine Hodja, Stambul n. d. (1930); deals very briefly with Khodja’s life on p. 7—8 and gives French translation of his jests arranged under 4 periods of his life). — Also the catalogues of MSS. in Leyden, Vienna, London, Berlin, Paris etc. (Feinm Bajram Stoev). NASRÁNI. [See Nâsârâ.] NASRIDS. [See Bând Nâsh, also sometimes called Banu 'l-Âshâr, a Muslim dynasty which ruled over the kingdom of Granada in the north of Spain from 629 to 897 A. H. (1231—1291).] While, thanks to the narratives of the contemporary Ibn al-Kâtib [q. v.] and Ibn Khaldûn [q. v.], we are very well informed about the history of the kingdom of the Nasrides down to the second half of the sixteenth century, we have for the later period only a very few sources available in Arabic — and it is not always easy to fill the gaps from Christian sources — a few pages of al-Mâqâm's Naşf al-7ib and the short anonymous chronicle published in 1663 by Muller.

We give below a chronological list of the Nasrides; when a date A. D. is not preceded by its equivalent A. H., this is because it is not given either by Muslim historians or Arabic inscriptions.

1. Abû 'Abd Allah Muhammed I al-8ââli
4 H: 629—671 (1231—1323).
3. Abû 'Abd Allah Muhammed III al-
Muhammad: 701—708 (1302—1309).
4. Abu 'l-Qâwûn Nâsh: 708—713 (1309—
1314).
5. Abu l-Walid Ismâ'îl I: 713—725 (1314—
1325).
6. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammed IV: 725—
733 (1325—1333).
8. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammed V al-Ghâmi
M 'âli: 755—760 (1354—1359); 2. 783—793 (1359—1360).
10. Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammed VI: 761—765 (1360—1362).
11. Abu 'l-Hâdîjîdî Yusûf II al-Muqtââbî
H: 793—794 (1391—1392).
alliance with the Marinids who were finally putting an end to Almohad rule in Morocco. The Marinids answered his appeal. On coming to the throne Muhammad II had found himself faced with the necessity of putting down threatening rebellions; the most serious was that of the Baśni Askhâfî, governors of Malaga and Guadix. He was able to rout the rebels near Antequera, with the help of forces sent him by the Infante Don Philip and Don Nuño de Lara. On the other hand, he soon realised that the king of Castille, his suzerain, had every interest in letting the kingdom of Granada exhaust itself in internal strife. This is why the Naṣrid turned to the Marinids. In consideration for the return of Algeciras [q.v.] and Tarifa [q.v.], the sultan of Fâs Abû Yusuf Ya'qûb b. Abû al-Ḥakîm agreed to cross into Spain, where he inflicted two defeats on the Castilian troops. The chroniclers of the Marinid dynasty record the four expeditions of the king of Fâs into Spain and give details of the loss of Tarifa which the Spanish leader Alonso Pérez de Gusman, celebrated in legend as Gusman el Bueno, was to defend heroically a little later, in 1293. But it is from this time that the permanent intervention of the sultans of Fâs in the affairs of the Naṣrids of Granada dates; under pretence of a gihrâf they were able at every opportunity to add to the confusion of a political situation already much troubled and to weigh heavily upon the destinies of the Naṣrid throne by playing a game of alliances which were often broken as readily as they were made. The kings of Granada henceforth were to have at their side a regular body of Moroccan soldiers, the gihrâfi (sing. gihrâf) under the command of a Marinid shahâd, consisting of adventurers of fortunes who had become more or less undesirable in their native land.

When he died in 701 (1502) Muhammad II was succeeded by his son Muhammad III who was later to be known as al-Makhâlîf (the deposed). It was he who built the great mosque of the Alhambra. He had to put down risings by the governors of Guadix and Almeria but had to bow before the rising of a prince of his family, Abu 'l-Djuyyâh Nasr b. Muhammad, who assumed the power in 708 (1309). Muhammad III abdicated and withdrew to Almuñécar [q.v.].

Nasr's reign was hardly any longer or happier than that of his predecessor. After a display of energy by which he forced the king of Aragon to raise the siege of Almeria and the king of Castille to raise the siege of Algeciras, he fell against a conspiracy hatched by a Naṣrid prince Isâ'il, who seized the power in Granada and left only the town of Guadix to Nasr. The latter established himself here in 713 (1314) and stayed there till his death in 732 (1322).

The fifth Naṣrid ruler, Abu ʿl-Walîd Isâm ʿAmr b. Farâj b. Isâm ʿAmr b. Yusuf b. Nasr, was one of the most remarkable members of the dynasty. As soon as he had assumed the power, he showed a certain strength of character and did his best to put his frontiers in a state of defence. He regained for a time the old Naṣrid lands which had passed to the Marinids: Algeciras, Tarifa and Ronda. In 719 (1319) he had to meet an offensive from Castille and with the help of the Shaikh al-Ghûrât, Abî Saʿîd ʿUthmân b. Abî ʿl-Uîlî al-Marînî, he inflicted heavy defeats on his enemies at Alicum and in the Sierra d’Elvira. In this last battle the Infantes Don Juan and Don Pedro, guardians of king Alfonso XI, were killed. Soon afterwards, Isâm ʿAmr regained the fortresses of Huescar, Orce and Galera, then that of Baza. In the following year he took Martos. In 725 (1325) he was assassinated in his palace at the instigation of one of his relations with whom he had quarrelled, the lord of Algeciras Muhammad b. Isâm ʿAmr. He left four sons of whom the eldest, Muhammad, succeeded him on the throne of Granada.

Muḥammad IV was still a minor on his accession and remained for several years under the strict guardianship of his ministers, notably of the governor Muḥammad ibn al-Mâhrîk. The latter, after a long struggle with the Shaikh al-Ghûrât Ibn Abî ʿl-Uîlî, was finally put to death by orders of his sovereign who then took the reins of power into his own hands. The remainder of his reign was continually troubled. The help which he sought from the Marinid Sultan Abû ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAll against the Christians earned him the enmity of the family of the Banû Abî ʿl-Uîlî. In succession he lost Ronda, Algeciras, Marbella and Gibraltar and was ultimately assassinated in 733 (1333).

His brother Abu ʿl-Hâdîyâd ʿUthmân b. Isâm ʿAmr succeeded him and reigned for a considerable period. His first care was to avenge his brother by expelling from his kingdom the Banû Abî ʿl-Uîlî who took refuge in Tunis and in giving the office of Shaikh al-Ghûrât to a Marinid lord, ʿAbârîb b. ʿUmar Ibn Raḥîb. The struggle with the Christians was resumed in his reign. He sought and obtained the help of the Marinid Abû ʿl-Hasan, who crossed the Straits of Gibraltar in 741 (1340) with a large force and laid siege to Tarifa. This expedition ended disastrously. The king of Castille, Alfonso XI, with his army and that of the king of Portugal inflicted a sanguinary defeat on the Muslims near the mouth of the Río Salado, on the 7th Djumâda I 741 (Oct. 30, 1340). Abû ʿl-Ḥasan had to take refuge in Algeciras, whence he was able to reach Morocco. ʿUthmân I returned with all speed to Granada, while Alfonso XI profiting by the confusion of the Muslims seized Alcalâ la Reial, Priego and Benaméjí. After taking Algeciras he granted the Naṣrid king a truce of ten years, at the end of which he laid siege to Gibraltar. Alfonso XI however died of the plague during the siege. ʿUthmân I himself was assassinated by a madman in the great mosque of Granada on the day of the feast of the "Breaking of the Fast" of 755 (Oct. 19, 1354). This Sultân's name will always be associated with certain monuments of the Alhambra. It was he for example who built the great gateway of the enceinte, called Bab al-Shârîf's "gate of the Espartinas" commonly called "gently "gate of Justicia," in Spanish "Puerta Judicaria" or "de la Justicia") the inscription on which records that it was finished in Rabî‘ I 749 (June 1348; cf. my Inscriptions arabes d’Espagne, No. 171). It was also ʿUthmân I who in 750 (1349) built the madrasa of Granada (ibid., No. 172).

His successor was his eldest son Muḥammad V, who bore the honorific laḥab of al-Ghâni bi-līlāh. This sultan left the exercise of power in the hands of his father's old minister, the ʿAbârîb [q.v.] Râfîl b. ʿUqîrî, who maintained peaceful relations with Castille. After a few years, a conspiracy of dissatisfied Naṣrid princes forced Muḥammad V to abdicate and take refuge in Guadix, and afterwards in Morocco where he was well received by the Marinid sultan Abû Sâlim (760 = 1359).
Isma'il II b. Yūsuf I, brother of Muhammad V, a Nasrid prince devoid of personality and prestige, was put on the throne, but only for a few months. In 761 (1360) he was assassinated at the instigation of the ruler Muhammad VI b. Isma'il b. Naṣr, who seized the power; his troops soon afterwards suffered a defeat at the hands of the Christians at Guadix. He was soon overthrown by Muhammad V, who had returned to Spain and asked the help of Peter the Cruel of Castile to recover the throne. Muhammad VI also appealed to the Christian ruler but the latter had him put to death in 763 (1362).

Muhammad V's second reign lasted for good or evil another 30 years. It was mainly occupied by family quarrels and civil strife. It was at this time that the famous vizier Liḥān al-Dirfi b. al-Khaṭṭīb had to seek refuge in Morocco, which however did not save him from assassination. It is also at this date that the history of the Nasrid dynasty not only by Ibn al-Khaṭṭīb, but also by Ibn Khaldūn, stops. Our information about the latter rulers is not only scanty but also inaccurate. The relations of the kings of Granada and of the rulers of Castile continued to be much what they had been, truces or expeditions of short duration with limited objectives. But gradually the ultimate aim of Castilian policy became apparent and generally became more and more easily attainable: the capture of Granada, which was at the same time to put an end to the Nasrid dynasty and to Muslim rule in Spanish lands. Below we give only a brief sketch of the last period of the history of the Nasrid kingdom.

III. End of the Nasrid kingdom.

Muhammad V died in 793 (1391) and was succeeded by his son Abu l-Hadhir, Yūsuf II who reigned only a short time. He died in 794 (1392) and the throne passed to his son Muhammad VII. The latter imprisoned his elder brother Yūsuf in the fortress of Salobreña and resumed the offensive against the Christians, who took the fortress of Zahara from him in 809 (1407). When he died next year his elder brother Yūsuf III, the prisoner of Salobreña, assumed power and held it till his death in 820 (1417). After him his eldest son Muhammad VIII became king of Granada; he is usually called by the chronicles al-Asār ('the left-handed'). It was in his reign, also much troubled, that we find the family of the Banu l-Sarrādī, the Abencerrages [q.v.], and that of the Zegris (Arabic ḥājārī; 'man of the frontier') beginning to play an important part in the history of Granada and the civil wars which characterise it. After various adventures Muhammad VIII had to abandon his capital for a time and went to seek an asylum with the king of Tunis, while Muhammad IX known as al-Ṣaghīr assumed power. Muhammad VIII soon returned and his second reign was marked by the disastrous battle of Higuerauela, near Granada, in which the Muslims were routed by the army of John II on July 1, 1431. Al-Asār had to take refuge in Malaga for some months during which the throne passed to Yūsuf IV b. al-Mawl, a grandson of Muhammad VI. Al-Asār then resumed the throne for a third time but the frontiers of his kingdom were shrinking every day. The towns of Jimena, Huescar (1435) and Huelma (1438) fell into the hands of the Christian power and in 1445 Muhammad VIII was forced to abdicate in favour of his nephew Muhammad X, while the Abencerrages, gathered at Montefrío, proclaimed Abu l-Naṣr Sa'd sultan. It was during the latter's reign that in 1462 Gibraltar was taken by Rodrigo.
Ponce de León and the Duke of Medina Sidonia. Archidona also fell to the Christians. In the reign of his successor Abu ‘l-Hasan ‘Alī, the Christian offensive, with the accession of the Reyes Católicos, Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castille, developed an extent and energy which it had rarely displayed previously. The second last Nasrid king Muḥammad XI, generally known in history as Boabdil (a corruption of his kingly Abu ‘Alī, Abu ‘l-Mulk), was forced to declare himself the vassal of the Reyes Católicos and the last Muḥammad XXI called al-Zaghal (“the brave”) in spite of initial successes at the siege of Loja (1482) and the battle of al-Šāghīn (1483), had no alternative but to bow to the triumph of the Castilian armies, and indignantly withdrew when the situation became hopeless to his estates of Alpujarra [q.v.]. Loja (1486), Velez-Malaga, Malaga and Almeria (1487), Baza (1489) fell in succession. There was nothing left for Granada but to open its gates to the conquerors who entered it on 2nd Rabi‘ al-Awwal 1492 (Jan. 1493). Muḥammad XI became an exile in Morocco where he died in poverty and misery.


**Nassā (a.), etymologically:** what is apparent to the eye, as a technical term: **text. In this sense the word does not occur in the Qur‘ān nor in the Ḥadīth. Al-Ṣāḥīf, on the other hand, appears to be acquainted with it. In his Kāhiyā he uses it chiefly in the sense of nasā ’āl-ṣāḥīf (p. 7, 16, 30, 41) or nasā fi ḫumāna (p. 5) “what has been laid down in the Qur‘ān.” In other passages nasā fi-ḥumāna is distinguished from summa (p. 21, 41, infra, 24, 37, pāṣ, 30, 63, 69). The combination summa occurs, however, also (p. 50, 14, 66, 72). From these passages it may also appear that al-Ṣāḥīf uses the term chiefly to denote legal precepts. In accordance with this is the definition of the term as given in the Liʿām al-ʿArab: Provided that the Qur‘ān or the summa means the precepts (abūlam). Contained in the plain words (ẓāhir) of these sources*. An extension of the term has taken place chiefly in three directions, so that nasā, apart from the general sense of text, may mean: **a.** the text of a precept of the law, written or not written; **b.** the ẓāhir [q.v.], of a sacred text; **c.** the sense of such a text. For other special meanings of the term, see Dux, Supplementum ad vocabulum dictionarium arabic, s.v. **Bibliography:** al-Ṣāḥīf, al-Risala fi Uṣūl al-Ṣāḥīf, Cairo 1741; Muḥammad al-Tuhānawi, Dictionary of the Technical Terms, ed. A. Spranger, Calcutta 1862, p. 1405 sqq. (A. J. Westenck)

**Nassads** were the light wooden warships built in Nassau or Hohenau (Lower Austria), the “Nassauer” or “Hohenauer,” Magyar nàzad, pl. nàzák, Slav. nàzād, which were used on the Danube. They were usually manned by Serbian seamen who were called mártalóz (from the Magyar mártalóz, mártalos, lit. “robber”). According to a Florentine account, this Danube flotilla in 1475 consisted of 300 ships manned by 10,000 “nassadists” armed with lances, shields, crossbow or bow and arrow, more rarely with muskets. The larger ships also had cannon. About 1524 the commander of the Danube fleet was Rádić Bože who reorganised it at Peterwardein (cf. K. J. Jireček, Geschichte der Serben, ii. 325 sqq.). Through want of money, the Serbian seamen then deserted to the Turks (ibid., p. 262) who after the fall of Belgrade seized the Danube fleet and developed it into a powerful arm. About 1530 the Danube fleet consisted of 800 nassads and was commanded by the voivod Kôšá (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 85).

**Bibliography:** E. Szontályi, A dunai hajóhadat forintetet, (Budapest, Ungar. Akadémie, 1886); G. Vitkovic, Vergangenheit, Einrichtungen und Denkmäler der ungarschen königlichen Seefahrer (= Prololist, utasmata i ženan ugarskih kraljevstvih jeftina), in Glasnica, vol. lvii, Belgrad 1887; Hans Derschmid, Die vierzehnjährige Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasiern (1553—55), ed. by F. Babinger (Munich and Leipzig 1923), p. 45; K. J. Jireček, Geschichte der Serben, ii. 242 and passim. (Franz Babinger)

**Nastaliq** [See Arab. l. 391 b.]

**Naṭūṭ Pasha,** an Ottoman grand vizier, was of Christian descent and was born either in Gümüşhane (the modern Komotini, Thrace, Greece) or in Drama. According to some sources (e.g., Baudier and Grimod in Knolles), he was the son of a Greek priest, according to others (e.g., Naṭum, ‛Uthūrīh, first edition, p. 283) armad

**The Encyclopædia of Islam, III.**
NAŠIĘ PASHA — NAVARINO

Inas of Albanian origin. He came early in life to Istanbul, spent two years in the Old Seray as a kardes [bhallardi] and left it as a naşib. Through the favour of the sultan's confidant, Mehemmed Ağa, he rapidly attained high office. In quick succession he became wovod of Zille (Anatolia), master of the horse and governor of Pülük (Hungary). He married the daughter of the Kurbid Mir Şereif and thereby obtained riches as great as his power, which every one was now beginning to fear. His ambition and arrogance, his vanity and cruelty knew no bounds and he was even said to be aiming at the throne. In 1015 (1606) he was to conduct the campaign against Persia, as the son-in-law of Mir Şereif and on account of his local knowledge, with the rank of third vizier and serasker, but his attention was claimed by the trouble in Anatolia which was affecting the whole of Asia Minor; through Kurb trachery he lost a battle and it was only in the autumn of 1608 that his troops joined the army of the grand vizier who received him very coolly (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 412 sq.). In 1011 (1602) Našıl Paşa had been appointed governor of Siwan, the next year of Hılağ and in 1015 (1606) of Dıyarbakır. His goal was the grand viziership. He did not hesitate to ask the sultan to give him the imperial seal and the post of commander-in-chief in return for a sum of 40,000 ducats and the maintenance of the army at his own expense. Ahmed I handed on the offer to the grand vizier, who summoned Našıl Paşa to him and fined him that sum as a punishment (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 446 sq.). When soon afterwards the grand vizier, the Croid Kuyuduz Murad Paşa died at the age of 90, Našıl Paşa became his successor (Aug. 22, 1611). In the following year he married 'Arşa, the three year old daughter of Sultan Ahmed I (Feb. 1612). His arrogance now knew no bounds; all his opponents were ruthlessly disposed of. His personal qualities dazzled everyone: *Of imposing appearance, brave and eloquent, never weary of talk or action, but at the same time passionate, impetuous, quite incapable of kind conduct and fluttering words and always intent on humiliating the other viziers* (J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 472). As human life was nothing to him but wealth, everything, he accumulated vast treasures. Sycophants and astrologers nourished in him the delusion that he was born to rule. The number of his enemies increased from day to day as a result of his intrigues and his ruthlessness. When on Friday the 13th Ramazan 1023 (Oct. 17, 1614) he was to accompany the Sultan to the mosque, suspecting no good, he said he was ill. The beşiri baştül sent to him had him strangled by his own garden guards. His body was buried on the Oğlan Mecidi. His estate which fell to the coffers of the state was enormous: pearls, jewels, carpets, cloth and bullion without number (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 474 sq. quoting Meseray, ii. 193). — Našıl Paşa left several sons, one of whom Hüssin Paşa (d. 1053 [1643]) and two of his grand viziers, Feldwebel, ii. 226) had a son named Mehemmed. The latter wrote a history of the Ottoman empire (Dhikr-i Timur-i Şah Altı 'Oğlanı) from the death of Murad IV (1048 = 1639) to 1081 (1670) the original MS. of which is in Dresden (cf. F. Bahinger, G. O. W., p. 221).


NAŢIJA (a) is the usual name for the conclusion resulting from the combination of the two premises (mukaddamāt) in the syllogism (jiyā) It corresponds to the Stolę zgrabp; this word in the works of Galen known to the Arabs is applied to the various discharges from the body but also means, as with the Stoics, the conclusion. Aristotle used the word syllogismos: that which concludes or completes the syllogism.

In place of the usual natiż we also find rīzef or ruzf (ess deduction). (TJ. DE BORB)

NĀTIK. [See SĀTİVA.]

NAVARINO (Navarino), a little seaport in the southwest of Messenia not far from the ancient Pylos, opposite the promontory of Koryphos on which there was in prehistoric times an acropolis and later, during classical antiquity, an often-renewed settlement. The harbour of Navarino is one of the safest in the Greek east for it is sheltered by the island of Spathon, which lies right opposite it and has intimate connections with many ancient, medieval and modern events. Recent research has shown that Navarino has no connection with the Homeric Pylos. The latter was in Triphylia near the village of Kakabatos where prehistoric tombs were recently excavated. The derivation of the name Navarino cannot be given with certainty. According to Fallmayer, Gesch. der Hallinzel Morea, l. 188, the name Navarino is a distinct survival of Avar rule in Morea between 587 and 807. On the other hand, Hopf thought that it owed its name to the Navarrese (cf. below). Fallmayer's view has been adopted by E. Curtius, Peloponnesos, i. 86; ii. 181 and W. Miller among others. According to M. Lasker, Travels in the Morea, i. 411, the name Navarino developed from τὸ τῆς Ἀβάρωνς. Hopf's view is however wrong, for Navarino is mentioned before the appearance of the Genoese in the Morea. In the middle ages the country round Navarino
was called Zonglun (Zonchio), from which came the French name of the place Junh (Old French juno "sun"). One of the earliest mentions of Navarino is in the geographical treatise, the *Nasbat al-Mu'جدد* of Irshidi; he refers to the place as "Iouda" and adds that it has "a very commodious harbour". After the period of Frankish rule, information about Navarino becomes fuller. The Knights, who under Guillame de Champlite and Godefroy de Villeharduin had planned the conquest of the Morea, in 1205 took its inhabitants and governor prisoners after the capitulation of Navarino.

Later the Baron of Thebes and Marshal of Achaia, Nicolas St. Omer (d. 1294), built for his nephew Nicolas III St. Omer, the Neoastro (New Castle) of Navarino. This is said, according to Buchon, to have been called Neo-Avarino in contrast to Palia-Avarino. At the end of 1281 or early in the next year, the Navarrese company seized Navarino and made it the chief centre of their military power. Navarino then became known as Château Neuf d'Avarino, or "oule le Seigneur [Nempar]" de Caumont, publ, par la Grange, Paris 1838, p. 89). The Greeks however at this time called Navarino Spanochori (= village of the Spaniards, after the Navarrese). In 1417 Venetian soldiers occupied Navarino and six years later the republic of St. Mark became the lawful owner of the place. In the summer of 1460 Sulṭan Muḥammad II appeared before Navarino with an army, which, in spite of the recently concluded peace treaty, laid waste the country round the town. In August 1500 the Turks took Navarino from the Venetians without difficulty after taking Modon and Koron shortly before, although the garrison of Navarino numbered 3,000 soldiers and had provisions for about three years. Soon afterwards the Venetians were able to retake Navarino by a stratagem and to destroy the Muslim garrison. "Ali Pasha now advanced from the land and Kenal Reës attacked with his fleet by sea and inshore. They took finally Navarino, inflicting great losses on the Venetians. Navarino maintained its importance under Turkish rule and was often the place of concentration of the imperial fleet. Hādji Khalifa and Ewliya Çelebi give some important information about Navarino and the former says that its original name was Anavarin. In the year 1686 the Venetians again took the town which they had held till 1715. The Turks then entered upon their last period of occupation.

During the first Russo-Turkish War in the reign of Catherine II (1768—1774) Navarino played an important part. After a stubborn defence for six days by the Turkish garrison and the Muslim civilian population, the Russians on April 10, 1770 forced the fortress of Navarino, no longer strongly enough fortified but still amply provided with munitions and artillery, to capitulate. By the terms of the treaty, the Turks of Navarino went to Chania (Crete) leaving behind them a number of Christian women whom they had imprisoned in the harems. Soon afterwards the Russians made Navarino, the fortifications of which they renovated, their principal base of operations in the Morea. Fate decided that the Russians had to evacuate Navarino again. On June 1, 1770, the Russian ships sailed from the harbour of Navarino. The Turks next day occupied the well placed fortress, which was in part burned and destroyed.

During the last decades of Turkish rule in the Morea, the Turkish family of Bekir-Agha of Navarino played a prominent part. Soon after the outbreak of the War of Liberation, the Greeks laid siege on March 29, 1821 to Navarino where the Turks of Arcadia (Cyparissia) had also taken refuge. On Aug. 7, 1821 the Turks surrendered to the Greeks who massacred them all without mercy in spite of all agreements. In the spring of 1825, Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt occupied Navarino and the neighbouring fortress in spite of a heroic defence by the Greeks.

What gave Navarino its special place in history was the naval battle fought on Oct. 20, 1827 in its harbour between the combined fleets of England, France and Russia on one side and those of Turkey, Egypt and Tunisia on the other, in which the latter were almost completely destroyed. It is calculated that the Turks lost 6,000 killed and the allied losses were only about 1,000. Soon after the battle, Ibrahim Pasha concluded a truce with Admiral Codrington.

Navarino remained in Ibrahim Pasha's hands until the spring of 1828. The French under General Mazon then relieved the Egyptian-Turkish troops. Alfred Reumont gives a fine picture of Navarino under French occupation in 1832.


**NAVAS DE TOLOSA (La), a place in the south of Spain in the province of Jaen on the frontier of Andalusia, a short distance from the modern town of Carolina. Its site corresponds to that of a fortress called *Harrin al-17b* in the Muslim period. It was in the plain which lies in front of it that there was fought on the 15th June 609 (July 16, 1222) the great battle between the Christians and the Almohads which ended in the rout of the latter. As a result of the defeat of Alarcoz [q. v.], the king of Castille, Alfonso VIII, had concluded a truce with the Muslims. On its expiration at the end of the 12th century, the Christian troops began a series of surprise attacks on the Muslim frontiers. Disturbed at this, the Almohad ruler al-Nasir [q. v.] prepared a great expeditionary force in Morocco while on his side the king of Castille secured the help of the kings of Aragon, **

*(Nikos A. Bers [REHE]*)

**NAVAS DE TOLOSA (La), a place in the south of Spain in the province of Jaen on the frontier of Andalusia, a short distance from the modern town of Carolina. Its site corresponds to that of a fortress called *Harrin al-17b* in the Muslim period. It was in the plain which lies in front of it that there was fought on the 15th June 609 (July 16, 1222) the great battle between the Christians and the Almohads which ended in the rout of the latter. As a result of the defeat of Alarcoz [q. v.], the king of Castille, Alfonso VIII, had concluded a truce with the Muslims. On its expiration at the end of the 12th century, the Christian troops began a series of surprise attacks on the Muslim frontiers. Disturbed at this, the Almohad ruler al-Nasir [q. v.] prepared a great expeditionary force in Morocco while on his side the king of Castille secured the help of the kings of Aragon, **

*(Nikos A. Bers [REHE]*)
Navarra and Leon, as well as of the Count of Portugal and the Pope, who preached a crusade against the infidel. The Christian troops gathered in Toledo, and in Oct. 1212, the encounter was a bloody one. The Muslim volunteers from Morocco and the Andalusian contingents soon lost ground and the Almuhadh ‘abd were in their turn decimated. The victors were able to exploit their success and took Ubeda [q.v.], Baza [q.v.] and other strongholds. The Christian victory of the Navas de Tolosa was certainly one of the most important steps in the "Reconquista".

**Bibliography:** The Arab historians given in the bibliography to the article AIOBIAS and Ibn ‘Abd al-Mumin’ al-Himyari, al-Rauq al-difir, article al-Iqbar. — A study on the campaign of 1212 by A. Husi, Estudio sobre la campaña de las Navas de Tolosa appeared in Anales del Instituto General y Técnico de Valencia, Valencia 1916. (E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

**NAVAR.** (See NUR.)

**AL-NAWAWI.** (or AL-NAWAWI), MUGHAL ADH-DIN ABU ZAKARIYAH YAHYA B. SHARAF B. MURU [following Nawawi’s own spelling, Syuyūṭi, fol. 53b] B. HAJAN B. HUSAIN B. MUIJAMAD B. DUMA B. HIJAM AL-HIZAM AL-DIMAGHAT, a SHAFITE JURIST, born in Muharram 631 (Oct. 1233) in Naww south of Damascus in Djawlan. The ability of the boy very early attracted attention and his father brought him in 649 to the Madrasa al-Rawhīya in Damascus. There he first of all studied medicine but very soon went over to Islamic learning. In 651 he made the pilgrimages with his father. About 653 he began to write and was called to the al-Ashrafiya school of tradition in Damascus in succession to Abu Shams who had just died. Although his health had suffered severely during his life as a student, he lived very frugally and even declined a salary. His reputation as a scholar and a man soon became so great that he even dared to approach Sulṭān Balbar to ask him to free the people of Syria from the war-taxes imposed upon them and to protect the teachers in the madrasas from a reduction in their income. This was in vain however, and Balbar expelled al-Nawawi from Damascus when he alone refused to sign a firmū approving the legality of these exactions. (This action of al-Nawawi’s is commemorated in the popular romance Siwar al-Zahir Balbar, Cairo 1326, xii. 38 sqq. in which the Sulṭān, cursed by al-Nawawi, becomes blind for a time). He died unmarried in his father’s house in Naww on Wednesday 24th Rajab 676 (Dec. 22, 1277). His tomb is still held in honour there.

Al-Nawawi has retained his high reputation to the present day. He had an exceptional knowledge of Tradition and adopted even stricter standards than later Iṣlām; for example he admits only five works on Tradition as canonical, while he expressly puts the Sunan of Ibn Mādjid on a level with the Musnad of Almhud b. Ḥuṣaib (cf. Sharh Muslin, i. 5: Adhākhār, p. 3). In spite of his fondness for Muslim, he gives a higher place to Bukhārī (Tahdhib, p. 350). He wrote the principal commentary on Muslim’s Sahih (pr. in 5 volumes, Cairo 1283); as an introduction to this, he wrote a history of the transmission of this work and a sketch of the science of Tradition. He gives not only observations on the text but a grammatical explanation of the traditions but he also comments on them, mainly from the theological and legal aspect, quoting whenever necessary not only the founders of the principal schools but also the older jurists like al-Waqi, Yahya etc. He also inserted in the text, al-Janah in Muslim’s work. We may also mention his frequently annotated Kitāb al-Ṣārā‘īn (pr. Bīlād, 1294 and often since) and portions of commentaries on al-Bukhārī (G. A. L., i. 158) and Abu Dawūd (Ibn al-Attār, fol. 10v); and an extract from Ibn al-Ṣalīḥ, Ulūm al-Hadīth with the title al-Tahfīz wa l-‘Tā’ir, partly transal, by Marquis, in F. A., ser. 9, xvi.—xviii, and printed at Cairo 1307, with a commentary by al-Suyūṭī, Tahfīz al-‘Uṣūl. Al-Nawawi’s importance as a jurist is perhaps even greater. In Shafite circles he was regarded with his Muhimmah al-Tīlīdīn (finished 685; pr. Cairo 1297 and frequently; ed. von dem Berg with French transl., Batavia 1882—1884; cf. theoreon Snouck Hurgronje, Verspr. Geschr., vii. 1881) as the highest authority along with al-Raqqī and since the 17th (with the two century) on this work, Ibn Hudjdar’s Tā’ir, and al-Raqqī’s Nihāyā, have been regarded almost as the law books of the Shafite school. The book consists of excerpts from the Muhātarāt of Raqqī and, as the author himself says, is intended to be a kind of commentary on it. It certainly owes the estimation in which it is held also to the fact that it goes back via al-Raqqī and al-Ghazzālī to the Iṣlām al-Hanāmin. We should also mention the Ramāḍ al-Muhimmah al-Sa‘rī al-Raqqī (on Ghazzālī’s Wafq) finished in 696 on which commentaries have often been written and the commentaries on Shatār’s al-Muḥaddithūn and al-Tanāḥ (G. A. L., i. 357) and al-Ghazzālī’s al-Wafs, which do not seem to have survived, and a collection of frā‘ādī put together by his pupil Ibn al-‘Attār (Cairo 1352).

His biographical and grammatical studies resulted in the Tahdhib al-Assūr wa l-Tahdhib (Part 1 on the names, Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1842—1847; Part 2 only in Ms. in Leyden, included by Ibn al-‘Attār among the unfinished works and there are certainly gaps in it) and al-Tahdhib wa l-‘Attār al-Tanāḥ. To his mystical tendencies — he had attended lectures on the Riḍā of al-Kuhaibī and transmitted it — we owe works like the Kitāb al-Adhākhār on the prayers, finished in 677 (pr. Cairo 1331 and frequently), the Kitāb al-Ṣārā‘īn (finished in 707; pr. Mecc 1302, 1312) and the incomplete Kitāb al-‘Avfīn wa l-Zayd wa l-Taqawwuf. An almost complete list of his some 50 works is given in Wüstenfeld, p. 45 sqq., those that are still in MSS, are given in Brockmann, G. A. L., i. 394 sqq. and index and those that are printed in Sarkh, Mu‘jam, coll. 1876—1879, etc. (See List.)

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-‘Attār (d. 744 = 1342), Tahfīz al-Tīlīdīn fi Tā’ījīm al-Mu‘jam wa l-‘Ā‘lam; [with many māthā‘īya], MS. Tübingen, No. 18; al-Skhawāt (d. 902 = 1487), Tā’ījīm Kitāb al-‘Ā‘lam ... al-‘Ā‘lam, Ms. Berlin, Wettstein, ii. 1742, fol. 140—207 (Ahwālīd, No. 11021); al-Suyūτī, al-Muhimmah fi Tā’ījīm al-Mu‘jam al-‘Ā‘lam, MS. Berlin Wettstein ii, 1807, fol. 533—688 (Ahwālīd, No. 11026); al-Subkī, Tā’ījīm al-‘Ā‘lam al-‘Abīrī, Cairo 1324, v. 165—168; al-Dhāhābī, Tā’ījīm al-Hadīth; Haidarābād n.d., iv. 259—264; al-Yā‘īnī, Misr al-Dīnām, Haidarābād 1339, iv. 182—186; the other sources are printed in Wüsten-
feld. Über das Leben und die Schriften des Schlech 'Abd Zakariya ft-Salihi al-Nawawi, Göttingen 1849; Snouck Hurgrone, Veros. Geschriften, ii. 587 sq. For the reference to the popular romance, I am indebted to Herr cand. phil. Vissering. (Heffening)

AL-NAWAWI Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. 'Arāki al-Dīaw, an Arabie writer of Malay origin, born in Tārīn (Banten), the son of a village judge (pangurah), after concluding his studies made the pilgrimage to Mecca and settled there permanently about 855, after making a short visit to his native land. After he had studied further and completed his education the teachers of the holy city, he set up as a teacher himself and gained great influence over his fellow countrymen and their kinmen. From 870 he devoted half his time to authorship. He was still alive in 888.

He wrote a large number of commentaries on popular textbooks, which are listed by Broekelman, G. A. L., li. 501 in addition to Snouck Hurgrone, Mekeh, ii. 362 sqq. Of these the following may be mentioned, with some information additional to what is contained in the two works.

In the field of Ḥadīṣ he annotated the Futūḥ al-Ḳuraṣ of Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Ghazzlı (d. 918 = 1312), a commentary on Abu Shuqayr's al-Iṣāba, entitled al-Tawīlī, Mecca 1905, and again entitled Kūt al-Ḥakīm, Cairo 1901, 1905, 1910.

He wrote a commentary on al-Ghazzlı's Bīyāq al-Ḥadīṣa under the title Marāṣi 'Ilātulī, Būkā 1293, 1309; Cairo 1298, 1304, 1307, 1308, 1319, 1327. On the Maṣūḥ al-Ḥadīṣa of Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Eshrajnī al-Ḳatib (d. 977 = 1569) he wrote al-Futūḥ al-muḥadditha, Būkā 1276, 1292; Cairo 1297, 1306, 1307; Mecca 1316. On the Safaft al-Sallāb of 'Abd Allāh b. Yuhali al-Ḥadrami he wrote the Sallām al-Munṣīdh, Būkā 1297; Cairo 1301, 1307.

He wrote a commentary on the 60 questions of 'Abd al-Malik b. Muhammad al-Zāhid (d. 849 = 1416) put to him by his fellow countryman Muṣṭafā b. ʿUthmān al-Dīaw al-Khāṣṣī as al-Futūḥ al-muḥadditha on salāt, alms, fast and pilgrimage and under the title al-Lubāb al-thāmin, Cairo 1300; the Safaft al-Nuqṣ of Sallām b. Šamīr al-Ḫaqāṣī, Cairo 1292, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1305; Būkā 1309. On the exposition of the ṭalāb al-ḥadīṣ by his colleague Muḥammad b. Salam-Fī, 'Abāl-Allāh-Allāh b. Ṣafī al-Ḫāṣṣī, Cairo 1299, 1308, 1329; Būkā 1302.

In the field of dogmatics he annotated al-Sanṣari's Umm al-Brāhīm (d. 892 = 1466) entitled Liḍrīṣ al-yaḥyä, Cairo 1304; the Aḥāba al-Anwaʿa of Āḥmad al-Maṣrāqī (c. 1281 = 1864) entitled Nūr al-Ẓāmin, Cairo 1305, 1306; the Maṣūḥ al-Ḳur'ān entitled Ṭirāz al-Tanāzil, Cairo 1301, 1309, Mecca 1329; the Muṣālaḥ of Abū ʿAbd Allāh-Allah b. Ṣafī al-Ḫāṣṣī, Cairo 1301, 1305; Mecca 1314; the anonymous Futūḥ al-Khāṣṣī entitled Hilāyil al-Šībān in a Maṣūḥa, Mecca 1305; the al-Dīaw al-farāḍ of his teachers Āḥmad al-Nafrawi entitled Futūḥ al-muḥadditha, Cairo 1298.

In the field of mysticism he wrote a commentary on the Maṣūḥa al-Ṭayyibat al-ʿAdhāyī of Zain al-Čīn al-Malahī (d. 920 = 1320) entitled Sahālān al-Yuṣufī, Cairo 1301, Mecca 1315; and on his Maṣūḥa al-Sarīf al-Ḳaṭīb, he wrote the Kūt al-Thāmin, Cairo 1296. On the al-Manḥāf al-tamām fi Taḥāfa al-Ḥakīm of 'Alī b. Ḥasīm al-Dīn al-Hindi (d. 975 = 1567) he wrote Miḥṣar al-Zāmin, Mecca 1314. His commentaries on stories of the life of the Prophet may be classed as edifying popular literature; such he wrote on the Mawṣūl al-Nabī under the title al-Lūṣār, Cairo 1916, which is sacralized by some to Ibn al-Dīaw, by others to Āḥmad b. al-Kāsim al-Ḫarīrī, entitled Futūḥ al-Salāh al-Adam 'ala Mawṣūl al-Salāh al-ʿAṣā, Cairo 1297 and again under the title Mawṣūl al-Adam 'ala Mawṣūl al-Salāh, Cairo 1298, and as well as on the Mawṣūl al-Dīaw al-Burāq, (d. 1179 = 1765) entitled Tarāz al-Muṣannaf, Būkā 1292, and again under the title Muṣannaf al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Būkā 1296, and on his al-Kaḥṣārī al-mawṣūliya entitled al-Dīaw al-Bahri, Būkā 1297. He made an excerpt from al-Kasbīlantī's (d. 923 = 1577) Mawṣūl entitled al-Dīaw al-Bahri, Būkā 1296, and on his al-Kaḥṣārī al-mawṣūliya entitled al-Dīaw al-Bahri, Būkā 1297. He wrote a commentary on the Aḥjar al-Muṣīra under the title Qīāl al-ʿAṣā under the title al-Nabī al-Muṣīra, Cairo 1908 and on a versification Futūḥ al-Ḥakīma 'ala l-Kaḥṣārī al-mawṣūliya entitled Qīāl al-ʿAṣā under the title al-Nabī al-Muṣīra, Cairo 1908, on 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Ṭawal al-Dīaw al-Dīaw, (c. 1271 = 1854) al-Mawṣūl al-baḥriya 'ala l-Abūl-al-tarīqiyat, Cairo 1909. In the field of rhetoric he completed in 1293 (1876) a commentary on the Rihlah al-Inbārī of Ḥusayn al-Nawawī al-Millī, entitled Lūṣār al-Masākīn, Cairo 1301.

Bibliography: In the article; cf. also J. L. Sarks, Muḥsam al-Maṣūḥa, vol. 1879—1883.

(Conbroekelman)

NAWBA, an art-form in the music of the Islamic East similar to the European cantata or sulte. There are two varieties: 1. the awba of chamber music, and 2. the awba of military music [for the latter see in the Suppment]. The awba of chamber music varies in construction according to its provenance, and does not always carry this particular name. As early as the viiith century A.D. we appear to see this awba in its nascent stage. The musicians at the court of the Caliphate under the early 'Abbāsids performed in turn (dawr) and succession (nawba), and by the time of al-Wadhīb (d. 1110 A.H.) we know that a court musician had a particular day for his awba (Rūbāb al-Ǧāḥrī, iii. 177; v. 82, 120; xii. 123; xvi. 131; xvi. 150). Some musicians were more famous because they specialized in certain genres of music, such as Ithlim al-Mawwīl in the māḥūr and Hakam al-Ṭawāt in the ṭabādī rhythms (Aḥābe, vii. 12, 66), and a programme made up of these diverse types of music probably led to the term nawba being transferred to the programme itself (Ribers, Les Cantigas, p. 48).

Although we read in the Allah Laila wa-Laila of a nawba (li. 54), a āhāf (a quick movement; cf. the modern darāf) of a nawba (li. 87), as well as a complete nawba (iv. 175) being played, yet it is not until the xixth century A.D. that we
possess precise information about the nawaab and its integral parts, 'Abd al-Karīm b. Ḏhālībī [q.v.] tells us that among the ancient forms of musical instruments found with the nawābī, muqaddās and bayāt. The nawābī, he says, consists of two parts: the musāqāt or instrumental pieces, and the na'īr or vocal pieces. In the year 1379, whilst at the court of Djalāl al-Dīn al-Husain the Djalālīrīd sulṭān of al-Ḥrāsī, Ibn Ghailīt introduced a fifth movement to the nawābī, which he called the musāqāt. During this occasion, he tells us, he composed fifty nawābīs for the court, and the words of one of these have been preserved (fol. 99v).

These five movements were instrumental as well as vocal, and besides the verse-form being specified (the tārūnī for instance was in muqaddās), the rhythms (tārīq) for the instrumental accompaniments were also prescribed, of the ghālibī group being essential. The purely instrumental movements are also mentioned by Ibn Ghailīt including the overture called the fīghraw, which even to-day is the prelude to the nawābī, and which calls it muqaddās ("embroideries"), and says that the fīghraw and tārūnī have three, five, or seven sections (bayāt).

In days of old the nawābī was considered the most important art-form in the music of Islamic peoples. To-day it has fallen into neglect and in some countries will probably soon disappear. Two distinct cultures may be found in the modern nawābī, the Eastern and Western. The former is clearly a survival of that nawābī described by Ibn Ghailīt in the sixteenth century A.D. The latter is claimed (Yāffi) to have had its origin in al-Andalus in the ninth—sixth century, and is known to-day as the nawābī gharānī. It is confined to North Africa, the purest type being found in the West, whilst the nearer the East is approached the more we find the influence of the Eastern nawābī.

The Levantine nawābīs to-day comprises the following movements: 1. The tārīqā, an instrumental prelude played by the muqaddām or chief d'orchestre; 2. the fīghraw or bayat-sīr, an instrumental overture; 3. the tārīqā, a vocal movement; 4. the muqaddām, whose name recalls the form of the sixteenth-century tārūnī; 5. the muqaddām, also reminiscent of the muqaddām of old, since its function is total "embroidery"; 6. the tārīqā hamādhi, in slow rhythm; 7. the tārīqā, comprising verses; 8. the tārīqā hamādhi, an instrumental finale (cf. Thibaut and Lavignac, v. 2861). A shorter nawābī is described by Duconday (p. 22), whilst the famous British musicologist Sir Arthur Sullivan has related (Fortnightly Review, 1905, p. 86) his experiences as an auditor of the nawābīs. The various movements, especially the instrumental ones, are also cultivated in the Near East as sole items of performance, the fīghraw, tārīqā, and tārīqā, being special favourites. The fīghraw or bayat-sīr is still composed in sections as of old, but these are called baḥīmī instead of bayāt-sīr. Another interesting type of nawābī in Egypt includes the dance, and an example is given in complete score by Victor Loret. It comprises seven movements: 1. the bayat-sīr, for instruments and voices; 2. the tārīqā hamādhi, for the ballet; 3. the tārīqā, for the solo dance; 4. the tārīqā hamādhi, for the ballet; 5. the tārīqā, for the solo dance; 6. the tārīqā hamādhi, for the ballet; 7. the tārīqā, for the solo dance. The whole is accompanied by choral and instrumental instruments.

In Western Turkestan the nawābīs of to-day shows that in the Middle East it has developed somewhat differently from that of the Levant. Here, more attention has been paid to the purely instrumental movements, and they have been kept separate. The nawābī is here called a muqaddām, a name which properly stands for "a melodic mode". It is divided into three parts, the first two being the most important. These two are the muqaddāmī or instrumental pieces, and the na'īr comprising vocal-instrumental pieces. The names of most of the sections of the muqaddāmī and na'īr refer to either rhythmic (muqaddāmī) or melodic modes (muqaddāmī), although two of them, the fīghraw and the tārūnī, retain names which occur in the sixteenth century Ibn Ghailīt treatise. In Bukhārā, only six muqaddāmī (= nawābīs) appear to have survived, although the Uzbegs claim that they know others. These six have recently been described by the Uzbeg poet Fitrū, whilst the notation has been published by a Soviet Union official, Colonel V. A. Uspensky. There is also another but shorter type of nawābī known in Bukhārā, and six of these have also survived. In Khawārizm, the muqaddāmī of the muqaddāmī (= nawābīs) differ from those of Bukhārā, and in the first additional one has been spared the ravages of time. The Khawārīzmī are probably purer than those of Bukhārā because they appear to have been handed down, not once voice as elsewhere, but by means of a notation which was known as early as the time of the Khawārizmī Shah 'Alī al-Dīn Muhammad (d. 1220) (cf. Pro-Musica, New York 1927, v.; The Sackbut, London 1924, iv.).

In North Africa, as already stated, a different tradition in the nawābī has been followed. Here there are several varieties, but the most highly esteemed is the nawābī gharānī. As the name signifies, al-Andalus is the place of origin, and this is claimed for both the words and music. Although MSS. exist which contain the words of the Granadan nawābī, yet we only know the music itself from modern Moorish practice. We read of the "twenty-four Nawabīs", which tells us that the nawābīs were composed in the twenty-four modes (jubū); others say that the Andalusians only possessed twelve or fourteen nawābīs (F. Salvador-Daniel, p. 52; Yāffi, Pref.) but it has now been shown (Farmer, The Old Moorish Late Tutor) that there were twenty-four originally, but their names are different from those which some writers have presumed (Delphin et Guin, p. 62; Lavignac, v. 2859). The nawābī gharānī as performed in Algeria to-day comprises the following movements: 1. the daqīq, a short vocal prelude; 2. the muqaddāmī, an instrumental prelude; 3. the ḍaḥīmī or tawāṣība ("ornamenting"), the overture proper; 4. the daqīq, also a vocal movement preceded by a short instrumental prelude called a kūrtī; 5. the ḍaḥīmī or tawāṣība, a vocal movement preceded by a kūrtī; 6. the daqīq, also a vocal movement preceded by a kūrtī, and whose name practically identical with the old ḍarāf (cf. above); 7. the ḍarāf, a vocal movement which is introduced by a ḍaḥīmī; 8. the ḍaḥīmī or tawāṣība, the finale (British Museum MSS. Or 6907, Yāffi, Maqāmī; cf. Lavignac, v. 2841; Delphin and Guin, p. 65). The words of the classical Granadan nawābī have been edited from MSS. sources and过分 voice by Edmond Yāffi in his Maqāmī al-Ashraf, whilst the collaboration of Jules Rouanet he issued his Répertoire de musique arabe
et mère which contains the music of a complete mawa gharnaq and sundry movements from others. In 1865, Christianowitsch published his *Esquisse historique de la Musique arabe*, which also contained the major portions of seven Granadan nawba. Another type of nawba practised in Algeria, but of secondary importance, is the *nawba al-imkhašt*. In Morocco the five movements of the nawba are the *bâb*, the *khammaʿ* or *khaibāb*, the *bâb* liʾ, the *sâb*, and the *dardj* as well as the overture *šaḥīya*.


**NAWBĀKHĪT**. This Persian patronymic (naam or *naʿîb* + *bašt* "new fortune") was borne in Baghda during the first two *Abbâsids* centuries by a family remarkable for its influence on the advancement of learning and on the political legitimism of the *Imāms*.

It claimed descent (cf. Bohdt, *Dichter*, p. 115) from the Persian hero Gis son of Gisâr celebrated in the Shâhânamâ (cf. Rustam, *Iranisches Naumbuch*, p. 399 and Christensen, *Kynandest*, 59, 117). Its first known representative Nawbakht, an satirologist, owed his fortune to the future caliph al-Manṣûr, to whom in prison he is said to have foretold the throne and later the victory over the Zaidi rebel Ibnʿābī, in the same year (144 = 762) in which, having drawn up the horoscope of Baghda, the new capital, he was granted fiefs in it. His son Abî Sahl Timāḏ (on this curious prenomen cf. Ibn Abî ʿUṣâbī, ed. Aug. Müller, Leipzig 1884, iii., p. xii. [Vorwort] and H. Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. 9) (d. 170 = 780) had seven sons by his wife Zurr, the founders of the various branches of the Al Nawbakht in which we find theologians like Ibnʿābī, Isḥāq b. Abî Sahl (wrote about 350 = 961 the *Kitâb al-Yâbaʿ* on which a commentary by Allâma Hilli has been found by A. Egbal; an earlier commentary had been written by Ibn Abî ʿl-Hālid, according to his *Ṣaḥîḥ al-Nahj*, iv. 575; and the *Kitâb al-Insâlīd*, Abî Sahl Ismāʿīl [cf. *NAWBĀKHĪT*], Husain b. Abî, third wakil of the Imāmī [cf. Ibn ʿRâzī], and Hasan b. Muṣṭafā [cf. *NAWBĀKHĪT*]; astronomers like Fâṣil b. Abî Sahl (Ibn al-Nadim, *Fihrist*, p. 275; who has been confused with al-Maʿāmīn’s minister) and Muṣṭafā b. Hasan Ibn Khirî (secretary of state); and finally enlightened students of poetry to whom the editors of the diwan of Abî Nuwâs, Ibn al-Rūmây and Buṭûrî went to establish the texts.

**Bibliography**: "Abûsâ ʿEgbâl, Kânsaʾ al-dâna Nawbakht*, Teheran 1933, 16 + 207 pp. with a genealogical tree, and useful indices, among others that of the Shi’i sects, p. 240—247; H. Ritter in his edition of the *Fihrist* of Hasan Nawbakht. (LOUIS MASHHONI)

**NAWBĀKHĪT**, nisa of the *Nawbakht* family.

1. Faqîl b. (Abî Sahl) b. Nawbakht (d. 200 = 815) an astronomer like his father (with whom he is confused) and, like his brother Hasan, attached to the Dâr al-Hikma to translate from Persian, wrote at least seven books (Ibn al-Nadim, *Fihrist*, p. 274). All of those survives of him is a fragment of the *Kitâb al-Nubkawín* (or *Vahdabawín*) on questions relating to horoscopes (*Fihrist*, p. 238—239).

2. Ismāʿīl b. Ali... b. Nawbakht (295—

312 = 849—923), the real political leader of the Imāmī party, who kept close touch with the famous vizier *Abî* b. al-Furat (whose father, Muhammad Muṣṭafā b. Hasan, we may note, was a follower of the Naṣairî heresy; cf. Nawbakht, *Fihrist*, p. 78), and was also a theologian (cf. Mâsimîn, *Pârâs al-Dâlîl*, p. 149—159) who disputed with the learned ʿAbû b. ʿUtîb, the Moʿazard, Jâhîm and the mystic Hallûd: he also refuted, after their deaths, Abu ʿl-Athâiyah, Abu ʿl-Wâzarî and Ibn al-Ruwândî. Of his 32 works (Ibn al-Nadim, p. 176; Tûsî, p. 57) only a fragment of the *Tâlîk* survives (in Ibn Bahawawī, *Ghâilha*, p. 53—56) (cf. Ibn al-Nadim, p. 176) which gives us the first outline of the Shi’i *ghâsha*.

3. Hasan b. Mîsîr... b. Nawbakht, d. before 310 (922), classed in this family through his brother, sister of the preceding: an Imāmī theologian, student of Helenicist philosophy, author of 44 works (Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. 17—20; Egbâl, p. 129—134) of which there survives, besides fragments of the *Râdî ala l-aʾšârâ* (in Khâthīb, vi. 385) and of the *Aṣâr wa-Dikhârist* (Mâsimîn, ii. 156; Ibn al-Dawâtî, *Tâbîn*, p. 42—43, 47, 49, 69, 74, 81—82, 88, 91), only one complete text, of very great value for our knowledge of the sects of the Shi’i, the *Kitâb Fihrist al-Shârî‘a*, ed. H. Ritter (Istanbul 1931, vol. iv. of the *Ibil Lit*). In an interesting chapter (ibid., p. 143—161), A. Egbâl has collected the passages of the *Fihrist* found in a contemporary, *Ṣaʿd b. ʿAbî Alīh Asghār* (d. 299 = 911), which shows either plagiarism or the use by both of an earlier source.

(Louis Mashhoni)
NAWRÚZ (P.), New Year's Day, frequently represented in Arabic works in the form Nàvrí (Kalghândi, Nàbíl al-'Ajur, ii. 408). It was the first day of the Persian solar year and is not represented in the Muslim lunar year (Más'ûdî, Murtîdî, iii. 416 sq.). In Achaemenid times the official year began with Nawrûz, when the sun entered the Zodiacal Sign of Aries (the vernal equinox). Popular and more ancient usage however would appear to have regarded the midsummer solstice as Nawrûz (Bûrûjî, Chronology, trans. Sachau, p. 185, 201). It was the time of harvest and was celebrated by popular rejoicings, but it also marked the date when the ûrbâdā'î was collected. The two different dates were retained in Persia proper and also in 'Irâq and Dibjâl under Islam, and 'Alâmas al-Isha'tâhnt states (Tâ'rikh, Berlin 1340, p. 104) that Nawrûz in the first year of the Hijra fell on the 18th Haštân (June), which he erroneously equates with the 1st Dhu 'l-Ka'dâ. Confusion arose however because the intercalation of one day every four years which allowed the date to correspond with the position of the sun was omitted in Islâm (Mas'ûdî, Khtîb al-Tâmbî, p. 215) and unscrupulous revenue officials found it to their advantage to keep to the false calendar date rather than to the correct traditional one because it permitted them to collect their dues earlier (Mâritz, Khtîbî, ed. Wiet, iv. 263 sq.). By the time of the Caliph Mutawakkil the date of collection of ûrbâdâ'î had advanced by almost two months and in 245 A.H. he fixed the date of Nâvrî as the 17th Haštân, which approximated to the old time (Tabari, iii. 1448; Bûrûjî, Chronology, 1340). The reform had no lasting effect and the Caliph Mu'tadîd was compelled again to move the date which was fixed as the 11th Haštân (Tabari, iii. 2143). Later again, in Sulâju's reign, the reform of the calendar, the Persian astronomers proclaimed the vernal equinox as Nâvrûz (Dhu al-Âthîr, x. 344; 467 a.h.) and the first day of the new era fell on the 10th Ramdân 471 (March 15, 1079).

Nâvrûz was adopted in Egypt as elsewhere and has been retained by the Copts as the New-Year's Day (Mâritz, Kalâqî, lv. 247 sq.), but it now falls on September 10 or 11.

Popular festivities have marked Nâvrûz wherever it has been celebrated. In Sâsání Persia the kings held a great feast and it was customary for presents to be made to them while the people who gathered to make merry in the streets sprinkled each other with water and lit fires. Both in 'Irâq and Egypt these customs persisted in Muslim times (Tabari, iii. 2163; Mas'ûdî, Murtîdî, vii. 277; Mâritz, loc. cit.; Kâlgûhândi, ii. 410). Although Mu'tadîd attempted to prevent the customary horse races in the streets during the midsummer saturnalia he was unsuccessful (Tabari, loc. cit.). In the various parts of the Turkish Empire the day was celebrated as a public holiday and in Persia it has throughout its history been marked by great festivities as the chief secular holiday of the year.

Bibliography: In addition to the passages noted in the text see: Bûrûjî, Chronology, p. 109 sq.; 'Umâr Khâlîfûn, Nâvrûz-al-nimû, ed. Minowî, Tihrân 1933; A. Mest, Renommance des Ismaïli, p. 400 sq.; Lane, Thousands and One Nights, ii. 406 sq. (he regards it as not improbable that Nâvrûz originated from the Jewish Passover); Carra de Vaux, Notice sur un Calendrier Tûrque, in Studiapresented to E. G. Brown, p. 106 sq.; A. V. W. Jackson, Persia Past and Present, p. 90 sq. (R. Locke).

NAZAR (A.) probably did not receive until the ninth century A.D. the meaning of research in the sense of scientific investigation as a translation of the Greek parâskeine. With Aristotle (e.g. Metaph., 1064 b 2) the philosophies were then divided into theoretical (parabarbata) and practical ('amaliya); the latter seek to obtain the useful or the good for man, the former pure truth, in physics, mathematics and metaphysics.

Nazar is primarily an epistemological conception and after the example of Ammonius Hermiae, a pupil of Proclus, is dealt with among the Arabs in a work prefixed to the Isagoge of Porphyry (Ἡγομονήματα τῆς φιλοσοφίας) (cf. the article MARTIN). Nazar is also discussed as an activity of the human soul in psychology but in this case as a rule under synonyms like fikr, tаfâkkr - etc. (cf. NAFS).

The history of this terminology has still to be written. In the oldest, still incomplete, logic (edited by 'Abd Allâh b. al-Muqaffa' or his son Muzahhad, 'ilm and 'asâl are already distinguished as branches of philosophy (shûbah), but 'ilm is defined as a tâhâfuz and tаfâkkr of the hâl (i.e. of the mind) (cf. G. Furlani, *Di una presunta versione arabo di alcuni scritti di Porfirio e di Aristotele*, in R.R.A.I., ser. vi, vol. vi. [1926], p. 207).

The old speculative theologians of Islâm were
perhaps more familiar with the distinction *ibilm* *kāhl* > *ṣ̱āfī* than with *maqāli* or *kānhā*. The *ṣ̱āfī* is generally recognised as a "foot" of the Mu'tazilite system. The *Sa'dī al-Tusi* mentioned it (beginning of the third century a. H.) among his *nusul*: *ṣ̱āfī*, *kānhā* and *maqāli* (R. Strothmann, *Die Literatur der Zaiditen*, in *Iltān*, ii. [1911], p. 54). *Nasār* was felt to be an innovation like *ra'y* and *ḥiyā* in *fikr*. The *Ḥanbalī* school objected to the adoption of *nazar* but its greatest representative Ibn *Ḥazm* admitted *ṣ̱āfī* without hesitation — of course the *ṣ̱āfī* created and equipped by God — as a source of knowledge. Not blind belief (*tahlič*) nor deduction from the unknown (*ḥiyā*) were to lead it to the acceptance of the *Kurān*, *sunna* and *ḥijrī*, but quite certain knowledge. There is something which Ibn *Ḥazm* insists upon so often and so emphatically as this; there is no other way to certainty than that of tracing to sensual perception (ḥis) and intuition of the intelligence (*ṣ̱āfī*). Deed sensual perception is so much preferred by him that comprehension by the reason is called a sixth *ṣ̱āfī* (*K̄išār al-Faqīh*, i. 4—7). The philosophical position of Ibn *Ḥazm*, which requires closer investigation, recalls Hellenistic eclecticism according to which all human cognition arises either from sensual perception or intuition or is derived from these sources through the intermediary of proof. Many however emphasise the direct evidence of sensual perception and reason, and regard the method of proof as a difficult and uncertain one. Hence we have from the *Stoics* onwards the emphasis laid on general agreement (*Ar. ẓ̱mah* and *ṭemsiij*) as a criterion of truth. Only where there is no agreement is investigation necessary.

The dualistic epistemology of the eclectic (senses X reason) was very greatly modified in *Islām* by the penetration of the intellectual monism in the Neo-Platonic mysticism and Aristotelian logic. While different stages in human knowledge were distinguished, true knowledge was only to be attained by rational intuition and the intermediary activity of the mind. The main thing for the Neo-Platonist was intuition (*nazar*, *nazar*). It is remarkable how in the Neo-Platonic *Theology of Aristotle* the latter is much to say to Plato as the divine perceives everything as once like God himself and pure *ṣ̱āfī*. *Nasār* in this sense of direct perception is constructed with *ila*, in other cases however with *fi*. For *nazar* *fi*, transmitted reflection of the human intelligence, the *Theology* generally uses *fikr* and *rawiya* and the world of the senses, with which our soul is associated, is called *Ṣ̊li̊m al-fikr* and *lā-rawiya*. Following the *Theology*, the Muslim mystics generally used *nazar* for spiritual perception (cf. L. Massingham, *Essai sur l'origine du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, Paris 1932, index).

In *Ka'il* however, in the disputes of the theological sects, *nazar* receives the dialectic meaning. Logical proof seems to have first been admitted into the *wujūd al-dīn* by the *Ṣ̊ha'īa*. In his *muḥā拉萨* (ed. Ritter, i. 51 sq.) al-*Aṣ̊ḥāb* gives a survey of the different views of the eight parties of the *Ravished* *Ṣ̊̄ nazar wa *l-ḥiyā*. According to him, groups 1—3 consider all cognitions (*maqāli*) as necessary (*ṭemsiij*) (i.e. given with the mind itself or not given) so that *nazar* and *ḥiyā* can add nothing to them; these as well as group 8, which traces all knowledge to the *Prophet* of God and the *Inām*, differ from the rest on this point. The other four recognise some kind of acquired knowledge (in both cases the reference is to the apprehension of God) as follows: 4 (the *Aṣ̊ḥāb al-Ḥāṣibī b. al-Ḥakam*) by *nasār* wa *l-tālimād*; 5 (al-*Ḥasan b. Mīnā*): possibly by a kind of *rehā* which cannot be more exactly defined (cf. this *rehā* with the *ḥad la-*al* of the latter *Aṣ̊ḥāb* schools); 6 and 7 (anomymous) by *nasār* wa *l-ḥiyā* with appeal to the testimony (*ṣ̏ajdā*) of the *ṣ̱āfī*. We are also told (p. 144) of a section of the *Murūj* which is that a belief (*inām*) without *nazar* is in their opinion not a perfect belief.

*Ṣ̊̄ hārī* himself is probably the best evidence of the fact that the speculation of the human *ṣ̱āfī* was not regarded as a source (or method) of knowledge of God for the first time in his school but before him by several sects. *Nasār* (like *ra'y* in *fikr*) was most probably applied to the activity of the mind of the reflecting theologian (besides *nasār* we find synonyms like *ḥiyā* and *ḥād, ra'y, ḍāf, fikr, ḍarār, ḍarār, ṭa'mal, ṭalab; perhaps also others). The logical methods here are used (perhaps here still synonymous) *ḥiyā* (deduction by analogy) and *ṭemsiij* (proof by circumstantial evidence). From what we know of *ḥiyā* in *fikr* (cf. the article *Fiāt* al-*Fiāt* by J. Schacht, and Snouck Hargonrie, *Perp. Grec.*, ii. 140 sq.) and of *ṭemsiij* in medicine (see *Masʿīdī*, Paris 1851—1877, iv. 40; vii. 972 sq.), we may probably think of a process which is a mixture of induction and deduction, often used very arbitrarily. Analogous cases, often superficially regarded as similar (cf. *Masʿīdī* al-*Ilūm*, ed. v. Vloten, p. 8 sq.), were sought for, the *illa*, i.e. not the actual cause (causa) but the reason (*ratio*) in a higher conception of method or species, under which the further cases could be grouped. For Aristotle and his followers in *Islām* (Fārābī etc.) deduction had one meaning; they believed in causality or even in the creative activity of abstract thought. The great majority of Muslim theologians, jurists and physicians did not rise so far. It was not till the school of *Ṣ̊̄ hārī* that the method of *nasār* superficially grasped penetrated into *ḥalām* and *ḥalām* was defined as *主旨 al-nasār wa *l-tālimād*. Rejected at first by the majority, gradually tolerated and used as an instrument against heretics and sophists, *nasār* in the orthodox school was finally recognised as a religious obligation.

Let us now turn back to the general conception of the *ṣ̊̄ lūm nasāriyya*. Al-Fārābī (d. 950) distributed them from the philosophical point of view in a special treatise (*lāf* al-*Ilūm*, Cairo n. d.) in a way which became the model for later times. It was he who first worked on the logic of Aristotle wherefore his school was often called that of the *Mashīxūnī*.* He assumed with Aristotle that the *ṣ̱āfī* contained in itself the fundamental principles of all knowledge, the evidence of which had simply to be acknowledged. But the way of reflection and proof leads to the non-evident, the culmination of which, apologetic proof (*būrūn*), is described in the *Second Analytic*. From this eminence the branches of knowledge can be surveyed. After some observations on philology (cf. the *Stoics*) first and most fully logic — whether as instrument of philosophy or as a part of it is a matter of indifference. Logic itself is of course *nasār* with an object
NAZIM, properly Mustafa U. Ismail, a notable Ottoman religious poet. The son of a Janissary, the inspector Yeni Baghieli Oder Ismail Aga, he was born in Constantinople and succeeded his father in his office; after rising through all the grades in the Janissary office; he became Şahîrî, Khalîfe, bosb Khalîfe and finally in 1108 (1696) yeniseri Khalîfe. He died in this year on the campaign against Belgrade.

He wrote an extensive Divân, the poetical value of which is not very great but which contains much that is religious and mystical in its ghaṭa, and about 50 cebrî of the end of the reign of Mehmed IV.


(Nazal)

NAZIM, Ya'qub, the most important Ottoman religious poet of his period, as is apparent from his epithet Nûbî-şâhî, the singer of hymns. Born in 1659 (1649) in Kâsim Paşa in Constantinople, he entered the Sezil as a boy where he received the education of the Enderlen and had the opportunity to acquire special proficiency in Arabic and Persian. He showed a talent for poetry and considerable musical ability. His beautiful voice and his work as a poet and composer gained him the favour of Sultan Mustâd IV. He was given important offices at the court as a result: the office of the Hâşî-şahî to the kîlî-rî Şâhî; he next became mevleve-şâhî and assumed considerable influence. He then retired of his own accord and became bâsar-şâhî. Later he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. He remained in Medina as mevlâvî where he died at the age of 80 in 1139 (1726). According to another statement (Brunull Mehmed Tahir), he died in Adrianople.

His flourished under Mehmed IV and down to the reign of Ahmed III. He was a member of the Mawlewi order. Sheikl Neshir-i Mawlewi was his teacher in poetry and probably also in music. Nazim is the most religious poet of his period. He devoted the whole of his poetical talent to the na'îr, the hymn. His Divân therefore resembles a warnant of pardon (berîti-şâhî). He also gave special attention to the devotional forms of the tevâbî, tahtâbî and muhâmâtî.

His Divân, printed in Constantinople in 1257 (1841), forms a thick volume of 290 pages, of which one third is devoted to the na'îr in the form of 60 tevâbî, hundreds of ghaṭa, tariy, terî, and teriî, mawlewi's and muhâmâtî's, ru'î's and a mawâmâtî for the Prophet. The Divân is divided into five parts, each of which is in turn a kind of Divân in itself. He also wrote mevlâvî's for Mehemd IV and Mustafa II, Ahmed III, Selim Giaid Khan, Mosehîb Mustafa Paşa and the vizier Ahmed Paşa; also tevâbî in imitation of Ne'fî and Nâhî and şâhî'î in imitation of Ne'dîm.

Nazim is a clever technician who gives expression to his effort for variety and change, not in the matter but in the form. In all his works however, a deep religious belief, even fanaticism is marked. His poems are a true reflection of the inclination of the period for religion and Şâfism.

**Biography:** Feisal, *Tabâ'ir*, Constan-
NÂZIM FARRUKH HUSAIN, a Persian poet. Mullâ Nâzîm, son of Shâh Riâz Shabzâvari, was born in Herât about 1506 (1607) and spent the greater part of his life there. Little is known of his life, except that he made a journey to India and, after spending several years in Džâhângîrân, returned to his native town where he died in 1681 (1670–1671). He was court poet of the Beglerbegs of Herât and his greatest work, the Ūsûf al-Zâbaâlîshâh, began in 1525 (1584) and finished in 1572 (1661–1662), was dedicated to one of these governors, Abûâhâs Kâlât Khân Şâhîmbî. This, a poem of considerable length, is an imitation of Târâfârâ's work of the same name and follows the original quite closely but endeavours to surpass it by using the most elegant language. Ethâ calls the language of Nâzîm's images distorted and thinks that some of the details put in by him can only have a humorous effect on the reader. But it must be agreed that Nâzîm judged the taste of his period very well for his work became extremely popular, not only in Central Asia. While Târâfârâ's poem is now known to only a few enthusiasts, manuscripts of Nâzîm's Ūsûf al-Zâbaâlîshâh are still quite common in the bazaars of the larger cities of Central Asia as are those of the even more celebrated version of the same subject by Džâmî. His lyrical Dâwûn is less well known, but it contains many excellent poems (especially ghâzâls) some of which are even at the present day sung by the classically trained singers of Bukhârâ and Samarqand.

Bibliography: H. Ethâ, G. F. Ph., ii. 231–232; Ries, Catalogue, p. 692a; and 3707; Ūsûf al-Zâbaâlîshâh, lit. Lucknow 1870. (T. Herrthels)

NÂZIR AL-MAŻÂLÎM (A.), "reviewer of wrongs". His office "combined the justice of the kâmtî with the power of the sovereign" and was instituted by the later Umayyads, who sat in person to receive petitions complaining of zâhm. The early Abbâsîds, from Mahdî to Muâta, followed their example (Mâwardî, p. 129; Biha'îsh, Kiṣâh al-Ma'âsun), the Mu'tazîlîs, al-Schâfî, under which they are present in the p. 245; At Baghdâd the Caliph Muktâdî ordered the shâb al-shâbîra to nominate fakha whose were to hear in the courts of the mahâllas. The court of the Nâzîr concerned itself with: a. zâhm committed by the Caliph's officials; b. injustice in the levying of taxes; c. wrongful acts of kâmd in public offices. Other matters proper for the cognizance of the court were complaints by officials of non-payment of their salary or of excessive reduction of salary, the interests of workâf and the enforcement of decisions made by kâmtî not strong enough to have their judgments put into execution. The Nâzîr had much wider powers than the kâmtî. He could postpone decision on a case in order to consider and investigate evidence, a proceeding not open to the kâmtî, who is compelled to give judgment out of hand; he could use irkîsh (intimidation) to overawe a defendant into admission and could refer litigants to persons of responsibility who could act as arbitrators. The officer presiding, if he was the vizier or other highly placed official deputizing as Nâzîr for the sovereign, sat aside a special day or days for the review of mašârâb. The Nâzîm al-Mulk (Shî'at-nâmâ, p. 10) regarded it as essential for the king to sit two days a week for the purpose, and in Egypt under the Fâtimid rule, the vizier or the shâb al-shâbî sat on two days of the week at the Golden Gate of the palace at Cairo. Complaints were there made orally if the petitioner lived at Fustâţ or Mişr and each plaint received was sent for necessary investigation to the nâbî of the police or the kâmtî of the quarter concerned. If the person against whom complaint was made lived outside the two cities the petition was presented in writing.


NÂZMI, Shâhî Mehmed b. Râmâznân, Ottoman poet and Khalîwît Shâhî. The son of a merchant named Râmâznân b. Rustem, he was born in Constantinople in the Ködîşî Pasha quarter in 1582 (1622–1623). He became a disciple of Aâb al-Ashâbî al-Nâşî. In 1605 (1654–1655) he became shâhî (شيخ) in the Khalîwît monastery of Yawâshî Shâhî Mâhâmîd Aghâ near Şehir Etnî, later (1104/1693) also preacher (emînî) at the Şahîn Wallâde mosque. He died in 1112 (1700) and was buried in a special türbe. His son was Aâb al-Râjîmî Râfî'. Nâzmi was considered a high authority on Hadîth. He wrote a number of works, none of which have been translated, namely: Hâdiyyat al-Âkhînâb ("Present of the Brethren"); biographies of the seven greatest Khalîwît personalities (Yûsuf Makhkîlîm; Mâhâmîd Râkî; Shâtîb Khalîfî; Shîrînî; Aâb al-Ma'âdî-î Sîtrînî; Shâmî al-Dînî-i Sîtrînî; Aâb al-Ma'âdî-î Sîtrînî; Aâb al-Ashâbî al-Nâşî) and some accounts of their successors. His poetical works consist of the rhymed Turkish translation of the first book of the Mi'rizmî of Dzâlî al-Dîn Râ'înî, a Dâwûn of the usual type (with many hymns and sacred songs); also the Mîyâr al-Târâfî ("Touchstone of the Order").

Bibliography: Târîhî Bâlî, Kitâb, vi. 560; Hîlmî, Ziyârît-i Etmîn, i. 1295, p. 120–121; Şîhû, Kâmîn-i Flâmîn, vi. 1459; 1459; Constantinople 1325, p. 120–121; Şântî, Kâmîn-i Flâmîn, vi. 1458–1459; Constantinople 1325, p. 120–121; Şahîrî, Ki'nîm, vi. 1500; 1500; Constantinople 1325, p. 120–121; Şahîrî, Ki'nîm, vi. 1500; 1500; Constantinople 1325, p. 120–121; Şahîrî, Ki'nîm, vi. 1500; 1500; Constantinople 1325, p. 120–121; Şahîrî, Ki'nîm, vi. 1500; 1500; Constantinople 1325, p. 120–121; Şahîrî, Ki'nîm, vi. 1500; 1500; Constantinople 1325, p. 120–121; Şahîrî, Ki'nîm, vi. 1500; 1500; Constantinople 1910, p. 127. (Menzel)

NÂZMI, Mehmed (according to the Sîyâhî-i Sîtrîmî: Nâzmi Nâşîmî), Ottoman poet in Adrianopole in the period of Sulaimân al-Kânînî. He was the son of a janissary, later himself became a janissary, then sâhibîdî and sipahi. He died in 996 (1588) in Adrianopole, where he is buried in the türbe of Shâhî Trainâlî.
Nasiri possessed great poetic gifts and ability, which he displayed particularly in the clever and accurate imitation of other poets, in so-called maqāre(m.l. maqār). He also himself wrote ghazals. He rendered a great service to Ottoman literary history by collecting an enormous anthology of the best Ottoman poems, arranged under the eight principal metres. This anthology contains 4,000 ghazals by 125 Turkish poets and maqāre by himself in addition: Muzaffar al-Naẓāmī. He presented this work, which he brought down to the year 930 (1524), to the Sultan. Hammer deals fully with it, as it deserves.

He also wrote a ghazal with the rhyme ēṣf on each bāgh of the Risāli Surname of Wahḥābi Tabrizī.


(MENZEL)

AL-NAẒĀMĪ, IBRĀHĪM b. SĀDIK b. HĀNĪ b. 'IZĀQ, a Mu'tanzi theologian of the Baṣra school. Brought up in Baṣra, he spent the latter part of his life in Baghdād, where he died between 223 and 230 (835—845) while still, it seems, at the height of his powers. A brilliant poet, a philologist of note, and above all an extremely perceptive and subtle dialectician, he is one of the most interesting figures in the culture of the 'Abbasid period. He occupied a most important place in the development of Muslim ideas. He studied speculative theology in the madhbits of Abu l-Hasābi al-Allāfī, from which he soon separated to found an independent school. In Baṣra he vigorously continued the struggle waged by his teacher against Manichaeism but devoted his abilities mainly to the refutation of the Dāhri philosophy, with which he was thoroughly acquainted. So far as we can judge, it was al-Naẓāmī who began the struggle, which was continued by Ibn Sīnā for centuries, against the philosophy of Asiatic Hellenism, the classic document in which is the Tahānif of al-Ghazālī. In Baghdād he engaged in lively disputations with Menzeli and Dāhri theologians, the traditionalists and the Mu'tazilis, submitting their views to a searching criticism which had considerable repercussions in the history of Sunni theology. On the other hand, his ideas seem to have had a considerable influence on the Mu'tazili school of Baghdād in spite of the resistance which it offered to him. Al-Naẓāmī was above all a theologian. Two tendencies dominate his thought: zeal for tawwāl, for the strictest monotheism, and zeal for the Kur'ān, which compelled him to set aside any other source of theology and ethics. His interest in religion was purely intellectual and emotion seems to have played a very limited part in it. His opponents described him as a Dāhri; this is to misconceive completely the fundamental idea of his theological work; nevertheless it is quite true that it was the dispute with the Dāhriya which imposed upon him the first principles of his dogmatics and which determined their structure, so much so that Iṣlām in his hands assumed a rather strange form. His dogmatic extravagances brought down upon him the condemnation of almost the whole of the Muslim community and even of the Mu'tazila; it was however he who was the first to state several of the principal problems of Sunnī theology. His writings are lost but considerable fragments have been preserved, mainly in the works of his pupil al-Dāhrijī. Many of the teachings which are attributed to him in books of writers on heresies were handed down by his pupils, not always correctly, as al-Khājiyya tells us. The exposition of his theology given by al-Baghdādī in his Kitāb al-Furqān probably goes back to Ibn al-Rawandi; it is a typical example of misrepresentation and deliberately false interpretation. — On the main features of his theology and of his school, cf. the article AL-MUṬĀZILA. Here we give a few observations on the problems of his theology.

1. Aṣīr al-inwād. Al-Naẓāmī's main interest here is to defend the Kur'ānic doctrine of the creation against the Dāhriya which teaches the perpetual circulation of the elements and therefore the eternity of the material world. It is with this object that he develops the doctrine of the qaḏār and the kawāna, a strictly anti-Dāhri thesis and one already adopted by Abu l-Hudhail al-Allāfī. His ideas regarding the body and its relations are the logical result of this teaching. The structure of these ideas is however strongly influenced by the polemic against Manichaeism, the fundamental problems of which al-Naẓāmī had studied deeply. In his positive demonstration of the dogma of the creation one occasionally thinks there are traces of Aristotelianism: the creation was a setting in motion and the created world is in a continual state of movement (even rest is defined as a form of movement). God is then himself immobile but at the same time the primordial moving power. The ta'wāl, the distinction between the creator and creation, is carried a considerable distance. The divine attributes are represented to us by negations. The divine word is a body (therefore created) but that of man is an accident. The Kur'ān is miraculous because of the information it gives about the past and on account of the secrets which it reveals but not on account of its style, which men could have imitated if God had not prevented them (in reality there is no mu'tawṣa in al-Naẓāmī). Al-Naẓāmī fundamentally rejects the arbitrary interpretations of the Kur'ān given by the great authorities on Tradition, as Ṭārima, al-Kullābī, a Suddī or a Māzikī b. Suhaimī; he demands a strictly literal exegesis. Prophethood has always been universal, i.e. all the prophets and not Muhammad alone have been sent to the whole of humanity (against the traditionalists; al-Naẓāmī thus did not deny the prophethood of Muhammad).

2. Aṣīr al-adl. The freedom of the human will is restricted, according to al-Naẓāmī in a way that anticipates the Aš'arī theology. The actions of a man are movements, therefore accidents and movements which relate only to the man himself; the effects which are realised outside of the man are not due to him but to the natural forces which God has placed in his body (denial of waqū'udda). Man is the rub, which penetrates the body; the body in its turn represents an in¬firmity (ṣifā) of the rub. Now it is the body, different from man in the strict sense, which sets in motion the action of which man (i.e. the rub) is capable. It follows that man (the rub) is capable of the action before it is realised (al-kifāya al-hallāb na'i), but at the moment when it is realised, the man is not capable of it.

3. Aṣīr al-wuḍūḍ wa l-wuḍūḍ. Al-Naẓāmī is very
krena interested in practical problems of the; he knew his views and those of his school on the , on fraud and on ritual purity (in which connection he gives some very curious psychological explanations). But he is particularly concerned with the . He waged a passionate campaign against the adab ad-day wa l-hiya, therefore against the Hanafi who were the representatives of the . He flatly refused to admit ad-day and said but did not shrink even from attacking the great men among the who in his opinion had been guilty of using them. He was in this way led to criticise violently the institution of the (which however he admitted to a certain extent. Through all this he prepared the way for and the .


(H. S. Nyberg)

**NEBUCHADNEZZAR. [See BUKIkal NAŠAR. ]**

**NAJDJ, the highlands of Arabia in contrast to the low-lying ground along the coast (Ṭihāma) or the depression (ṭāda). In the dialect of the Hadhāli Nadjj is pronounced Nadjj.** The exact application of this originally topographical conception is very differently understood and sometimes it means more generally the elevated country above the coastal plain or the extensive country, the upper part of which is formed by the Tillāma and the Yemen and the lower by Syria and the Ṭurk, or the part of Arabia which stretches from the frontiers of the Tillāma to Madina and thence across the desert from al-Baqra to Bahrayn on the Persian Gulf (Ṭṣaqḥāt, Ibn Hāṣar) or the territory between the Ṭurk (al-Ṭannās) and Ṭurk (Ibn Khaṣṣārhiṣa) or from the Ṭurk to the Tillāma (Khaṣṣārhiṣa) or the land which lies behind the so-called Ditch of Choosres (Kirsqā) as far as the Ḥarrā (al-Bihāl), or lastly, the territory between the depression of the Ṭikāk al-Rumma and the slopes of Ṭikāk (al-Ṭarq) that originally the name was applied to the part of the land, and only not only from the definitions of the separate authors but also from the fact that Nadjj appears in combination with various place-names; thus al-Qasmī (Yaḵūt, iv. 745) knows of Nadjj Barak (in al-Yaman), Nadjj Uṭb, Nadjj Khabbah (near al-Aṣfāt), Nadjj Ṭafīr (in the Ḫainam), al-Bakri (li. 574) besides the three last named mentions Nadjj al-Yaman, Yaḵūt (li. 750 z.g.) farther mentions Nadjj al-Ḥijāz, Nadjj Alwah in the country of the Hudaḥ, Nadjj al-

**Sharā, al-Hamdadyn (p. 55) Nadjj Ḫiyūr and Nadjj Madīdāl along with a number of places not otherwise known which are combined with Nadjj.** Hamdadyn (p. 177) further makes a distinction between upper Nadjj (Nadjj al-Ṭūḵā) which is regarded as Nadjj proper (al-Nadžājī) and in which he includes the district (ḫurā) of Ḫurayq and the town of Ḫamibanim, and lower Nadjj (Nadjj al-Sufā) which is described as Ṭaʾf Nadjj and with the Ḫidājā and al-Ṭarīq forms Central Arabia (p. 1, 4, 50, 56, 78 sq.), the territory in which pure Arabic is spoken (p. 136, 8 sq.). The original meaning is also seen in the dual Nadjjān, which, it is interesting to note, is used for two mountains in the Aila range, as well as in the place-name Nadjjār Marīf and in the spring pasture ground Nadjjān in the land of the Khāṭīm mentioned by the poet Ḫuṣayn b. Ḫaww (Yaḵūt, iv. 745).

That the wide interpretation of the name Nadjj above given is not unjustified is shown by the foundation in the second half of the fifth century a. d. by Ḫariṣ, chief of the Khāṭīm, of a short lived kingdom which extended from the Syrian limes and al-medina to al-Yamanā and till the lines of Yemeniyah in the N.E. on the Wadī l-rumma to Ḫidājā Ṭīr. At a later date, the whole of al-Nadjj belonged to the administrative district of al-Yaman (Yaḵūt, iv. 746).

The widest area to which the name Nadjj has ever been applied is probably that of the present kingdom of the same name which owes its origin to the Ḫawāṣib chief ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamād al-Saʿīd, who, as Amir of Nadjj conquered Riyād in 903, was chosen sultan of Nadjj and the adjoining lands in the name of ʿAbd al-Ḥamād, on Jan. 19, 1927 was proclaimed king of Nadjj and its dependencies at Riyād. The frontier of his kingdom are: in the east, the Persian Gulf from Ḫīfrah and Qaṭār to Ṭās al-Mīrāb, then the neutral zone between Nadjj and Kuwait from this promontory to Ṭās al-Khiliya; in the west: the kingdom of the Ḫidījā; in the south the line which runs from the port of Ḫanūfiya on the Red Sea south of Ḫarīb in the Ṭarīq and south of the Wadī l-Daʿāwīr and includes Nadjjān. The war at present going on between the king of Nadjj and the Imām of al-Yaman may perhaps alter this frontier, especially as Ḫaww in the Ḫaman has previously been a bone of contention. The northern frontier which was delineated by treaties between the ruler of Nadjj with the Ṭīr and England on the one side (signed at Ṭāʾf on Dec. 2, 1922) and Nadjj, Great Britain and Transjordania on the other (signed on Nov. 1, 1921) east Nadjj and the frontiers which run from the northern zone between Nadjj and Ṭīr (20°-30° N. Lat. and 45°-46° E. Long.) and is then continued in a line running N. and N. W. to the intersection of 39° E. Long. and 32° N. Lat. and leaves the Ḫabāl (Aṭān el on its north, then S. W. to the Wadī Ṭirāj and passing through in the S. E. the point where 35° E. Long. and 30° N. Lat. intersect. The Wadī Sīrīn is thus still in Nadjj. This line continues towards the south from 25° to 38° E. Long. and crosses the Ḫidējā railway towards Aṣkhās. The extent of the territory is estimated at 900,000 square miles and its population at 3,000,000. The capital is al-Ṛiyadh; the more important towns are Ḫurma (Berdīn, Ḫirān, Ḫaṭīm, Tarmalūmah.
Both ranges, which rise out of a tableland levelled by weathering, are of granite. The Djabal Adja, stretches from N. N. E. to S. S. W., about 35 miles S. E. of it in approximately the same direction the Djabal Salmá, a near Dibam, while S. W. of the Djabal Salmá lies the Harra of Faid, of volcanic origin.

S. W. of this lies the sandstone plateau, overlaid with limestone, of Dibab Tuwak (Tu Bek) running N. W. to S. E., which forms the western declivity of a plateau which has come into existence through weathersing and slopes towards the Persian Gulf on the one side and the sands of the desert of Rub al-Khali on the other. It begins S. E. of the district of al-Ka'im (S. E. of the Harra) and stretches E. from al-Waghib, al-Arid with the town of al-Riyadh and then turns, west of the Kharijian, S. S. W. towards the Wadi l-Dawit. The most important peak on this edge of the plateau is the Dibabal example in al-Khardj the springs of which form three pools, the largest of which is 150 paces long and 50 broad (cf. the picture in Philby, ii., p. 34) while the springs of Al-Adja feed a lake nearly a mile long and a quarter of a mile broad (Philby, ii., pl. at p. 86). These supplies sometimes dry up suddenly, probably because they have found a subterranean exit as has happened in the case of two water-holes in Al-Adja and the two larger ponds in Al-Khardj. The hydrographic conditions of the country are therefore exceedingly dependent on the rainfall from the summer and winter rains. The former (masut or mactar al-zayf) fall in August and September and particularly refresh the pastures which the summer sun has dried up, while the latter produce a springlike effect in the land on which they fall. The classic phrase 'Allah Nadjīdī nūn rahtī wa-qafīm (Bakri, ii. 627) eloquently sums up this state of affairs. Heavy rains were also observed in April 1871 in the central
Wadi I-Rumma and in May in 'Anzê between Djabal Salîm and 'Anzê (1854 Ch. Huber), and Philby (ii. to) noticed thunderstorms in May as well as drizzle, while Doughty met with hail at Qhabna (near 'Anzê) in April. That the climate here cannot have changed very much is evident from Djabal who records very heavy showers in this district in April. 1849 A.D. Huber met with rain in June 1834 between 'Anzê and Mecca, Sadillar at the end of July 1819 between Al-Hassâ and Darîya heavy thunderstorm and rain, which however was described by the natives as unprecedented. Philby (i. 141, 142) records thunder and rain in December. The rainwater collects in the hollows below and forms a thick layer of sand and enables palms to grow and also on occasion deserts to become fertile soil, wheat and barley, vegetables and fruit trees. The hot summer of course everywhere makes it necessary to water the crops from wells.

On the other hand, the frequently very sudden flooding of the water courses led in quite early times to the building of dams to hold back and store the water; such were built in the Wâdî I-Rumma at 'Aneiza (Bakr, i. 207: Vâkât, iii. 738), Darîya (Bakr, ii. 637) and on the road from Al-Yamâma to 'Aneiza (al-Hamadhânî, p. 174, 192). Doughty found remains of such dams in the Djabal Adja.

The district of al-Sharaf is the richest part of al-Najd, and the valleys of the Wâdî al-Ljârî and Wâdî al-Mîlah are celebrated for their pastures. Here the early caliphs had vast grazing grounds (jumâ) e.g. in Darîya, al-Rahabîa, Faid, al-Nîr, Dha l-Sharâf and Nağî. The most famous was that of Darîya, where the caliph 'Omar I secured an annual sale of 128,000 asses, 30,000 camels and 500 horses in diameter as pasture for 300 hand and 30,000 camels for the army. Othmân extended this area until the diameter was ten miles. The 'Abâsâsid al-Mahdi abandoned it, as the policy of this dynasty was to neglect Arabia deliberately in contrast to the Omayyads who, for example, intensively colonised western Najd. In the sixth century A.D. Najd was still well wooded, and al-Shuraba, south of the Wâdî I-Rumma, and Wadja were particularly celebrated in this respect, while at the present day they only possess scanty remnants of these forests.

Many areas seem to have been ruined by drought or disastrous inundations (Philby, i. p. 115; ii. p. 9); the decline of al-Yamâma is probably due to the latter cause. Crops are sometimes damaged by sharp frosts — in winter (January) the temperature sometimes sinks from a maximum of 53° F. by day to below 23° and ice and snow have been occasionally seen at the higher levels — while the summer drought with a maximum temperature of 113° destroys the crops. The two most important wâdis are the Wâdî I-Rumma about 650 miles long, which runs right across the plateau of Nuba Arabia, rising in the Harrâ of Alhabar and entering the Euphrates plain at Harrâ, and the Wâdî I-Dawâsa. These have formed since ancient times the two main routes of traffic in Central Arabia.

It is with the object of improving agriculture that the king of Najd is endeavouring to keep the Bedu to the soil. Every tribe or clan has therefore been allotted a definite area of ground near a well where huts are being erected and the ground planted. These new settlements are called hijâra. In the last ten years, since the revival of Wahhâbîsm, about 70 of these colonies with 2,000—10,000 inhabitants have been established; the most important is Irtawiya built in 1912; Rihâni (p. 198) gives a list of others. In this way not only is the cultivation of the land secured but the revenues of the state are increased; these consist of the zakât (10% on movable property), the customs, a fifth in case of war and (formerly) £60,000 subsidy from England. The coins in circulation, in addition to the Maria Theresa dollar, are the English and Turkish sovereign, the Indian rupee and copper coins of Omân of the last century, 60 of which go to the dollar. The once famous gold mines of the Banî Sulaim at al-Akîb, al-Mudjarra and Biha (Hamâdîn, p. 154, 54.) are now no longer of importance and unlike al-Yaman the country possesses no industries.

NEDJMA — NEDROMA

(with numerous plates and two sketch maps), p. 31 sqq.; or, TOVÌÉ, Nadir al-Ma'alih, Bari, 1925; H. Musti, Northern N.W. and Western N.W. of Tinmen, has since the dawn of the modern period been the most important town in the hilly country between the sea on the north, the lower course of the Tibesti on the east, the plain of Lalla Moghila on the south, and the Algero-Moroccan frontier on the west. It is the country known since the xvii century A.D. as the land of the Tréa, Berbers converted to Islam and Arab culture in the period of the Idrisids who were known in the middle ages as Kháníya. This little Berber bloc, speaking Arabic, forms with Nadríma, which is as it were the heart of it, a whole so homogeneous that they cannot be dealt with separately.

1. Past History. We may reject the chilialish suggestion given in "Nedroma "by Livi of Nadríma, which was first of all the name of a tribe, a section of the Kınya family of the Berber stock of the Bautili, or Bani Haddad, Berberes, at the commencement of the xvi century). The name is mentioned by al-Bajás (in the "Livi-Pravanel, Deser. d'Hist. Alm., Paris 1612, ed. de Goeje, p. 117) where we must understand by a-khás Nadríma "the people of the city (i.e. the Nadríma)." This passage, written in the xvi century, would tend to show how the name of the tribe of the Nadríma became attached to the little town which was then their principal centre.

Before this period however, Nadríma was the name of the town; for al-Bakri (xii century) gives it the same name and gives us a brief description of it; he qualifies it as "nadríma "a town" and not as simply jayya. In the time of al-Idrisí (cf. the "Bulla") in the xvi century, the town was a prosperous one surrounded by walls and had an important market. There is no doubt also — although these two geographers do not mention the fact — that Nadríma had a mosque.

In the xvi century A.D., the Muslim geographer al-Yasıch (Ala', ed. de Goeje, p. 18 and transl., Desr. d'Alm., Leyden 1660, p. 117) mentions a considerable town inhabited by Berbers at the extreme boundary of the lands ruled by the descendants of the Idrisid Muhammad b. Sulaimán. The name of this town, written in the Arabic text as ترود, might be Félâlasen or Félâlasen, but with difficulty "Fellohausen" (cf. R. Bassut, Nedrémah et les Tréa, p. 7, N. 2) on account of the present day pronunciation of the word by the natives of the country. René Bassut (肋) thinks this town could be identified with Nadríma, built on the N.W. flank of mount Félâlasen (modern local pronunciation) — the Félâlasen of the maps.

The Almoravids of the xiv—xvii centuries gave Nadríma an important mausoleum and a pulpit, in-spired, G. Maqris, says, by that of the Great Mosque of the Umayyads of Cordova as that of the Almohad Kutubiyah of Marrakech was later to be. This fact alone would suffice to show the importance in the Almoravid period of this Muslim centre which must have been the greatest in the land of the Kınya at this period.

Nadríma had access to the sea by several small ports, the most important of which, Homían, which also served Tinmen (cf. Maqris, Historia, xi, 4, 1925, p. 353—355) was however somewhat difficult of access from Nadríma, by the very steep N.W. flank of mount Tafira. This town had therefore rather to use the port of Maddrin (al-Bakri) which was only 10—12 miles away, easy of access at the end of a valley (Wādi Māšā) north of Nadríma.

In the Almohad period Nadríma as well as all the land of the Kınya, where Abd al-Mu'min, the first caliph of the Almohad dynasty, was born, must have been the object of special solicitude by these rulers, who were lords of Africa and Spain. Moreover it was on the Kınya, the tribe in which they originated, that the Almohad caliphs relied for support — like all Muslim rulers — these Berbers were the best armed and the most reliable supports of the throne of Marrakech. Although the name of the Kınya has now disappeared and has been replaced by that of Tréa, it would be too much, as we shall see, to think that the Kınya tribes disappeared in the wars of the Almohads.

The name of Tréa is quite recent; it appears, it seems, for the first time in a treaty of union — of which the Arabic text is given by R. Bassut (xvi, ed. de Goeje, p. 212—218) — between the Arab and Berber tribes of the N.W. of Tinmen and eastern Morocco, prepared in 955 (1549—1549) in anticipation of the struggle with the Spaniards, thus lords of Tinmen. In the text the Tréa are described as made up of many sections, the names of which are unfortunately not given. At later dates we again find this name of Tréa in various authors without being able to say to which it refers. As in the xvi—xvii centuries, Nadríma is still the capital and the principal town for these tribes.

Most of the Tréa tribes of to-day have preserved the names which the same Kınya tribes bore in the time of the caliph Abd al-Mu'min.

This little Berber capital was undoubtedly very large if we may judge by the traces still visible of its walls, which have hardly changed since the time of al-Bakri. It appears in the history of the middle ages, as in modern times as one of the chief towns of the province of which Tinmen was the capital, whose political and religious influence dominated it and whose destinies it followed.

When in the xvi—xvii centuries, Tinmen became the capital of the 'Abdalwâlidid kingdom, Nadríma, a peaceful town with a temperate climate, in a charming position, overlooking the blue sea a few miles away, because the country resort of the rulers and princes of the royal house. They had a fortified palace there (the 'akife) of which considerable remains of the surrounding wall still stand as well as the walls of the buildings. It commanded the town, standing quite near it on the south, and its ruins are still called ۸کعیف. It was to this place that Abd Ya'qub Tibi, renouncing the royal throne of Tinmen to the advantage of his two younger brothers Abd al-Salāl
and Abd Thabit, retired in 749 (1348) to live far from the court and politics in meditation and prayer (Du Kahidin, Gods, transl., iii. 422-39; Yağhi-b. Râhidin, Histoire des États de Timmern, ed. and transl. A. Bel, Algiers 1903-1910-1913, ii. 14, 18).

It was here that his son Abd Hammi II (reigned at Timmern 1359-1359) lived with him and the latter's son was born, Abd Tâshphil II who dethroned his father and reigned after him (1389-1393). This peaceful withdrawal of Abd Ya'qub to Nadrana was only to last about four years until the conquest of Timmern and Nadrana by the Marinids of Fez in 1352.

No king and apparently no prince was ever buried at Nadrana. There is however the mausoleum of a saint in the midst of the ruins of the palace. The individuals who went to visit it is believed to mark is called "Sidi Sultan". Neither the name, nor history, which does not mention him, nor legend, which simply makes him come from Egypt at a remote period, tells us anything of value about him. Nevertheless, in view of the numerous similar examples of the creation of holy places sacred to saints by the Berbers, who are of a deeply religious nature, and in particular by the Berbers of Nadrana and the Trara, it is easy to reconstruct the process of the foundation of the mausoleum in question. The sojourn in the palace of Nadrana of a great prince who had abandoned his rank for a life of devotion must have impressed the people of the time and long afterwards the spiritual merits of this "sultan" must have been respected, as one who had certainly been touched by the grace of Allah. When many years later the name and story of this devout king who had been forgotten, the place where he had lived, this zarqa, or hajja as it is still called, though in ruins, impregnated with his sanctity — his hajja — remained a holy place. It was only a very short step from this to localise the centre of radiation of this hajja in a little sanctuary in which prayers could be addressed to the unknown saint who is alleged to be buried there. At the present day the little white domes covering the so-called tomb of Sidi Sultan, under a very old wild olive tree is the goal of the pilgrimage of thousands of pilgrims; the come particularly to seek the care of a sick child; they expect to obtain, by the invocation of the name of Sidi Sultan, what is regarded as the power of the Allâh. Every year the negroes of Nadrana (who say that Sidi Sultan was a descendant of Bôla, the Prophet's wife) go there on a mass pilgrimage and sacrifice a bull calf; they hope thereby to obtain the regular rainfall needed by the district.

If we have dealt rather fully with this feature of the religious mentality of the people of Nadrana, it is because it is a sign, among many others, of one of the most characteristic aspects of the religion of the Berbers and of those of Trara. Morabiboun has so developed among them that René Basset in his study of Nadrana and the Trara has collected the mosques and sanctuaries of 206 holy men and 9 holy women, which is a large number for such a small area. This however does not prevent the people from observing, as well as they can the ritual duties of Sunni Islam and of zealously attending the many mosques in Nadrana and in the villages of the Trara.

The Encyclopædia of Islam, III., during the great popular mystical movement which spread through all North Africa, that the people of Nadrana and the Trara have developed this cult of saints and placed all their trust in these men of religion and Shâfi’i. Particular evidence of this was seen in the assembly on the banks of the Warda on the borders of the land of the Trara, of the tribes of the region of Nadrana and the adjoining country when in 1548 the holy man al-Ya’qub, whose genealogy is [q.v.] is a little to the west of Nadrana, led them against the Spaniards who then held Timmern.

As a matter of fact the Spaniards who were established in Orsa and Timmern were never able to occupy Nadrana and the land of the Trara. The Turks who finally occupied Timmern and the province were never always warmly welcomed there. On several occasions the sultans of Morocco were able to advance their frontiers in the lower Tafnia. However the Turks ended by establishing their authority which lasted until the conquest of Algeria by the French. Nadrana and the Trara did not at once accept the rule of the Abi al-Kadiir; they preferred to be under the sultans of Morocco. Later they took the side of the enemy against the French and it was in these mountains that Abi al-Kadiir often found a safe asylum when he was defeated, even after 1844 when the French occupied Nadrana, and notably in 1845 at the time of the famous affair of Sili Brâhim. (cf. P. Ame, L'Essai Abd al-Kadiir, Paris 1923, p. 207-214) a few miles west of Nadrana.

II. The Present. Nadrana, surrounded by gardens full of olive and other fruit-trees of various kinds, lies on terraces which lie on a well-marked hog's back sloping from N. to S. running from the Kasba, it is enclosed in a quadrilateral of about 15 to 20 hectares, which is still marked by the traces here and there of its old walls.

This town has preserved the appearance of a city of Western Islam with the Great Mosque dominating the houses with its high square minaret. A small square (zarqa) of which is open gives a little open space for the building and the central quarter which also bears the name of zarqa. Other smaller mosques are in the different quarters but they are hardly distinguished from the surrounding houses because they do not have minarets or only a very low one hardly rising above the roof. The chief of these mosques is the Djami al-Khadârîn, the "mosque of the potters", which is said to be the oldest of all. It and the Great Mosque are the only two in which the Friday juma is held. It is in the Bâni Zid quarter in the S.W. of the town. The Rû dibâdâ's quarter in the S.W. are the chapels of Sidi Ru Ali and Lâila Ayia; those of the Djamâ Haddâtân, I2. Arrayays, Dj. Sidi Syyâd are in the quarter of Darb al-Shi, to the north of the great mosque and town. At the hours of prayer all these mosques are filled with pious Muslims, many of whom possess a certain amount of Arab culture and religious knowledge; most of them are anxious to have a Muslim education and to give it to their children in addition to French education in the French elementary schools. Petty traders of experience and agriculturists tilling their fields, the people of Nadrana also include a considerable number of capable artisans. We shall here confine ourselves to mentioning two of the oldest and most important local industries.
of Nadrénna; that of the weavers (darrémen) and that of the potters (badarèmen).

The weavers of Nadrénna have retained their ancient loom with low warp without any modern improvements; not even the picker, and all the old equipment of their ancestors, notably the warper (nefara) and spinning wheel (niqdàma). On the loom, material and method of working, one may compare what is done in Tlemcen in identical fashion (cf. A. Bel and P. Picard, Le travail de la toline à Tlemcen, Algiers 1913, p. 63 sq.). The weavers of Nadrénna now make only woollen blankets (hiràddàna), white or decorated with stripes of colour, hooded cloaks with very short sleeves (dùllàna), the white dàra for men (particularly old men here) which is a long piece of wool without seams, which is wrapped round the body in a certain way. Nadrénna makes several kinds of dàra (cf. L'industrie de la toline, loc. cit., p. 105).

The potters have for centuries from father to son had their ateliers in the upper part of the town in the S.E. beside the Kasba. They make pots and other articles on wheels (maddàna) of the usual type driven by the foot; cooking pots of round shape without handles called cadra (whence the name badarèmen given to the potters), cooking dishes for ragouts (dàdgu) and for barley or when giselle cakes or different kinds of cakes (màddàna), portable ovens (madjau), thàrràna which is in the form of an oven with an earthenware damp above, shaped like the bottom of an inverted pot on which is poured the liquid part of these picamas, as thin as paper, which on account of their thinness are called by the Beduins in Oranès egg "aïches" and in Nadrénna as in the towns are called by the old Arabic name of thàd. When required the potters of Nadrénna also make other earthenware articles such as frozen pots (màbbàra) and the musical instrument called eggel, used by women, consisting of a large earthenware tube, one of the ends of which is closed by a skin stretched over it which is beaten.

The total population of the town of Nadrénna is 7,051 of whom 6,124 are Muslims, 850 Jews and about 200 Europeans (chiefly French). The females of this city usually have a Qatqam quarter but they live almost entirely in the two streets of Darb Al-Silâ and in another in the Bâeb Zaid quarter; there are petty traders, labourers and artisans (it is they who make the saddles for the mules and asses). The majority are of Berber origin; they are usually poor. Although they only marry with one another and live apart from the Muhummadans, the Jews live in houses quite like those of the Muhummadans, lead the same kind of life and use an Arabic dialect among themselves.

The negroes (tahal) who are not very numerous are called swarès (Guineans) and live in a separate quarter in the west centre of the town. They are in very humble circumstances, stokers of the house ovens or the furnaces of the baths, labourers and workmen. Although regarded as Muslims, their religious life is not at all regular and they are regarded, as elsewhere, as more or less of sorcerers.

The French element is very small; it consists almost entirely of officials and their families. They live by themselves in the public buildings (schools, gendarmerie etc.) and in European houses roofed with red tiles, which form an entirely distinct quarter outside the native town (to the N. and N.E.).

Nadrénna is the capital of a mixed commune. The civil administrator who lives there has under his authority the town and the surrounding neighborhood: Egdàna, Zawiyat Al-Mis, Sauhidya, in the West and N.N.W., Bâeb Mudir, B. Mâhî, B. Kâhîlî, B. Abîd, in the N.E., or S.E. the population of which numbers 47,324 native Muslims and 83 Europeans.

The other Târa tribes are not under Nadrénna; these are the Mardà, in the extreme N.W. who belong to the mixed commune of Marnà; the B. Wàrîfà, and the Ullaîsa Ghrîba, to that of Rench-Montagnac.

On Thursday which is the market-day there come into Nadrénna large numbers of people from all the country round; they bring in their stock, especially sheep, goats, cattle and mules and, according to the season, the produce of their fields and gardens (wheat and barley, almonds, carobs, figs, grapes, etc.) and of their flocks (wool and goat-skins, butter, curds etc.) as well as chickens, eggs and honey. The country artisans (men and women) bring in the articles they have manufactured (articles of woven gass, walking-sticks and little articles of wood carved with the knife with Berber designs), wool, articles of terracotta, notably Berber pottery decorated with geometrical designs, made by the women of Mâa (and similar to the other Berber pottery made by the women of Kalybîa, the Taâlî and elsewhere).

It is on market-day that one realises that Na-drènna is the economic centre of the whole district of the Târa and sees the variety of products of the soil and industry of these Berbers.

The abundance and variety of these products are not due only to the activity of the inhabitants; the climate and the soil also help. The climate is fairly equable: tempered by the proximity of the sea it is never extreme as in the case of continental districts. For the rest, the height of the hills, while sufficient to encourage rainfall, is not very great; it does not exceed 3,500 feet at Fallusen and 1,200 at Nadrénna. It is therefore only in the very hardest winters that snow for brief periods whitens the summits of the range. As to the soils of this coast range, which, between the depression with the Tâna in the east and the neighbouring plains of the Moroccan frontier in the west, runs from the Wad Mòllah (2 miles N. of Marnà) to the sea, they offer a certain variety in their nature and origin. Around the primary massif, which includes the highest peaks, Fallusen and Tàdrà, are several eruptive lavas (granite) and hills of secondary formation (Jurassic). The lower areas, especially the plains of the N.W., as far as the coast (where there are several old eruptive mamelons) and the depressions of the S.E. and E. along the Tâna, are middle Miocene formations.

The mountains also possess numerous perennial springs which feed little streams which irrigate the gardens; there are also various minerals, several of which have been recently or are still being exploited by Europeans.

It is due to the quality of the clay around Nadrénna and the granitic sand used for moulds that the pottery industry is one of the oldest and most prosperous in the town. The native vegetation is abundant and varied; in addition to the many varieties of trees of the highlands (notably sumach [shâsha]), the wood of which is exported.
to Europe through the port of Namaqua), we may mention many kinds of plants used for medicinal purposes or dying. It is for example thanks to the modest abounding in these regions and used by the natives for fusing the dwarf palm leaf that the people of Ulikhagharithia are able to make a fine and famous straw work (men's hats with high crowns and broad brims called *muttal* — baskets of various shapes all of dwarf palm leaves). All these articles are prettily decorated in red on the yellowish white foundation of the palm leaf; they are known and purchased by the natives of the whole of Orana and eastern Morocco.

It is also owing to the abundance of pasture in this hills that the rural dwellers, none of whom however are nomads, can raise so many flocks especially sheep. The wool from their flocks is almost entirely used in the country by the weavers of Nador and by the country women who by their weaving, using the loom with a high rail like all the women in North Africa, make a considerable part of the family's woollen garments. All these women are excellent spinners; they have a great reputation for the fineness of their work.

Even from chickens — to feed which the country women in the autumn collect the red fruit of the mastic which is very abundant in this country — people who are greedy of gain, make a profit; thousands of eggs are also exported every month from Nador via Nemaoura, to France and particularly to England.


**NEFT, the greatest satirist of the Ottomans.** Omer Efendi whose nom de plume (snadıja) was Neft came from the village of Baskale near Erzurum (Eastern Anatolia). Not much is known of his early life. He spent his early years in Erzurum where the Khadjis Laleh, an Ali [q.v.], who was a *seferdar,* there, became acquainted with him. During the reign of Ahmed I, he was appointed to the post of Agha, he worked for a time as a book-keeper. He failed in an attempt to gain the sultan's favour or that of his son, the unfortunate *Oghman II, with some brilliant *şahvans.* It was not till the reign of Murad IV that he gained the imperial favour but his malicious, sarcastic and indecent poems soon brought him into disgrace. He was appointed to the poll-tax office and later again became a member of the sultan's circle. His irritable impulse to make all the nobles of the empire the butt of his mockery made him a host of enemies. A satire on Bairam Pasha, the sultan's brother-in-law and viceroy, who had succeeded in being recalled from banishment and again attaining influence, must have hit the sultan as the snuff gave him sanction to the execution of the great poet. With the sultan's consent he was shut up in the same castle of the serai, then strangled and his body thrown into the sea. The year of his death is 1044 (beg. June 27, 1634), not 1045 as Hâdji Kallias, Fiefichte, ii. 185 wrongly says (cf. on the other hand his *Kazi oğlumın,* ili. 318 and 631 where the correct date is given).

Neft wrote Turkish and Persian with equal ease. His mastery of technique and natural poetical talent make him one of the greatest Ottoman poets; he is also undoubtedly one of the greatest, although hitherto little known satirists. The reason why he is so little known is that a scholarly edition with full annotations of his Turkish *Odmewe* entitled "Arrows of Fate," *Şahvans* *Neft,* has so far never been undertaken, so that at the present day hardly any one is able to understand the countless allusions to particular circumstances and the veiled attacks on the individuals dealt with. The publication of his poems demands a knowledge of the conditions of his period and particularly of life at court which it is hardly possible to attain and which it would be very difficult to gather from the existing sources. Many of his flashes of wit and allusions are very difficult to understand. Many of his poems are distinguished by an obscurity which can hardly be surpassed, and however great may be their importance for the social history of his time, they are of little value as evidence of his poetic gifts. The "Arrows of Fate" are directed against almost every one prominent in politics and society in his time. In G. O. D., iii. 241, J. v. Hamser has compiled a list of them. Some of his poems which pillory existing institutions, like the popular asans, the *Kalendar-dervishes* [q.v.] are, of value for social history. Hardly one important contemporary was able to escape the snare and ridicule. They were all made targets for his "Arrows of Fate" without mercy. He attacked the jurist (kâhm) particularly unsparingly.

Neft's Turkish *Odmewe* has been several times printed: two parts at Bâlik in 1553 and in 1669 at Stambul. Selections (with ample evidence of "Abd al-Hamid's censorship") were published by Abu 'l-Dâya Teswîkî in 1551 at Stambul. There are MSS. in European collections in London, Leyden and Vienna. Mr. Walter von der Porten now (1933) in Zurich owns two particularly beautiful and old MSS. A short *Şahvans* by Neft is mentioned in the catalogue of MSS. of the Leipzig council library by H. L. Fleischer (p. 547b). On his death, cf. *Faruküldük,* *Trlîkâhî-gülâmî Metûfe,* i., Stambul 1524, p. 668, and Nâsimî, *Târîkîh,* ii. 489.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the sources mentioned cf. also Glibb, *Ottoman Poems,* p. 208 and *H. O. F.,* iii. 232 sqq., the history of Nâsimî (*L. 386*) and Behsayl Mehemmed Tahir, *Oghman Müellifleri,* ii. 441 sqq. (according to which parts of his Persian *Odmewe* were published in the *Kâhi-emî Famin.*)

(*FRANZ BARDESCHER*)
NEFTA, a town in the south of Tunisia, lies 15 miles W. of Tozeur on the isthmus which separates the depressions of the Shott al-Djerid and the Shott Gharra. In the middle ages it was considered one of the principal centres of the land of Kaštîlya [q.v.] along with al-Hamma, Taqīyya, and Tozeur, which was the capital. It was regarded as a very old town. Nefta as a matter of fact replaced the town of Nephte or Aggaras-Nephte. The Roman town must now be buried in the sands close to the present town.

We may presume that there still existed in the early centuries of the Muslim period visible traces of the old town. Al-Bakri tells us that the town was built of large blocks of stone (qāṣṣār). The author of the Istīqār remarks that the wall which surrounds it as having been built by the ancients. The dam on the Wad Nefta is made of Roman blocks if it is not actually of Roman work (Tissot).

Memories of the pre-Islamic past were also found among the people of Nefta. Its large population was regarded as constituting for the larger part of descendants of Christians (Yaḵūṭī, Istīqār) who must have retained their faith for a considerable period. Ibn Khaldūn (Bīrārī, l. 146; transl. l. 231) remarks on the presence of Christians in the province of Kaštīlya at the end of the sixteenth century. The outlying position of this province perhaps explains the survival of a Christian colony, which was exceptional in Barbary. It is moreover worth noting that the attitude of the people of Nefta in religious matters has often been non-conformist. In the tenth century, according to Ibn Hawqal, Khāridjism still survived there; in the eleventh century, according to al-Bakri, the people of Nefta still professed their faith. Shuʿayb al-ʿAjamī says that this town is called Little Kafra. We shall see that at the present day it is an important centre of maraboutism.

The remoteness of the capital assured Nefta, like other towns of the Djerid, a fairly regular political independence. Like al-Hamma and Tozeur, it was long (probably from the period of anarchy which followed the Hīlāṭi invasion) governed by a council of notables, the president of which held the position of a feudal lord, indeed prince. In the xivth century this office was held by the family of the Banū Khalaf, who claimed to be of Ghassānid Arab origin. The Banū Khalaf and the people of the oasis whom they ruled maintained regular relations with the Sulaimid Arabs of the great tribe of Koṭb who periodically frequented the country around. A tradition of reciprocal service united these immigrant nomads and settled natives, the nomads defending at need against the attempts of the central power the settled population who in turn assured them their subsistence and the provision of their supplies. The central power when it felt sufficiently strong naturally endeavoured to bring this Djerid under its authority again. Nefta thus underwent alternatively periods of subjection and independence. In 744 (1343) the Ḥasfīdī caliph Abū Bakr sent his son Abū Ṭāb-Abbās who secured the submission of the people of Nefta by cutting down a part of their palm-trees and putting to death nearly the whole of the Banū Khalaf. A century later (845 = 1441) the caliph Abū ʿOmar ʿOthāmīn, having taken Nefta, sacked it, executed the chiefs of the Banū Khalaf and placed the town under a ṭālī on his own choice. If the partial destruction of the palm-trees—a classical procedure—had brought the people of Nefta to terms, it was because these trees supplied the greater part of their income. Very abundant springs (the largest of which rising north of the town forms the Wad Nefta) assured and still assure the life of this splendid oasis. There is at the present day a forest of 275,000 palm-trees there. Nefta was however also a commercial town, a wealthy emporium and a centre of the exchange of goods. Between the establishment of the Protectorate, trade was mainly carried on at two periods of the year: at the beginning of spring, when the expeditionary force which had come from Tunis to collect taxes could guarantee the security of the routes and at the end of summer when the marauding Arabs had left the country, to buy corn in the north.

Consisting of merchants and farmers with the important aristocracy of the Sharfī (q.v.), the population of Nefta (estimated at the present day at about 13,000) is distributed over eight quarters separated from one another by palm-groves. Each of the quarters has its mosque. Al-Bakri tells us that Nefta in his day had already a great mosque, several smaller places of worship and many baths. The places of worship belonging to the aṣwāya of the various brotherhoods are still characterized by their hemispherical or oval domes. The most important aṣwāya is that of the Kādirīa, an influential centre of worship. The architecture of the houses, the decoration of their façades with relieves of brick, contribute to give to Nefta an imposing appearance which is also characteristic of Tozeur.


NEḤĀWAND. [See Nuhwān.d.]

NERGISI, properly *Nergis-e Zād* Mirzā Mīr-Emēd Efendī, an important and distinctive stylist of the old school, poet and calligrapher. Born about 1000 (1592) in Sarajevo (Bošna Seni) the son of the nābī of Nergis Aḥmad. Efendī, he received his education in Constantinople where he attached himself as a pupil to Kāṭf-rūde Faizī Abū Ḥasīna. On the completion of his studies he served as mādīrī and nābī in Gabela, Mostar, Vidi Pazar (Novihāzat), Elbasan, Banyaluka and Mostar. He was on intimate terms with the Shaikh al-Islām Yahiyy Efendī. He travelled a great deal. Nergīs was appointed imperial historiographer (Alī nābī) when Murad IV set out for Baghdad on the campaign against Ertuğrul. He died on the march at Gebrie (Gelbe) on the Gulf of Isfand as the result of a fall from his horse and was buried there (1044 = 1634). The statement (Ḥabīb and Rıza) that he was buried in Aṭīb is not at all probable.

(M. Marçais)
Nergis is also a great calligrapher particularly celebrated for his speed in writing. There are works written by him in several libraries.

**Bibliography:**
- Brunsw Hahn, 'Osmunda Müellifleri,' ii. 440–444; Hahn, Kehit, a Karid, Istanbul, 1932, p. 245;

**Neshet** Kâzın Sülaínân, an Ottoman poet. He was born in Adrianople in 1148 (1733), the son of the poet Ahmad Kâzî Efendi, then in exile; the latter is known as Müşaffer-i Şehrîyarî. With his father, who had regained the sultan's favour by writing a shairî, which met with general approval, he came to Constantinople. He also accompanied his father on a journey to the Hidâm and the young Hâdim, on his way back, joined the Mewlânî order in Konya. After his father's death, he devoted himself to study, especially Persian, in order to understand the Mehemetî. In Persian, which he came to love passionately, he attained a high degree of perfection with the result that he had more pupils than an ordinary professor. In his house in Molla Gürânti, where he taught Persian and expounded the Mehemetî (Mehmetî-Kâzîî). He enjoyed great prestige among the people. Later he attached himself to the Nağşbendî Shaikh Brusewi Emin Efendi. He held a fief and therefore took part in 1182 (1768) in the Russian campaign. He could use the sword as well as the pen. Neshet died in 1222 (1807) and was buried outside the Top Kâpa.

He received the nom de plumes of Neshet from Djielî. Neshet was a moderate poet but an admirable teacher. No one could say an unkind word about him and they regarded at his smoking the îleb which was otherwise forbidden. As a poet, he was the most produced in Turkey in Persian and in Persian. Many of his pupils far surpassed him, such as Gašîb Dede. He left a Dîvâm which was printed in two parts by Bilik (1525 = 1836). His Müshaffî-i namers (about 20 in the Dîvâm) are distinctive in character; these are poems in which he bestowed epithets upon gifted pupils. In addition he left writings on the Nağşbîye: Tasfîn-i Mûrefî, Tasfîn-i akhî, Mâšâak al-Ammâr wa-Mânâhî al-Âmirî. His Tarîzîmî Şehirî dî Bâlî-i Molla Dzhêmî was printed at Constantinople in 1693. A biography of him by his pupil Pervet Efendi which was continued by Emin Efendi is said to exist.

**Bibliography:**
- Brunsw Hahn, 'Osmunda Müellifleri,' ii. 461; Muâlâma Nâdirî, Mehdım, No. 8, p. 74–76; Do, 'Osmunda Şairleri,' p. 64–70; Kâzîî-i Fuüsî, Istanbul 1312, ii. 230 (Erlâfî); Thurekýa, Siddîq-i othmanî, iv. 552; Sami, Kâzîî al-Âhim, vi. 4576; Mehmûd Djielî, 'Osmunda Edibiyat Nümânieleri,' Istanbul 1312, p. 263; Flügel, Die arabischen... Hist... in Wien, i. 886.

(Menzel)
NESHRI, MUSHEMID, an Ottoman historian, with the nom de plume (mukaddes) of Neshri, his origin is not definitely known. According to Ewliya Celebi (Neşîrîname, i. 247), he belonged to German-ei (q.v.), 'Ali, Khâbi al-Kâbîr, v. 225 sketches the career of a certain Mêhmed Mûsah Neshri among the 'ulûm of Murad II. According to him, the latter came at an early age to Brusa, studied there at the Selîme Medreses, was appointed muhterem there and died in Brusa, In view of the rarity of the name — indeed it is not otherwise known — it is probable that this Mehmed Mubene Neshri was the grandfather of the historian. As to the latter we know only that he was a teacher in Brusa and may be assumed that he died there in 920 (1520).

Neshri wrote under the title Diğhem-umûmî a history of the world in six parts, of which only the sixth, dealing with Ottoman history, seems to have survived. This, usually called Tevbih-Allah'Uthmânî, is obviously a compilation but the question is still unsettled whether Neshri was the compiler or whether he copied a compilation already in existence in order to add to it a sixth part (hitem) to his own compilation on the history of the world (cf. F. Wittek, in M. O. G., i. 130, who decides for the second hypothesis). These are suspicious echoes of the work of 'Abdul Halîm and of Bihîšî's Chronicle (cf. F. Bahringer, G. O. W., p. 43 sqq.) and it should perhaps be investigated whether the mukaddes Neshri made a popular version of Bihîšî's Tevbih which has been written in an elevated style, or the stylist Bihîšî rewrote the work of Neshri in elegant language. The sixth part of the Diğhem-umûmî is divided into three sections (Jâbârî): Evâni-i Orhun, Sadîkalî of Rûm and the House of 'Uthmân. The history of the Ottomans is narrated down to the time of Bâyazîd II; the work comes down only to the year 1485, that is, as far as his sources go, of which one went up to 1485. He concludes with a laudis in praise of the ruling sultan in his own time, the ruler of the period. Neshri had considerable influence on contemporaneous and later historiography and is frequently cited as a source, e.g. by 'Ali, Sa'd al-Dîn, Şâbûr-ibn and Mûnîzîm-Bashî. A full survey of the contents of the Tavbih of Neshri is given by Wittek, in M. O. G., i. 77-150. It has so far not been published. There are a number of good manuscripts in existence, e.g. in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Supp. Turc. No. 153, a very handsome MS.) and No. 1183 of the Charles Schefler collection, and in Vienna, Nat. Bibl., No. 986 (cf. Flügel, Kat., ii. 209). Specimens of his text have often been published; see a list of them in F. Bahringer, G. O. W., p. 39.


NESİMI, SAIYİD 'ALİ AL-DÎN (known as Nesimi, an early Ottoman poet and mystic, believed to have come from Nesim near Baghdad, whence his name Nesimi. As a place of this name no longer exists, it is not certain whether the place should not be derived simply from nezîm, "breath of wind". That Nesimi was of Turkish origin seems to be fairly certain although the "Sâjîd" before his name also points to Arab blood. Turkish was always familiar to him as Persian; for he wrote in both languages. Arabic poems are also ascribed to him. Little is known of his life; he fell in the reign of Murad I (1359-1360) as his biographers tell us. He was at first a member of the school of Shâhî Shhibi (247—334 = 861-945) but about 804 (1401) he became an enthusiastic follower of Fâdî Allah Harîfî (q.v.), with whom he was undoubtedly personally acquainted. He championed the views of his masters with ardour and at the risk of his life. The poet Redît, author (811 = 1408) of the Bokhâri-nâmâ (copies in London, cf. Rieu, Cat., p. 164 sqq. and Vienna, cf. Flügel, Kat., p. 461 and 462 (two MSS.), the second more complete) has a Gânjîn-nâmâ (in Vienna, cf. Flügel, Kat., i. 720) was his pupil. A certain Shâh Khanînî who was a dervish mystic is mentioned as his full brother. Nesimi met a cruel death in 820 (1417-1418) in Aleppo where he was stayed for his heretical poems on a fârâd of the extremely fanatical mullah. He is considered the greatest poet and preacher of the Hârij sect. His work consists of two collections of poems, one of which, the râzîn, is in Persian and the other in Turkish. The Turkish Dîvân consists of 350-500 gazelles and about 150 quatrains, but the existing MSS. differ considerably from the printed edition (Stanimirovic 1298 = 1881). No scholarly edition has been made of them. The Persian Divan has not been examined at all. Nesimi's spiritual influence on the dervish system of the earlier Ottoman empire was considerable. The pro-Alît dâwâ in particular honour Nesimi as one of their masters, testimony to whose far-reaching influence is found even in the earlier European travellers like Giov. Antonio Menavino (c. 1540; cf. F. Bahringer, in Isl., xi. 10, note 1, from which it is evident that Nicolas de Nicolay copied him and therefore cannot be regarded as an independent source, as Gibb, H. O. F., i. 535 sqq. thought) and Sir Paul Remusat (18th century; cf. Gibb, H. O. F., i. 557 sqq.). Nesimi's importance as a poet and mystic can only be estimated and realized in connection with the study of the older Hârij texts, among which a most important one is that mentioned but not recognized by W. Petrus, Pers. Handbuch, Berlin, p. 264 sq., No. 223 by Saiyid 'Ali al-Dîn (d. 822 = 1419) because it might show the connection of the Hârijî with the Bektâshî. Nesimi's poems were made popular in earlier times, especially by the wandering dervish orders [q.v.] and were known to every one.

Bibliography: Gibb, H. O. F., i. 343 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., i. 124 sqq.; also the Ottoman biographers of poets who however contribute practically nothing to the life history of Nesimi. (Franz Bahringer)

NESTORIANS. The Christian community (sâkidî) which we know as Nestorians is at the present day better known under the name of Mihrân or al-Millî. Down to the year 1014 they lived in the central part of Kurdistan which lies between Mâsîl (see MAŠîL), Wân and Urmîyâ (see ORMILIA). Their main nucleus was represented by the highland Nestorians, in practice independent, living in the inaccessible regions of the highlands on the middle course of the Great Zâb, Tîbân, Tîkâm, Tâghub, Dîjît, Dîza, Urâ, Sabâlakan, Bêz, etc. Outside of this national centre the Nestorians are
found scattered in enclaves among the Muslim
medieval population, Kurd and Persian, of the
neighbouring districts: Gavar, Tergawar, Margawar, 
Shamtenar [e. v.]; on the plateau of Urmia (some 
sixty villages), in this town itself; finally in the
north at Salmas, Bash'kala's Khooshb and in the
south in Mawili and around it (Alkosh etc.).

Geography. It may be useful here to touch on
some of the salient features of the Nestorian country
in the strict sense, which is but very little known.
We mean by this the area on both sides of the
middle course of the Great Zab, in the part where it
descends towards the east, between 37° and
37° 30' N., 43° 30' and 44° E. In Layard (Ni'merek, I)
we have a description of the Nestorian districts
on the right bank: the upper Tiyari with Cambi
and the greater part of the Lower Tiyari
with Aghist and Lisan. We shall give here a
general account of those on the left bank, namely,
going from N. to S. and from W. to E.: Diz, 
Kiu, the eastern part of the Lower Tiyari, Tal,
Walto, Tkhuna (with Tkhud); further to the east,
Diit, Baz and lastly Ishturan. All these districts
lie in the folds of the massif which the Turks
know by the general name of Tijik Deigh, but
which for the native has a more precise
signification. The Tijik Deigh, to some degree forms
a curve in the inverse direction of the arc of
the Great Zab.

History. The teaching of the Nestorians, who
were very active missionaries, was at one time
very widely disseminated in Asia. An inscription
in Chinese and Syriac was discovered at Singanfu.
At Travancore, in South India, there is still a
Nestorian community in existence. It was under
the Sassanians that the Nestorians played an
important part. It is true that under Shahpur II (309-
379), Vardagird I (399-420) and Bahram V
(420-438) severe persecutions took place for
various reasons, but the extraordinary spread of
the sect was not the least. On the other hand,
purely political reasons, fear of Byzantine influence,
made the Persian government distrustful of them.
We know for example, that the Byzantine emperor
demanded from Bahram V and Khosraw I the
free exercise of the Christian religion. Permanent
good relations between the Nestorian Church and
the state therefore date only from the declaration
of independence of the Eastern Syrian Church
under a Catholico of Seleucia with a dyophysite
confession of faith. The most flourishing period
of Nestorianism was therefore in the reign of
Hormizd IV and at the beginning of the reign
of Khosraw II, i.e. from 579 to 605 A. D. Under
the influence of Gabriel of Singar, who had gone
crossed to the Catholicon, Shahpur II began to
persecute the Nestorians; one result was that from
609 to 628, the year of Khosrau's death, the
position of Catholico remained vacant. Two events
in this period are of special importance to us.
The first was the establishment of Christianity in
Central Kurdistan, where we still find direct and
indirect traces of it at every step: churches,
monasteries, traditions, place-names. In the fifth
century, the faith gained ground daily among the
people of the high plateaux of Iran proper and
among the Kurds. Petiton (4. 447) conducted
a very successful missionary campaign in these
mountains, which was crowned by his martyrdom.
Emulating him, Saba, the "teacher of the breast",
went among the Kurds, who were sun-worshippers.

His eloquence supported by numerous miracles
won many converts (J. Labouret, Le Christianisme
dans l'Empire Pers en vue de la Dynastie Sassanide,
Paris 1904). Let us not forget this first Nestorian
advance into Kurdistan. The oldest Nestorian
churches in Central Kurdistan date from the fourth
and fifth centuries. These are Mar Zayn at Dlijii,
Mar Bogh at Ill; Mar Saha (ruins) at Kofenes;
Miri Memi at Ornam. The monastery and church
of Mar Saha at Aghist in Tiyari were also
held in great veneration but we do not know
that. Secondly we must note here how relations
were established between the Nestorians and Islam (Ter
Andrac, Der Ursprung des Islam und des Christentums,
Uppsala 1936). The part played by the Nestorians at a certain period under the Sassanians
explains the conversion of the Yaman to Nestorianism
at its conquest by the Persian general Wahriz in
597. It was in the Nestorian form that Christianity
penetrated into Arabia in the zone of Persian
influence, i.e. from Hadramawi to Palmyra.
We know many Islamic Nestorians of the
eastern shore of Arabia. The first to be founded
was that of 'Omran ( sce of Councils 424, 544,
576, 676). A Christian community on the island
of Socotra, need not to be considered as part of the
Catholics of Persia. Relations with Persia were
established by sea. The time of Muhammad the
South Arabian church was already Nestorian. We
have definite evidence of this in the fact that
Sajir, prince of Nadjran, came with the bishop
Labysfah to Muhammad to seek favours. Bar Hebraeus
who records the incident adds that the Prophet
gave them a document ordering the Arabs to see
that no injury was done to the Christians and to
help them to rebuild their churches. The priests
and monks were to be exempt from the poll-tax,
which besides was not in general to exceed 4 sikhs
for the poor and 12 for the state. According to
another source, the bishop only wrote to Muhammad.
A passage in a letter of Labysfah III (647-658)
shows that the relations between Arabs and
Nestorians were very good. This may be attributed
to the fact that the Christology of the Nestorians
was much more acceptable to the Musli-,
man than that of the moneophysites. Every Nestorian
church in the east possessed its own version of
the letter of protection alluded to have been given
by the Prophet (cf. for example that given by
George Dav, Malech in his History of the Syrian
Nation and the Old Evangelical-Apostolic Church
of the East). In any case this letter did not pre-
vent (see below) the proclamation of the ghadir
from which the Nestorians later suffered so much.
The life of the Nestorian Church during the
period from the Muhammadan conquest to the
establishment of the Mongols need not detain us
here, as it is part of the religious history of the
Christian sects. We need only mention as particu-
larly concerning Adherbajjjan that the Jacobite
and Nestorian rites were rivals there. Thus from
630 to 1265 we have a line of Jacobite bishops.
We know also (Assman, Bibl., Or., illi, illi, 707) of
Nestorian bishops both to the east of Lake Urmia
and also in the country of Lake Whit and Central
Kurdistan. It is not always easy to identify the
names found there. We have good evidence of
the antiquity of Nestorianism in Salammas where
there is in the burial ground of Khosrow an
epitaph of the 8th century recording the name of
Khvorv Shoklay, "the student Khosraw" (cf.
Duval, Dialecte més-avestan, 1885). Under the Mongols we find at first that the Nestorian priests (parshans) were treated with consideration at the taking of Bagdad (Hamer, Jochen, ii. 142). We know also that Hulagu's wife was a Christian: at the taking of Arbil, the son of an important Nestorian metropolitan (Abadaghian) was under it, the launces of the Mongol horsemen bore little crosses. Later, in proportion as the Mongol army was converted to Islam, the Nestorians became subjected to persecution, particularly after the invasion of Timur they sought refuge in the mountains of Kurdistan from which they did not begin to emerge till the beginning of the 19th century when they spread eastwards towards the region of Urmia and S. E. towards Mawzi. Duval (op. cit., p. 9, note 4) gives notes on the different residences of the Nestorian patriarchs after the taking of Bagdad in 1258. It was under the Patriarch Simeon IV in 1450, that an innovation was introduced, making the episcopate hereditary; this produced a schism in the Nestorian community in 1551 when Sulakia was elected in opposition to Simeon Buxa-Barma. From this date the term "Chaldæans" henceforth applied to those Nestorians who recognised the supremacy of Rome, while English and American writers speak constantly of the "Assyrians"; and lastly the Nestorians themselves like to be called Suriit. In Russian the name used is aktor. In the second half of the 18th century, the bishop Mər Vafis recognised the authority of Rome and received the title of Catholic Patriarch of Babylon and Chaldaea, while one of his near relatives, elected patriarch of the Nestorians and remaining faithful to this rite, was enthroned under the name, henceforth hereditary, of Mər Shlmun and at once set out for the mountains of Central Kurdistan, where his residence was sometimes at Kuchna and sometimes at Lujlandar. Thus originated this quasi-autonomous community of Nestorian highlanders in which an ecclesiastical authority exists alongside of a purely tribal organisation. Indeed while the supreme power is in the hands of a hereditary Mər Shlmun (passing from uncle to nephew) having the title of pātrārka as-mawzān, who was consecrated patriarch by the Metropolitan Mər Hmān, living in Dera Resk at Shamāzn, each tribe (zābān) had alongside of a bishop (zādīn), the ecclesiastical chief, a msqlk or lay chief, distinguished by peacock feathers fixed on his conical felt hat, a characteristic feature of dress. The custom of the men arranging their hair in little pigtails may also be mentioned. The msqlk had power to declare war on another tribe and to conclude peace.

The tribal organisation and mode of life of these highlanders have caused some writers to give them the name of "Christian Kurds" (Garzoni, Lereb). A. Wigram in the introduction to his History of the Assyrian Church thinks that some at least of the Christians of Hakkâri (cf. Kurds) are of Kurds origin although they deny it vigorously. On the other hand, there are Kurds tribes who remember that they once were Christians. Other writers (Grant), led astray perhaps by the historic aspect of Nestorian society, the names and certain Biblical traditions, in giving evidence in support of the hypothesis that the Nestorians are the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel. We know however which actually, are the Jewish communities in Kurdistan, quite distinct from the Christian groups in dress and customs. Only their language is also a Neo-Aramaic dialect. — The Highland Nestorians annually pay Mər Shlmun a contribution called rizg ḏabīta. The arrears due to the Turkish treasury, were simply left to mount up. Caint (p. 749—751), speaking of the autonomous tribes, gives the total of arrears as already 100,000 £T in his time. There was besides somewhere in the Nestorian country (cf. Lailayan, who gives a photograph) a "truck of the collector of taxes" marking the limit beyond which this official never risked going. The relations of the Nestorian hillmen with their Kurdish neighbours were no worse than those of the highlanders with one another usually are. The interest of the tribe came before every consideration of religion, so that ad hoc alliances could be concluded between the Kurds and the Nestorians for joint action against their co-religionists. "The grass grows quickly over the blood split in a just battle". A kind of fair play is therefore the ruling principle of the inter-tribal code. There are, it is true, exceptional cases. The pan-Islamism of 'Ahd al-Ḥamid had its unpleasant repercussions in Kurdistan; the Turkish officials appointed there after the revolution of 1907 only complicated the position still further. Since the affairs of the Nestorians and the Kurds were conducted on a tribal basis, we find the door of the patriarch's residence open to Kurds and Nestorians indiscriminately, who come to settle their disputes and hospitality is offered to all alike. On the other hand, we find the Nestorians seeking the good offices of Shaikh Salim of Barzan known as the "Christian Shaikh", who was executed by the Turks in Mawzi at the beginning of the War.

The Nestorians and the Djilūš. Even before the official outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Turkey, in August 1914, the patriarch Mər Shlmun was invited by Djewdet Bey, the wali of Wān, to come to see him. Presents were lavished upon him and assurances given that all the grievances of the Nestorians would be redressed. As a result of the proclamation of the Djilūš however, the atmosphere became heavy in Kūrdisht. In November, Turkey entered the war and the persecution of the Nestorians of Alakū (Bushkāna) began at once. In Persian fighting broke out between the Christians of the Urmia region and the Bekāka Kurds. At the end of 1914, the Russians evacuated Urmia and Salamas. Those Christians who did not save themselves in time by going to Djilūš perished in large numbers. As to the Nestorians of the highlands, although the massacres and deportations of Armenians were at their height, the Turks endeavoured to attach the Patriarch to their side and to secure the loyalty of the Nestorians. Complete educational freedom, good riles, subsidies and grants of land, the Patriarch and so the bishops and miliks, all these things were promised in vain. Mər Shlmun retired to the particularly inaccessible district of Dirish from which the Patriarch's personal bodyguard had always been recruited. About this time an "accidental" shot killed Mər Shlmun's uncle Nestoros, who was, it was said, urging a more conciliatory policy towards the Turks. After an interview, which decided matters, with the Russian commander at Mahsudjik, near Salamas, the Patriarch on May 10, 1915, issued the order for mobilisation. The fortune of war resulted in the Nestorians, at first encouraged by the Russian successes at Wān and Urmia at the beginning
of the summer, being left to their own resources. To be brief, with the help of the Baronial Kurds, the Turks sacked Tikhts, Tikta, Bome, Buns, and Baa. We may note especially the destruction of the irrigation canals exactly as was done in Sargon's campaign in the same region. The famous church of Mr. Zaia at Djilu, of the fourth century, was desecrated for the first time in its long history. Interesting **ex voto**, Chinese vases, brought there in early days by missionaries, disappeared. The inviolability enjoyed by Mr. Zaia is said to have been due to a letter guaranteeing it written on a piece of cloth, attributed to the Prophet (cf. above). After this disaster the Nestorians withdrew to their summer pastures, at a height of 10,000 feet. This first difficulty however was surmounted, thanks to the kindness of the Kurds, with insufficient food and no salt, the Nestorians nevertheless held out. The Patriarch, taking refuge on the plateau of Shina, endured privations which were even harder for him who could not eat meat (even the mother of the patriarch appears not to have eaten meat). The Nestorian **vulgaris** of Gawar were massacred at this time under the orders of Nuri Bey. Finally in October 1915 a skillful retreat was carried through the Kurds were actually holding the approaches to the Persian frontier. A detour was effected towards Allahk in the south via Koteanis (Berwar) and the bridges were burned after crossing the Great Zan. The Kurds continued however in that part of them. Harassed by the use of the natural bridge of Hererak, but driven back by Maliki Khishkhan of TIQTU whose bravery is destined to become legendary. In the month of November the exodus of the Nestorians was completed and they were safe within the Russian lines at Salamacs. The Russian authorities organised assistance for the refugees, who to the number of 40,000 were settled in the Persian districts of Khobi-Salama and Urumya where they remained till 1918. After the departure of the Russians as a result of the revolution, the Nestorians formed detachments with the help of Russian munitions and instructors and opposed the advance into the western districts of the Turks led by All Nishan Pasha. Towards the end of 1918 however, their munitions being exhausted, the Nestorians left the region of Urumya via Sichau-Sali's-Baidar to Hasamshen where the English forces then were. From there the refugees were sent to the concentration camp of Baksha near Hasamshen. The Patriarch was no longer alive. Led into an ambush by the Shidk Kurd chief lani M. Agha Simkho, Mr. Shirm-an was treacherously assassinated at Koma Shdrn on March 4, 1918.

The Nestorian community is now living in scattered groups in the Irrak, Persia, Syria etc. The post-war history of the Nestorians is closely bound up with the problem of the wilaya at Mawil, finally attached to the Irrak. The line adopted for the northern boundary of the wilaya in question, however, leaves the Nestorian districts to Turkey and it is very unlikely that they can return there. The material qualities of the Nestorians were used by the British authorities who raised four battalions from them, which were very useful especially at the beginning of their establishment in the 1918.

In conclusion a few words should be said about the Nestorians of the region of Lake Urumya. Those of Salama believe (Dural, op. cit.) that they are aborigines converted in the early centuries of our era. In 1883 there were however only fifteen Nestorian families, the remaining 3,000 having become Roman Catholics under the bishop Mar Isab, 1883, 1795. As to the region of the plateau of Urumya, they preserve a tradition according to which their immediate ancestors came down from the mountains five or six centuries ago, which corresponds very closely to historic fact. The Nestorians of Urumya have been the object of lively competition among the missions, of which the Presbyterian was first established (1833). The Roman Catholic Lazarists followed in 1863 and finally an Orthodox mission, the brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, began work in 1905. At one time shortly before the War, there were also Anglican and Catherian missions. The work of the missions has made quite appreciable modifications not only in the beliefs of this ancient Christian community but also in its life and customs. Although little information has been preserved on the subject, there is reason to believe that the Nestorians of Urumya also lived under the authority of **ullaha**, who were recognised by the Shias as the official representatives of the community. We have seen a number of **firooan** preserved in the family of Dr. Johanna Malik. They were administered according to the old collection of canon law called **Samhunor** of which Shamsi Mani Kalets published a new edition in 1916 at the American Mission Press.

This is probably only one of the versions of the Syriac, which we know in the Atish-Chaldean addition with its wealth of learning. In the eyes of the Muslim authorities the Nestorians were **simani** (shmoni; cf. shinna) and their position was regulated by Muhammadan law. With the coming of the missionaries, the position gradually changed. The **ullaha** were replaced by **millet bidjki** each dependent on its respective mission. The Persian government had to appoint a **servez**, an official whose special duty was to deal with foreigners and those under their protection. During the War a national council called **mofus** was organised, which dealt not only with the defence of Christian interests before the local authorities but, especially after the addition to its numbers of the Nestorians from Turkey, acquired a certain political character but latter disappeared in the general debacle. — In conclusion it should be mentioned that in the present article we have confined ourselves mainly to the Nestorian highlanders of Central Kurdistân. The historical phenomenon that we have been led to study in this connection is far from being so limited and simple, for it demands not only consideration of linguistic problems, the ramifications of which go back to a remote past (through Aramaic), but also of facts of ethnology even less known which are implied in the idea of Nestorianism. Finally the geographical area is also enormous: if we remember for example the epigraphic material from Russian Central Asia.

**Bibliography**; Church history: Hoffmann, **Amschur und syrischem Aktion pästisch.** Mörtzer, Leipzig 1880 (contains a full and valuable bibliography in the references); Wigram, **History of the Assyrian Church.** L. O'Reilly, The Syrian Church and Fathers; J. Labours, **Le Chrétien pur l'Empire Perse,** Paris 1904; G. D. Molech, **History of the Syrian Nation and the Old Evangel.** Apostol. Church of the East; Baudet, **The Nestorians and their...**
NEWI-ZADE "ÂATÌ" [q.v.]

NEWI-ZADE "ÂATÌ", AY Notices, an Ottoman author and poet, better known as "ÂATÌ" with the nom de plume Newi-zade, i.e. son of "Newi", was born in 1915 (1232 H) in Stambul, as the son of the celebrated "Newi" [q.v.], after the death of his father from whom he received his early education, he placed himself under Khâfi Allah Efendi, the compiler of an anthology, and later under Akhi-zade. "ÂATÌ" al-Halim Efendi. He then joined the "Ulema", but did not attain any of the higher offices. After becoming a muallim, he was appointed a judge and served in this capacity in a number of Rumelian towns like Lofta, Silistra, Ruščuk, Tarnovo, Monastir (Bitola).
Trikkala and Ushkūb (Skopje).: Soon after his retirement from this sphere of activity he died in 1041 (1634) in his native city of Stambul; here he was buried beside his father.

'Aṭṭār' is best known for his continuation (jāfārī) in Turkish of Ṭaḥṣīlūsūrūtāda's Shāhī Ḥāfuẓ al-'Alāmīnaya. This work, entitled Ḥadīth al-'Alāmīnaya fi Taḫṣīl Ṭaḥṣīlūsūrūtāda's contains, in addition to a supplement to the Shāhī Ḥāfuẓ in which a place is given to any scholars of the title of Salāhānī and Solm in II, overlooked by Ṭaḥṣīlūsūrūtāda, the biographies of Ottoman 'Ulema' and dervish shaykhs down to the reign of Mūsā IV (on the contents see C. F. Bhabing, G. O. W., p. 172). Death prevented the author from continuing his work which has been taken up by others. 'Aṭṭār's book contains 949 biographies. It is written in a very archaic style with an important amount of Persian, which was popular at the time. 'Aṭṭār also enjoyed a great reputation as a poet. He wrote a quintet (khamsa) on the contents of which see Gibb, H. R. P., ii. 334. The Ḥadīth al-'Alāmīnaya, manuscripts of which are also common (cf. C. F. Bhabing, G. O. W., p. 172 to which may now be added Stambol, LlE, K. c., Nos. 339, was printed at Stambol (1577, p. 24) in 1686. The poetry still awaits a printer. 'Aṭṭār's significance as a prose writer is much greater than as a poet.

Bibliography: C. F. Bhabing, G. O. W., p. 171 sq. and the works there given, especially J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., iii, 475; Gibb, H. R. P., iii, 334; Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 427 (where he is wrongly, according to Wustenfald, G. A. W., called Muhammad); Ḥāfiẓ Khātif, Fr. Antiq., ii. 168; Rīdī, Turātīr, p. 70 sq.; Māfī, K. c., Cairo 1824, iv. 263.

(Frāṇz Babering)

NIEBELA (NIEBLA), a little town in the S. W. of Spain, 45 miles W. of Seville on the right bank of the Rio Tinto. Now much decayed, it has less than 2,000 inhabitants and is in the juridical district of Moguer, in the province of Huelva. It is the ancient Illipa. In the Visigothic period it was the seat of a bishop. In the Muslim period it enjoyed considerable prosperity. It formed part of the district of al-Sharaf (Al-rasif) and was also called al-Humā, "the red," no doubt from the colour of its ramparts and of the water of its river. It was particularly an olive-growing centre. The garrison was also cultivated there and deposits of alum and of sulphate of iron were worked.

Niebla was taken in 947 (1535) by the Al-Asad, son of Mūsā b. Nusair (q.v.). In 1068 (1665) it was the starting point of the rising of Sa'd al-Asfar al-Yaḥyūb who seized Seville but was soon defeated and slain by the troops of Abd al-Rahmān I. The town in 947 (1535) suffered from a visit of the Normans (Magrāz; q.v.). In 1509 (507) it rebelled against the Umayyads; it was however retaken by force of arms in 1509 (517) by order of Abū al-Rahman al-Nasir by his general Bādr al-Din. At the time of the fall of the Caliphate, it became the capital of a little kingdom formed in 1044 (1634) by Abū l-'Ala al-Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā, who took the title of al-Dawla, which also comprised the lands of Huelva and of djāhīl al-Aswān (Gibraltore). This prince died in 1044 (1641) was succeeded by his brother Mūsā al-Dawla. The 'Aḥlāškī sovereignty of Seville al-Muwašād (q.v.) soon displayed his desire to annex the principality of Niebla and made several raids into it. Izz al-Dawla had to abandon his capital and take refuge with the lord of Córdoba. Abu l-'Ala al-Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā, a nephew of Izz al-Dawla, who at first sought peace from al-Muwašād by paying him tribute but was forced two years later in 1053 (1645) to abandon his.
principally to the ruler of Seville and joined his uncle in Cordova. Niebla passed a little later to the Almohads (q.v.). When the power of this dynasty began to collapse in Spain, it became the headquarters of another rebel, Yusuf b. Ahmad al-Birwaghi (or al-Burjidi), who in 1146 finally submitted to the Almohad general Barraiz al-Muslihi and went five years later to Sada on the summons of 'Abd al-Mumin. A few years later Yusuf al-Birwaghi, maintained as governor of Niebla by the Almohads, rebelled and the town was retaken in 1154 by the governors of Seville and of Cordova, Vahy b. Vaghmarit, who executed 'Abd al-Mumin. This massacre was condemned by 'Abd al-Mumin who had Vahy brought in chains to Morocco and then exiled to Tlemcen.

Niebla remained under Muslim rule until 1237, when it was taken after six months siege by Alfonso X and became finally Christian.


(See *Lévi-Provençal*, *Niffar* (Niphar), a ruined site in southern Spain, in 32° 11' N. lat. and 45° to East Long. (Greenwich), now in the hands of Afek in the district of 'Akk, where the ancient town of the Jews is supposed to have been. Niphar corresponds with s. J. Oppert was the first to point out, to the town of Niphar well known from numismatic inscriptions, one of the oldest and most important places in Babylonia. Its great importance was not political but religious, as the temple of the chief deity of the town formed a sort of central sanctuary or place of pilgrimage for the whole of Babylonia, to which almost all the important sovereigns of the period before Hammurapi, and Hammurapi himself, as well as the Kassite kings and many later rulers like Assurbanipal, dedicated gifts.

Niphar's period of greatest prosperity lay in the 7th century B.C. before Hammurapi; but it remained an important city down to the last Babylonian and Achaemenid rulers and an important commercial centre with a very mixed population which gave it a somewhat cosmopolitan character. In the 6th century B.C., under Artaxerxes I and Darius II, we find in it an important business and banking house, the firm of Mursaght and Sons to whose activities many documents still bear eloquent testimony. Niphar still continued to flourish under the Seleucids and Arsacids as buildings of this period show, quite apart from the numismatic evidence. It is not directly mentioned by Greek or Roman writers, but the name of the district of Niphar may be concealed in nipparsu, the name of a town which Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, xxviii, 10, 175) says is of Persian (i.e., presumably Parthian) origin.

In the Babylonian Talmud Nippur appears as Niphar (‘Niphar’) and Niphur (‘Niphur’); the latter term corresponds to that which is now most usual: Nippur. In the passage in question in the Babylonian Talmud (Yoma, 110b) we read: *Kalneh* (‘Kalneh’) is Naphar (Naphar) Ninni (‘Ninni’); the qualification Ninni (‘Ninni’) is obscure; Dales’ explanation in *O. L.*, xi. 359 as Nimm falls to the ground as the name of this deity is now known to read Ninmar. The basis of the equation: Kalneh (Gen. x. 10) = Nippur is not yet satisfactory. A Babylonian place-name Kalneh has so far not been found in cuneiform inscriptions.

Nippur was also an inhabited place in Muslim times; for example we find it mentioned in 38 (659) on the occasion of a rising against the caliph 'Ali (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 3425, 3424) as well as during the Khurābī troubles (op. cit., ii. 939-7), cf. also Ybhli, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 275, 798 and ibn al-Fahri, in *B.G.A.*, i. 210. In the later middle ages we find Nippur mentioned as a Nestorian bishopric in the chronicles of the Patriarcha *Abūhār* *Fawārīsh*, *zgrab* al-Maghrib, ed. Gissiandos, Rome 1897 and 1899) of 'Amr b. Mattū, p. 83; *95* and of Mār b. Salimān, in the period 1000-1058 A.D. (cf. also Sachau, in *Abb. Pr.* Akk. W., 1909, NV. i, p. 31). When the town was abandoned by its inhabitants and became completely desolate we do not know. It probably was the result of one of the Mongol invasions, that under Hulagu or that under Tamerlane, which dealt their death-blow to so many flourishing places in Mesopotamia.

The ruins of Nippur are next to those of Babylon and al-Warkā (q.v.) the most extensive in the whole of the Babylonian plain; they cover an area of almost 180 acres. The first European to visit them was W. K. Loftus who spent some time here in 1850 and came back again in 1854 (see the *Bibl.* for his report). A year later than Loftus, in Jan 1851, Layard was in Nippur and spent two weeks digging but with little success because Layard, paying too little attention to the difference between Assyrian and Babylonian mounds, did not dig deep enough and only turned over the cemetery of a people who had settled here only in the last centuries of antiquity, under the Assyrians.

The University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia) was the first to undertake a methodical investigation of the ruins and in four expeditions from 1888 to 1900 (1888-1889, 1889-1890, 1890-1891 and 1891-1892) under the leadership of Petrie, Haynes and Hilprecht carried out excavations on a large scale. On the results of this intensive work see Hilprecht’s full report in *Explanations etc.* (see *Bibl.*), p. 299 sq.

On the topography of Nippur see, in addition to the descriptions by Loftus and Layard, especially Petrie, op. cit., ii. 104 sq.; Hilprecht, op. cit., p. 450 sq. and notably Fisher, op. cit.; cf. also King, op. cit., p. 83-86. The American expedition also found an ancient Babylonian plan of Nippur which Hilprecht, op. cit., p. 318 (reproduced in *Zehnpfund*, op. cit., p. 66) published, more distinct in Fisher, op. cit., pl. 1. This plan has been since 1926 in the possession of the University of Jena with the rest of Hilprecht’s private Assyriological collection; see Zimmer, in *Z.A.*, xxxvii.
The sight of the ruins is very impressive; they rise like a range of hills in close formation from 30—80 feet above the plain, culminating in the core of Bint al-Amir 95 feet high, the sigrunat of the chief temple.

The most imposing part of the whole eastern quarter is the sigrunat of I-m-Khassg, still 95 feet high, which the inhabitants for some reason now forgotten call Bint al-Amir, the "prince's daughter." The triangular mound south of the sanctuary proper marks the site of the great temple library, about a twelfth of which, yielding some 25,000 cuneiform tablets and fragments, has been excavated. The western half of the inner city contains the residential quarters, while the bazaars, business houses and private dwellings of its history is still obscure, as in the course of centuries it was repeatedly resettled. In the Parthian period a large cemetery extended over a considerable part of the clay buildings which had fallen to pieces there.


In addition to the great Enlil temple E-kur there were a number of other highly venerated temples in Nippur.

According to the cuneiform inscriptions, Nippur must have in ancient times lain on the Euphrates itself or at least in its immediate vicinity (cf. e.g., O. L. Z., XX, 142, note 1); this fact forces us to the assumption that this river in the Babylonian period must have taken a much more easterly course below Babylon than in the middle ages and present day. The inner city is divided into two parts by a canal now dry but once navigable, which the natives call Shatt al-Nil. This was an important watercourse which, according to Hilprecht, was in many places at one time 20—25 feet deep and 150—190 feet broad and which the modern inhabitants rightly describe not as a mere nahr (stream, canal) but as shatt (river).

According to the medieval Arab geographers Nahru al-Nil was the name of one of the canals led off from the Euphrates to the Tigria. It still survives in its entirety; as in the middle ages, it starts from Babylon and flows a little above 32° 50' N. Lat., in an almost straight line eastwards. The geographer Subras (who used to be called Ibm Sibarion; cf. lv., p. 11308) writing in the fourth (tenth) century observes that this canal bears the name Nahr al-Nil only after passing the town of al-Nil (the modern ruins Nilsie). At the present day it is called only Shatt al-Nil throughout its course. Somewhat east of Nilsie a small canal, now dry, branches off to the south for which, not only in its upper part where it flows by the ruins of Nisib, but along its whole extent, the name Shatt al-Nil, the same as that of the main canal, was and is usual. Yâkût however says (lv. 77, 798) that Nisib lay not on the Nahru al-Nil but on the bank of the Nahru al-Nars, a canal dug, as it is said, by the Sasanian king Narsûk Bahrâm (293—303 A. D.), which leaves the Euphrates at al-Hilla a little below the Nahru al-Nil and turns southeastward. It was presumably connected by a branch with the southern small canal of the same name which branches from the Nahru al-Nil, so that the occurrence of the two names Nahru al-Nil and Nahru al-Nars for the river in Nisib is explained. It should be noted also that the nomenclature of the Babylonian canals changed several times already in the middle ages. On the Nahru al-Nil or Shatt al-Nil and Nahru al-Nars see Beitr. 1910, p. 238; G. Le Strange, in T. R. A. S., 1895, S. 239, 260—261 and do., in The Lands of the East, Cambridge 1905, p. 72—74; Streck, Babylonien nach den arabischen Geographen, i. (Leiden 1900), p. 30 sq.; Herrfeld, in Sahrer-Herrfeld, Archäologie, Reise im Euphrat- und Tigisgebiet, i. (Berlin 1911), p. 234 ef.; Hishâm al-Sadd, Qaṣīdah fi al-Sādh al-qādîhî, Baghhdh 1927, p. 34, 35.

Below Nisib the Shatt al-Nil loses itself in the swamps of Hûr al-Afek. The Shatt al-Kâr very probably forms its southern continuation.

If the "Euphrates of Nippur", as it is called in the cuneiform inscriptions, really represents the old course of this river and not simply a branch of it, the modern Shatt al-Nil with its continuation, the Shatt al-Kâr, probably corresponds to the bed of the Euphrates of Babylonian times. The great changes in its courses which the rivers of Mesopotamia have undergone, cf. especially Fisher, op. cit., p. 2 sq. Hilprecht, who is followed by others like Zehnpfund, Unger etc., thinks that the name of the canal, Kabaru (= the large) sound in later texts from Nippur, corresponds to the "Euphrates of Nippur" of the older texts. He further compares it with the Kebar (725) of Eusebius (i. 1 etc.); see Hilprecht, Explorations, p. 412 and also in Der Bild-Tempel in Nippur, p. 10. The identification of the Kabaru with the old bed of the Euphrates, i.e., the modern Shatt al-Nil, I do not consider proved; the Kabaru may also be a canal in the neighbourhood of Nippur.

West and Southwest of Nisib lies the very extensive Hûr al-Afek (on the meaning of Hûr see iii., p. 147).

NIGGE, a town in the Turkish sanjak (now wilayet) of the same name in a fertile trough on the east edge of the Central Anatolian steppe. The town is first mentioned in the Turkish period; previously, the chief town of the district was Yumna (Aramaic Yumana) but it is probable that the striking hill which commands the important road from Cilicia across the Taurus to Kalkhere entered to a pass over the mountains had a fortified settlement upon it in the pre-Turkish period. The old place-name may be the origin of the modern one, an older form of which was Nekdize (Yakshir, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 847; Nakhoda; Ibn Bih and others, also in inscriptions down to the xvist century: Nakhoda; the modern form Niki). In the new Turkish script: Nigde is already found in Hämni Alilî Muqaiwî, Makhtatî, in G.M. S., xxiiii, (1930). In this particular district some villages have retained their ancient names (Amdavâl, Andabalis, Microwave-Pahukapit), and considerable numbers of descendants of the original Christian inhabitants survived until quite recently (K. M. Dawkins, Modern Greek in Asia Minor, Cambridge 1940, p. 169 sqq.).

Nigde is first mentioned in connection with the partition of the territorial territory among the sons of Kılıç Arslan I (685 = 1250) when it was allotted as an independent lordship to Arslan Shâh (Ibn Bih, ed. Houtsou, Rec., iv. 11). Nigde had perhaps previously belonged to the Damghanidisa but Eawaiy, iii. 180, cannot be taken as evidence of this. Kadi'ûn I granted Nigde to the Emir-i Akkâr Zaim al-Din Bagdâdi (Ibn Bih, p. 44) who shortly before his death built the important mosque of "Alâ". In the xiiiIST century Nigde was the headquarters (verîd lahir-i) of one of the great military districts of the Seljuks. Under Kiliç Arsalan IV, Ibn al-Khaṭîr Ma'add held this office. At first an ally of the all-powerful Mu'aw al-Din Perwân, with whom he killed the sultan in 1264, he endeavoured to remove the young Kâl-Kâmar II out of Perwa's influence and brought him to Nigde (1270). But the help for which he had appealed to Egypt came too late and he succumbed to Perwân who was supported by the Mongols (Ibn al-Hadi, Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, iv. 80 sqq.). He built a well in Nigde opposite the "Alâ" al-Din mosque (666 = 1266). Under the Ilkhans there ruled in that name, or in the name of their Anatolian governor Eretas, Sunkur Agha who is known only from inscriptions and is, it is remarkable to note, not mentioned by Ibn Battûta who visited Nigde about 1333 (ed. Dâsimer-Sangânî, ii. 386); he made himself independent after the death of Abî Sa'îd. He gave the town a large mosque on the wall of which facing the Belottan is a Persian inscription, in which he grants Christian foreigners exemption from dînsy and hâridî (736 = 1333). The Sultâh princess Khulâswând Kâtîn built in 732 (1337) in her splendid turret built in 712 (1312) on the other hand probably did not rule in Nigde although she resided there. She was, if the lady buried beside her in 1344 was her daughter, the wife of the emir Shugâl al-Din, who is mentioned as the father of the lady on her sarcophagus; he ruled according to al-Umar (ed. Teucher, p. 33) in the Bolgârdagh, where a wilayet Shugâl al-Din is still mentioned in Sa'd al-Din (p. 517 following Idris) and where lies Urukshâ which, according to Khâshâ Khâtîf (Zahabnâmâ, p. 517), was also called Shugâl al-Din. After the period of Sunkur's rule, Nigde probably passed directly to the Karmanoglu, who held it against the attacks of the Eretnâl 'Alî al-Din 'Alî (c. 1372) ("Asb. 'Alâ, Târîh u-Ras, p. 141 sqq.). In 1390 Nigde surrendered with other Karamanian towns to the Ottomans but was restored to the Kara-
NIGDE — NIHÅWAND

NIHÅL CÂNÖL LÄHÅWRI, Indian man of letters. Hindu by religion, was born in Dihli, but left it in early life and went to Lahore where he lived for a considerable time. Owing to this circumstance he called himself Tâhåwî. Some for a livelihood led him to Calcutta. Here he was introduced to Dr. J. B. Gilchrist who asked him to translate into "Hindî rekhâ" the story of Tâdîl al-Mulâk and Bâkâwî. He consented and thus became one of the famous band of Fort William translators. He made the translation from Qul' Bâkâwî, a Persian rendering by Shahîl 'Izaz Ullâh, 1772, of an old Hindî story, which has been reproduced in Urdu verse by Dayû Shânhâk Kâwi Nâsun [q.v.], in his well-known matnînawâri Gûlîâ-nâsun.

Nihål Cânöl called his work Mâdâhî-i Tâhâwî. It is in very good prose mixed with verse. The name gives the date 1817 (1864). Apart from the above mentioned facts nothing is known about the writer.

Bibliography: M. Vâyê Tânî, Sîyar al-Musawwînîn, l. 117—119; Garcîa do Tasso, Litt. Hindooime et Hindoutonique, ii. 458—470; T. Grahame Bailey, Hist. of Urdu Lit., p. 84; R. B. Saksena, Hist. of Urdu Lit., p. 249.

(N. T. Grahame Bailey)

NIHÅWAND, a town in the old province of Hâmûlân, with, at the present day, 5000—6000 inhabitants (de Morgan), at a height of 5360 feet on the branch of the Gâmuşhâ which comes from the S. E. from the vicinity of Bârûljîrît; the Gâmüşhâ then runs W. to Bâricht. Nihåwând lies on the southern road which, coming from Kürmânhân (Ibn Kûrâdîjilh, p. 195), leads into Central Persia (Ijâlâhân) avoiding the massif of Alwând (Qâvârâ) which rises W. of Hâmûlân. Hence the importance of the town in the west of Persia with her western neighbours.

The French excavations of 1931 (Dr. Contemou) have shown that the site of Nihåwând was inhabited from pre-historic times. The ceramics ("his style") which have been found there, seem to be older than those of style I and II of Susa. Proleny VI, 2 knows of Nâwâsh and according to the Fâşk, p. 258 the town already existed before the Deluge. In the Sîkkanîa period the district of Nihåwând seems to have formed the seat of a large family (Dinâwâr, p. 99). There was a fire near the town. According to Ibn Fâşk, p. 259 there could be seen on the mountains near Nihåwând two figures of snow in the form of a bull and a fish (similar tallasmans are said to have existed at Bîthâ also cf. also the steles of worship ["dragons", protectors of waters] in Armenia west of Lake Sevan which combine these symbols, Zâg, xxii/3, 1916, p. 409). The same legend is reflected in the name of the river Gâmü-el (Gâmü-el = "water of the bull and fish"; màshî is the Kurdis form of the Persian màshî). Among the products of Nihåwând the Arab authors mention willow-wood which was used for polo-sticks (pâvûlûg), aromatic gums (lûqûhûr al-shârû or al-shamâl al-âlîkhûrû) which were used like family (a perfume put in snuff) and black clay used as wax for sealing letters. The district of Rûdîshâw was under Nihåwând (cf. de Morgan, Mission, ii. 136: Nûdîshâw) and was famous for its abundance of saffron (îstâmî, p. 199).

For a list of the places more or less dependent on Nihåwând, cf. Schwarz, Iran etc., p. 305—509.
In the Mongol period, the Nushat al-Azwar mentions three districts of Nihawand: Malbey (now Dawlatshah), Isfahān (Isfahān, see below) and Dilūya. (Nihawand: no longer forms part of the province of Hamadhān; cf. Babino, Hamadhān, in R.M.M., xlviii, 1921, p. 221–227.)

Near Nihawand was fought the famous battle which decided the fate of the Iranian plateau and in which the Kūfī Naṣṣār b. Muḥarrīn defeated the Sasanian generals. The commander-in-chief is given different names: Dīn al-Ḥālij b. Mardavāj (cf. Baladhūrī, p. 305); Marquart, p. 172; the latter also gives the names of his generals: Zanluč, Bahmai Djalīlya and the commander of the cavalry Antūnjāḥ. The Arab camp was at Isfahān and that of the Persians at Wyhybjur (I). The sources do not agree about the date: Sāfī b. Omer (Tabari, li, 2615–2616) gives the end at the year 18 (639) or the beginning of 19 (640); cf. Wellhausen, Gesch. der Perser, v, 189, p. 97, while Ibn Ḥabīb, Abu Baniḥār and Wāṣḥīdī, followed by Castén, Annali dell’ Islam, iv, 1911, p. 474–504 put the battle in 21.

The district of Nihawand (formerly called Mab-Bahmai or Mab-Dinkir) was finally incorporated in the possessions of the Baṣrians and called Mab-Baṣra (‘the Media of Baṣra’: Baladhūrī, p. 306).

Nihawand is often mentioned in the period of the wars between the Safawids and the Ottomans. In 998 (1889) at the beginning of the reign of Ābāh I, Chaghāzāde built a fortress at Nihawand (‘Akam-ārād, p. 273). After the death of Murtūd IV a rebellion took place among the garrison of Nihawand; the Ottomans were driven out by the Shīʿa inhabitants. As a result in 1012 (1603) war again broke out with Turkey (ibid., p. 440). In the spring of 1142 (1730) Nādir [q.v.] took Nihawand again from the Turks.

Bibliography: de Morgan, Mission scientifique en Perse, ii, Études géographiques, 1895, p. 152 and passim, pl. xvi. (view of Nihawand); Marquart, Erinnerungen, index; Barthold, Istorossijegorie, i, 2nd edn., 1903; index; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, i, 195–197; Schwarz, frem im Mittelalter, i, 490–509, index; Contemnes and Ghirshman, Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles de Tepī-Gūšā, près Nihavand, 1932, in Syria, 1933, p. 1–11.

NIKĀH ([\text{A}]), marriage (properly: sexual intercourse, but already in the Kūraḵ used exclusively of the contract). Here we deal with marriage as a legal institution; for marriage customs see "ānā-. 4.

The essential features of the Muslim law of marriage go back to the customary law of the Arabs which previously existed. In this, although there were differences according to districts and the conditions of the individual cases, the regulations governing marriage were based upon the patriarchal system, which permitted the man very great freedom and still bore traces of an old patriarchal system. It is true that before the coming of Islam a higher conception of the marriage state had already begun to exist but the position of the woman was still a very unfavourable one. The marriage contract was made between the suitor and the "guardian" i.e. the father of the nearest male relative of the bride, the latter's consent not being regarded as necessary. But even before Islam it had already become generally usual for the dowry to be given to the woman herself and not to the guardian. In marriage the woman was under the unrestricted authority of her husband, the only bounds to which were considered for her family. Dissolution of the marriage rested entirely on the man's opinion, and even after his death his relatives would enforce claims upon his widow. 5.

Islam reformed these old marriage laws, in far-reaching fashion, while retaining their essential features; here as in other fields of social legislation Muḥammad's chief aim was the improvement of the woman's position. The regulations regarding marriage which are the most important in principle are laid down in the Kūraḵ in Sūra iv. (of the period shortly after the battle of Uḥud): 4. 5. If ye fear that ye cannot treat justly . . . to your wives, whom ye think good (to marry), by twos, threes or fours; but if ye fear (even then) not to be just then marry one only or (the slaves) whom ye possess; this will be easier that ye be not unjust. Give the women their dower freely, but if they voluntarily resign you a part of it not be just then shear one only of the dower freely. 26. Marry not the woman whom your fathers have married (except what is already past) for this is shameful and abominable and an evil way.

27. Forbidden to you are your mothers, your daughters, your sisters, your aunts, paternal and maternal, the daughters of your brother and sister, your foster-mothers and foster-sisters, the mothers of your wives and the step-daughters who are in your care, both of your wives, with whom ye have had intercourse — but if ye have not had intercourse with them, it is not a sin for you — and the wives of the sons, who are your offspring, also that ye marry two sisters at the same time except what is already past; Allah is gracious and merciful. 28. Further married women except (slaves) that ye possess. This is ordained by Allah for you. But he has permitted you to procure (wives) outside of these cases with your money in decency and not in formation. To those of them that ye have enjoyed give their reward as their due, but it is no sin to make an agreement between you beyond the legal due. Allah is allknowing and wise. 29. If however any one of you has not means sufficient to marry free believing women (let him marry) among your believing slaves, whom ye possess; Allah best knows (to distinguish) your faith. Marry them with the permission of their masters, and give them their dowry in kindness; they should be modest and not unchaste and take no lovers. Also Sūra ii. 220 (uncertain date), the prohibition of marriage with infidels, male or female (cf. Sūra lx. 10, Sūra xxxii. 49 [probably of the year 5]), an exception in favour of the Prophet, and Sūra v. 7 (of the farewell pilgrimage in the year 10), permission of marriage with the women of the possessors of a scripture. Other passages of the Kūraḵ which emphasise the moral side of marriage are Sūra xxiv. 3, 26, 32 and Sūra xxx. 20. In tradition various attitudes to marriage find expression; at the same time the positive enactments regulating it are supplemented in essential points. The most important is the limitation of the number of wives permitted at one time to four; although Sūra iv. 3 contains no such precise regulation, this interpretation of it must have predominated.
very early, as in the traditions it is assumed rather than expressly demanded. The co-operation of the "guardian", the dowry and the consent of the woman is regarded as essential and competition with a rival the result of whose suit is still in doubt is forbidden.

3. The most important provisions of Muslim law (according to the Shi'a school) are the following. The marriage contract is concluded between the bridegroom and the bride's wali (guardian), who must be a free Muslim of age and of good character. The wali is in his turn bound to assist in carrying out the contract of marriage demanded by the woman, if the bridgegroom fulfills certain legal conditions. The wali should be one of the following in this order: 1. the nearest male ascendant in the male line; 2. the nearest male relative in the male line among the descendants of the father; 3. among the descendants of the grandfather etc.; 4. in the case of a freed woman the musul'm (manumitter) and if the case arises his male relatives in the order of heirs in intestacy (cf. Miṣr,- 6, 5); 5. the representative of the public authority (kālim) appointed for the purpose; in many countries it is the hāfiz or his deputy. In place of the kālim the future husband and wife may agree to choose a wali and must do so if there is no authorized kālim in the place.

The wali can only give the bride in marriage with her consent but in the case of a virgin silent consent is sufficient. The father or grandfather, however, has the right to marry his daughter or grand-daughter against her will, so long as she is a virgin (he is therefore called wali muqarrir, wali with power of somnium); the exercise of this power is however very strictly regulated in the interest of the bride. At minors are not in a position to make a declaration of their wishes which is valid in law, they can only be married at all by a wali muqarrir. According to the Hanafī on the other hand, every blood relative acting as wali is entitled to give a virgin under age in marriage without her consent; but a woman married in this way by another than her ascendant is entitled on coming of age to demand that her marriage be declared void (fist) by the sāhib of the bridgegroom, who is a minor may also be married by his hiyya's muqarrir in the same kind of equivalent for the rights which the husband acquires over the wife, he is bound to give her a bridal gift (mahr, gādāh) which is regarded as an essential part of the contract. The contracting parties are free to fix the mahr; it may consist of anything that has value in the eyes of the law; if it is not fixed at the conclusion of the contract and if the parties cannot agree upon it, we have a case for the mahr al-mithl, a bridal gift fixed by the fist according to the circumstances of the bridgegroom. It is not necessary to pay the mahr at once; frequently a portion is paid before the consummation of the marriage and the remainder only at the dissolution of the marriage by divorce or death. The wife's claim to the full mahr or the full mahr al-mithl arises only when the marriage has been consummated; if the marriage is previously dissolved by the man the wife can only claim half the mahr or a present (wa'a) fixed arbitrarily by the man; these regulations go back to Sun. ii. 237-39 (cf. xxxii., 48). In form the marriage contract, which is usually prefixed by a solicitation (kālim), follows the usual scheme in Muslim contracts with offer and acceptance; the wali of the bride is further recommended to deliver a pious address (khuffā) on the occasion. The marriage must be concluded in the presence of at least two witnesses (zījī), who possess the legal qualifications of a witness; their presence is here not simply, as in other contracts, evidence of the marriage but an essential element in its validity. On the other hand, no collaboration by the authorities is prescribed. But since great importance is usually attached to fulfilling the formalities of the marriage contract, upon which the validity of the marriage depends, it is usual not to carry through this important legal matter without the assistance of an experienced lawyer. We therefore everywhere find men whose profession this is and who usually act under the supervision of the hāfiz. The part they take is to pronounce the necessary formulae to the parties or even to act as authorised agents of one of them, usually the wali of the bride. The most important impediments to marriage are the following: 1. blood relationship, namely between the man and his female ascendants and descendents, his sisters, the female descendents of his brothers and sisters as well as his aunts and great-aunts; 2. blood relationship which by extension of the Kur'ān by tradition is regarded as an impediment to marriage in the same degrees as blood relationship; 3. relationship by marriage, namely between a man and his mother-in-law, daughter-in-law, step-daughter etc. in the direct line; marriage with two sisters or with an aunt and niece at the same time is also forbidden; 4. the existence of a previous marriage, in the case of a woman without limitation (inclusive of the period of waiting after the dissolution of the marriage; yadda, q. v.) and in the case of a free man with the provision that he cannot be married to more than four women at once; 5. the existence of a threefold gādāh [q.v.] or of a kālim [q. v.]; 6. social inequality; the man must not be by birth, profession etc. below the woman (unless both the woman and wali agree); a free Muslim can only marry another's slave girl if he cannot provide the bridal gift for a free woman, and the marriage between a master (or mistress) and his slave (or her slave) is quite impossible (a master is however permitted concubinage with his slave); 7. difference of religion; there is no exception to the prohibition of marriage between a Muslim woman and an infidel while the permission given in theory for marriage between Muslim men and the women of the possessors of a scripture is at least by the Shi'ites so restricted by conditions as to be prohibited in practice; 8. temporary obstacles such as the state of ḥiṣāba (q. v.). On the other hand, the law knows no minimum age for a legal marriage. If a marriage contract does not fulfill the legal requirements, it is invalid; the Hanafīs and especially the Mālikis but not the Shi'ites distinguish in this case between invalid (ṣūrī) and incorrect (fist) according as the error affects an essential or an essential element in the contract; in the former case there is no marriage at all, in the second its validity may be attacked but (according to the Mālikis) consummation removes any defect. Marriage does not produce any community of property between husband and wife and the woman retains her complete freedom of disposal; but certain laws regarding inheritance come into operation (cf. Miṣr,- 6, 5). The man alone has to bear the
expense of maintaining the household and is obliged to support his wife in a style befitting her station (mash'aka); to whom it should not be a position to do so. His wife may demand the dissolution of the marriage by fi'dh [q. v.]. The man can demand from his wife readiness for marital intercourse and obedience generally; if she is regularly disobedient, she loses her claim to support and may be chastised by the man. The latter however is expressly forbidden to take upon himself vows of continence (hilfah and piha'sh). Children are only regarded as legitimate if they are born at least six months after consummation of the marriage and not more than 4 years (the predominant Sihah view) after its dissolution; it is presumed that such children are begotten by the husband himself; the latter has the right to dispute his paternity by dinu [v. v.]. Parentage can also be established by the husband's thar [q. v.], while both recognition and adoption of illegitimate children are impossible.

4. The laws regarding the rights and duties of husband and wife cannot be modified by the parties at the drawing-up of the contract. This can however be effected by the man pronouncing a conditional fi'dh [cf. fildah, vii.] immediately after the conclusion of the marriage contract; this shift to secure the position of the woman is particularly common among Indian Muslims. For the rest the couple are left to private agreements which need not be mentioned in the marriage contract. The actual position of the married woman is in all Muslim countries entirely dependent on local conditions and on many special circumstances. It is not a contradiction of this to say that the legal prescriptions regarding marriage are most carefully observed as a rule. In spite of certain ascetic tendencies Islam as a whole has been decidedly in favour of marriage. — In modern Islam the problem of the woman's position in marriage and polygamy is especially discussed between conservatives and adherents of modern social ideas. For the different views resulting from these conditions see the Bibliography cited below.

5. Alongside of the usual form of the old Arabian marriage which in spite of its laxity aimed at the foundation of a household and the procreation of children, there existed the temporary marriage in which the pair lived together temporarily and period previously fixed. Such temporary marriages were entered upon mainly by men who found themselves staying for a time abroad. It is by no means certain that these are referred to in Surah 13. 28, although the Muslim name of this arrangement (mar'a [q. v.], "marriage of pleasure") is based on the literal meaning of the verse; it is however certain from Tradition that Muhammad really permitted mar'a to his followers especially on the longer campaigns. But the caliph 'Umar strictly prohibited mar'a and regarded it as fornication (zina) ([a group of traditions already ascribes this prohibition to the Prophet]). As a result, mar'a is permitted only among the Shi'ahs but prohibited by the Sunnis. The latter have however practically abandoned the same arrangement; those who wish to live contrary to the law as husband and wife for a certain period simply agree to marry without stipulating it in the marriage contract.

Bibliography: (only the most important works are cited). For the pre-Muhammadan Arabs: G. A. Wilken, Het matrechteh by de oude Arabieren (German transl.: Das Matracheth


NIKOPOLIS, in Turkish spelling Nikhilbol or Nikibbol (in Ewliya Celebi, vol. 4: 1053: نيكبول), a town on the southern bank of the Danube, at 45° 41' N., 24° 54'E. This Nikopolis, founded by Heracleion (c. 575-543), has often been confused, especially in medieval literature, with Nikopolis ad Istrum or ad Hannerum, founded by Trajan in 101 in commemoration of his victory over the Dacians (after recently excavated near modern Nikup in the upper valley of the Djantra by Mr. Haenius). The Byzantine Nikopolis is sometimes called Nikopolis Major to distinguish it from Trajan's Nikopolis and Nikopolis Minor on the opposite bank of the Danube near the Romanian town of Tarno Magurele.

The importance of Nikopolis as a trade centre and military post is due chiefly to the command which it holds over the Osma and the Aluta, the two Danubian arteries reaching into the heart of Bulgaria and Roumania respectively. Situated on a naturally fortified site, it commanded the passage to the south, the Danube to the north, and the eastern gorge connecting the interior of Bulgaria with the river. The medieval double walls and strong towers surrounding Nikopolis were destroyed by the Russians during their occupation of the city in 1810 and 1827.

Nikopolis was first captured from the Bulgarians in 701 (1389) by 'Ali Pasha Candereli [see "Ali Pasha"]. Seven years later, it was the scene of the famous battle in the Crusade which is called by its name. The acquisition of Bulgaria by the Turks and their continual irruptions north of the Danube into territories claimed by Hungary, to

gether with a state of comparative peace in western Europe in the last decade of the fourteenth century, made it both necessary and possible for most Catholic countries to participate in the expansion. An army of about 100,000 crossed the Rhone, coming among the most reliable estimates) from France, Burgundy, England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Hungary, Poland, Wallachia and Transylvania marched along the Danube, seized Widdin and Kohova, and finally set siege to Nikopolis while an allied Veneto-
Genoese fleet blockaded the city from the river. The siege lasted about fifteen days, during which Béjaïa [q.v.] abandoned the siege of Constantinople, hastened the siege machinery, and summoned his Asiatics and European contingent to arms. A Turkish army of perhaps 110,000 men met Adrianople and, marching through the Shipka Pass, descended into the valley of the Osma and pitched their camp on the southern hill commanding the Nikopolis plain.

The battle took place on Monday, September 25, 1396, and the crusaders were completely routed owing to the superiority of Ottoman tactics and the dispositions amongst the leaders of the Christian host. Béjaïa divided his army into two large sections. The first, consisting of two large bodies of irregular cavalry and of irregular infantry, occupied the slope of the hill. Between the cavalry vanguard and the foot rearguard of this section, the Turks planted a field of pointed stakes. Beyond the skyline on the other slope of the hill, hidden from their unsuspecting enemy, the second and more important section, consisting of Béjaïa with his Sipâhis and Stephen Lazonovitch with his Serbs, watched for the right moment to advance against the exhausted Christians. These tactics proved to be effective when the Crusaders' vanguard of French and foreign auxiliaries defeated the Turkish irregular cavalry and, after forcing them to dismount, routed the irregular infantry and pursued them uphill to force the new and unseen forces. Meanwhile, a stampede of riderless horses produced confusion in the Crusaders' rear which comprised the Eastern European armies. Mircea and Lacobki, who had no sympathy for Sigismund of Hungary, retired with their Wallachian and Transylvanian auxiliaries who constituted the left and right wings of the rearguard. After desperate fighting for the relief of the French and foreign contingents, the Hungarian nobles persuaded their king to board a Venetian galley and escape by way of Byzantium and the Morea to Dalmatia. The rest were either killed or captured, only to be massacred on the following day by Béjaïa in order to avenge in this way the severe losses which he sustained. A small number of nobles were, however, saved from the massacre for a ransom of 200,000 gold florins.

The immediate result of the Ottoman victory was the extension of the conquests into Greece and the submission of Wallachia to Ottoman suzerainty. More important, however, was the breathing-space it gave for the consolidation of the Turkish empire in Europe, which enabled the Ottoman empire to survive the critical struggles of the next decades.

In later history, Nikopolis plays only a minor part. During the wars of the sixteenth century it was twice captured by Russian armies (Sept. 1812; July 1839; July 1877), and by the Treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878) it was included in the tributary principality of julugia.

Bibliography: The standard histories of the Ottoman Empire. For the "Crusade of Nikopolis" a full and classified bibliography of the extensive MS. and printed sources, both Eastern and Western, is contained in A. S. Atiya, The Crusade of Nikopolis (London 1934); see also the following older monographs: A. Brauer, Die Schlacht bei Nikopoli 1396, Breslau 1876; J. Delaville le Roulx, La France en Orient au XIe siècle, Paris 1888; H. Kiel, A. Neopoli ulkind, Magyar Akadémiai Ertesitő, 1896; L. Köhler, Die Schlachts bei Nikopoli und Warnen, Breslau 1882; F. Stic, Die Schlacht bei Nikopoli, Vienna 1893. (A. S. Atiya)

NIKÔSAR, Nego-Caresser, first mentioned by Pliny (vi. 15) as that it presumably arose under Tiberius, lies in the Awatiul vilayet of Sivas [q.y.] 1,150 feet above sea level. The town is picturesquely situated at the foot of a hill, crowned by the ruins of a medieval castle which was erected from the material provided by the numerous buildings of antiquity there. Here in remote antiquity was Cabriss and after its decline Diopolis founded by Fompey, later called Sebaste. In Church history Niksar is famous as the scene of a Council (314 A.D.) and as the birthplace of Gregory the miracle-worker. In the Muslim period it became important under the Seljuks of whom numerous and important buildings have survived to the present day. It became more important under the Diriipunmdy [q.v.], whose founder Malik Diriipunm took Niksar among other places. His grandson Muhammad successfully resisted a siege by the emperor Manuel in Niksar. His son Yaghish (537—562 = 1142—1166) of whom there survives an inscription of the year 552 (1157) died in 562 (1166) whereupon Niksar was taken by the Byzantine emperor Manuel (Kinnamos, p. 996 sqq., 300) although only for a short time. In 1399 Niksar passed to the Ottomans and gradually lost its former importance. It remained noted for its very fertile orchards, celebrated already in Kazwin's time (Afgâr, ed. Wientzels, Gottingen 1848) the special producer of which, very large and sweet cherries, pears, figs etc. were famous at all times. Eflâyî Celebi (cf. Siyâhat-nâme, ii. 359; v. 14; Travels, p. 102 sqq.) who visited Niksar in 1083 (1672) describes the town in his usual extravagant fashion, mentioning 70 schools, 7 monasteries, many mills and water wheels and 500 shops with a large number of shoemakers. The pomegranates there, he says, are the size of a man's head and weighed 8 okkas. The remains of the Muslim period so far as they bear inscriptions, have been published by Ismail Nâsh, Kitâbî (Stanbul 1345 = 1927), p. 58—

The Turks (episcopal cupola) of Malik Ghazi and of Hadjiwil Chelis are worth mentioning; among old dervish monasteries there are the Ihsâs-tekke and the Kolek-tekk. Niksar has often been visited and described by modern travelers. The population (c. 4,000) was before the war an out quarter of Christians; they were mainly engaged in the silk and rice trades.

AL-NIL, the river Nile. The Nile is one of the large rivers which from the beginning have belonged to the territory of Islam, and the valleys and deltas which have accompanied the development of an autonomous cultural centre in Islamic civilization. In the case of the Nile, this centre has been more influenced at different times by the cultural and political events in the Muhammadan world. Thus the Nile has, during the Islamic period, continued to play the same part as it did in the centuries that preceded the coming of Islam.

The name al-Nil or, very often, Nil Mīṣr, goes back to the Greek name Νήσας and is found already in early Arabic literary sources, though it does not occur in the Korān. (In Sīra xx. 39 the Nile may be meant by al-yāṣam). The Christian habit of calling the river Gīyūn, after one of the 'rivers of Paradise', as found in the works of Ephraim Syrus and Jacob of Edessa and in the Arabic-Christian author Agapius (Patrologia Orientalis, v. 586), is not followed by the Muhammadans, who know only the Oksas under this name. Al-Zamakhshārī (Kitāb al-Atba'īn, ed. Sularda da grave, p. 127) mentions as another name al-Fayd, no doubt a poetic allusion to the yearly flood. Already in the Middle Ages, the word bahr having come to acquire in Egyptian Arabic the meaning of 'river', the Nile is also called al-Bahr or Bahr Mīṣr (cf. al-Makrī, ed. Wiet, I. 235), which is also the case with several smaller streams of its river system, such as Bahr Wīsāf or Bahr al-Ghrār. In the Delta the different ramifications of the river are occasionally also called Nile, but where necessary the main stream (Camōl) is distinguished from the minor branches (al-Murāf or al-Muḥāflat) and the canals (tur'a).

The geography of the Nile is treated here only from a historico-geographical point of view so far as the knowledge of Islamic science is concerned. The geographical knowledge of the Nile among the Muhammadans, so far as we can learn from their literary sources, is based partly on direct observation, but for the most part on legendary or pseudo-scientific traditions which go back to basic beliefs or to classical science.

For a long time during the Middle Ages the limits of Islamic territory on the Nile were well fixed; it ended at the first cataract near the island of Bilāk (Ph blames) to the south of Wāṣān (Aswan), here began, since the treaty (Bahr) concluded by 'Abd Allah b. Abī Sarh with the Nabians, the Nabian territory, where for long centuries Christianity prevailed (al-Baladhuri, p. 325): Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Futūḥ Mīṣr, ed. Torrey, p. 188). The first locality on Nubian territory, where tribute was paid, was called al-Kasāf (al-Masādī, Marūjī, iii. 40, 41).

Historical tradition has preserved parts of the alleged correspondence between 'Amr b. al-Ĥādī and the satrap Ṭurūn on the subject of Egypt, then newly conquered; hence the Nile is described as a river "whose course is blessed", while the flood and its inundations are praised in poetic terms ('Umar b. Muḥammad al-Miṣrī, ed. Zihra, p. 204; al-Dimashqī, ed. Mehren, p. 105). The same correspondence reveals the perhaps historical fact that 'Umar did not wish to see the Arab army established in Alexandria, because there would be then a great river between the army and the satrap (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 91; cf. also what is said on p. 129 about those who went to live in al-Khākn).

The principal towns by which the Nile passed in medieval Egypt in Upper Egypt, between Wāṣān and al-Fuṣṭāt, were Ṭubā (Edfu, on the left), Iṣān (Isna, 1.), Armant (1.), Kāk (r.), al-Asyūr (Luxor, 7.), Kīlī (r.), Ikhnām (Akhmim, r.), Usyūn (Asyūn, Sīyūn, 1.), al-Ughmūnān (1.), Amīna (r. opposite al-Ughmūnān), Taḥā (1.), al-Kārī (1.), Dalā'ī (1.), Ahnās (1.) and Bīfī (Aṭīfī, r.). This succession of towns is given for the first time by al-Yaḥṣūbī (B. G. A. I, viii. 331—334), while Ibn Hawkal (B. G. A., ii. 95) is the first to give a table of the distance between these towns, expressed in hars, the entire distance being 20 days' journey (al-Idrisī, ed. Dowy and de Goeje, p. 52, gives 25 days' journey for the same distance). Shortly before al-Ughmūnān branched off on the left the canal that conducted the water to al-Fayyum, which is known to Ibn al-Kāfīth (B. G. A., vii. 74) as Nāḥ al-Lūkān and to al-Idrisī (p. 50) as Khālīd al-Mānī; this canal, which according to unanimous tradition was dug by Joseph, occurs already on the MS. map of the year 475 (1086) of Ibn Hawkal in the Serey Library of Constantinople, No. 3346 (reproduction on fol. 653 of Monumenta Africana at Egypte by Youssouf Kamal). It is the Bahr Wīsāf of our days; on it was situated al-Bahmās.

The banks of the Nile in Upper Egypt are not very completely described by the geographers; one finds repeated everywhere the assertion that the borders were cultivated without interruption between Wāṣān and al-Fuṣṭāt (cf. al-Iṣākhūrī, B. G. A., i. 50), but that the width of the cultivated territory varied during the river's course, dependent on the greater or lesser distance of the two mountain ranges that border the stream. Ibn Hawkal (MS. of Constantinople, of aspr) describes two extremely narrow strips, one between Wāṣān and Aṭīfī (now called Gebelein) and one between Iṣān and Armant (now called Gebeh Sila"la). The courses in the curve of the Nile, especially in the upper part of the Sīwāl, are not indicated on the maps of Ṭurūn and Ibn Hawkal. The oldest extant Arab map of the Nile, however — which is at the same time the oldest Arab map — shows with a sure hand that its sinuous course was a known fact. This map is found in the Strassburg MS. of the year 1307 (1307) of al-Khāfītī's Fatāt al-Ars, and has been reproduced in the edition of this text by H. v. Milik (B. A. H. C. G., iii. Leipzig 1916). The representation of the Nile here is connected with the classical tradition of astronomical geography; al-Khāfītī himself, and after him Ṭurūn (Ibn Serapion) and Ibn Yūnis (MS. 143 Col. of the University Library at Leyden, where on p. 35 a special table is given of the towns lying on the banks of the Nile) give exact indications as to the longitudes and latitudes of the Nile towns, but these indications need many very uncertain corrections to allow of the reconstruction of a map, as v. Milik has tried to do for al-Khāfītī in Denkschre. Alte Wiss. Wien, vii. 1916 and J. Lietzel for Ibn Yūnis, in: of the Atlas annexed to his Géographie du Moyen-âge, Paris 1850. But the fact that the course of the Nile is from south to north is well known to all the Arabic sources, which often repeat the
assertion that the Nile is the only river in the world for which this is the case. Only the text of Ibn Hawkal seems to imply that the Nile reached al-Fustāṭ from the S. E. (B.G.A.A., ii. 96).

The Delta of the Nile begins to the north of al-Fustāṭ, where the distance between the two mountain ranges widens, while these hills themselves become lower and pass gradually into the desert. Immediately below al-Fustāṭ began the canal that was dug by 'Amir b. al-ʿAzīz to link up the Nile with the Red Sea; this canal (ṣaḥāba) Miṣr or ʿIbād Miṣr or ʿAmīr al-Miṣr) was made in 23 (644) according to Mahāmir b. Yāsuf al-Kīnī (cited by al-Maqrīzī, Khayrī, Pīlīk, ii. 143; cf. Yākūt, ii. 466) and served for the conveyance of provisions to the Hijāz until the reign of ʿUmar Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz; afterwards it was neglected and even obstructed by the order of the caliph al-Ḥārūn, so that, in the 11th (4th) century, it ended at Dīnah or Tīnum in the lakes of the north of al-Kutsūm (cf. al-Muḥīṭī, Murājī, i. 147).

The two principal arms of the Nile in the Delta began about 12 miles to the north of al-Fustāṭ (a little further than nowadays, according to Guest) and had, as now, great numbers of ramifications which communicated in many ways and ends for the greater part in the big lakes or lagoons stretching behind the sea coast from west to east; these lakes were called in the Middle Ages Bahārāt Maryūṣ (behind Alexandria), B. Ḳūṭ, B. al-Baḥrānī and the very large B. Tīnūt, which last contained a large number of islands with Tīnūt as the most important. On the land tongue, where the two main arms separated was situated the town of Shabūt. The western arm went as now to the town of Rashīd (Rosetta) after which it reached the sea; near the town of Shabūt a branch parted from this arm in the direction of Alexandria, ending in the Bahārāt Maryūṣ; this branch was only filled with water in the time of the flood (a very complete survey of the different canals of Alexandria by P. Kahle, in D.Q., xii. 33 sqq.). The eastern arm ran, as is still the case, past Dīnah (Dinanto) and reached the sea shortly afterwards; it had several branches that went to the Bahārāt Tīnūt, one of which continued one of the Nile mouths of antiquity. Though many sources, based on a pseudo-historical tradition, repeat after each other that there are seven Nile arms (Ibn Abd al-Hakam, p. 6; further al-Khārīṣī, Khālid, Suhrawardi, al-Maṣūfī, Ibn Ẓālīlī, the more realistic authors Ibn al-Ḳandūlī, b. Ḳālīb; Ibn Rusta; ibn Ḥawkal, al-Īdrīsī) only know of the two main arms. These were linked up by a canal system which, in the Middle Ages, differed considerably from the present situation. The chief sources from which we know these are Ibn Hawkal and al-Īdrīsī, who give itineraries following the different branches, but as the places named in these itineraries have been identified only in part, an integral reconstruction is not yet possible (on this problem cf. K. Guest, The Delta in the Middle Ages, in J.F.A.S., 1912, p. 941 sqq. and the map annexed to this article). The description in the text of Suhrawardī (ed. v. Mīlīk, B.A.H.U.G.C., v.) has little value as an endeavour to trace back to his time (11th century) the seven legendary arms; among these arms special attention is paid to the "arm of Sandīna", which, according to tradition, was dug by Hāmān.
knows only of two lakes, not lying on the same latitude and does not speak of a great number of rivers coming from the Mountains of the Moon. The third lake especially is an innovation (cf. A. v. Mühl, in *Deutschbr. Ab. Wiss. Wien* Ixxxix., p. 44); it is also adopted by later authors such as Ibn Sa‘d and al-Dimāghṣī; this third lake is called Kūrā and may be connected with some notion of Lake Chad (the same authors change the name of Djabal al-Kūrā into Djabal al-Kumar which pronunciation is commented on by al-Maqrimī, ed. Wiet, ii. 219), but this is not probable for the time of al-Khwarizmi; the knowledge of more equatorial lakes, however, may possibly be connected with the expeditions of the Hunnic emirs despatched by Neco to explore the Nile and who reached, according to Seneca, a marshy impassable region, which has been identified with the Baḥr al-Ghazāl. The system described by al-Khwarizmi of the origin of the Nile is represented on the map in the Strassburg MS., and is repeated many times after him (Ibn Khurṣidābhid, Ibn al-Fakhrī, Kudāmā, Saḥrbī, al-Idrīsī and later authors). Al-Mas‘ūdī, in describing a map he has seen, does not speak of the third lake (*Marqūzī*, l. 205, 206) and Ibn Rusta (*B. G. A.*, vi. 99) says that the Nile comes from a mountain called B-ba, and also knows only two lakes. Al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawqāl on the contrary, frankly admit that the origin of the Nile is unknown. This is also illustrated by their maps. Still the system of al-Khwarizmi continued to be a geographical dogma and is found as late as al-Suyūṭī. Al-Khwarizmi also took over from Ptolemy a western tributary of the Nile, which comes from a lake on the equator; this river is called by Ptolemy *Aṣṭapos* and may perhaps be identified with the Atbara. A later development, which connects with the Nile system a river that flows to the east in the Indian Ocean, is found for the first time in al-Mas‘ūdī (*Marqūzī*, l. 205, 206; ii. 383, 384); this view is later taken up again by Ibn Sa‘d and al-Dimāghṣī.

Another category of notions about the origins of the third lake seems to be borrowed from Jewish and Christian traditions which make the Nile come from Paradise. Medieval cosmographical theory places Paradise in the extreme East, on the other side of the sea (cf. the maps of Bostanian, so that the Nile, like the other rivers of Paradise would have to cross the sea. This state of things is actually described in an old tradition, probably of Jewish origin, of a man who went in search of the sources of the Nile and had to cross the sea, after which he reached Paradise (al-Mas‘ūdī, *Marqūzī*, l. 268, 269, and *Aḥḥār al-Zamān*, MS. Vienna, fol. 156b–157; al-Maqrimī, *B. G. A.*, ii. 21). With this origin in Paradise is perhaps connected the view, which all sources attribute to al-Dībajī in his lost *Kitāb al-Baladn*, that the Nile and the Indian (Indus) have the same origin (cf. al-Mas‘ūdī, *Zamākhsāri*, *B. G. A.*, vii. 55), a view which is sarcastically criticized by al-Dībajī (*Indian*, p. 101).

The same origin may go back to the idea, often found in Muhammadan sources, that, when the Nile rises, all the rivers of the earth go down in level.

Thirdly there is a cycle of geographical conceptions which link up the western part of Africa with the river system of the Nile. Herodotus already had sought a western origin and Pliny quotes the *Livy* of king Juba of Mauretania, who makes the Nile rise in western Mauretania. Marqūzī (*Sūrat al-Samawāt*, p. 115) has explained this view from a corruption of the name of the river Nubal, which he identifies with the Wādī Nil and which has its origin in the Mauritanian Atlas. Traces of this western Nile are to be found in Ibn al-Fakhrī (*B. G. A.*, v. 87) who, following an authority of the time of the conquistadores, places the origin of the Nile in al-Sa‘da al-‘Aṣhā. Al-Bakrī for the first time identifies this western Nile with the river Niger, although we find already in al-Mas‘ūdī the knowledge of a great river, far to the south of Sūbabulūs (*Marqūzī*, iv. 92, 93). Al-Bakrī describes the territory to the south of the river Stūdān (ed. de Slane, i. 172) and enumerates a number of Berber and Stūdān tribes and their towns which border the river; the westernmost town is with him Sanghāl, followed in eastern direction by Tabrūr, Sulūq, Ghāznā, Tiraqāt, and finally the country of Kawaw. After al-Bakrī a similar description is given by al-Idrīsī, but this last author goes back to another source than al-Bakrī when he places the mouth of the Nile in the neighbourhood of the salt town Awīl, thus identifying the lower course of this Nile with the Senegal (Marqūzī, *loc. cit.*, p. 171). Al-Idrīsī likewise shows himself informed on the course of the Nile to the east of Kawaw, though he is in doubt if Kawaw itself is situated on the Nile or on a Nile arm (ed. Drower and de Goeje, p. 11); he finally derives this western Nile from the third of the big Nile lakes mentioned above, thus connecting the Nile of the Stūdān with the Nile of Egypt in one river system. So long as the complete text of al-Bakrī is not known, we cannot ascertain if this conception goes back already to that author. Al-Idrīsī’s Nile course is clearly indicated on his map of the 1st–4th section of the first climate. After him it is especially Ibn Sa‘d who has described the western Nile in this way and he has been followed again by Abu ‘l-Fīda‘ī. Al-Mas‘ūdī (*Ed. Mehran*, p. 89) gives the same representation; this last author even makes the third lake, which he calls the Sā‘da, the source of the Nil and of Kūrā, give birth to three rivers: the Nile of the Stūdān, the Nile of Egypt, and a third river running in eastern direction towards Maqṣūdī in the Zanj country on the Indian Ocean. This last river, which was also connected by al-Mas‘ūdī with the Nile (*cf. zāpīra*) is probably identical with the Wehi river in Italian Somaliland.

While the geographical authors constructed in this way the Nile system with a good deal of credulity and imagination, the real knowledge of the Nile south of Egypt advanced but slowly. The southernmost point reached by the Arab conquerors was Dongola (al-Khūt, ed. Guillaume, p. 121). It was well known that this town was situated on the Nile; its latitude and longitude are given by al-Khwarizmi and Sahraūr. Al-Ya‘qūbī (*Tabakht*, ed. Houtteau, p. 217) knows that, in the country of the Nība called Alwa, who live behind the Nība called Murkura, the Nile divides into various branches; this same author, however, places Siid behind Alwa, Al-Mas‘ūdī (*Marqūzī*, iii. 31, 32) knows that the country of the Nība is divided into two parts by the Nile, Ibn Hawqāl (*Constantinople MS.*) describes two places where there are cataracts (*ghumūd*) — namely the one above Usān, which is the "first cataract," and one near Dongola, of which it is not certain whether the "second" or the "third" cataract is meant. About the same time,
however, a traveller named Ibn Sulaim al-Uswānī wrote a valuable description of the middle Nile course, which has been preserved in al-Ma'ārí's *Kitāb (ed. Wiet, in M.I.F.A.O., xvi. 252 sqq.); this Ibn Sulaim, on whom al-Ma'ārí's *Kitāb al-Mufrad gives some information (cf. Qutrubm, Memoires sur l'Egypte, ii.), had been sent by the Fatimid general Da'wār to the king of the Nūbā on a diplomatic errand, and was the author of a *Kitāb al-Nūbā wa l-Mukarrara al-'Alwā ruwa l-Mufrad wa l-Muṣṭaṣf wa l-Qīnāh, in which a detailed description is given of these countries. He says that the region between Usān and Dunyāla is inhabited in the north by the Mann and more to the south by the Mūkarrara; the northern part is barren and the great cataracts are correctly described. The country between Dunyāla and 'Alwā (this last spot is the region of Kārṣīm) is described as highly flourishing; the big winding of the Nile here is perfectly known to Ibn Sulaim. The Nile is "divided" then into seven rivers; from the description it is clear that the northern one of these rivers is the Athbara, coming from the east; further south the "White Nile" and the "Green Nile", join near the capital of "Al-Ma'ārí. "The White Nile", coming from the east, is again the result of four rivers, one of which comes, as the author thinks, from the country of the Habagha, and one from the country of the Zanjī; this last, incorrect, statement may have been influenced by learned tradition. Between the "White Nile" and the "Green Nile" there stretches a large island (qabba, as it is still called on our maps), which has no limits in the south. This is about the only description in mediaeval Islamic literature that shows how far the knowledge of the middle Nile really went. Only little of it seems to have reached the systematic geographic treatises; al-Idrīsī, e.g., describes this part of the river in a way which only shows that he did not make good use of the inadequate sources that were at his disposal.

The exploration of the upper Nile and its sources since the end of the xvith century was the work of European travellers. They discovered, or perhaps re-discovered, the real big Nile lakes and identified the Ruwenzori mountain range with the Moon Mountains, the "source of the Nile," which was found again by the explorer Speke in the name of the Nyamukwe country, the "country of the moon." A part of the exploration of the Nile was due, however, also to Egyptian initiative. The well-known military expedition of 1820—1822 under Muḥammad 'Alī's son Ismā'īl Pāsha, during which the city of Kārṣīm was founded, established Egyptian domination in the Egyptian Sudan and opened the way for further scientific exploration. In the years 1839—1842 three Egyptian expeditions went up the White Nile, and during the reign of Ismā'īl Pāsha the Egyptian government repeatedly tried to cleanse the swamps of the White Nile above Solāh from the masses of vegetation (ṣalīr) which hindered navigation.

The yearly flood of the Nile (fīyūla, fāṭiha, fāyūna) is the phenomenon to which Egypt has been at all times indebted for its fertility and prosperity, as it provides, in compensation for the almost complete lack of rain in the country, a natural and almost regular irrigation for the lands on its borders and in the delta. It is the foundation of all cultural life and justifies entirely the attribution of χαλέπιον so often given to the river. On the same account the Nile is considered, as well as the Euphrates, as a "believing" river (al-Ma'ārí, ed. Wiet, M.I.F.A.O., xxx. 218). The flood deeply influences the private and public life of villagers and townsmen alike, and already the oldest Muḥammadan traditions about Egypt reflect the feelings of wonder and thankfulness that animated the people of Egypt before them (Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, p. 109, 205). Having reached its lowest level towards the end of May at Assam and in the middle of June at Cairo, the Nile begins to rise again, reaching its highest level in the beginning of September at Assam and in the beginning of October at Cairo. This regularity brings about a similar regularity in the methods of irrigation in the several parts of Egypt, in the times of the sowing and reaping of the different crops and consequently in the modes of levying the land taxes (e.g. al-Ma'ārí, ed. Rūbūk, i. 270, which text comes from Ibn Hawqāl); all the dates referring to these occupations have always continued to be fixed according to the Coptic solar calendar.

There is much discussion in the literary sources about the causes of the flood. The most ancient belief, which still some time corresponds best with reality, was that the flood is caused by heavy rainfalls in the countries where the Nile and its tributaries have their origin. This is expressed in a somewhat exaggerated way in a tradition that goes back to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-Ṭāṣ, according to which all the rivers of the world contribute, by divine order, with their waters to the flood of the Nile (Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, loc. cit., and p. 149). This implies the belief that all other rivers fall while the Nile rises, but, on the other hand, it is sometimes observed that other rivers also show the same phenomenon of rising and falling, especially the Indus, and this again is considered as a proof of the common origin of the two rivers (al-Ma'ārí, ed. Wiet, M.I.F.A.O., xxx. 227). There are, however, other views, which attribute the cause of the flood in the movement of the sea, or to the effect of the winds; these views have been inherited from sources of the pre-Muḥammadan period, among others from the treatise on the flood of the Nile attributed to Aristotle, and they are discussed and refuted at length in a special chapter of al-Ma'ārí's *Kitāb (M.I.F.A.O., xxx. 238 sqq.).

Up to the xviith century the irrigation system of Egypt continued along the same lines. When the flood begins all the outlets on both sides of the main stream and its principal arms in the Delta are closed, to be opened again about the time of the highest flood, when the water level has reached the necessary height according to the different places. The most important of these yearly "openings" was that of the canal (Khalīla) of Cairo, which, until recent times, remained a public festival. In Cairo the flood is complete (wafū' al-Nīl), when it has reached 16 shīrā, generally in the first decade of the Coptic month of Mesore (about the midst of August), and this was proclaimed everywhere. In the town (cf. the description by Lane, Monuments and Customs, ii. 287 sqq. and E. Littmann, Ein arabischer Text über die Nilwelle, Festschrift Oppenheim, Berlin 1933, p. 66 sqq., for older times, al-Kāfisalāh, iii. 316).

The height of the level of the Nile has been measured since olden times by the Nilometers (cf. 446). Many of these nilometers are recorded by the
sources, the southernmost being that of ‘Alwa and the most celebrated the one of Al-Fustat, constructed by Yaqub b. Zaid al-Tan‘i, about 921 (731) and often restored afterwards (a complete survey of all the sluices is given in Omar Youssouf, Mémoire sur l’Histoire du Nil, ii. 265 sqq.). The sluices generally were made of stone, with marks upon them, but they were sometimes of other material (e.g., a fig-tree near the monastery of Safanfūr in Nubia; cf. Evetts, Churches, p. 262). The level necessary for the operations of irrigation existed in different places; in the capital the average level had to be 16 šērās above the lowest level of the Nile; if the flood surpassed 18 šērās it became dangerous, while a flood not exceeding 12 šērās meant famine (cf. e.g., al-‘Idrīsī, p. 145, 146). In the history of Egypt the years after 444 (1054), and especially the year 451 (1059), are notorious for the famine and disaster caused by the failure or practical failure of the flood. A historical account of the flood from the years 152—1298 (769—1379) is given on p. 454 sqq. of Omar Youssouf, Mémoire sur l’Histoire du Nil, ii.

The regulation of the main streams and its branches are ascribed to the ancient Egyptian kings (al-Makrizī, on the authority of Ibn Wāṣif Zāhī, but no real irrigation work of a wider scope existed in the Middle Ages and later except the famous canal system of al-Fayyūm [s.v.], which all the sources ascribe to the prophet Yūsuf. In the rest of Egypt the water was allowed to flow freely over the lands after the piercing of the dams, so that large areas were completely inundated for some time; the Arab sources contain some vivid descriptions of the large stretches of water, above which rose the villages and the communication between the villages being only possible by means of boats during that time of the year (al-Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, i. 162; Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, p. 205).

Since the reign of Muhammad ‘Ali new attempts at irrigation works have been planned with the aim of making the country more productive, a possibility at which already the medieval authors hinted more than once. The first efforts, however, failed. About 1840 was begun the construction of a great barrier across the two arms of the Nile at the apex of the Delta, according to the plan of the French engineer Mouget, but this enterprise began to yield its fruit fifty years later when this barrage project, including the Twelfthiyya, Manfūtiyya and Muḥāfira canals, had been completed in 1890. The later great irrigation works were executed higher up the river, such as the great dam and locks at the head of the canals near Philae above Assuan, in 1902, which was raised again in 1912, and again in 1933. While allowing, on one side, a better regulation of the distribution of Nile water in Egypt, these barrages higher up enable at the same time a better irrigation of the borders to the south of Egypt. Herewith is connected the enormous barrage of Makwīr near Semnār on the Blue Nile above Khartum, which permits the irrigation of the region called al-Dīrās, between the Blue Nile and the White Nile. This work was finished in 1925 and is meant to be completed by a similar barrage on the White Nile. In this way the control of the Nile waters has passed to a certain extent out of Egypt itself; it recalls the days of the great famine in 1059, when the Egyptians thought that the Nubians were holding up the flood of the Nile.

The same problem came up recently with regard to the new project of constructing a dam on the frontier of the Sudan and the Belgian Congo and the question was raised whether this dam will prove a fatal al-Nil or a fāṭilah al-Nil for Egypt (cf. the newspaper al-Malā‘ūd of March 17, 1934).

It has already been shown above that the opening of the canal of Cairo. But in other respects also the Nile is connected with traditional customs of a religious character, which are to be traced back through the Greek-Christian period into very ancient times. When the Arabs conquered Egypt, the sacrifice of the "Nile Bride" was still in use; every year a richly apparelled young virgin was thrown into the Nile to obtain a plentiful inundation. According to a tradition first recorded by Ibn Abī al-Hakam (p. 150), this custom was abolished by Amr Ibn al-‘Āṣ and the Nile resumed its flood after a note of the caliph ‘Umar had been thrown into it requiring the river to rise if the flood was willed by God. In later times a symbolic offering of a girl called "Ararat al-Nil" was still practised on the Coptic festival al-Salāt (Norden, Travels in Egypt and Nubia, 1757, p. 63—65); Lane (Manners and Customs, p. 290) mentions a round pillar of earth, near the dam of the canal of Cairo, which pillar was called al-‘Ārūs. Another custom, practised formerly by Christians and Muḥāmmadians alike, was to bathe in the Nile on the eve of the Epiphany, in memory of the Baptism of Christ (cf. Evetts, Churches, p. 129). Al-Mas‘ūdī (Murūj, ii. 364 sqq.) describes this festival, which he calls Lailat al-‘Igīlās, for the year 330 (943). Lane (p. 363 sqq.) describes the same ceremony, but in his account the Muḥāmmadians did not take part in it. But bathing in Nile water in general figures harakā (cf. W. Blackman, The Beginning of Upper Egypt, p. 32 with regard to bathing in the Bahārīs). The quality of the Nile water is a matter of discussion in medical treatises. Avicenna (al-Qānūn f. ‘Ilā Tadbir al-tibb, ed. Blümel 1294, l. 98; cited by al-Makrizī) holds that the circumstance that a river flows from south to north has a bad influence on the water, especially when a south wind blows; and on this account he thinks that the abundant praise given to the Nile is exaggerated.

The Egyptian physician Ibn Risālīn (d. 453 = 1061) says that the Nile water reaches Egypt in a pure state, owing to the health in the country of the Sudan, but that the water is spoiled by the impurities that mix with it on Egyptian soil (cited by al-Makrizī, M. J. F. A. C., xxx, 275 sqq.). This same author describes very clearly the troubled condition of the water when the flood begins. He discusses likewise the influence of the Nile on the climate of Egypt and the medicinal properties of its water.

Other authors speak at length of the fauna of the Nile, giving especial attention to the fish. A very long list of fishes is given by al-Ikhšās (p. 16 sqq., with a description of their often curious qualities. The animals most frequently described by the geographers are, however, the crocodiles, and the animal called sakhābūr, which is said to be the result of a cross between a crocodile and a fish, but which seems to be in reality a kind of lizard. The possibilities which the Nile afforded for navigation are best seen from the historical sources. Seagoing vessels do not seem ever to have entered
its arms, while the traffic on the river was maintained by small craft; various names of Nile boats occur in literature; in the sixth century the vessel called axshabitya is especially known. In earlier times the term selëftâ was used for a Nile boat (al-Kindi, Kitâb al-Ummâr, ed. Guest, p. 157; Dozy, Supplement, i. v.). The skill of the fishermen in their sailing boats on the lakes in the Delta is often recorded; on shallow places, however, as well as on the inundated lands, boats had to be moved by means of sars or poles. The rapids between Egypt and Nubia were, as nowadays, an insurmountable barrier to river traffic; the loads were conveyed along the shores to the other side of the falls (Ibn Hawkal, MS Sultan Ahmed Koshâ, Nûg. 3346, fol. 86).

The cataracts above Assuan for a long time continued to form a barrier to the spread of Islam towards the countries bordering the Nile to the south of Egypt, which forms a curious contrast with the part played by the Nile in the introduction of Christianity into Nubia (cf. J. Krause, Die Anfänge des Christentums in Nubien, Münster [Diiss. 1926]). Islam penetrated only slowly into Nubia and became more generally disseminated in the Sudan only in the eighth century (cf. Schum.).

Something has been said already about the praises of the Nile and its descriptions in poetical terms, by which this river has contributed to Arabic literature. Al-Maârikî (loc. cit., p. 297 sqq.) gives some fragments of poems in praise of the Nile and its flood; among the poets who he names are Taullum Ibn al-Muqta (q.v.) (d. 983) and Ibn al-Kalâikî (d. 1172). Further âqabî (i. 592; iv. 865) cites some poems which he attributes to Umâia b. Abi l-Šâit; this poet is probably Abu l-Šâit Umâia b. 'Abd al-Âzîz (d. 1154) who wrote a treatise al-Šâit al-Mihrjâ, from which also al-Maârikî makes quotations. The earliest Arabic poems on the Nile are probably those found in the Dîwân of Ibn Kais al-Rukiîrî (q.v.), the court poet of 'Abd al-Âzîz Ibn Marwân in the beginning of the eighth century. Several treatises have been especially devoted to the Nile. Ibn Zîlîkî (d. 1108) says in his Fawâîd al-Mihrâb (MS, arabic Nûg. 1818 of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, fol. 317) that he has written a book on the importance and the salutary qualities of the Nile, which now seems to be lost. Further there are a treatise Tahârîr al-Âkkâsh fî al-Nil wâlal-Âkbâthi mîn al-Âkkâsh (MS. in Algiers; cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L. ii. 566), and two short opuscules by Djalîl Ibn al-Mahallî (d. 1459) and al-Suyûtî, which are found together in the MS. Orl. 1535 of the British Museum (Rieu, Suppl., Nûg. 1168; G. A. L. ii. 114).

Biography. As the aim of the present article is to give an account of the Nile from the point of view of Islam and its history, it seems superfluous to quote here even the most important modern works and articles belonging to the abundant bibliography of the Nile. The earlier Maâhmadan authors have all been named in the text; the later ones, such as Yâqût, 'Abî al-Lajîfî, Abu l-Fâdîl, al-Kalâgashî, al-Maârikî, al-Suyûtî (Hum al-Maâhmadî, al-Nawawî and others are in most cases a compendium of earlier views and statements. A very important later Maâhmadan source is al-Kalâgashî al-Tamârîsa by 'Ali Bâgha Mâdârkî. The Maâhmadan literary sources have been used in the following works: Else Reitzenmeyer, Geschichte Ägyptens im Mitteltal, Leipzig 1903, p. 31—61; J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la Geography de l'Egypte, in M.F.A.C., xxxvi, 215 sqq. and very profusely: Omer Tsoukounou, L'histoire de l'Egypte, vol. ii, ii, iii, in Mémoriala frères à l'Institut d'Egypte, vii, viii, x, Cairo 1945. The last of the three volumes contains a series of cartographical reconstructions. A number of ancient Maâhmadan maps of the Nile are to be found in the Maps of Arabic, ed. Konrad Miller, Stuttgart 1926—1930, and more completely in vol. iii of the Monuments Cartographiques Arabes et Egyptiens by Tsoukounou Koutoum, as far as this work has appeared; in this same work all the geographical references to the Nile are also to be found in a chronological order. (J. H. KRAMER)

NÚMAT ALLÁH b. AHMAD b. Kádí MUKÁN, known as Khalîfî Sülû, author of a Persian-Turkish Dictionary, entitled Longâh-î Nûmat Allàh. Born in Sôhà, where as an anonymous he made a reputation as an artist, he moved to Constantinople and there entered the Nakib-bândî order; Association with the Nakib-bândî dervishes made him more closely acquainted with literature and

Nûmat Allàh b. Ahmad b. Kâdi Mukân, known as Khalîfî Sülû, author of a Persian-Turkish Dictionary, entitled Longâh-î Nûmat Allàh. Born in Sôhà, where as an unnamed he made a reputation as an artist, he moved to Constantinople and there entered the Nakib-bândî order; Association with the Nakib-bândî dervishes made him more closely acquainted with literature and

Bibliography: J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., i. 59 sq.; Sîflîd al-Umâmî, i. 86 (according to Neût); P. Tschauchner, in H. xii. 133—137.

(NAZIME BAHÇENGİ)
especially with Persian poetry. Nīmat Allāh decided to make accessible to others the knowledge he had acquired by an ardent study of Persian literature and thus arose his lexicographical work which he probably compiled at the instigation and with the assistance of the famous Khānābādī Qājār, Ābād Allāh Vāfi [see Vāfi]. After his teacher’s death, he went to Samarqand, then visited Herāt and Yezd and finally settled in Māhān, 8 farakhs from Kirmān, where he spent the last 25 years of his life and died on 22nd Radjah 834 (April 5, 1431). His tomb is still a popular place of pilgrimage (shāh-darāz). In his lifetime, he was held in great honour by all rulers and received particular marks of esteem from Shīh-Bakht. His grandchildren migrated to India and were appointed to high office in the Deccan by ‘Alī al-Dīn Ābād Allāh Bahmanī (1435–1457). Nīmat Allāh was a very prolific theorist of Sīflm and is said to have written over 500 šāhids on different questions of Sufi doctrine. About a hundred of these have come down to us and can be identified. They are for the most part quite short treatises, generally explanations of difficult passages in the classics of Sīflm like Ibn al-Arābah, Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Ibrāhīm, etc. His large Dīvān of lyric poetry is much more valuable; it contains much true poetry and is marked by a fervent sincerity.

Bibliography: E. Echê, in G.E.P., ii. 139, 142; J. Rieu, Catalogues, p. 433, 534, 541, 774, 823, 831, 836; E. G. Browne, History of Persian Literature under Tatar Dominions, Cambridge, 1902, p. 463 sq.; D. Wālsh, in J. of the Persian, iv. 145 (where 23th Radjah is given as the date of his death) and Dāwlatshāh (ed. Browne, p. 333–340), which however with his usual carelessness gives 827 as the date of his death.

Nīmat Allāh al-Dīn ‘Alī, Mirzā Nisār al-Dīn Muḥammad, son of Ḥakim Fath al-Dīn Shīkh, a Persian author, was born in India and came to a family of several of whom had been distinguished physicians in their ancestral homes in Shīrāz. He entered the service of the state under Shāh-Dījāhn (1628–1659) and was appointed keeper of the crown jewels with the title of ‘alā al-mulk. He attained his highest honour under Awaragbī (1659–1707) who gave him the title of Nīmat Allāh (1104 = 1692–1693), which was later exchanged to Muṣarrab Khān and then to Dāvūngān Khān. He died at Delhi on the 1st Rafī’ 1132 (May 30, 1710). Nīmat Allāh who wrote under the pseudonym of Ālī, was exceedingly prolific and wrote a number of works in prose and verse of which the following are the most important: 1. Nasīl’din Hāfiz, a description of the siege of Hāfiz̄ābād by Awaragbī in 1687–1688. This work is characterized by a biting wit and describes the siege in a satirical form which procured the little book the greatest popularity; 2. Dāwlatshāh, a chronicle which covers the last years of Awaragbī’s reign and the war which broke out after his death among his sons; 3. Bahādur-Shāh-nāma, a chronicle of the two first years of the reign of Shīh ‘Abd al-Bahādur-Shāh (1707–1712); 4. Hūsadī, also called Kāshkulīd, a chronicle, an allegorical love story, an imitation of the celebrated Hūsadī al-Dīl of Faṭāhī [q.v.]; 5. Raḥīmat al-Kulūb, satirical sketches of a number of contemporaries; 6. Shāhīd-i Hādībād-i Ḥakāmān,
anecdotes of physicians and their incompetence; 7. Kähni's Nümöd, a work on cookery; 8. Rüppel's, letters to Mżrż Mühszfr Allah Hikūh, and Wżţs, Mżzābīd Mżhāmād Sā'ud, the head of the imperial kitchen and others, which were very highly thought of as models of a choice style of letter-writing; 9. a lyrical Dīvān; 10. a short Matn Mōsulwī without a title, which deals with the usual Sūfi ethical themes. This survey shows a great versatility on the part of Nümöd Khan but it must be pointed out that, with the exception of the satirical works which are really original and of great value which are the characterisation of his age, none of them rises above the level of degenerate imitations of classical models.


NIRMŪR. [See Namūr]

NIRMŪR, a ruined site in the ancient Assyria, the northern portion of the modern 'Iraq, about twenty miles south of Mosul, in 36° 1' North Lat. and 43° 20' East Long. (Greenwich), in the angle formed by the Tigris and its tributary, the Upper or Great Zāb, six miles above the mouth of the latter. The plateau of Nirmūr rises abruptly from the surrounding country, and the great advantages of this situation, caused a settlement to be made here already in remote antiquity. Excavations on the site have established the fact that the ruins there were those of the town of Kalkhu (Kalâh), which is already mentioned as Kâlish (Calah) in the Old Testament in a passage which is not absolutely unsatisfactory (Gen. x. 11-12), which says it was built either by Nimrod or Ashurib; the latter appears to me more intelligible. In Greek writers we find only the name of the district Kaksisvē or Kaksisvē (cf. Pamy-Wissowa, Realms of the East, Altertumsw., xi. 1530). It was no doubt its favourable strategic position that decided the Assyrian King Shalmanasar I (c. 1250-1205) to raise it to be his royal residence alongside of the previous capital Ashurib (now Kalâh, Nimmur, q.v.).

We learn nothing from the cuneiform inscriptions about the decline of Kalkhu. Kalkhu probably fell about the same time as Nineveh after a stubborn resistance to the onslaught of the Median-Babylonian army. When Xenophon in 405 B.C. passed by the town, which he describes clearly, it was already a ruin.

So far as I know Kalkhu is not mentioned in Syriac literature and in the Arab writers of the middle ages only incidentally and under wrong names. In Yâfî (ed. Wustenfeld, i. 119, 167 ii. 113), we are told that al-Salāmān is the vicinity of the ruins of the town of Askir, which can only mean the ruins of Kalkhu (cf. also ib., p. 184). At the present day the site is known only as Nimrud, which so far as I know first appears in the Itinerary, who stayed in Mōsul in 1766, see his Reisebeschreibung, nach Arabien und andern unentdeckten Ländern, ii. (Copenhagen 1779), p. 355, 368. When this, no the same day, the usage appears to me unknown, I consider it to be of modern origin. It should be noted that names like Nimrud, Tell Nimrud, etc., are not found in the geographical nomenclature of Mesopotamia and the 'Iraq in the middle ages, while they are several times met with at the present day.

The first European to give a brief account of the "ruined castle" of Nimrud and the remains there was Niebuhr, although not from his own inspection. In 1721 Dr. Rich visited the site and gives the first detailed account of the ruins; in his pithy and succinct work are the first pictures of cuneiform tablets discovered there. A few years before Layard, William Ainsworth examined the site. In 1834 F. R. Laidard visited it. Layard, the real investigator of Nimrud, twice examined the mounds of ruins in 1840 but it was not until 1845 that he was able to begin excavations, which were conducted in two great expeditions (1845-1847 and 1849-1851). Layard's reports were supplemented in many details by the notes, which to little attention has so far been paid, by Sandacek (see Bibliothek) who spent a considerable time in Mōsul and its neighbourhood in 1830. After Layard's departure home, H. Rassam continued his work in Nimrud. In 1873 G. Smith resumed Layard's work but only for a month. Finally Rassam on behalf of the British Museum again continued the earlier excavations for a period of five years (1878-1882).

Our study of the topography of Nimrud must still be based on the large map of the vicinity of Nineveh and the whole area between the Tigris and Upper Zāb made by F. Jones in 1852, which the Royal Asiatic Society published in three sheets under the title Visits of Assyria (sheets 2 and 3 deal with Nimrud). The commentary on these maps is the article by Jones, in J. R. A. S. vol. xv. (see Bibliothek).

The fairly comprehensive complex of ruins at Nimrud forms a rectangular plateau, out of which a triangular mass juts in the southeast giving the whole the appearance of an irregular hexagon. The longest side, which runs east and west, measures 7,000 feet; the northeaster side 5,000 feet (in the southeast including the salient triangle 6,600 feet). The circumference of the whole area is six miles. Layard's investigations revealed that this extensive area marking the site of the town of Kalkhu was surrounded by a wall with towers. In the north he found fifty-eight, in the east fifty of these towers; in the southwest the wall of earth has now almost entirely disappeared (cf. Layard, Dissevows etc., p. 630). The length of the wall was seven miles, that is to say it was longer than the boundary of the whole ruined area because two arms were necessary to include the suburbs in the southeast.

The royal quarter in the southwest corner with the palaces and chief temples occupied a relatively small part of the area described. It lay on a terrace and was shut off from the rest of the town by a wall. To it also belonged the high cone-shaped mound in the northwest which is the dominating
The Tigris now runs about one and a half miles from Nimrud but in Assyrian times it flowed directly past the walls of the town as distinct traces still prove (cf. thereon Jones in J. R. A. S., xv. 342—343 = Selections, p. 446 sq.; Lehmann-Haupt, *Materialien*, p. 27 and his Aramäis, 111, 250 sq.). In the centre, between the still distinct ancient bed of the Tigris and the modern one, is a third bed which the river filled in the middle ages; this latter now bears the name of Tell Abû Darban (see Jones, *Vestiges* and J. R. A. S., xv. 343 = Selections, p. 447) = "The road of Abû Debâh"); apparently after a Debân tribe (the explanation given by Jones is hardly tenable).

A quarter of an hour west of the ruined site of Nimrud (called frequently al-Kal’a = the citadel) is an older settlement, the fair-sized village of (old) Nimrud also called Darâwish. Still farther west, near the Tigris is a village also called (New) Nimrud of more recent origin and a mile N.W. of it directly on the river the village of Nafie. Again a mile N.W. are the remains of a dam first described by J. Macdonald Kinnes from personal observations (see his *Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia and Kurdistan*, London 1858, p. 405). The natives call it Sıkâ or Sıkâh Nimrud (see Kinnes, loc. cit.; Layard, *Nimrud*, i. 8) = Nimrud’s Dam. Jones gives (J. R. A. S., xv. 343 = Selections, p. 447) and Fergusson of *Assyria*, sheet ii; Sıkâh Nimrud ( = Nimrud’s Cliff); I suspect that he picked up the name wrongly (ṣâbîr for ask *dam’). At the same time we also have the name Sıkâ al-Awâzî (Rich, loc. cit., p. 129) as simply al-Awâzî, Away (Layard, *Layard’s Map*, i. 8, 365; Jones, loc. cit.) = "dam of noise" or *(the) noise* (ṣawâhīl or ṣawâh from Farsi bâz̄âh; see Vullers, *Lex. Pers.*, p. 36) and this second name owes its origin to the great noise caused by the waters breaking over the rocks here. The people of the vicinity say that there was once a bridge here. Probably a barrier of rock in the river was already used in ancient times as the foundation for a dam for irrigation purposes.

Still farther west there is also a town about three miles from the ruins of Nimrud lies Seleúcîa on the Tigris, now a small village but in the middle ages as Yâḵût, iii. 115 (al-Saltûmâ); cf. also i. 119, 124) tells us, one of the most beautiful places in the region of Mûsûl. The modern Selâmû lies in the southeastern corner of an area covered with old ruins.

This Belûmîyâ may with great probability be identified with the Biblical Resen, numbered among the four Assyrian towns founded by Ashûtût (or Nimrud; cf. above) according to Gen. x. 11-12, and thence located as lying between Nineveh and Kalâkh (Calah). The assertion constantly made in learned works because of the words describing them "the same is a great city" and in view of passages in Jonah (3, 3-4; 4, 1-11) that these formed a gigantic tetrapolis linked together hardly deserves serious refutation.

The greater part of the finds at the English excavations at Nimrud are in the British Museum where they are exhibited in the Assyrian transept, the Nimrud Gallery and in the Nimrud Central Saloon (cf. the B. M. Guide etc. [see Bâlût], p. 41 sq.). Nimrud provided the British Museum with even greater treasures in sculptures (not inscriptions) than Koyunjik-Nimrud. Various objects from Layard’s collection were left in Bombay on the way home and are now, with some pieces brought
by Rawlinson, in the possession of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; on them see Karkarian in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xviii. (Bombay 1891), p. 97–107. A large series of sculptures came to the Louvre; cf. E. Pottier, *Catalogue des Antiquites de la Grande Babylone* (Louvre), Paris 1842, p. 23, 49–63. There are also miscellaneous antiquities from Nimrud in the national collections in St. Petersburg, Berlin, Zürich and Leningrad (Hermitage); on a few finds by Lehmann-Haupt, see his *Materialien*.

The English excavators left the site without filling in or even roughly levelling the ground they had cut up. In the spring of 1920 the Iraqi government however had the half-exposed sculptures lifted and put in the new Museum in Baghdad. During my stay in Nimrud (May 1928), I saw the sculptures lying on the bank of the Tigris ready to be moved (2 statues of Nabû, a colossal bull, fragments of another, an unfinished lion in stone, two great slabs with inscriptions of Ashurnasirpal II).


**NIMRUD** [See Sharrân].

**NIRIZ, a place in A.Dharhashîdîn on the road from Marâgha[s] to Urmiya.** The stage on this route is still obscure. At about 15 farsâks south of Marâgha was the station of Barza where the road forked; the main road continued southward to Dinawar while the northwest went from Barza to Tidin (3 farsâks), thence to Djâbarwân (6 farsâks), thence to Niriz (4 farsâks), thence to Urmiya (14 farsâks); cf. Ibn Khurdâbdîh, p. 231 (referred to by Kudânâ with some variations); Maqâdshî, p. 383.

The distance from Urmiya indicates that Niriz was in the vicinity of Suldur [s. v.] which would find confirmation in the etymology from *Arüm* "flying". Suldur lies in the low plain, through which the Gâder flows to the Lake of Urmiya. At the present day the name Niriz is unknown, but a Kurd tribe of the region of Sa‘ulî-hulâq [s. v.] bears the name of Nirizi.

After the Arab conquest a family of Türe Turks settled in Niriz. The first of these semi-independent chiefs was Murh b. Ali Majwûl who built a town at Niriz and enlarged the market of Djâbarwân (cf. Bâylûhûrî and Ya‘qûlí, ii. 446). One of his sons, "Ali, was among the rebels of 128 (829) whom the governor of A.Dharhashîdîn Muhammad b. Hamad Tîsî deported to Baghdad, but "Ali succeeded it, seems, in returning to his lands) cf. Ibn Khurdâbdîh, p. 119. Abîl Rûfîn Omâr b. "Ali, appointed in 260 (873) governor of A.Dharhashîdîn by the caliph, made war on his predecessor "Ali b. Ahmad Asdî and killed him (Tabart, iii. 1886). He was supported by the Khuwâaisy. Cf. the account in Pâshâlini-i gümûsî, Teherân 1909, ii. 27, 34. In the 4th century Jâshîh, p. 186 and Ibn Hawkûl, p. 240 mention the Banî Radînà as a dynasty already forgotten which had reigned over Dâkhkûn (read Djâbarwân). Tâhirî (read Niriz) and Ughnûn al-Ashkariyâ [cf. Ughnûn].

(V. Minoteky)

**AL-NÍṢÁ, the "Women", the title of Sûra 1v. of the Kur‘ân; so-called because in the opening verses the position of women is dealt with; Nóldeke (Geschwicht des Qur’ân, i. 195) thinks that the greater part belongs to the period between the end of the year 3 and the year 5.**

This sûra contains many verses that were abrogated: among the principal we may mention 8–9 abrogated by 12; 10 abrogated by Il. 178; 20 abrogated by xxv. 2; 33 abrogated by xxiv., 60 et al.

It is also one of the most important sûras of the Kur‘ân because many of the precepts formulated in it form the foundations for the Muhammadan laws of marriage.
The site lacks unity, consisting as it does of a collection of verses of different origins and on different subjects. The following is a brief analysis of its contents: the creation of man; consanguinity; the care of orphans; rules for succession; marriage; relations of husband and wife; impediments to marriage; almsgiving; evidences and local homicide; holy war and the art of war; obedience to Allah and the Prophets; punishment of the unbelieving Jews and Christians.

Bibliography: Cf. the art. AL-NASH and add: Tanwiq Dijwaru, Tafsir, Cairo, 25 vol.; Ahmad Ridda, Tafsir al-Madini, Cairo, 9 vols. so far appeared. (MAURICE CHE MOUL)

NISAB. [See ZAKAT.]

NISAN, the seventh month in the Syrian calendar. Its name is taken from the first month of the Jewish religious (seventh of the civil) year with the period of which it roughly coincides. It corresponds to April of the Roman year and like it has 30 days. On the 10th and 23rd Nisar, according to al-Butrus, the two first stations of the moon are on the morning plane (the number of these two stations is first and second; and so it appears that the numbering was established by scholars for whom Nisar was the first month) and the 8th and 16th. At 1300 of the Seleucid era (549 A.D.), according to al-Butrus, the stars of the 28th and 1st stations of the moon rose and those of the 14th and 15th set while the rising and setting of the 28th and 16th stations of the moon took place in Abyr.

Bibliography: al-Butrus, Abu Nasr, ed. Sacheau, p. 60, 70, 347-349; cf. also the references under TAMMUL. (M. PLESSNER

NISH (Serbian Nis), the second largest town in Serbia, the capital of the banate of Morava in the kingdom of Jugos-
slavia, situated 650 feet above sea-level in a fertile plain surrounded by hills, on both sides of the Nisava not far from its junction with the Morava and an important centre of communications by rail and road, and on the international route to Sofia-Istanbul or Salonika-Athens. The larger part of the town with the railway station lies on the left bank, the fortress is on the right. The two parts of the town are connected by four iron bridges (including a railway bridge), cover an area of 11 sq. m. and had in 1931 35,354 inhabitants of whom only 3,776 are Muslims. According to the latest (Dec. 1933) statistics of the Imam-registrar, Nish has 1,082 Muslims in 365 households, chiefly gypsies, while Muslims speaking Serbo-Croatian, Turkish and Albanian form the remainder. These gypsies call themselves Muslims, bear Muslim names, marry with Muslim rites but nevertheless observe at home some of the Serbian Orthodox Church feasts, visit the churches etc. There are a number of offices of the civil and military authorities in the town, including a district shah's court. This court has existed only since Oct. 29, 1929, i.e. since the abolition of the old office of district mufti whose authority till then extended over the whole of Serbia. The authority of the new court extends over a part of that of the older (19 districts) while the remainder are under the kadi of Belgrade. The Muslims of Nish have also a district waqf mufti council (cf. 1, p. 760); a common council (Rashadsko sabor) and a registration office (qanunma). There are said to have been in Nish in 1878, the last Turkish period (1878), only one of which now survives. The second last mosque of which the great minaret is still standing, was destroyed as a result of the great floods of 1896. Nish has also Serbian Orthodox churches and a Roman Catholic church, besides several synagogues. Besides several hospitals it has a Hygienic Institute, two hospitals and a society for popular education. The town is making steady progress. Its whole history shows that Nish has always been an important strategical and commercial centre.

In antiquity Nish (Naisus, Nya, Nissa etc.) belonged at first to the Roman province Moesia Superior and later became the capital of Dardania. Nish's greatest claim to fame is that it was the birthplace of Constantine the Great (306—337) and attained great prosperity in ancient times. The Romans had state munition works here.

In the time of the migrations of the Huns, Nish was taken after a vigorous resistance by Attila (434—453) and destroyed but rebuilt and refortified very soon afterwards by Justinian I (527—565). By the middle of the sixth century the first forces of the Slavs who had entered the Balkan peninsula in their endeavour to found states at the expense of the Byzantine empire appeared before Nish. Nish was thus in the ninth century usually in the hands of the Bulgars and until 1018 it belonged to a Slav state founded in Macedonia in 976 by the emperor Samuel. The Byzantines held it from 1018 to the end of the 11th century, when, after a long and bloody siege, it fell to the Hungarians. In 1072 the Hungarians reached the town on a marauding campaign; in 1096 its inhabitants had to defend themselves in a strenuous battle at the Bridge against the Crusaders in which the latter suffered very heavily, and in 1183 the town was taken by Reza III supported by Nemania, the Serbian prince. A little later, Nemania took Nish and the whole country as far as Servica (Sofia). The town suffered considerably in these troubled times. The Third Crusade (1192) found it almost empty and practically destroyed. In spite of this, Nemania was able to receive the emperor Barbarossa in Nish with great ceremony. From this time on to the Turkish conquest Nish was generally in Serbian hands. In the feudal Turkish chronicles (e.g. Subkakulis, Umil b. Xalt, Aškhabaghadik, Neški [Nisak], Anonymous [Gise]) there is no mention of the taking of Nish: Sa'd al-Din (192—93), Hadiji Khalifa and Ewyia Čelebi, than von. Hammer (G.O.K.3, i, 152) and Laine-Poulle (Turkey, p. 40) on the other hand, assume that it took place in the reign of Murad I in 1777 (1375—1376). The Serbian chronicles however definitely give 1386 and this year, which Gibbons has recently strongly urged as the correct date (The Foundations of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916, p. 163—162), is now generally accepted.

During the Turkish period (1386—1878) Nish had chequered fortunes. In 1443 it was taken by the Christian army under king Vladislas III and John Hunyadi and destroyed. After the fall of Smardenovo in 1459 the Serbian despotate became a Turkish province and Nish was even more securely in Turkish hands. For several days after June 20, 1524 a great fire raged in Nish which would have destroyed it completely if the Ruggerbeg Ahmed Pasha, who was leading an army against Hungary

NISHÂNDJI, secretary of state for the Sultan’s subjugs, chancellor.

The Saljukis and Mamufkus already had special officials for drawing the tuguri, the sultân’s signature.

As their official organization was inherited in almost all its details by the Ottomans this post naturally was included, its holder was called nishânji or tughul. The nishânji held the same rank as the defterars [q.v.] and indeed even preceded them, for we had defterars promoted to nishânji but never a nishânji becoming a defterar. The nishânji was included among the "pillars of the empire" (cîrbân-dârîc). The part which he played varied in course of time. Besides being secretary of state for the imperial tughras (nîzâm) he had originally considerable legislative powers and he was called cumhûc-i bâsma (to distinguish him from the cumhûc proper, i.e. the Şâlah-i-Ìmâm). In his office the texts of the laws were prepared under his supervision. Most of the Ottoman codes of law (bâsma) that have come down to us go back to nishânji. As they had besides the right to approve the contents of documents put before them for the imperial tughras, they had no slight influence on the business of administration.

Of their official career we know that according to the Kâmün-i nâma of Mehmed II they had to be chosen from teachers acquainted with law (mütlevev), apparently because they had to display legislative ability, or from the defterars and ruwm al-bûtûth. As their authority diminished more and more in course of time, so did their influence, and finally they were limited to preparing the tughras. According to Mouradija d’Ohlson (Tableau de l’Empire Ottoman, iii. 373), the nishânjîs received from the state a salary of 6,620 piastres. On their official dress, see v. Hammer, G. Ö. A., viii. 431, according to whom they were red in contrast to the other defterars who were violet.

Bibliography: Cf. the article TUGHRÂ and the references there given; also J. v. Hammer, G. Ö. A., iii. 173; ii. 217, 229; iv. 3; viii. 431; J. v. Hammer, Der Osmanischen Reiches Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, Vienna 1815, i. 64; ii. 127, 135. (FRANZ BASHINGER)
NISHANDIL [See Diyalaladeh Mustavi Ck-
lehi; Karamanl Mejiem Pagha].
NISHAPUR, the most important of the
four great cities of Khurasan (Nishapur, Marw, Herat and Balkh), one of the great
cities of Iran in the middle ages.
The name goes back to the Persian Nēw-Shāhpūr ("Fair Shāhpūr"); in Armenian it is called Nū-
Shapuh, Arab. Naisabūr, new Pers. Nishapūr, pronounced in the time of Yaqūt:
Nūshapūr, now Nishapur (Noldke, Tabari, p. 39,
note 5; G. Hoffmann, Annales..., p. 61, note 530).
The town occasionally bore the official title
of honour, Irānshahr.
Nishapur was founded by Shāhpūr I, son of
Ardašīr I (Hamza-ī Asfahāni, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 48),
who had slain in this region the Turanian Pahlītāk
(Pālētāk) (Studialettica von Erān, § 13); some authors say
it was not founded till the time of Shāhpūr II
(Tabari, l. 840; al-Thālūthi, ed. Zotenberg, p. 259).
In the wider sense the region of Nishapur
comprised the districts of al-Tabās, Kūshānāst, Nizī,
Bīrūn, Abūzarābār, Djam, Khūshār, Tūs, Zandār-
and Isparān (Yaqūtī, ed. de Goeje, p. 375; cf.
Tabari, l. 388a); it is in the narrower sense
Nishapur which comprised the province of Abāzarābār (Arm.,
Apur ashkar, the district of the Arabo-
Marāqu, Ersāfūrā, p. 74; do., Catalogue of the
Roy. Câpsules of Erānshār, p. 52), which was
in turn divided into 13 Rustākā and 4 Tāstādāb
(names in Ḩa ṣ hā, p. 268; Ibn Ḥ awkal, p. 313;
Ibn Khurādzbijb, p. 24; Yaqūtī, p. 278; Ibn Rūsta, p. 171). The latter were: in the west Rewand
(now Rewand), in the south al-Shāmsī, Pers. Tāk-Ab,
in the east Fūghrashān (now Pōšt-Varzīd) and in the north Māzār (now Māzāl); cf. al-Maḥdiat,
p. 314—321.
In the Rewand hills to the northwest of the town
was one of the three most sacred fire-temples of the
Sūstānūn, that of the fire Hurūtā-Mib (G.
Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 290), Vansjāfīdī II (438—57)
made Nishapur his usual residence.
In the year 30 (651) or 31 (652) the governor of
Bawara, Abū Allāh b. Amīr [q. v.], took Nishapur
(Tabari, l. 3305; Balldīn, p. 404) whose governor
Khurājang (Xwāgıgyev: Marquart, Ersāfūrā, p. 75)
capitulated. The town was then insignificant
and had no garrison. During the fighting between Abī
ta-Mawīyā (36—37 = 659—697) the Arabas
were again driven out of Nishapur by a rising
in Khurasan and Tukhtābārdī (Tabari, l. 3249,
3350; Balldūrī, p. 405; Dinwārī, p. 163).
Perūz III, the son of Vansjāfīdī and of the
daughter of Khurājang of Nishapur, is said to have
lived for a period in Nishapur. Khulaid b. Kāt
davīd revolted against the rebellious town
(Dinwārī, op. cit.). Mawīyā reappointed Abī
Allāh b. Amīr governor of Bawara in 41 (661—662)
and commissioned him to conquer Khurasan
and Sījīṣtān. The latter in 42 (662—663) installed
Kātāt b. al-Hattām al-Salāmī in Nishapur
as governor of Khurasan. Ziyād b. Abī Sufiyān
in 45 (665—666) made Khulaid b. Abī Allāh al-
Hanafi governor of Abāzarābār (Nishapur). Abī
Allāh b. Khāsim rebelled in 683 against the
Umayyads. He fell in 692 at Marw fighting against
Abī-Adīl-Malik, whereupon Umayyad rule was restored
in Khurasan.
The prosperity of the city dates from the time
when Abī-Abābā Abī Allāh b. Tāhir made it
his capital in the third (ninth) century.

The founder of the Šaffārid dynasty, Yaqūtb b.
Al-Lāhī b. Mū’addal, entered Nishapur on the
2nd Shawwal 259 (Aug. 1, 873) and took Mu-
hammad b. Tāhir prisoner (Tabari, iii. 888; Gardizi
in Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion,
p. 217, note 6) but the latter soon regained
his liberty and bade. Only after Yaqūtb’s death was
his brother ‘Amr b. al-Lāhī granted the fiefs of
Khurasan and other districts. Rād b. Harjām
in 882 took Nishapur from him (Tabari, iii. 2039)
and Muhammad b. Tāhir became viceroy of
Khurasan in 885 again; but in 279 (929) ‘Amr was
finally confirmed in office as governor and erected
many buildings there. He finally fell in battle
(590—901) with Ishāk b. Ahmad. The town thus
passed to the Sāmānīs, under whom it attained
its greatest prosperity. It was the residence of the
 governor and commander-in-chief of the province
of Khurasan (nīşāk-alawar).
The Arabian geographers describe Nishapur at
this time as a thickly populated town divided into 42
wards, 1 farākh in length and breadth (al-Iskāhūr,
L. A., p. 542) and consisting of the citadel, the
city proper and an outer suburb in which was
the chief mosque built by the Šaffārid ‘Amr. Beside
it was the public market called al-Mu’askar, the
governor’s palace, a second open place called
Maidān al-Ḥanāmīyn and the prison. The citadel
had two gates and the city four: the Gate of the
Bridge, the Gate on the road from Ma’līk, the
Gate of the Fortres (Bāb al-Khawānzār) and the
Gate of the Taktān Bridge. The suburbs also had
walls with many gates. The best known market
places were al-Murabbašt’al-Kahara (near the Friday
Mosque) and al-Murabbašt’al-Saghāra. The most
important business streets were about fifty
in number and ran across the city in straight lines
intersecting at right angles; all kinds of wares
were on sale in them (on the products and exports
of Nishapur see G. Le Strange, The Lands of the
Eastern Caliphate, p. 429 sq.). Numerous canals
were led from the Wādi Saghāwr, which flowed
down from the village of Buhthanka and drove
70 mills, from whence it passed near the city
and provided the houses with an ample water
supply. Gardens below the city were also watered
in this way. The district of Nishapur was regarded
as the most fertile in Khurasan.
The town suffered many vicissitudes after this
period. A great famine broke out there in 901 (1011).
At the beginning of the 11th century Nishapur was the centre of the pietist Karrām’s led
by the anchorite Abī Bakr Muhammad b. Isābj. 
The Sīdājāl Ṭughrul-Beg occupied the town in 1037
and made it his capital. Alp Arslān also seems to
have lived there (cf. Barhebræus, Cœræs, Syr., ed.
Bedjan, p. 243). In May 1142 the Khwārimon Amīs took the town for a time from the Sīdājāl
Sūlān Sandjār. When it was sacked by the Ghuris
in 548 (1153), the inhabitants fled, mainly to the
suburb of Shādīyāk (al-Shādīyāk) which was
enlarged and fortified by the governor al-Mu’ayyad.
Tughrul-Shāb Abī Bakr ruled the city 1174—1185 and his son Sanjār Shāh 1185—1187.
In May or June 1187 the Khwārimon Amīs took
Nishapur and gave it to his eldest son Malik-
Shīh. At the end of 1193 the latter received Marw
and his brother Kubl al-Dīn Muhammad became
governor of Nishapur. Malik Shīh died in 1197
in the neighbourhood of Nishapur. ‘Abī al-Dīn
Muhammad (as Kubl al-Dīn called himself after
his father's death) took Marw and Nishapur in 1302 from Ghiyath al-Din and his brother Shihab al-Din.

In addition to the wars and rebellions (e.g. 1207—1208) which afflicted the town, it suffered from repeated earthquakes (540 = 1145, 605 = 1208, 679 = 1280). Yakhut who visited it in 613 (1216) but stayed in Shadakhan, still could see the damage done by the first earthquake and by the Ghuze but nevertheless thought the town the finest in Khurasan. The second earthquake was particularly severe; the inhabitants on this occasion fled for several days into the plain below the city.

In 618 (1221) the Mongols under Cughur Khan sacked the town completely, and in 621 of Hostur (1225) Allah Mustawfi (c. 1340) and of Ibn Battuta (c. 1350) it had to some extent recovered. After each earthquake the inhabitants had rebuilt the town on a new site but it never regained its former importance.

According to the Georgian chronicle (transl. by Brosset, Hist. de la Gorgie, i. 472), the Georgian queen Thamar is said to have taken the city of Romgaur between 1210 and 1212; Brosset identifies this with the Mahalla Ramdar mentioned by Yakhut in the district of Nishapur (more probably a suburb of it). Here the patriarchs of Antioch, whose jurisdiction Cuffur Khan sought to extend, were imprisoned in 634 (ed. Schürer in his edition of Eusebius, i. 230, p. 82 sq.) already at this time extended to Khurasan (muqta aṣ-ṣawātir al-mawātum al-Nawr), created about 1053 the cathedral of Dagestan (Dagestan) or Dagestan (Dagestan) is Persia which, in name at least, still existed in 1365 (Brief des österrömisches Patriarchen Petrus III. an Domico von Gramo und Aquileia, ed. by Cornelius Will, Acta et scripta quae de controversia ecclesiae Græc. et Lat. serie XI composita extant, Leipzig and Marburg 1861, p. 212, 97; Neitha Antiochenae, ed. Gietler, in B. Z., i. 427, 28; Neithos Dosapatrios, ed. Parthey in Hieroclis Symmachi de Notitiis geographie episcopatuum, Berlin 1866, p. 271, 97; Acta patriarchatus Constantiopolitani, i. 207, 494—465; Pref. p. x.).

The modern Nishapur is in 56° 20' N. Lat. and 58° 40' East Long. (Greenwich) on the east side of a plain surrounded by hills. To the north and east of the town lies the ridge of Binalid-Khü, which separates it from the valley of Meshhed and Tüs. At its foot spring a number of streams, among them the Shuru River and the river of Divan (Hamd Allah al-Mustawfi) which irrigate the lands of Nishapur and disappear in the salt desert to the west. North of the town in the mountains was the little lake of Ghaghma Sahn out of which, according to al-Masih, run two streams, one to the east and the other to the west. Northwest of Nishapur are the famous turquoise mines (Mudjia: the district is still called Bato-Madam). In the S.E. of the town is found the tomb of her celebrated sons Omar Khayyam and Farid al-Din 'Attar.

A history of the 'alam of Nishapur was completed in 3 volumes by Hikim Abd al-Malik al-Bajri. 1145 (a. 1041); it was used by Yakhut and Haji Khali (ed. Flugel, ii. 155 sq.) and continued by 'Abd al-Ghaffar ibn al-Islam al-Attar down to the year 518. Al-Djahabi produced an abbreviated version of al-Bajri's work.


THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
Further the niya must immediately precede the act, lest it should lose its character and become "simple decision" (tsam). It must accompany the act until the end (Abū Isḥāq al-Shīrāzī, Tirmidhī, ed. Jayyosh, p. 3). Its seat is the heart, the central organ of intellect and attention. Lunatics, therefore, cannot pronounce a valid niya.

So the niya has become a legal act of its own. It is usually called obligatory, but in some cases, e.g., the washing of the dead, commendable. It can even be asked what the intention of the niya is. According to al-Bārūqī (1357), four conditions must be fulfilled in a niya: who pronounces it, must be Muslim, camplu mutan, well acquainted with the task he wants to perform, and having the purpose to perform this act. In some instances, "几乎所有" is used, where the later language has 무소 (e.g., Nashī, Shāfī, p. 68; Tirmidhī, Sunnah, p. 33).

The term does not occur in the Qur'ān. It is found in canonical hadith, but the passages show that it has not yet acquired in this literature the technical meaning and limitation described above. The development of this technical use appears to have taken place gradually, probably aided by Jewish influence. In Jewish law the ḫimmaḥ has a function wholly analogous to the niya. Al-Ḥanāfī (†304 = 820) appears to be acquainted with the niya in its technical sense (Khitah al-Umm). In canonical hadith, e.g., the term which generally speaking, reflects the state of things up to the middle of the eighth century A.D. — neither the verb "nīyā" nor the noun: niya appear to have any special technical connection with the ḫimmaḥ. On the contrary, niya has here the common meaning of intention.

In this sense it is of great importance. Bukhārī opens his collection with a tradition, which in this place is apparently meant as a motto. It runs: "Works are in their intention only." (ismama tāwālib ʿān nīyā ʿāti bawāt). This tradition occurs frequently in the canonical collections. It constitutes a religious and moral criterion superior to that of the law. The value of an "āmīn" even if performed in complete accordance with the precepts of the law, depends upon the intention of the performer, and if this intention should be sinful, the work would be valueless. "For," adds the tradition just mentioned, "every man receives only what he has intended:" or his wages shall be in accordance with his intention" (Māliki, Dhālinik, tr. 36). In answer to the question how long the ʿāmīn is open, tradition says: "There is no ʿāmīn after the capture of Mecca, only holy war and intention." (Bukhārī, Momma: Al-ʿAmrī, b. 451; Dāin, b. 1, 277; Muslim, Ṣahih, tr. 85, 86 etc.). This higher criterion, once admitted, may suspend the law in several cases (cf. Snouck Hurgrono, Islam en Paganisme, in T.E.O.K.W., xvi. 393 sqq.; Verrass. Geschriften, ii. 419 sqq.).

So the intention, in this sense, becomes a work of its own, just as the intention in its legal application. Good intention is taken into account by Allāh, even if not manifested outwardly: it elevates the value of the work. On the other hand, refraining from an evil intention is reckoned as a good work (Bukhārī, Ṣahij, p. 31). In this connection the (post-canonical) tradition can be understood, according to which the intention of the faithful is better than his work (Lūqū al-ʿArāf, xx. 223 ; cf. Ghazālī, Ṣādī, iv. 350 sqq., where this tradition...
is discussed). In similar instances niya comes near to the meaning of "deception" [q. v.].


NIYAZI, an Ottoman poet and mystic.

Shams al-Din Mehemmed known as Miyr Efendi, Shaikh Mii, whose maktaba was Niyazi, came from Aspiut, the former summer capital of Malta (cf. Evelyn Celebi, iv, 15; v. Moltke, Reisbriefe, p. 349), where his father was a Nakhshbandi dervish. He was born in 1027 (1617—1618). The statement occasionally found that Soghasuli his birthplace is not correct. His father instructed him in the teaching of the order, then he went in 1048 (1638) to Diyarbakir, later to Mardin where he studied for three years and finally to Cairo. There he joined the Kamal ad-Din order, travelled for seven years and finally settled down in the Anatolian village of Elma, once notorious as a centre of heresy, to devote himself to study under the famous Khatwani Shaikh Umm-I Sunit (d. 1066 = 1658). He stayed with him for twelve years until he was sent by the Shaikh as his deputy to Usbahan near Smyrna. After the death of his master he moved to Brusa where a pious citizen, Abdal-Celebi, built a hermitage for him. The fame of his sanctity and his gifts of prophecy spread more and more and finally reached the ears of the grandvizier Kopriili-i Ahmad Pasha, who invited him to Adrianopol, entertained him with great honour for 40 days and sent him back to Brusa. When in 1052 (1642) the army set out for Demery and in Fodola [q. v.], he was summoned to Adrianopol where he had great audiences as a preacher. As he had allowed himself to drop obscure allusions (belwiti-i dzifrei) he gave nephews and be was banished to Lemnos. There he spent some years in exile until he received permission to return to Brusa. The fact that during his stay on the island it was spared Venetian attacks was interpreted as a miracle wrought by this holy man. But when he stirred up the people by "kabbalistic" preaching he was again banished to Lemnos in 1058 (May 1647). All kinds of prophecies which he was fulfilled. Neither the oracle that his coming had been foretold by Ibn al-'Arabi [q. v.] nor the statement of his reputation as a holy man and miracle-worker. He spent ten years on Lemnos until in 1101 (1698) the vizier Kopriilia-i Miyr Efendi Pasha allowed him to return to Brusa. In the next year he was summoned to Adrianopol; he again excited the people by political utterances and mystical allusions so that the Karamanli Oghuz Pasha had him taken with all respect by a guard of Janissaries and Cawashes out of the mosque and sent directly via Gallipoli to Brusa. From there he was again banished to Lemnos but died on the 20th Rajab 1105 (March 17, 1694). The date 1111 (1699) given by A. V. Hammer, G. O. D., iii, 388 must therefore be wrong.

Unfortunately the contemporary notices give no information about the nature of the sermons by Niyazi which gave offence from the political as well as religious point of view. The historian Cemet Karatuv said Niyazi was secretly a Christian. His doctrine, in Arabic and Turkish, does not justify this suggestion although the poem declared by W. Hammer (G. O. D., iii, 35) is apparently apocryphal, given in translation by Kamal, is really taken from his Dava, as Gibb, H. O. E., iii, 315 has proved. No study has yet been made of the Dava of Niyazi's position in the religious life of Turkey generally.

The order founded by Niyazi once possessed several monasteries on Greek soil, in Morone, Negroponte (Efighfo), Sounikli, Mytilene, also in Adrianopole, Brusa and Smyrna. Cf. thereon the study by V. A. Cordelievsky, Tarih mutliy Niyazi, in Dieholyk Anatolik Nauk S. S. E., 1929, p. 153—160.

The main source for the history of Niyazi's life and work is the rare Turkish treatise of Morali- salei Lufi (= Mutafa Lufiuh), Tarih deft-i Niyazi iis Mutafa-i Niyazi, published at Brusa in 1308 (1890—1891).


NIYAZI AL-DIN AHMED B. MUSAHMAD MUHMMAD AL-HAWARI, a Persian historian, author of the celebrated Tahzib-i Akhbari-i. He was a descendant of the famous Shaikh of Harir, 'Abd Allah Anis. His father Khashi Muhammar Harawi, a major-domo to Sultan Batur (1526—1530) and later a vizier to the governor of Gudjarat, Mirz Sahkarl, Niyazi al-Din himself held several high military offices under the Great Moghul Akbar and became in 1585 Bakshiti of Gudjarat and in 1593 even Bakshiti of the whole empire. According to Buda'uni (i. 397), he died on the 25th Safar 1003 (Oct. 18, 1594) aged 45. At his father's instigation he took up historical studies while quite a boy. His fondness for this subject increased as time went on and induced him to try writing himself. The lack of a complete history of India made him decide to fill the gap and thus arose
his celebrated work, called the *Tuhfet-i Akbarshah* or *Tahfib-i Akbar* (Tuhfet-i Nizam) which was finished in 1000 (1688). Nizam al-Din used 227 diverse sources for this work, all of which he mentions by name and in this way produced a very thorough piece of work on which all his successors have relied. He deals with the history of India from the campaigns of Babur to 1597-98 to the 50th year of Akbar’s reign (1593). The work is divided into 12 books which deal with the Ghurids and nine turbans: 1. the Sultanates of Delhi from the Moguls to Akbar (571-1002 = 1176-1594); at the end of this part is biographical information of famous men at Akbar’s court, sultans, “slaves,” poets, writers and artists; 2. the rulers of the Deccan (749-1300 = 1350-1504); 3. the Baniats, Nizam al-Mulk, Adilshah and Khoja al-Mulk; 4. the rulers of the Chishtis (794-816 = 1364-1386); 5. the Mongols (732-1273 = 1303-1392); 6. the Turkomans (749-1300 = 1350-1504); 7. the Ottomans (749-1300 = 1350-1504); 8. the rulers of Bengal (749-1300 = 1350-1504); 9. the rulers of the Chishtis (794-816 = 1364-1386); 10. the rulers of Sind from the Arab conquest (867 to 1000; 11. the history of Multan (847-1300 = 1397-1545). The whole work was designed to be a history and a topographical description of India but it was apparently never finished by the author.


**NIZAM AL-DIN AWLYE** whose real name was MUHAMMAD b. AHMAD b. ALI BUKHARI AL-BADAYI’I was born at Badayi’ in 636 (1238). He studied elementary Arabic literature with Mawla’IYA b. al-Ujaili al-Badayi’ and then went to Delhi and became a pupil of Shams al-Mulk and Mawla’IYAH of al-Din of Badayi’. Later on, he went on, on the 15th Rabia 655 (July 29, 1257), to Baghdad where he became a devoted disciple of Shahrzad al-Din Musa’i al-Shakar (decl. 642 = 1245), whom he nominated as his Khalifa or spiritual successor in 656 (1257). Some years later he was called to reside in an adjoining village (Ghribipir which is now called *Nizam al-Din Awlye khat to* where he died in 725 (1325). He is regarded as one of the most celebrated saints of India and he is popularly known as *Sultan al-Awlye* "the king of the saints" and Mawla’IYAH "the beloved of God". He was as proficient in mysticism as he was in *Haddith* (Traditions), *Tafsir* (Commentary on the Qur’an) and literature. His tomb is visited by innumerable Muhaamadians from all parts of the country during the month of "Urs" (anniversary of his death). His *works* are the following: *Fawaid al-Faith*; *utterances of the saints* taken down from his lips by Hasan ‘Ali Sandhari (cf. Rieu, Cat. Brit. Mus., p. 972; H. B. Khalifa, ir. 475); *Khawaf al-Mukhibbon* and *discourses of the saint* uttered in several mysterious settings during the year 659 and 660 A.H. and taken down by one of his disciples (cf. Rieu, Persian Cat. Brit. Mus., p. 973).


**NIZAM AL-MULK**, *Ali b. Ali b. ‘Ali al-Badr*, the celebrated minister of the Sultan of the Saljukid sultans Alp Arslan [q.v.] and Malik Shah [q.v.]. According to most authorities, he was born on Friday 21 Dhu ‘l-Qa‘da 405 (April 10, 1018), though the sixteenth century Turki S serif, which alone supplies us with detailed information about his family, places his birth in 410 (1019-1020). His place of birth was Radakan, a village in the neighbourhood of Tash, of which his father was revenue agent on behalf of the Ghurids government. Little is known of his early life. The Waqifs (a) (for a discussion of the credibility of which see J. R. A. S., Oct. 1931: "The Sar-i-Qubad-Silayidin, etc.") contains several anecdotes of his childhood, and is also responsible for the statement that he became a pupil in Nishapur of a well known Shafi’i doctor Hibat Allah al-Muwafaq. On the defeat of Mas’ud of Ghur at Dandanikan in 431 (1040), when most of Khusraw fell into the hands of the Saljukids, Nizam’s father Ali fled from Tush to Khowarjird in his native Baluchistan, and then made his way to Ghuristan. Nizam accompanied him, and while in Ghuristan purchased a post in a government office. Within three or four years, however, he left the Ghurid government service, first attaching himself to Caghti-beq’s [q.v.] commandant in Balkh (which had fallen to a Saljukid force in 452 (1041-1042)), and later, probably about 455 (1053-1054), moving to Caghti’s own headquarters at Merv. It seems to have been now, or soon after, that he first entered the service of Alp Arslan (then acting as his father’s lieutenant in eastern Khusraw) under his warm, Ali b. ‘Ali b. Shadi. And he so far won Alp Arslan’s regard as to be appointed waiz in his steed (then, probably, receiving his best-known *fakhs*). During the period between the death of Caghti-beq in 451 (1059), and that of Tughlat-beq in 455 (1063), therefore, Nizam had the administration of all Khusraw in his hands. The fame he thereby acquired, and the fact that by now Alp Arslan was firmly attached to him, played a considerable part in prompting Tughlat-beq’s waiz al-Kamurti, first, before his master’s death, to scheme for the throne to pass to Caghti’s youngest son Saladin, and then, after it, to do his utmost to prevent Alp Arslan’s succession. For he calculated that Alp Arslan, on becoming sultan, would retain Nizam rather than himself in office. Alp-Kamurti, who
soon found himself too weak to oppose Alp Arslan, and therefore sought to retrieve his position by acknowledging his claim, was retained in his post on the new sultan's first entry into Rusiy. But a month later Alp Arslan suddenly dismissed him and handed over affairs to Nişâm. Al-Kundur was shortly afterwards banished to Musr al-issued, where ten months later he was beheaded. His execution was undoubtedly due to Nişâm, whose fears he had aroused by appealing for help to Alp Arslan's wife.

During Alp Arslan's reign Nişâm accompanied him on all his campaigns and journeys, which were almost uninterrupted. He was not present, however, at the famous battle of Minâk bird, having been sent ahead with the heavy baggage to Persia. On the other hand, Nişâm sometimes undertook military operations on his own, as in the case of the reduction of Iṣâqī's citadel in 459 (1067). Whose, his or Alp Arslan's, was the directing mind in matters of policy it is hard to determine. Its main points, however, appear to have been the following: first, the employment of the larger numbers of Târākkuma that had immigrated to Persia as a result of the Sâlûqîd successes, in raids outside the Ėsâr al-Sâlûq in into Fīstân territory; hence the apparently strange circumstance that Alp Arslan's first enterprise after his accession, despite the precarious condition of the empire he had inherited, was a campaign in Georgia and Armenia; secondly, a demonstration that the sultan's force was both irresistible and mobile, coupled with clemency and generally reinstate, for all rebels that should submit; thirdly, the maintenance of local rulers, Şî's as well as Sunn, in their positions as vassals of the sultan, together with the employment of members of the Sâlûqîd family as provincial governors; fourthly, the obtivation of a dispute over the succession by the appointment and public acknowledgment of Malikshâh, though he was not the sultan's eldest son, as his heir; and finally the establishment of good relations with the 'Abbasid caliph al-Kâ'im [q.v.], as the sultan's nominal overlord.

Nişâm al-Mulk did not really come into his own until after the assassination of Alp Arslan in 465 (1072). But thenceforth, for the next twenty years, he was the real ruler of the Sâlûqîd empire. He succeeded from the outset in completely dominating the then eighteen-year-old Malikshâh, being assisted in this purpose by the death of Qâwardbeg, the sultan's attempt to secure the throne for himself (for which service Nişâm received the title ēhast-deg [q.v.], thus bestowed for the first time). Indeed in one aspect the history of the reign resolves itself into repeated attempts by the young sultan to assert himself, always in vain.

Malikshâh undertook fewer campaigns and tours than his father, the prestige of the Sâlûqîd arms now being such that few would risk rebellion, and warlike operations being left largely to the sultan's lieutenants, as they had not been under Alp Arslan. Nevertheless, from Iṣâqī, which had by now become the sultan's normal place of residence, Malikshâh was the greater part of his empire accompanied by Nişâm.

Policy continued on the same lines under Malikshâh as under his father. Nişâm, however, was notably less tender than Alp Arslan had been to inordinate members of the Sâlûqîd family, insisting at the outset on the execution of Qâward, and, later, on the binding and imprisonment of Malikshâh's brother Takht.

Nişâm also reversed during the earlier part of Malikshâh's reign the conciliatory policy originally pursued under Alp Arslan towards the caliph. He had been rewarded for the friendly attitude he first evinced—which formed a welcome contrast to that of Al-Kundur—by the receipt from al-Kâ'im of two new ēkāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāāαι.
The celebrity of Niẓām al-Mulk is due to the fact that he was in all but name a monarch, and ruled his empire with striking success. It was not his aim to innovate. On the contrary, it was to model the new state as closely as possible on that of the Ghurids, in which he had been born and brought up. His position was similar to that of his forerunners, the Barmakids (q.v.), and the notable Būyid waqf (sunūl) to ʿAbbasid (q.v.). All three may be said to have represented the old Persian civilization (progressively Islamicized, of course) in the face of a new empire of barbarism conquerors, Arab, Dailami and now Türkmen. The monarchs were in each case equalled, if not surpassed, by their warirs, and most of all in the case of Niẓām al-Mulk. For with him the invaders aspired to an emperor's position whilst still quite unacclimatized to their new habitat, so that his superiority in culture was the more marked (cf. Barthold, Turkhistan, p. 308). But in revenge the Saldājkīyids' lack of acclimatization stood in the way of a complete realization by Niẓām al-Mulk of the now traditional Farsī-Muslim state. Hence the lamentations that recur in the Sīyāṣet-Nāṣaʿ.

The Sīyāṣet-Nāṣaʿ, written by Niẓām in 484 (1091), with the addition of eleven chapters in the following year, is in a sense a survey of what he had failed to accomplish. It scarcely touches upon the organisation of the dīwān, for instance, partly, it is true, because the book was intended as a monarch's primer, but also because Niẓām, having absolute control of the dīwān, as opposed to the dārgāh (cf. again Barthold, p. 237), had succeeded, with the assistance of his two principal coadjutors, the muqtaṣar ʿAbbas al-Mulk and the muqtaṣarī Kamāl al-Dawla, in exactly modelling this, his special department, on traditional lines. Of the dārgāh, on the other hand, Niẓām complains that the sultāns failed to maintain a sufficient majesty. They were neither magnificent (though he approves their daily free provision of food), formal, nor awe-inspiring enough. At their court, accordingly, the formerly important offices of ḥāfiz, muḥtār and muwāt-ī ābdar had declined in prestige. Nor, as had his model potentes, would they maintain a sound intelligence service, whereby corruption might be revealed and rebellion forestalled. The Sīyāṣet-Nāṣaʿ consists in all of fifty chapters, of advice illustrated by historical anecdotes. The last eleven chapters, added shortly before the waqf's assassination, deal with dangers that threatened the empire at the time of writing, in particular from the Isamīkīs (for a review of the work see Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii. 210—217).

Niẓām's situation resembled that of the Būyid administrators in another respect. He was faced, as they had been, with the problem of supporting a largely tribal army, and solved it likewise by a partial abandonment of the traditional tax-farming system of revenue collection for that of the ṣafāʾ, or ṣef (q.v.), whereby military commanders supported themselves and their troops on the yield of lands allotted to them. Since in the decay of the Ṣafāʾi power provincial ābdar had tended to assume the originally distinct and profitable office of ṣef, the way for this development had been paved. The Būyids had later attempted to revive the older system; but the establishment of numerous local minor dynasties had favoured the new. Niẓām now systematized it in the larger field open to him. In the Sīyāṣet Nāṣaʿ he insists, however, on the necessity of limiting the rights of ābdar-holders to the collection of fixed dues, and of setting a short time-limit to their tenures (see on this subject Becker, Staatliche und Lehnswesen, in Isl., v.).

In the absence of the intelligence service he desired, Niẓām contrived to intimate potential rebels and suppress local tyranny by a judicious display of the might and mobility of the Saldājkīyids. He also insisted on the periodic appearance at court of local dynasts such as the Māśadīdīs ([q.v.]) and ʿOyūsidīs (q.v.), and proclaimed the sultān's apprentices to appeals for the redress of wrongs by means of notions circulated throughout the empire and exposed in public places (see al-Mufarrakhī, Muḥammad-i ʿIbrāhīm). He also gained the powerful support of the Ḥusainīs, especially those of the Shāhī school, of which he was an ardent champion, by the institution of innumerable pious foundations, in particular of muqāms, the most celebrated being the Niẓām-ya of Baghdad (opened 459 = 1067), the earliest west of Khurāsān; by the general abolition of muqāms (taxe, sanctioned by the shaykh) in 479 (1086—87); and by the strikingly extensive public works particularly in connection with the Ḥudābī. After the Ḥudābī had returned to Fāṭimid to ʿAbbasid allegiance in 488 (1076), he exalted himself to make the Ḥudābat road safe from brigandage for pilgrims, as well as to diminish their expenses; and from the next year until that of his death the journey was accomplished without mishap. It was not until the second half of Malikshāh's reign that the full effects of Niẓām's achievement made themselves felt. By 476 (1085—86) however, such were the unwanted security of the roads and the low cost of living that reference is made to them in the annals.

Niẓām al-Mulk was naturally much sought after as a patron. The poet al-Maʿrūfī (q.v.) accedes of him having "no great opinion of poetry because he had no skill in it", and of paying "no attention to anyone but religious leaders and mystics" (see ʿAbū ʿAbd Allāh, al-Farʿaḥ, p. 46). But though his charity, which was profuse (see for example al-Sukkī, il. 41), went in large measure to men of religion — among them the most notable objects of his patronage being Abū Ishāk al-Shirāzī (q.v.) and al-ʿAzāzī (q.v.), he was clearly a sixth patron also of poets, as is testified by the Dammār al-Kifār of al-Balāghī (q.v.), the greater part of which is devoted to his panegyrics. In another sphere, the inauguration of the Dālīlī calendar ([q.v.]) in 466 (1074) was probably due to his encouragement, since at this time his ascendency over Malikshāh was at its most complete.

For the first seven years of Malikshāh's reign Niẓām's authority went unopposed unchallenged. In 472 (1079—80), however, two Turkish officers of the court instigated Malikshāh into killing a protégé of the waqf, and in 473 (1080—81), again, the sultān insisted on disbanding a contingent of Armenian mercenaries against Niẓām's advice. Malikshāh now began to hope, indeed, for the overthrow of his mentor, showing extraordinary favour to officials such as Ibn Bahmānīr and, later, Sāliḥ al-Rudāʾīs, who were bold enough to criticise him. Ibn Bahmānīr went so far as to attempt the waqf's assassination (also 473)
whereas Saiyid al-Ru'asāl/contented himself with words. But in each case Niẓām was warned; and the culprits were imprisoned. In the case of Ibn Bahamayyār, in whose guilt a court jester named Dīja' al-Farq also implicated, Malikshāh retaliated by committing the murder of Niẓām's eldest son Dīja' al-Mulk, who had taken Dīja' al-Farq's execution into his own hands (475 = 1082). After the fall of Saiyid al-Ru'asāl in 476 (1083 - 1084), however, the sultan left plotting till some years later, a new favourite, Tādji al-Mulk, caught his fancy.

All went well with Niẓām al-Mulk till 483 (1090 - 1091). In that year, however, occurred the first serious challenge to the Saljūqid power, when al-Andalus was sacked by a force of Karmațians; and almost simultaneously their co-secretary, the Assassin leader al-Hasan b. al-Sabbāḥ (q.v.) obtained possession of the fortress of Alarnut, from which repeated attacks failed to dislodge him. Meanwhile, moreover, an awkward problem had arisen over the succession to the sultānate, on account of the death in turn of Malikshāh's two eldest sons, Dīja' (474 = 1082) and Almād (481 = 1088). These sons had both been children of the Karkhpānī princess Terken Khātūn (see Lāmnī al-Tuwmārīb), who had borne the sultan a third son, Maḥmid, in 480 (1087). She was eager for Maḥmid to be formally declared heir. Niẓām, however, was in favour of Bārkiyārūk (q.v.), Malikshāh's eldest surviving son by a Saljūqid princess. Hence Terken became his bitter enemy, and joined with Tādji al-Mulk, who was in her service, in instigating Malikshāh against the ważir.

Tādji al-Mulk accused Niẓām to the sultan, who by this time was in any case incensed with the waste's championship of al-Muṣṭānī, of extravagant expenditure on the army and on festivities; and Malikshāh's wrath was finally inflamed beyond bearing by an unguarded reply made by Niẓām to a formal accusation of these practices. But even so he did not dare to dismiss him. (The earliest historian to assert that he was dismissed is Rāshīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, who appears to have misunderstood the purport of some verses by al-Naŷīb quoted in the Aṣbaḥ al-Sūfīrīn, and really composed after Niẓām's death).

Niẓām al-Mulk was assassinated on 10th Ramaţān 485 (October 14, 1092) near Siğna, between Kangawai and Biştana, as the court was on its way from Iṣlanîn to Raḫdūd. His murderer, who was disguised as a Šāfi'i, was immediately killed, but is generally thought to have been an emissary of al-Hasan b. al-Sabbāh. Contemporaries, however, seem to have put the murder down to Malikshāh, who died suddenly less than a month later, and to Tādji al-Mulk, whom Niẓām's retainers duly tracked down and killed within a year. And Rāshīd al-Dīn combines the two theories, stating that the ważir's enemies at court concerted it with the Assassins. The truth is therefore uncertain; but as Rāshīd al-Dīn is one of the earliest historians to whom the Assassin records were available, his account would seem to deserve attention.

The extraordinary influence of Niẓām al-Mulk is attested by the part played in affairs after his death by his relatives, despite the fact that only two appeared to have displayed much ability. For the next sixty years, except for a gap between 517 (1123) and 528 (1134), members of his family held office under princes of the Saljūqid house.

---

Of Niẓām's family Diya' al-Mulk is remarkable as being his son by a Gevāni princess, either the daughter or the niece of Bagrat I, formerly married, or at least betrothed, to Alp Arslān, after the campaign of 456 (1064).


(HAROLD BOWEN.)

NIýAZ BADÁKHSHÍ, a religious and political leader under Mawíkání 'Abd al-DÚn Ibíh and under his successor Mu'allam Ùsá in his native land Badákhshán and was looked upon as one of the most learned men of his age. He was also the murid (disciple) of Sháhíz Huáin of Khwáizir. His attainments procured him access to the court of Sulaimán, king of Badakhshán, who conferred upon him the title of Khát Khán. Subsequently he left his master and went to India. At Khánbád, he was introduced to the Emperor Akbar (1556-1605). He received several presents, and was appointed a Persian writer. Akbar soon discovered in him a man of great insight, and made him a "Commander of One Thousand" (Bahá Shaúyá). He also bestowed upon him the title of Ghán Khán after he had distinguished himself in several expeditions. He died in Oudú at the age of seventy in 1593 (1584). He is the author of the following works: 1. Hajísháy Sháhíz Abú'ábd, a commentary on the Taftásh-Nama of the Sháhíz; 2. several treatises on Súfísm.


(M. HÍDÁYET HOÁIN.)

NIýAZ ÙJDÉDÁ, new decree, the formers of Selím III. Sulímí Selím III [q.v.], recognizing the necessity of a thorough reorganization in certain departments of state, promulgated in 1797 under the name of Níyáz-ì Ùjdédá, i.e. new decree, a series of measures for the reform of the feudal military system, the admiralty, the artillery and the navy, and a "vázirárn ordinance for the governors of provinces, a law dealing with provincial taxation, another for the creation of a body of infantry raised and drilled on western lines, and lastly the institution of a special military fund from new sources of revenue, to provide the funds for the reforms. These revenues consisted of taxes on henna, tobacco, coffee, silk, wool, sheep and the yields of the fields of holders of timar [q.v.] in Anatolia, who had neglected their duty in war and were therefore deprived of their fiefs. It was intended that the new body of infantry, niýázn-ì Ùjdédá, should number 12,000. To begin

with a model battalion of 1,600 men was raised, to be composed of volunteers. This body was formed of young men of different nationalities and religions, mostly Austrian or Russian deserters collected during the war with Russia. The result was that the force enjoyed little prestige and native Turks only joined it in small numbers, with the consequence that this corps, popularly called bar wašá, consisted of only a few hundred men and was unable to attain to the strength of a battalion (1,600) until 1799. The Sulímí's force trained and armed on European lines was limited to this body. The Sulímí employed foreign officers, mainly from England, Sweden and Spain, to train the soldiers and see to the management of the arsenals, shipbuilding and fortifications. Large barracks and ammunition depots were built. The new revenue earmarked for military purposes which by 1797-1798 amounted to 60,000 rupees, i.e. 48,000,000 francs (cf. Djevdet, Ùjdédá, viii. 139 sq.), supplied the necessary funds. Internal difficulties, especially the ever increasing number of opponents of reform, prevented the Sulímí from completely realising his plans. The name Niýáz-ì Ùjdédá became more and more hateable to the military and political classes. His successor, Selím II, decided to abolish it altogether and to call the corps of regular troops Se'men or Seğan, i.e. "kómém-lmen". So Selim's deposition was disbanded. Under his successor Mustáfa [q.v.], the attempt was made to revive the niýázn-ì Ùjdédá. The Austrian renegade Sulaimán Ághá who had previously commanded the division quartered in Lewend Ciffík was ordered to reconstitute it again secretly, but this effort met with no permanent success (cf. Zinken, G.O.R., vii. 552 sq.).


(ERNEST BAHNIDER)

NIýAZ ÙSHÁ, title assumed in 895 (1490) by Malek Abúmád Básír, founder of the Niýáz Ùshá state of Ahmadnagar [q.v.], one of the five independent sultanates which arose out of the ruins of the Bahamán kingdom of the Dákhán towards the end of the fifteenth century. For a chronological list and genealogical table of these kings of Ahmadnagar see Cambridge History of India, ii. 704-705; also Zambur, Manuel, p. 298-299.

The second ruler, Burhán Niýáz Ùshá I (914-960 = 1509-1533), adopted, in 1537, the Sháhí's form of Islam which, except for a brief period under Ùnsí when the Maháwíns were in power, became the established religion of this kingdom. During Burhán's reign an unsuccessful attempt was made by the anti-Dákhán rebels, among them the Foreigners, to place his brother, Rájjíd, upon the throne. The flight of the defeated rebel to Berá, combined with the refusal of 'Abd al-DÚn Ùmád Ùshá to surrender Fateh, the home of Burhán's Brahman ancestors, led to war with Berá and to the capture of Fateh. It was a dispute as to the possession of Sholípur, the chief base of contention between Ahmadnagar and the neighbouring kingdom of Bijápur, that caused Burhán to adopt the disastrous policy of joining forces with Súrábírâíyá of Vijaynagar, as a result of which the Hindu monarch was able to annex the Ráj, the base of his dominions, while Burhán was successful in capturing the fortress of Sholípur.
Barhaan was succeeded, after a period of civil warfare, by his son Husain who reigned until 972 (1565). His reign, however, is of outstanding importance in the history of the Dakhân; for it was at this time that the Muslim rulers of this area, with the exception of Bârî, irritated by the overwhelming insolence of Sâdghâr-wân and realizing the strength of the Hindu menace in the south, combined to crush the military power of Vîjaya-nagar at the battle of Tâlîkot (972 = 1565).

In the same year Husain was gathered to his fathers and his son, Murîdâ, Nizâm Shâh I (972-996), signed in his youth to Murdâ, called Diwânâ or Murdâ and neglected the affairs of his kingdom for a life of dissipation, the real power being in the hands of his ministers. An unsuccessful attempt was made during this reign to drive the Portuguese out of India, but the effort came too late for, during the critical years when the Portuguese had been establishing themselves along the coast, the forces which might have united to hurl the invaders into the sea had been engaged in inglorious internecine conflicts. The most important event in this reign was the annexation of Bîr, in 982 (1574). The subsequent history of this dynasty, until the Mujlâ invasions of the Dakhân, is unimportant. Full details will be found in the pages of Firûzâ, the contemporary chronicle. Despite the heroic efforts of the dawar贵族, Când Bibê, the imperial forces conquered Almûnâr in 1602. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the incorporation of the Nizâm Shâh dominions in the Mujlâ Empire was effective under Akbar. All attempts by his successor Dârânâ to complete his father's policy were frustrated by the organizing ability of Malik Ambar, an able Abyssinian miestor, who was in charge of the affairs of Almûnâr until his death in 1635 (1696). It was not until 1642 (1693) in the reign of Shahjâhân that this kingdom was finally annexed, although for some years afterwards the Marâtha leaâr Shâhjâhân attempted to recapture the Nizâm Shâh dynasty.


NIZAMI, Nizâm al-Dîn Aâtî Muhammad Ilîyâ b. Yûsuf, one of the greatest poets of Peria. He was born in Gûlgis, the later Elîsevâtîl in 535 (1140-1141). His parents died while he was still quite young so that the education of the boy and of his brother had to be undertaken by his uncle. From Nizâm's poems, it is apparent that his uncle very soon followed his parents to the grave. Nevertheless the two boys succeeded in getting an excellent education, for Nizâm's brother, who wrote under the pen-name of Kûsîm Mafjûrî, attained a very high skill as a writer of ghâzîs (an ingenious ghâzî by him is given in Harem, Lit. Hist. of Peria, II, 47 cp.). Nizâm was thrice married and had a son named Muhammad. The poet was interested in Sûfî, and studied in Sûfî circles under a certain Shahîd Albî Pârîghî Râshôtî. Nothing more is known about his career and it may be presumed that Nizâm was relatively unfavorable, as he says himself, that he avoided the Court of princes' courts and had a strictly ascetic conception of life. Nevertheless all his great poems are dedicated to rulers of his time and, for one of them he even received the reins of the village of Hâmûnîyîn but it yielded him very little, he tells us. He died in 599 (1198-1199) aged 63/4, Dâlîvlâshgâh gives the date of his death as 376 (1180-1181), which is however impossible as three of his poems were written after this year; this is probably an instance of the usual carelessness of this writer.

Nizâm's great work is his Khamsa or Quintet, a collection of five great epic poems, with different subjects. It is very possible that these poems were not collected under one title by the author himself, as all the 25 poems, 23 years after Nizâm's death does not yet seem to have been collected whole, although he himself states very highly and was perfectly acquainted with it. The Khamsa consists of the following parts: 1. Mâhànân al-Athr (561 = 1165-1166) dedicated to Ilîgîrâ, Attâbîk of Aghârîbâdîjân. It is a didactic poem strongly permeated by the spirit of Sûfîm. The principles inculcated are expounded by the insertion of short stories. In spite of a certain prosiness, the work is characterized by certain passages of remarkable beauty (e.g. chap. 5 "On old age") and played a prominent part in the history of Persian didactic poetry 2. Khosrow u-Shirín (574 = 1175-1176) dedicated to the king and queen of Ilîgîrâ, Muhammad and Kâsîl Aûsalân; unlike the first poem, this is a romantic epic poem, based on historical incidents dealing with the story of the Sâsînian Khosrow Parwîz and concluding in parts with the corresponding sections of the Shâh-nâmêm. The heroic element however here falls into the background to give free play to the romantic; and to a penetrating psychological analysis. 3. Lâlî (or as now pronounced Lalî) u-Muqarrâm (584 = 1188-1189) dedicated to the Shirwânîsh Aghâzân Mûsâfîr. The subject was adopted at the request of the Shirwânîsh. Nizâm was by no means satisfied with this choice; the love-story of the Bedouin poet Kair al-Aqîâm, known as Muqarrâm [q. v.], seemed to him "like the Arabian desert." Yet it is this very poem that is his greatest work, for it was an astonishing success and stimulated countless imitations, among them some of the pearls of Oriental poetry, such as the work of the same name of the Aghâhârîbîdîjân poet Fûlûn. Here the heroic style is completely dropped and we have a simple love-story, only occasionally interrupted by the clash of arms. 4. Shûhâr or (fâshâr) al-nâmeh (587 = 1191) divided into two parts, which are known as Shûhâr-nâmeh or Shûhây-nâmeh and Khâvân-nâmeh (or Shûhâr-nâmeh-ye bârî and Shûhâr-nâmeh-ye baxr). The first version of the work was dedicated to 'Isâ al-Dîn Ma'âshûd I, Attâbîk of Mûsâfîr. A revised version, a discussion of the poet to Naqâr al-Dîn Abî Bâkî Bâshâtîn, Attâbîk of Aghâhârîbîdîjân, Nizâm took the romance of Alexander as the foundation for his poem and treats it very much on the same lines as Fûlûn. The subject afforded ample opportunities to work in scientific and philosophical material, which Nîzâm does very skillfully in the conversations between Alexander and his tutor Aristotle and other scholars. The work thus became a kind of encyclopedia, which touches on almost all branches of knowledge of the time. 5. Haji Påhir (595 = 1198-1199) dedicated to the same ruler as the previous poem. In this poem Nîzâm again goes back to the popular Sâsînian hero Bahrum Gîr. But here again
it is not on his chivalrous adventures that stress is laid but on seven stories related to the hero by seven kings' daughters with whom he is in love. Each of these stories is associated with a day of the week, a planet and a colour. They form a universal tale, on which storytelling which has never been surpassed and the grotesque and fantastic style is particularly effective. As a master of fantasy, Nizami recalls E. T. A. Hoffmann and J. Callot and is able to make his readers visualize his wonderful pictures just as vividly as the European masters. Besides these large works, Nizami left a lyrical Divan of which only three MSS. are known (Bodleian, No. 618, 619 and Berlin, Verts. Cat., No. 691) and which so far has received little attention. It contains no kashfis in the court style and is distinctly Stif in tone.

Nizami's works are of the greatest importance in the history of Persian literature. They mark the zenith of Persian poetry in Persia, as in them for the first time the antithesis between the language of the lyric and the archaic style of the epic is overcome and the epic is brought into the milieu of the court style, which at this time was already fully developed in the lyric. The epic however at the same time loses its heroic character and devotes itself more and more to psychological characterisation at which Nizami was master. The overloading with learning, which in time came to choke the action completely, is very noticeable.

Nizami's influence on the later poets was unusually strong. A whole series of important poets, among them men like Amir Khusrav Dihlawi, Khwajâ Kirmânî, Kâthî, Úلî and Hâfitz and even the great mystic Farid al-Din 'Attar and the great mystic of Qâfghâz poetry Mîr 'Abbâr Naw‘ût, tried their hand in his style (the number of poems in later writers rises to seven).

In spite of its great importance, so far critical editions of parts only of the Khamsa have appeared and we are dependent for the rest on bad Indian lithographs or manuscripts of doubtful access. It is most desirable to put an end to this state of affairs and devote greater attention in Europe to the study of Nizami.


(R. B. W. E.)
of the first rank, to judge by the fragments that survive; in any case it was very inferior to his prose, which Browne says is almost unequalled in Persian.

The *Cahār Maḥālāt* consists of four discourses, each of which deals with one of the classes of men whom the author regards as indispensable in the service of kings: secretaries, poets, astrologers and physicians. Each discourse begins with general considerations, which are followed by anecdotes, often from the writer's personal experience. The number of these anecdotes, which form the most interesting and valuable part of the book, is about forty; some give valuable information on the literary and scientific state of Persia. We may say that the *Four Discourses* (especially the second) and Awfī's *Lūḥāt* are the two old works which deal systematically with Persian poetry. Davālūtšāh made a great deal of use of it (cf. Browne, *Sources of Davālūtšāh*, in *J. R. S. A.* 1899, p. 57–69). We may specially point out that it is to Nizām Šāhi that we owe the earliest notice of Firdawsi and the only contemporary reference to Khayām. On the other hand, we must point out the historical fallacy of certain passages, even in the case of events in which Nizām Šāhi claims to have taken part. His book is mentioned or quoted by Awfī (*Lūḥāt*), Ibn Iṣfandiyār (*Hist. of Tabaristan*), Mūsawī Kārsān (*Tārīḵ-e Gūstāb*), Dāmān (*Ṣūrišat al-Ḍabāb*), Ghaffārī (*Nigarzān*), Ḥādżḏī Khānlī, and in some cases by *Mardvān* of *Nizām Šāhī* which he thinks is different from the *Cahār Maṭālāt*; but Mīrzā Muḥammad Kāwinsī has shown that this is another title of the same book.


(H. MAŠRĪQ)

**NIZĀM ŠĀHĪ**, a Persian historian whose full name was *Ṣāḥib al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥānān. Born in Nīshāpūr, he went on the advice of his sheikh Muḥammad Kūfī to Gharzī to give an opportunity to his remarkable talents as a stylist. A severe illness forced him to leave Gharzī, and he went to Dihlī where he obtained an appointment as court historiographer to the Pathāvī Sulṭān and began in 60/1266 his great historical work, *Tārīḵ al-Maṭālāt* fi *Tārīḵ*, which brought him great fame. It deals with the history of the first three Pathāvī Sulṭāns of Dihlī — Muḥammad b. Sām (588–602 = 1192–1206), Kūfī al-Dīn Aḥbāk (602–606 = 1206–1210) and Shams al-Dīn Būtūmī (607–653 = 1210–1258). The book begins with the capture of Adījmī by Muʿāṣira al-Dīn in 587 (1191) and ends with the capture of Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad as governor of Tabrīz (614 = 1217). An Appendix contains a panegyric of Būtūmī and his campaigns of conquest. The work was very highly esteemed in the Muslim east as a model of elegant style. It is written in high flowing and difficult language and has a large number of poetical passages inserted in it. It is only with difficulty that the historical facts can be extracted from the medley of rhetoric but nevertheless the book is of no small value for the history of India and Afghanistan.


**NIZĀM ŠĀḤĪ** (i.e. *Mardvān Nizām Šāhī* "ambassador of Nizām Šāhī") of the Dakhān, a Persian historian whose real name was Khūthbā al-Jusūsī. Born in the Persian *ʿIrāq; he entered the service of Sulṭān Burdānī (cf. S. A. F. 1367). The latter being converted to the Shīʿa sent Khūthbā as ambassador to ṬahmāsĪ-Shāh Safawī. Reaching Kāīr in Ṭabāk (Sept. 1545), he accompanied the Šāh to Georgia and Šīrāz during the campaign of 953 (1546) against Akkūnī-Mirzā. He stayed in Persia till 971 (1563), perhaps with occasional breaks. He died at Golconda on the 15th Dīn 973 (June 24, 1564).

Khūthbā's chief work is the *Tārīḵ-e Ilūyī Nizāmī*-śāḥī, a general history from the time of Ahmad ibn Shāh to a later accession of Ṭabākī, *Ṭabākī gawda, Zafrā-nāme, Ṭabākī al-Siyar, the *Memoirs of Šāh-Ṭahmāsp* etc. The book is divided into a precise and seven maṭālāt, each of which is again divided into several gūftūr. The most important part of this work is that which refers to the reign of Ṭahmāsī-Shāh (in the Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 153, written in 972 = 1565, the events come down to 966) and to the local dynasties of the Caspian provinces: Māzanfarīn, Gīlān, Shīrāz. The two manuscripts in the British Museum show differences in their contents: Add. 23-513 (written in 1065 = 1654) has passages added by some commentator and taken from the *Kūḥān-i-āra* of Ahmad b. Muḥammad Ghaffārī. The latter additions of Or. 153 come down to late 960. According to Fīrūzī, "Shāh Khūthbā", during the reign of Ṭabākī Kūthbū Shah of the Deccan (957–988) also wrote a history of the *Kūthbū-Shāhī* (p. 4). It is difficult to reconcile this with a continuous stay in Persia from 952 to 971.

**Bibliography:** Rieu, *Catalogue*, p. 107–111; Schaffer, in his *Christianische Persien*, ii, 1885, p. 28–30 (notes: 65–133) printed the sections relating to the Caspian provinces.

(V. MIRHAKAYE)

**NIZĀR b. MAʿADD**, common ancestor of the greater part of the Arab tribes of the north, according to the accepted genealogical system. Genealogy: Nizār b. Maʿadd b. *ʿAdān* (Wustenfeld, *Gens. Tabellen*, A. 5). His mother, Muʿāna hint Ḍjhāla, was descended from the pre-Arab race of the Ḏjuram. Genealogical legend which has preserved mythological features and folklore relating to several eponyms of Arab tribes is almost silent on the subject of Nizār (an etymological tale about his name: *Ṭāḏg al-ʿAʿrī*, ii. 653, 23–27 from the *Rāmi al-Dīn* of al-Salāḥi [i. 8, 8–10] is without doubt of very late origin as is shown by the connection which is established
with the prophetic mission of Muḥammad; the same etymology from swr "insignificant" is further found in Ibn Farrādī, Khvājā Ilkhanī, p. 20, 1; *Mażdā jā hā fevral*, ed. Lyall, p. 763, 16 (without the story in question). Tradition has more to say about his son Ṣaḥīb, ʿAmmār, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, ʻIyād and about the partition of the paternal heritage among them, in connection with which they visited their uncle Ḥusayn and his descendants and in fact partook of a meal in his house (they are able to describe minutely the appearance of a camel they have never seen from the traces it has left) for the object of the story which has parallels among other peoples; its object is to make the meaning of the šiyya go back to the most remote period (al-Maṣādīr b. Ṣaḥīb, al-Ṭāhirī, p. 155–156 and the sources there quoted; Tabārī, i. 1108–1112 etc.); it perhaps is of interest to note that the story was known to Voltaire who introduced it into his *Zadig*.

As Robertson Smith showed half a century ago (*Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 5 sqq., 265–289) and as Goldscheider has confirmed by numerous quotations (*Muhimmadīaentische Schriften, I*, 346–348) of the Remote period, *Mażdā jā hā* is the latest form of an Arab poetry while that of *Mażdā jā hā* is found as early as the Byzantine historians Procopius and Nicetas) appears quite early in it, although its ethnic character is rather vague (as to that of ʿĀmmār, still more comprehensive, one of the oldest historians of Arab poetry, Muhammad b. Sallām, d. 230 = 844–845, and already pointed out that his name was almost unknown in ancient poetry, *Tabārī al-Saḥīb*, ed. Hell, p. 5, 15, cf. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Ṭāhirī* *ṣūrāt al-Ṭāhirī al-Ṣūrī*, Cairo 1359, p. 48). Before the Umayyad period the only trace we find of the use of *Nizār* as an ethnic is in a verse of the pre-Islamic poet *Bīgha b. ʿAbd Ḥamīd* (in the *Mażdā jā hā*, p. 667, col. and in another of *Kab b. Zuhair* (in *Tabārī*, i. 1106, col.) verse 8, 9 in the verse of *Hassān b. Dālib*, ed. Hirschfeld, l. s. c, the reference is to another *Nizār*, son of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAmīr, b. ʿAmīr, b. ʿAbd al-Salāt, b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, son of Maʿṣūm b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, descendant of *Anmār*, often disputed, as well as that of their brethren the Khubṣūm [q. v.], and to refer the same origin to the *Kab* descendants of the *Kab* to which it was attributed just at the time of the strife that raged around the succession to ʿAṭāl I. The verse quoted by Ibn Ḥishām, *Sura*, p. 49 (and often elsewhere; they are sometimes attributed to ʿAmīr b. Muṣṭa ḫa b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, a contemporary of the Prophet, and sometimes to a certain ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, otherwise unknown) in which we find used with reference to *Kab* the verb *tawṣīf* to announce oneself to be descended from *Nizār* can be regarded as apocryphal. No stress need be laid on the isolated reference in al-Baladhuri (*Futūḥ*, ed. de Goeje, p. 276, 10) to the quarters of the Bandi *Nizār* in Khāṣīf contrasted with those of the *Yamanis*; his language simply reflects the position the author's time or that of his sources; later than the great revolution of the first century A.H.

a real historical existence nor, as is the case with the Ma'addi, as a comprehensive term indicating an effective grouping together of a number of tribes of different origin. Nizār is simply a fictitious invention, a label intended to serve political interests. One must however ask whence the names came and what were the precedents which suggested its use in the sense above outlined. The problem has not yet been thoroughly studied and perhaps we do not possess the material necessary to solve it. It is possible that the history of the four sons of Nizār (cf. above), a popular story the nature and distribution of which seem to take it back to a very early date, may be one of those instances to do with genealogical tradition, supplied the names on which the marāšid later gave definite imagination free play. But this is a pure supposition which would have to be confirmed by definite proofs.


**NIŻĀR b. AL-MUSTAṢĪR, Fāṭimid claimant, born 10th Rai’ 1 437 (Sept. 26, 1045).** On the death of his father, having been displaced by his youngest brother al-Mustaṣīr (q.v.), Niżār fled to Alexandria, took the title of al-Muqtafa b-Din Allāh, and rose to revolt early in 488 (1095) with the assistance of the governor, Naṣr al-Dawla Aṭāfūn, who was jealous of al-ʿΑfāl, and the population of the city. He was at first successful in driving back al-ʿΑfāl and advanced as far as the outskirts of Cairo, supported by Arab auxiliaries. Aḥāf again took the field against him, and after a short siege in Alexandria he surrendered towards the end of the same year, was taken to Cairo, and there imprisoned by order of al-Mustaṣīr. By the Ismaʿili organization in Persia (see the art. AL-ḤĀSĀN b. AL-ṢABRAH), Niżār was recognized as the rightful successor of al-Mustaṣīr, and this, with its offshoots in Syria, formed a new group (al-ḥāsa al-ṣāyiʿī), opposed to the Mustaṣīr group (al-ḥāsa al-ṣedūla), now known as khdjas (q.v.) and Bohoris (q.v.), respectively. A party of the Niżārs at first held the belief that Niżār was not dead and would return as the Mahdi or in company with him, but the majority held that the line of Niżār was continued by the Grand Masters of Aḥāf.

**Bibliography:** See under AL-MUSTAṢĪR; also Ibn Khalīfah, transl. of Siane, l. 360–
16 (from the Naṣirī). Sulṭānī... al-Mustanṣīrī-

(H. A. R. Gibb)

**NOAH. [See Nuḥ].**

**NOVIBAZAR or YENI BAZAR** is the name of a former (down to 1912) Turkish sanjak in what was once the vilayet of Kosovo; it now belongs to Jugos-Slavia. The district, through which the river Lim flows and which is therefore also called the Lim district (area 7350 sq. km. with a population of about 56,000, of whom 44,000 are Christian Serbs and 12,000 Moslems), is bounded on the north by Bosnia and separated Serbia from Montenegro. The importance of Novibazar was for military reasons as it secured communications between Bosnia and Rumelia and at the same time prevented communication between Serbia and Montenegro. By art. 85 of the Treaty of Berlin, Austria-Hungary held the western part of the sanjak (the Lăm district) from Sept. 1879 to 1908, namely the towns of Plešije (Turk. Tašchina), Prijevol and Bijelo Polje with a garrison of some 3,000 men, while the southern part, the kaza of Mitrovica, was returned to the Turks. After it was handed over in 1908, Novibazar formed a bone of contention between Turkey, Serbia, and Montenegro. In 1912 the sanjak was conquered by Montenegro (Bijelo Polje Oct. 12, Tuzi and Tuzi Oct. 14, Berane Oct. 20, Plešije Oct. 28) and Serbia (Novibazar Oct. 23, Sjenica Oct. 24) and in 1913 divided between the two countries.

The district forms with Zeta the ancestral home of former Serbia and roughly corresponds to the ancient Rašan. The chief town Novibazar (cf. the official spelling Novipazar) 1800 feet above sea-level on the Raška, is now an impoverished place of 11,000 inhabitants with miserable houses and poor streets. In the middle ages however, it was of considerable importance as the imposing remains of churches monasteries and baths around it show. It was once the capital of the town of Ras, of importance in the time of the old Serbian Kingdom and already mentioned in Byzantine history in the 11th century (Planina), where the Nemanjić prince Stephen held his court for a time. The settlement of Pasarić and Trgovlje was called by the Turks Eski Bazari, "Old Market." A sarayeb is mentioned as being there in 1459 after the conquest of the land by the Turks (1455) and in 1461 a šehi. The Turks then founded a New Market not far away, Yeni Bazar, which soon became the capital of the whole district. The Ragusan historian Lucari says the founder of Novipazar was Ser, i.e. undoubtedly Isk-Beg (1444—c. 1460, from 1453 governor of Sarajevo), son of Isk-Beg (1414—1444), both of whom were governors in Zeta (Skoplje) and were among the most important Turkish leaders of the time. The foundation of Novipazar must have taken place about 1460 for a year later we find mention for the first time in the archives of Ragusa of Ragusan merchants in Novipazar. In 1467 we already find a šehi and a sarayeb in Novipazar. The town from the end of the xvth century was frequently visited and described by western travellers as it lay on the old trade route from Ragusa (Dubrovnik) to Nikšić, the knight Arnold v. Harff mentions Novipazar 1499 as Newport, Jean Chausson (cf. Le voyage de Moulin d'Anjou, ed. Ch. Scheler, Paris 1887, p. 11) describes Novipazar as a town formid. assa marchands. While these and other travellers of the xvi-th century like Benedict Kuričieli (1530; cf. Benedict Curicicchot, Historia

**Rerum de Botasferiae des. v. Lambor, etc., ed. by Eleonore Čučin Lemberg-Schwarzenburg, Innsbruck 1910, p. 41 sqq.); Cattaneo Zeno (1550), in his Descritione del vicino de Constantinopolis, 1550 in the Storine of the Jugoslav Academy of Agram, vol. x.) and Melchior v. Seydlitz (1555, in his Gründliche Beschreibung der Weltfort, Görlitz 1580) were very little impressed by Novibazar, Paolo Contarini (1580, in his Diario del viaggio da Venezia a Constantinopoli, Venice 1856; nean Grimaud-Francon) and the Sieur de
Stohove [c. 1630, cf. "Voyage du Sieur de Stohove fait en année 1630, 1631, 1632, 1633, Bruxelles 1634, p. 30: at second hand and not from his own observation] and also Louis de Hayes, Sieur de Commenon (1621, in his Feuille de Lévant Fait par le Commandement du Roy en année 1621 par Le Sieur d'Y [de Commenon], Paris 1623) devoted far more attention to it. P. Contarini spent a day of rest in the caravanserai of Novibazar (New Bazaar) which he found was a town with 12,000 Turkish and 100 Christian houses. In the main street of the Kayseri settlement and the 16 mosques, the very large bazaar in which artisans of all kinds offered their wares for sale (mostly articles of iron from the adjoining Ghabriac in the S.E. of Novibazar which was as early as 1396 the seat of an Ottoman judge and had a customs house). The Sieur de Stohove describes La ville de Gens Bazar, qui en Turc veut dire nouveaux marchés, elle est située sur la petite rivière de Rizieh en un lieu haut et beau, ce qui en rend la vue fort agréable, son circuit est de dix lieues sans entrer enferment de murailles, est la ville la plus considérable que l'on trouve depuis la frontière (i.e. the Danubian-Bulgarian frontier). Louis de Hayes in 1621 found Iğdır Bazaar (i.e. the Kayseri Bazaar) a pleasant place with one storey houses. It was under the governor of Bosnia and had a judge who was under the Chief Kaş Şefi of Sarajevo (q.v.). The description given by the traveller Ewliya Celebi (q.v.) of his visit to Novibazar (1666) (p. 534 sqq.) is as usual full of exaggerations. He says there were 45 quarters in Novibazar, 23 large and 11 small mosques, 3 madrasas and 2 monasteries. Of the mosques he mentions the Alani mosque and the mosque of Ghabriac (Mask-Raj, formerly a church, and the Taghkörpit lace and mosque of "Hajidži milhārem" (q.v.). The bazaar had 1,410 shops, and there were 7 churches of the "Serbs, Bulgars and Latins" in Novibazar. He particularly praises the white unmixed bread and 48 kinds of apples and 35 of pears. Among the notabilities of the time "Hajidži Ibrahim Efendi, who had "canowed" the roads to Bosnia and Herzegovina and erected bridges and rest-houses, and Ewliya Celebi Mahmut Agha receive words of praise. Both hadpalaces (türbe) in Novibazar. In consequence of its exceedingly important military position and as the key to Bosnia for Turkey in Europe (cf. F. Kanitz, Serben, Leipzig 1868, p. 200 sq.) Novibazar has frequently played a part in military history. In 1689 it was occupied under the Margrave of Baden; but the Christian inhabitants, disillusioned by the tyrannical attitude of the garrison, the excesses of the imperial armies, the heavy taxation, the intolerance shown the orthodox clergy and the parsimonyship of the Roman Catholic church, soon turned against their masters and very soon Novibazar with the whole of Old Serbia again passed to the Ottomans. In 1737 Novibazar was again occupied for a few months by the imperial forces, but as a result of the careless leadership of the generals fell with Nish again into Turkish hands and this settled the disastrous result of the war for Austria (cf. F. Kanitz, op. cit., p. 203 sq.) and the Turkish description of the Bosnian campaign, from the pen of the Şah of Novi, Ömer Efendi (q.v.), e.g. in the German version by J. N. v. Dubsly, Vienna 1789, p. 54 sqq. or the English by C. Fraser, London 1830, p. 48 sqq.). It is remarkable that the defences of Novibazar in the Turkish period were never what the strategic importance of the place demanded (cf. the description in A. Boué, Die Europäische Türkei, vol. i., Vienna 1889, p. 549). In view of the stubborn defence and steady opposition of the people, the Ottoman authorities — Novibazar was the seat of a Şahin-i-müşkült (q.v.) — had a difficult time. General Hasan Pasha who was to carry out the distressing in 1860, was killed in the street in a rising and those guilty were never brought to book. Unpopular officials were as a rule simply driven out. As the new force contended with these difficulties with the rebellious population of the sandjak it never decided to undertake another military expedition against them. The result was that all branches of administration, trade, agriculture and industry gradually went to pieces. From the 18th century therefore Novibazar was always a place of little importance. Nor did it revive under the semi-indepenent feudal lords of the family of Ferhadagić (Ferhagadagić). Of the remains of Muslim times in Novibazar may be mentioned the fortress (kule) built in 1103 (1690) in the reign of Süleyman the Great. The surrounding buildings as a rule date only from the time of Abd al-Čaím II. Historically most interesting is the Altan-i Alan Mosque built by Ghabriac Shah (Mask-Raj, above), the founder of Novibazar. Behind it lie the foundations of a mosque and a mausoleum of the erstwhile feudal lord of Novibazar, Ayif Pasha (d. 1423 = 1521). Of other Muslim houses of prayer may be mentioned the mosques of Murad al-Din Efendi, first mufti of the conqueror Mehmed II, of Ghabriac Siināk-ı-beg and of Ayif Pasha. — The capital of the sandjak of Novibazar in modern times was the little town of Sjenica (cf. K. Oestreich, Reisen im Filister Kame, in the Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft fur Erdkunde zu Berlin, vol. xxvi., 1899, p. 319). Bibliographie: G. Munz Machemey and A. P. Ibrig, "Travel in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe," London 1877, i. 245—284 (condition of Novibazar about 1875); A. Steinhaus, Das Sandbacht Novibazar, Darmstadt 1879; Ewliya Celebi, Seyahatname, v. 544 sqq.; K. J. Jireček, Die Handelsstrassen und Bergwerke von Serbien und Bosnien während des Mittelalters, Prague 1879, p. 77; [Theodor Ippen], Novibazar und Kosovo (Das alte Rascien), Vienna 1892; K. J. Jireček, Staat und Gesellschaft im mittelalterlichen Serbien, part iv., Vienna 1919 = Denkschriften der Akad. der Wiss. in Wien, vol. 64, fasc. 2, p. 11 sq.; J. Kosinić, "The Sandjak Novibazar and its Ethnological Problem" (Serbien-Blagovin), 1912; K. N. Kosinić, Novi gradovi, 4, Novibazar, in Delo, Year xiii., fasc. 70, March 1914, p. 399—397; Fr. Bahniger, Führer durch Südostserbien (Bosnia n. d. = 1951), 23 sqq. (Franz Bahiner).

Nüba, name of a country [and people] to the South of Egypt. The name Nuba, Nuh, Nuba are commonly used without scientific precision and it is only in the linguistic sense that they have an ambiguous meaning. The frontier separating the Nuba from Egypt proper is well defined as the first cataract of the Nile in the neighbourhood of Assuan, and the area where Nubian is spoken nowadays ends in the vicinity of the 18th parallel, but the southern limit of Nuba is sometimes placed as far south as the junction of the Atbara and the Nile, or even the confluence of the two. Nuba is often sub-divided into Lower Nuba.
from Aswán to Wāli Hafsa and Upper Nubia from Wāli Hafsa southwards, but neither term has any political or administrative significance.

The medieval Arabic writers are equally vague about the southern extent of Nubia: the region immediately bordering on Egypt, which bore the name of Marsa, seems to have been regarded as Nubia par excellence; to the south of it lay Māqarrā with its capital at Dongola (Danğula, Dumbula), and beyond this the kingdom of 'Alwa the capital of which was Sōbat, near the site of the modern Khartūm. According to the tenth-century author 'Abd Allāh b. Ahmad b. Salīm (Sūsim), quoted by Makrīzī) Marsa and Māqarrā had distinct languages, and the frontier between them was situated three poststations (ādzīs) to the south of the Third Cataract; politically, however, Marsa formed part of Māqarrā and this probably accounts for the fact that Ibn Salīm immediately afterwards places the commencement of Māqarrā at a day's journey from Aswān. The frontier between Māqarrā and 'Alwa was the district of al-'Āwīb, a name still in use for the country round Kābāghīya in Berber province. 'Alwa is generally placed outside Nubia, and the preamble to the treaty which governed the political relations between Nubians and Arabs makes its provisions incumbent on the 'Alwans, the 'Alwīs, as the 'Alwané people of his dominions, and it is clear that 'Alwa lies on the frontier of 'Alwa'; yet Mas'ūd al-Rūmī speaks of 'Alwa as part of Nubia and states that it is under the political suzerainty of Māqarrā. According to Yākūt, Nubia extends along the Nile a distance of eighty days journey, Dongola being situated halfway at forty days distance from Aswān; of 'Alwa he speaks, with obvious exaggeration of the distance, as a people beyond Nubia three months' journey from the king of the Nubis, whose official title is 'king of Māqarrā and Nubia'.

The modern conventional division of the population of the northern Sudan into Nubian, Bejda, and Arab is in the main a linguistic one and does not correspond to any clearly-marked racial divisions. The "Nubian" type, itself a hybrid one, which dates back to the age of pre-lycic Egypt, is most purely preserved in the Kente, Mahas, and Sukkot, who between them compose the so-called Barabta, though even here, a considerable element of alien admixture must be recognised. The Nubian-speaking Danğula (Dançult), on the other hand, are scarcely distinguishable from the rest of the Dançula-Dja'dīya-group (see MacMichael, History, i. 197, 197) which includes a number of Arabic-speaking tribes extending from Dongola province to the neighbourhood of Khartūm; the origin of this group must be sought in a fusion of the original Nubian element with the Arabs who poured into the Sudan in the sixth ages and eventually brought about the fall of the Christian kingdoms of Dongola and 'Alwa. The numerous Dançula colonies on the Blue and White Niles have given up their language in favour of Arabic, and the same applies to a branch of the Mahas, settled since the sixteenth century in the neighbourhood of Khartūm, who now claim to be descended from the Kharrajd of Arabia. Throughout the northern Sudan the original Nubian stratum has coalesced with the Arabs to such an extent that it is no longer possible to separate the two streams. This fusion has also affected the groups which still speak Nubian, though the Barabta may be said to have maintained a separate identity and to have absorbed the foreign elements rather than the reverse. The Dançula retain the appellation Nubian, and the term Barabta is confined only by Egyptians and other foreigners, while the people themselves prefer to call themselves by their tribal names (Kente, Mahas, Sukkot). It is only in recent times that they have begun to develop a national sentiment as Nubians and to make occasional use of the name.

Language. The Nubian language can scarcely be indigenous to the Nile Valley, and it is in no way connected with the language of the Merotic inscriptions which preceded it in that area. The problem of its linguistic grouping has not been satisfactorily solved, but Hamitic and Sudanic features are present, and L. Reinach (Die Sprachliche Stellung des Nuba, Vienna 1914) regards it as a connecting link between the two groups. G. W. Murray (Sudan Notes and Records, vol. lii.) suggests the conclusion that in the remote past Dinka-Shilluk, Bari-Maasai, and Nubian had a common origin, and that they all have to a greater or lesser degree been permeated by Hamitic influence. W. Meinhold (Unter Stidienfahrt nach Kordofan) definitely classes Nubian as a Hamitic language.

The following branches are distinguished:

a. Nilotic Nubian (the language of the Barabta and Dançula) with three dialects: Kente, Mahas, and Dongola; the first and third, though separated geographically, form a single dialect group. A fourth dialect distinguished by Reinach (Fadlija, Fadilka) is stated by Lepsius to be only a variety of Mahas.

b. Hill Nubian spoken by a number of negroid tribes in the present province of Kordofan. The area in question is inhabited by a medley of tribes of different linguistic and racial stocks, and it is only in the case of the Nubian-speaking groups of southern Nubia that the appellation Nubian is justified. The best-known dialect is that of Dilling (Dellen). A form of Hill Nubian is also spoken by the people of Jiebel Middib in northern Darfur.

On the problem of the racial and historical connexion between Hill Nuba and Nilotic Nubians, see below.

c. The isolated dialect of the Birbad tribe in Darfur designated by Zyhlarz as South-West Nubian.

d. Old Nubian, the literary language of medieval Nubia. The examples which have survived belong to the viith-viith centuries and consist of homiletic and edifying pieces intended for the common people, as distinct from strictly theological literature for which Greek was employed. The language of these texts approximates most closely to modern Mahas, although the provenance of the existing remains is the northermost part of Nubia where Kente is spoken. Scanty remains from Upper Nubia justify the conclusion that Nubian (perhaps in a form more closely connected with the Hill dialects) was also used for literary purposes in the kingdom of 'Alwa.

Modern Nubian has no literature apart from biblical translations produced under European influence. The Dançula and Barabta use only Arabic for written communications and for literary purposes.

History. In speaking of the early history of the country the name Nubia is misleading, as there is no evidence of its use in ancient Egypt as a tribal or geographical name. To the Egyptians Lower Nubia was known as Wawat, and Upper
Nubia is Kush (the biblical Cush) which corresponds to the classical Ethiopia. From the earliest times there existed relations of trade, conquest, and cultural influence between Egypt and its southern neighbour, and under the Middle Empire the Egyptian penetration of what is now Dongola province led to the development of a special local civilization based on the culture of Egypt, but deeply affected by local forms, materials and customs. Under the New Empire Nubia and Kush were annexed by Egypt, and Nubia (Djebel Barkal) became an important centre of the cult of Amun-Ra. Later Napatia was the capital of an independent Ethiopian kingdom which, in its turn, conquered Egypt, and five kings of Napatia sat on the throne of the Pharaohs (the 25th dynasty, c. 730–663). Subsequently the centre of gravity shifted southwards and Meriit, about 130 miles north of Kharitum, was the capital of a kingdom which still preserved the elements of a civilization based on that of Egypt, though the isolation of the country, which was now almost complete, led to a rapid decline. In circumstances of which we have no detailed knowledge, the change in population might be due to the pressure of negrooid elements from Kordofan and the Djabal, and cultural contact with the north diminished to such an extent that the Helleno-Roman world Ethiopia was but vaguely known, as indeed was the case of medieval Nubia in its relation to the Muslim world. Byzantine missionaries, however, introduced Christianity in the sixth century, at which period the two kingdoms of Mokaara and "Alwa were already in existence: the Maccarittas, as we are told by the chronicler, became Christians in 559 and the Alawaenses in 560, and an embassy of the Maccarittas visited Constantinople in 573.

The name Nubian appears for the first time in the Hellenistic-Roman age and the earliest occurrence seems to be in Erotholhnes (quoted by Strabo, xvii) who speaks of the Noubai as "a great race living in Lycia on the left side of the course of the Nile extending from Moros to the bend of the river". In this passage, as well as in other references in Greek and Latin writers, Nubians are clearly distinguished from Lyians, Ethiopians, and other negrooid folk, and as late as ca. 550 A.D. a kinglet of Lower Nubia speaks of himself as EKALIPEK LEUKABOV KAI KHEM TAQ ALCTRAS. It is not until the Muslim period that Nubia is found to have replaced Ethiopia as the name for the whole of the riverine country to the south of Egypt.

Of the events which brought about this change of name (no doubt signifying a change in language and in the ethnic character of the people) there is no historical record. From the linguistic evidence it is probable enough that the name originally belongs to the negroes of Kordofan, and that the Nobaii (Noubades, Nobatae) of the classical writers were immigrants from the southwest who, as a result of political ascendency, imposed their language on the Ethiopians of the Nile valley. The fact, however, cannot be disregarded that the modern Hill Nuba are strikingly dissimilar in physical character and culture to the mainly Hamitic Beduins-Danagla, and on this ground the possibility of a racial connexion of the two groups has been challenged by C. G. Seltzmann and H. A. MacMichael (see esp. MacMichael, History, I. 14 sq.). Yet it is certain that the separation of the dialects must have taken place at a comparatively early date (before Christianity); the presence of "Nubian" speech in Kordofan can therefore not be explained as the result of Damajal settlement in recent times. For a discussion of this vexed question see Ernst Zylbers, Zur Stellung der Dorf- und Nebenachsen in W. Z. K. M., vol. xxxv, and S. Hillenbrand, "Nubian Origins" in Studia Nubium et Aegyptiaca, vol. xii. (1950). What can be said with certainty is that the Arab conquests of Egypt were found on their southern frontier a population mainly Hamitic in the north, but containing negrooid elements which increased in importance in the south. These people were Jacobite Christians, and they used Nubian as the language of government and letters.

Viyol quotes two sayings ascribed to the prophet in which Nubians are praised as faithful friends and useful slaves, but there can hardly have been any contact between Arabs and Nubians before the two invasions (A.D. 641–642 and 651–652), the second of which carried the Arabs as far as Dongola (q.v.). As a result of these raids the Christian kingdom in the north was weakened, and Nubians were regulated by a treaty which ordered out a system of mutual tolerances and non-interference; the tribute of slaves (bokh [q.v.]) from the daqar) which the Nubians undertook to pay annually was not so much a sign of submission as the basis for an exchange of commodities. Intercourse between the two countries, whether commercial or political, remained very restricted, and the interests of the Arabs to the south of Egypt were in the main confined to the exploitation of the mines of al-Al khayy, which affected the Bedja rather than the Nubians. An invasion of Upper Egypt, said to have been undertaken by the Nubian king Kyriakes in A.D. 737 (or between 744 and 750) is recorded only on the doubtful evidence of Christian writers and ignored by Muslim historians. Minor raids occurred from time to time, and the "tribute" was occasionally withheld, but on the whole relations were peaceful. The Muslims began to penetrate into Nubia at an early date, presumably for purposes of trade, and as early as the tenth century they are said to have had a special lodging-place (ruhag) in the capital of "Alwa. According to a Syrian writer (quoted by Mez, Renaissance des Islam, p. 37), Nubian resident in the lands of the caliphs remitted taxes to their own king and enjoyed the privilege of an autonomous jurisdiction. Further evidence of friendly relations is found in an account of an embassy to Baghdad in the time of al-Mutawakkil when a Nubian prince was hospitably entertained.

Of internal conditions in Nubia we know very little; there are no native sources of information and Muslim accounts throw light only on special periods and occasional contacts. The fullest descriptive accounts, both dating from the tenth century A.D., are those of Mas'udi (ii. 362; iii. 31–32; 39–43) and Ibn Sa'dm (Sulaim), who wrote an account of "Nubia, Mukaara, 'Alwa, the Bu'dja, and the Nil"), of which extensive fragments are extant in the Khulaj of Murshid (ed. Wiet, vol. iii, ch. xxx. 399).}

During the reign of Saladin Nubian affairs came into some prominence owing to the support given by the semi-Nubian Bu'di Kana (on whom see below) to a Fatimid pretender, and Lower Nubia was
invaded by Saladin's brother Tūhja-Kānū (1172—
1175) who pillaged them and took many captives,
but reported unfavourably on the resources of the
country with the result that a planned invasion
was not proceeded with. Soon afterwards (about
1208), the Armenian Abū Sa'īd composed his ac-
count of the Churches and Monasteries of Egypt
(ed. and translated by R. T. A. Vrettos and A. J.
Butler, Oxford 1895) which contains some interest-
ing data about Muḥammad, Muḥammad b. Ḥafṣ, and Ḥilāla, but must
be used with caution owing to the confusion in
the writer's mind between Nubia and Alawīya and
his uncritical use of older authorities.

The factors which brought about the disintegra-
tion of the Nubian kingdom and the Islamisation
of the country were the invasion of the Arab
tribes, the rise of the Banū Kānū, and the interven-
tion in Nubian affairs of the Mamlūk rulers of
Egypt, especially during the reigns of al-Ẓāhir
Bāibars [q.v.] and al-Manṣūr ʿAlāʾ [q.v.].

The Banū Kānū were first heard of in 1230
when the Fāṭimid alīsh al-Dīn, as a reward
for services rendered, conferred the hereditary title
of Khān al-Dawla on Abū Ḥamīd Ḥilāla-Kānū, a chief of the Rūfī Arabs
who settled on the borderland between Egypt and the Süddān. 
Already in the tenth century the Rūfī had gained control of the mines of al-ʿAllāk and imposed their rule on the Beja with whom they allied themselves by intermarriage. Another section, settled near Awālān, fraternised with the local Nubians, and the tribe, formed by this amalgamation and ruled by the Khān al-Dawla dynasty, came to be
known as the Banū Kānū; they are represented by the Kents of the present day. During the reign of the Mamlūks they were virtually in independent control of Upper Egypt, alternately in alliance with or in revolt against the Mamlūk government, and though repelled at times with a heavy hand, they remained a powerful tribe until the Ottoman conquest of Egypt. Before this event, however, they had played their part, together with nomad
Arabs and Mamlūk troops, in the destruction of
Nubian independence.

The Bahriti Mamlūks, for reasons not apparent
in our sources, departed from the traditional policy
of Muslim Egypt, and actively intervened in
Nubian affairs. The pretext for the expeditions undertaken by the generals of Bāibars and Kānū-Bāibars were non-payment of the tribute and, more frequently, the征战ship of Nubian pretenders who had solicited Egyptian support in order to gain the throne. On several occasions such pretenders of the Mamlūk government were installed in Dongola only to lose the throne again as soon as the Egyptian troops withdrew (see the article DONGOLA).

A formal treaty concluded with one of these kings virtually established an Egyptian protectorate. Meanwhile the disintegration of the kingdom went on under the pressure of Arab immigration, and Arab chiefs who married into the royal house took advantage of the matrilineal line of succession to grasp the throne. The age-long Christian
Nubia was gradually undermined and in the xivth
century Muslim kings began to appear: the first
to bear a Muslim name was Abū Ḥamīd Ṣanūb, who was installed in 1316 and after a short
reign lost the throne to a Kānū al-Dawla.

The Kānū al-Taʾrīf of Ahmad b. Yahyā b. Faḍl Allāh, written some time between 1340 and
1349, we learn that at this date Christian kings
still alternated with Muslims and Ibn Battūta in
1332 (iv. 306) speaks of the Nubians as Christians.

The conversion of the common people we have no
details; no doubt it was brought about by the
absorption of the native inhabitants, or those who
survived, in the Arab tribes.

The immigration itself has left little trace in
the pages of the historians, though the outlines
of the process can be reconstructed from occasional
references and from oral tradition. The nomads
who had entered Egypt in the wake of the first
conquest can now be found that country con-
genial to their mode of life, and the string of non-
Arab dynasties tended to make conquests still
less attractive, while the Süddān seemed to offer
all the advantages, from the nomads' point of
view, that Egypt denied. For a long time the
kingdom of Dongola formed an effective barrier
to southward expansion, but a gradual infiltration
of Arabs must have begun at a comparatively
early date, even though the end of the process
was not accomplished for several centuries.

The early stages of the movement are seen in the
conditions depicted in the story of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Dīn, the events of which are laid
in the reigns of Ibn Jumaa (Mārko's) and Ibn
Maḥṣūf, quoted by Quṣayrānī, ii. 59—80. Arabs of
Rufī and Shūlijan, led into the Süddān by a
brigand prince, have fraternised with the
Beja and exploit the mines of the Eastern Desert,
but the Nile is forbidden them and Nubia is too
strong to be attacked by force of arms. A frac-
tional struggle in the Nubian royal house provides
an opportunity for an alliance between the Arabs
and a prince pretender to the throne. Acts of
outrageous treachery are committed on both sides
and in the end the Arabs have the worst of the
encounter. The end of the process is seen in the
fifteenth century. The Kingdom of Nubia had
now to all intents and purposes ceased to exist
and such kings as reigned in name were puppets
of the Arab tribes... It is from this period,
the early years of the fourteenth century, that
the immigration of most of the camel-owning nomads of the Süddān dates. Generally speaking, it seems, the
Djūlijan and their allies, most of whom we
may be sure were Feṣṣa, loosed their hordes
southwards and westwards, leaving the Banū Kānū
and Ikirma in northern Nubia and Upper Egypt" (MacMichael, loc. cit., p. 187).

Of ʿAlwa nothing is heard at this period, but
no doubt the course of events was similar to that
in the northern kingdom, and shortly in the time
of Ibn Ḥaṣṣan (1322—1400) we hear of harpies of
Djūlijan "close to the Abyssinians", that is to
say no doubt on the upper reaches of the Blue
Nile in the southern Ḥjarra. The kingdom of
ʿAlwa nevertheless lingered on precariously and
Nubian Christianity was still a living memory in
the time of the Portuguese Alvares (1520—1527),
but about the year 1500 Sūsia fell to an alliance
of Kawāna Arabs (a branch of Ruufi-Djūlijan) and
the negroid Fungji [q.v.] who here for the
first time appear in history.

The fifteenth century is almost completely bar-
ren of records relating to Nubia, and the historical
memory of the great inhabitants remembers little
of pre-Fungji days. With the coming of the Fungji,
who soon extended their influence to Dongola,
the history of Nubia is merged in that of the
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Sudan, and the Nubians, now Muslims and deeply affected by racial mixture with their conquerors, survive only as a linguistic minority on the northern fringe of their ancient kingdom.

Lower Nubia, however, was politically separated from the Fundh kingdom by Selim I, who annexed the country south of Awsén as far as the neighbourhood of the Third Cataract, and garrisoned it. The people of Tell el Dér and Berbera were mercenaries (see Ghaza by the people of the Suddán). From these, many of the modern Barába claim to be descended.

The Barabba-Danagha of the present day (in the Egyptian province of Awsén and the Sudan provinces of Kafa and Dongola) are a peaceful race of cultivators and skillful boatmen of the Nile. Owing to the poverty of their country and aided by an enterprising disposition, large numbers seek their livelihood in Egypt and the Sudan where they are found everywhere engaged in various forms of manual employment. The Danagha have also spread all over the Sudan as traders, and in the nineteenth century they played an important part, together with their rivals, the Djalilin, in the commerce of Egypt. On the Nile and the Bahr al-Ghazál where they adventured as slave-traders, sailors, and mercenary troops.

The men are generally bilingual in Nubian and Arabic which latter: they speak ungrammatically and with an accent of their own. Those in foreign employment show themselves remarkably adaptable to alien ideas, at the same time they are tenacious of their own customs and claimish to a degree.

Under modern conditions they are keen to take advantage of educational facilities, and show an aptitude for the educated professions. In the past they have made no important contribution to the intellectual and spiritual life of the Sudan and produced no scholars of note. The 7-Nián in the mystical w.v. is said to have been of Nubian origin, but he is generally called "the Egyptian". The most remarkable figure of their race is Muhammad Ahmad [q.v.], the Mahdi of the Sudan (died 1885), who was a Dongolat, though his family claim to be Ghaza. The Barabba and Danagha are generally devout Muslims, and most of them belong to the Muckantiya (Khatnaya) tribe.


Other references are given in the text.

(S. Hillebrand)

NUBANDADJIAN. [See Shul'taš.]

NUBÁR PASJA (1825—1899), an Egyptian statesman, who played a most prominent part in Egyptian politics in the 20th century. Summoned by his uncle Bohgas Bey, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and of Commerce under Muhammad ᴜ'lı, he came to Egypt at the age of 17 and entered the government service as second secretary to the Viceroy. In 1848 he accompanied Ibrahim Pasja to Europe as secretary and interpreter. Under Saïd, Nubar began to play a part in public life. His independent spirit, his methodical and precise mind were revealed in the organisation of the Egyptian railways which he put in order in the space of six months (1857).

But it was under Isma'il that he fully revealed his gifts as a negotiator and diplomatist. He was, however, not called upon to play a national part because of his Armenian origin and his ignorance of the language of the country. Raised to the rank of Pasja at the beginning of the reign (1865) he hastened to take advantage of the support and advanced views of the Vicerey to carry through a great scheme: to encourage externally the independence of Egypt and its development not in Asia — this was Isma'il's bias — but in Africa where her destiny summoned her, and at home the regeneration of Egypt with the help of Europe. From the first Nubar Pasja grasped the great truths of the Egyptian question. But if the conception was grandiose, the execution of the scheme proved difficult on account of the confusion of interests and the European jealousies. These inherent difficulties in the Egyptian problem proved impediments to many solutions and the policy of reform frequently had to twist its way round obstacles of all kinds.

On the smallest matters Egypt had to wage an unequal struggle with Europe. Nubar conducted the struggles on three fronts at the same time, on these fundamental questions.

The question of the Suez Canal. On Isma'il's accession the Company formed a state within the state and constituted in the very heart of Egypt a kind of colony, as a result of the lands it had obtained along the sea canal and the fresh water canals which were linked up with it. Nubár conducted negotiations in Constantinople and in Paris with the object of securing the territorial sovereignty of Egypt. His activity ended in the famous decision of the Emperor Napoleon III on July 6, 1864, which ordered Egypt to pay the Company 840,000 francs to regain its rights. This enormous indemnity was nevertheless lost from bringing about a final settlement.
The question of judicial reform. Nubar used often to say: "Give Egypt water and justice and the country will be happy and prosperous". But in order to place justice on a sound footing, so that it could protect the native against the government and the European who was exploiting him and particularly against the arbitrary decisions of the consuls, each of whom laid down his own law to the governed and governors alike, Nubar thought of organizing a mixed system of justice composed of Egyptian and European elements and thus establishing uniformity of jurisdiction, legislation and executive action. As a result of the systematic opposition of France and of certain powers interested in maintaining the "privileges", the mixed tribunals were not established till 1875 after ten years of striving and of waiting censured by the government.

The question of autonomy. The territorial servitudes inflicted by the Suez Canal and the system of capitulations did not prevent Nubar from remembering the political restrictions imposed by Turkey, the master power. From 1863 to 1875 Nubar endeavoured to extract from Constantinople by negotiation and bribery privileges which would enable the work of progress to develop freely.

After the firmaments of 1866 and 1867, Egypt obtained the famous firman of 1875 which constituted a new charter conferring on the sultan the title of Khedive [q.v.], hereditary successor to the throne in direct line from father to son, an increase in the army — limited to 18,000 in 1840 — and lastly the right to conclude loans and commercial treaties with the Powers.

But the error made by Nubar and the Khedive was to consolidate Egyptian independence in theory but not in practice. Nubar was anxious for the introduction of capital and European enterprise; a beneficial idea but also dangerous because the Khedive, encouraged by his minister, became involved without due consideration in a disastrous series of loans. The various enterprises which arose with the rapid development of the resources of the country had to be put in the hands of companies like the Steam Navigation Company, the Sudan Company, the Agricultural and the Trading Companies, in which Nubar, Oppenheim, Dervies and others were the chief directors. The failures of the companies were liquidated by Egypt which made good all losses. The collaboration of Nubar with these financiers brought an atmosphere of suspicion into the good understanding between the minister and the Khedive, as did the negotiations conducted by him to conclude loans in Paris and elsewhere.

But the tragic side of the question lay in the accumulation of a debt of £30,000,000 which opened the gates of the Delta to foreign control. There is no doubt that Nubar had always resolutely opposed any foreign interference. Down to 1875, during the little time that he was actually in Egypt — he was often on missions to Europe — Nubar endeavoured to set as a check on absolute rule and to oppose all European interference from wherever it came. He was not popular either in England or France. He was rightly distrusted in the entourage of the Khedive also.

Towards the end of 1875 an event took place which modified his attitude. England having taken the unusual step of intervening in Egypt to defend the private interests of some of her capitalists and sending a mission under Mr. Cave to conduct an enquiry in the country, Nubar, with his remarkable political instinct, felt the imminent danger of such interference and resolved to oppose it by all means. He was unable to provoke the intervention of the consuls-general of Russia and Germany, who offered the Khedive the support of their governments. Ismail declined this offer, which was a grave political error. He went farther and communicated with the English consul and did not scruple to sacrifice his minister.

Nubar had to hand in his resignation on Jan. 5, 1876 and to leave Egypt on March 21. Hencorth he swore a bitter feud against his master and his attitude gradually changed and inclined to England. In deciding to undermine the personal authority of the ruler, and allying himself with the foreigners, without being able to fix in advance how far the alliance was to go, in a word in wishing to humble his sovereign, Nubar weakened his country for the benefit of England. For it was to the government of England that he appealed in 1876 to intervene, acting on the pretext that intervention was here inevitable as a result of the enormous debts contracted by Egypt and that England's action would be of more benefit to Egypt than that of any other power. The result was that England finally imposed on the Khedive both Nubar and her complete control by extorting from him the rescript of Aug. 28, 1878 which established a "possible ministry" presided over nominally by Nubar but in effect by Rivers Wilson as Minister of Finance and de Briegel as Ministers of Public Works. This dangerous innovation in the formation of a European ministry not responsible to the Khedive whose authority was now negligible, and installed in the heart of the country to support European policy and high finance — aroused the Egyptians from their lethargy and created general discontent. The Khedive became at once popular and his cause was identified with that of the nation. The result was the outbreak of Feb. 18, 1879 which removed Nubar from power. A new European ministry presided over by the crown prince was formed, and the rest remained. Finally Ismail, emboldened by public opinion, dismissed the European ministers (April 5) and formed a national ministry under Sharif Pasha. For the Tewer — and Nubar's doings in Europe were not without influence on their decision — decided on the ruin of the Khedive and succeeded with the help of Turkey in deposing him (June 26).

Two years after the English occupation, Nubar returned to Egypt to form a ministry after the resignation of Sharif Pasha as a protest against the evacuation of the Sudan by Egypt, dictated by England. Nubar endeavoured in vain to come to terms with England and to put a check on her policy of practically depriving Egypt of her territory in Africa (Jan. 1884—June 1885).

He again formed a ministry (April 16, 1894) but he soon had to submit to the control of the English councillor in the Ministry of the Interior and seeing himself powerless against Lord Cromer's policy which aimed at controlling the whole of the administration he had quickly to retire from the scene (Nov. 1895).

Nubar then went to Europe to compile his memoirs — still unpublished — and peacefully await his end. He was, to sum up, a great minister, a statesman who made mistakes, it is true, but
the fates were against him: 1875 marks the final blocking of his great policy. We must not however forget the early struggles in which he exerted himself from Europe and from Turkey piece by piece rights and privileges which constituted a great boon to his country.


(M. Sahn)

NUBUWUW. [See Nabi.]

NUH, the Noah of the Bible, is a particularly popular figure in the Korân and in Muslim legend. The latter gives 15 virtues by which Nuub is distinguished among the prophets. The Bible does not regard Noah as a prophet. In the Korân Nuub is the first prophet of whom mention is made. He is followed by Hz. Sayid, Hz. Shu'ub and Hz. Isha. Isha is one of his following (Saan'a) (Sunan xxi. 57). He is the pious admonisher (mujakkir) and the preacher (mustâfîr) to whom the Korân says, "forthwith to him has come the messenger of God" (xxvi. 107), the 'alb shabîr, "the grateful servant of God" (xxi. 3). Allah enters into a covenant with Nuub just as with Muhammad, Ishaun, Hz. Musa and Hz. Isâ (xxiii. 7). Peace and blessings are promised him (xi. 50). Muslim legend is fond of seeing himself reflected in the earlier prophets. In the case of Nuub, the Muslim Korân exegesites have already noticed this (see Grünbaum, Neue Hebräerg, p. 90). Muhammad puts into the mouth of Nuub things that he would himself like to say and into the mouths of his opponents what he himself has heard from his. Nuub is reproached with being only one of the people (s. 72-74). God should rather have sent an angel (xxii. 24). Nuub is wrong (vii. 57), is lying, deceiving (vii. 63), is possessed by jinn (iy. 9), only the lowest join him (xi. 29; xxvi. 111). When Nuub replies: "It is grievous to you that I live among you, I seek no reward, my reward is with Allah" (x. 72-74; xi. 31); I do not claim to possess Allah's treasures, to know his secrets, to be an angel and I cannot say to whom ye despise, God shall not give you any good" (xi. 31-33), we have here an echo of Muhammad's defence and embarrassment about many of his followers. Muhammad pictures events as follows: Allah sends Nuub to the sinful people. Suna xxvi. which bears his name, gives one of these sermons threatening punishment for which other analogies can be found. The people scorn him. Allah commands him to build an ark by divine inspiration, then the "chaldron bulls" (xxii. 42; xxiii. 27). The waters drown everything; only two of every kind of living creature are saved and the believers whose Nuub takes into the ark with him. But there were very few who believed. Nuub appeals even to his son in vain; the latter takes refuge on a mountain but is drowned. When Nuub hides the water he still, the ark lands on mount Tijjâr (q. v.; xi. 37-53). Not only Nuub's son but also his wife (with Hz. Isha's wife) are saved (sunan xvi. 10).

Fenomen. 'The Haggoda is developed, as Geiger shows, from the following statements of this Korânic legend of Nuub: 1. Nuub appears as a prophet and admonisher; 2. his people laugh at the ark; 3. his family is punished with hot water (main passages: Talm. Sanhedrin, 108b; Gem. Naba, xix.-xvii.).

The poet-Korânic legend of Nuub as in other cases fills up the gaps, gives the names of these not mentioned in the Korân, makes many links e. g. connects Nuub with Fadlun. The Korân apoc is possible it is pointed out that the Magi (Persians) do not know the story of the flood. Nuub's wife is called Isha and her son is that described in the Haggoda. Every one of these names of Nuub's sons, Sâm, Hâm, Nuub are known to Korân exegetes from the Bible but it also gives the name of Nuub's sinful son who perished in the flood: Kânân, "whom the Arabs call Yam". Muhammad's statement that Nuub was 950 years of age at the time of the flood (Saan'a) (xxii. 13; 14) is probably based on Gen. 5: 5 3 which says Nuub lived 950 years in all, but on the other hand, it serves as a basis for calculations which make Nuub the first man (naqib): according to the Kitab al-Mu'awmirfat of Abû Haflân al-Squistan (ed. Goldscheider, p. 1), who begins his book with Nuub, he lived 1,450 years. Yet in his dying hour he describes his life as having had two houses in which one was "the house of the nude" and one the "House of thecls", in which he lived. Muslim legend knows the Biblical story of Nuub, his time and his sons, but embellishes it greatly and in al-Kinâ'it it becomes a romance. From the union of Khâfî's and Shad's descendants arises a sinful people which rejects Nuub's warnings. He therefore at God's command builds the ark from trees which he has himself planted. As he is hammering and bulding the people mock him: "once a prophet, now a carpenter?" "a ship for the mainland?" The ark had a head and tail like a cock, a body like a bird (Cts'abû). How was the ark built? At the wish of the apostles, Jesus arouses Sâm (or Hâm) b. Nuub from the dead and he describes the ark and its arrangements; in the lower storey were the quadrupeds, in the next the human beings and in the top the birds. Nuub brought the art into the ark first and the ass last. It was slow because Bible was clinging to his tail. Nuub called out impatiently: "come in even if Satan is with thee"; so.Hûs also had to be taken in. The pig arose out of the tail of the elephant and the cat from the lion. How could the goat exist alongside of the wolf, or the dove beside the birds of prey? God tamed their instincts. The number of human beings in the ark varies in legend between seven and eighty. 'Uqîb b. A'as was also saved along with the believers. Khâfî's niece was drowned. Nuub also took Adam's body with him which was used to separate the women from the men. For in the ark constructed was ordered, for man and beast. Only Hûs was transformed and for this was punished with a black skin. The whole world was covered with water and only the Harâm (in al-Kinâ'it, also the site of the sanctuary in Jerusalem) was spared; the Ka'ba was taken up into heaven and Dîbrîl concealed the Black Stone (according to al-Kinâ'it the stone was now white until the Flood). Nuub sent out the raven but finding some carries it forgot Nuub; then he sent the dove which brought: buck an olive leaf in its bill and mud on its feet; as a reward it was given its collar and became a domestic bird. On the day of 'Ashurî' every one came out of the ark, men and beasts fainted and gave thanks to Allah.

There are many contacts with the Haggoda: the
NUH

(different, it is true) partitioning of the ark. NUH's anxiety about the animals, Ham's sin and punishment (Surah Al-Hud, 168 b). The story that the great "Og escaped the Flood" is also taken from the Hagada (see "Bibl."). But Muslim legends go further than the Bible and the Hagada: according to Muhammad, who saw himself in NUH.

Bibliography: Principal passages are Kūrān, vii. 57-58; vi. 47-51; xxiii. 33-31; xxvi. 105-222; xxxii. 75-81; lxxi. (whole); Tahtim, ed. de Goeje, i. 174-201; Ir al-Athir, al-Khalila, i. 27-29; Thālib, Ḥaṣāy al-ʾAshkāl, Cairo 1329, p. 34; al-Nakšī, Ḥaṣāy al-ʾAshkāl, ed. Eisenstein, i. 85-102; Ghāzī al-Muhammad, i. 1902, p. 160-161; M. Grünberge, Neue Beiträge, p. 79-90; J. Heinze, Hebrew Union College Annual, ii., 1925, p. 151; so, Kosmische Rundschau, 1926, p. 15-18, 32-39, 35-45, 54, esp. 146; J. Walker, Biblical Characters in the Koran, p. 113-121.

On the name NUH: Goldsáder, in "Z. D. M. G.", xxxiv. (1870), 207-211; on NUH as Muḥammar; Goldsáder, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philosophie, ii., Leyden 1899, p. xxxix and p. 2.

(Rekhárd Helke)

NUH, the name of two Sánūsids i. Abū Muḥammad NUH i. Nūs ṣūr b. Amār, called Abū Amīr al-Nuḥnadd, succeeded his father as nāṣir, but the real ruler was the pious theologian Abū ʾl-Fadl Muḥammad b. Abī Ṣaʿīd Sāliḥ. The latter long refused to take the title of "wali" but finally succumbed to NUH's pressing representations, and took much less interest in the business of government than in his devotional exercises and theological studies which earned him the name of "al-Ḥikmī al-Shāhid". There were also by this time unmistakable symptoms of decline. In 332 (943-944), Abū ʾl-Fadl b. Abī Ṣaʿīd rebelled in Khurāsān and NUH set out with an army from Būbakhrā towards Merv. But when Abū ʾl-Fadl placed himself under the protection of the ruler of the Turks, whose son was a prisoner in Būbakhrā peace was restored by the release of the Turkish prince and the surrender of Abū ʾl-Fadl who was pardoned by NUH. Much more trouble was caused to the Sánūsid dynasty by the rebel governor of Khurāsān, Abū ʾl-Bayrān al-Muhādī. Shortly after his accession NUH sent him with an army against al-Rāyī to take this town from the Būbakhrā al-Dawla. A section of his troops deserted him on the way however and when he encountered Rūkh al-Dawla three farākhṣ from al-Rāyī, the majority of his Kūrī troops went over to the enemy. Abū ʾAll was defeated and had to return to Naisūr. In Djamālī I 333 (January-February 945), he again advanced against Rūkh al-Dawla but was defeated by order of NUH; on this occasion Rūkh al-Dawla did not meet him but took to flight, and in Ramadān (April-May) Abū ʾAll took the town and the surrounding country. In the meanwhile his enemies in Khurāsān took advantage of his absence to liberate him to NUH, whereupon the latter replaced him by Abīrāhīm b. Shufrū. But Abū ʾAll was not inclined to let this happen and on account of financial difficulties the government could not enforce its orders. As the troops were not paid regularly they blamed the vizier and said he was in collusion with Abū ʾAll. In the end the discontent increased to such a degree that NUH was unable to protect the vizier and in Djamālī I 335 (Nov.- Dec. 946) he was put to death. As early as

Ramadān 334 (April-May 946) Abū ʾAll had summoned NUH's uncle ʿAbdullāh b. Abī Ṣaʿīd from al-Mawṣil and when Abū ʾAll approached Merw, the government troops went over to him, while NUH fled to Būbakhrā. In Djamālī I 335 (Nov.- Dec. 945) Abū ʾAll entered Merw and in the following month Būbakhrā, where the people paid homage to Abīrāhīm as their ruler, after NUH had fled to Samarkand. But Abū ʾAll did not remain long in Būbakhrā. Under pretext of going to Samarkand, he left the town and made his way to ʿSaghānīyān; which he entered in Shībān (Feb.-March, 947). After Abīrāhīm, who with a brother of NUH's, Abū ʾDāʾīr Muḥammad, had remained in Būbakhrā, had begun negotiations with NUH, according to another story, had been defeated in open battle by him, NUH entered Būbakhrā in Ramadān of the same year (March-April 947) where he put to death one of the leading personalities, the chamberlain Togān, and blinded Abīrāhīm along with two of his own brothers, Abū ʾDāʾīr Muḥammad and Abū ʾMuḥammad Abū Ṣaʿīd. But the details are variously given; cf. Dhu al-Athir, al-Kāmil, vii. 348, where it is said after a very full description of events based on the Khurāsān historians: "The 'Irlā qīs give a different version", followed by a brief account of the same events from the 'Irlā qīs point of view; cf. also Barīḥīd, Twartūn, p. 247.

Maṣūṣ I b. ʿArsūlān was then appointed governor of Khurāsān and sent with a naval arm against Merw, where a follower of Abū ʾAll named Abū Ṣaʿīd Muḥammad b. Abī Ṣaʿīd was in control. The latter submitted to ʿAbdullāh's approach and was brought to Būbakhrā. Here NUH at first treated him kindly but when he discovered that he could not rely on Abī Ṣaʿīd he had him put to death. Peace between the government and the ambitions Abū ʾAll did not last long. When the latter learned that NUH was preparing for war he left ʿSaghānīyān and went to Būbakhrā; he then advanced against Būbakhrā once again. A battle was fought at Kūrīhī by Abī Ṣaʿīd, where he was defeated and returned to ʿSaghānīyān. After some time a rapprochement was arranged and NUH intended to attack him once more, whereupon Abū ʾAll again mobilized his followers. Būbakhrā and Toghrīkūstān fell into his hands; in Rābī I 337 (Sept.-Oct. 948) however, he came into conflict with the government troops and suffered a defeat. The latter sacked ʿSaghānīyān but when they were cut off from communication with Būbakhrā, NUH had to open negotiations for peace and in Djamālī I 336 of the same year (Dec. 948-Jan. 949) peace was made. The "Oriental" sources give no further details of the terms of the treaty; at any rate, Abū ʾAll's son Abū Maṣūṣ Abū ʾDāʾīr did not stay the peace and remained in ʿSaghānīyān. Since Maṣūṣ b. ʿArsūlān could not maintain discipline among the troops in Khurāsān he repeatedly asked NUH to relieve him of his office. The latter therefore promised Abū ʾAll to restore him to his old post and when Maṣūṣ died in Rābī I 340 (Aug.-Sept. 951) Abū ʾAll was appointed his successor. In Ramadān (Jan.-Feb. 952) he left ʿSaghānīyān, the administration of which he gave to his son Abū Maṣūṣ Naṣr b. Abū Ṣaʿīd, then went to Merw and arrived at Naisūr in Dhu l-Hijjah (April-May 952). He restored order in Khurāsān, but when by NUH's orders he attacked the Būbakhrā
al-Dawla and his achievements did not come up to expectations, he was dismissed and Abū ʿAlī Scīd Bakr b. Mālik al-Fārābhī appointed his successor, whereupon Abū ʿAlī sought refuge with Khaṭṭ Abū Daws. On Nūh's dealings with the Būyids see the article waqfūṣa n. eitān. Nūh died in Raḥb al-I 343 (Aug. - 954), and his son Abū al-Maʿlūk succeeded him.


2. Nūḥ b. Māniṣ, also called al-Maḍīr or al-Raʾṣīl, ascended the throne at the age of 13 after the death of his father in Sh. 13 (June 977). The government was at first in the hands of his uncle and the title viceroy Abū ʿUqāīr Abū ʿAlī al-Maʾṣūr, who assumed office in Raḥb al-I 367 (Nov.-Dec. 977). In 371 (982-983) the powerful Sīhābjār in Khāṣṣan Abū ʿUqāīr Muḥammad b. Iṣṭakān, also known as al-Ṣimārā, who according to Ibn al-Athir's description of him "only obeyed when he pleased" (fī ʿayna ḫannī waṣāṣ), was dismissed and Muḥammad al-Daws Abū ʿAlī Thāl, a devoted servant of the vizier, put in his place. But the rule of the vizier did not last long; the Sīmārā forces were defeated by the Būyids and the vizier himself murdered at the instigation of Ibn Suṭūdī. When Thāl went to Buḥrān in order to restore order there, Ibn Suṭūdī joined forces with the former Mamlick Fīṭkī, who had taken part in the war against the Būyids and offered him his assistance in the conquest of Khāṣṣan; they then met in Nāṣirābād and seized the country around it. When Thāl heard of this he went to Merw and entered into negotiations with the two viziers with the result that it was agreed that Thāl should retain the supreme command along with Muḥammad while Fīṭkī was to get Bahk and Ibn Suṭūdī's son Abū ʿAlī was to receive Nāṣir. At the same time, in 373 (985-986) and 376 (989), "Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. ʿUṣāir was appointed vizier. The latter was hostile to the ʿUṯūn family and at once dismissed Thāl and restored Ibn Suṭūdī to the supreme command in Khāṣṣan. Some officers indeed appealed for Thāl but their representations were of no avail with the vizier, who was supported by Nūḥ's mother. Equally unsuccessful were the efforts of the former Sīhābjār to enforce his claims by force of arms against Ibn Suṭūdī and Fīṭkī, although he was supported by the two Būyids, Fīṭkī al-Daws and Shāfīʿ al-Daws Abū Ṭabīṣ al-Daws. Thāl was defeated and killed in Djiḡān Ṣamān al-Daws and died in 377 (987-988) of the plague or, according to another statement, of poison. In Dij al-Hidżāja 378 (March 990) Ibn Suṭūdī also died and was succeeded by his son Abū ʿAlī, who was jealous of Fīṭkī and wished to get him out of the way. When he resorted to arms Fīṭkī could not resist him but fled to Merwāštī. Abū ʿAlī then was recognised as governor of all the provinces south of the Amīt-Darmān and soon made himself independent of the central government in Buḥrān while Fīṭkī took possession of Bālāk. The amir Abū ʿAmīr Muḥammad b. Abū ʿAlī al-Maṣūr, whom Nūḥ sent against him, was defeated and joined Fīṭkī against the lord of Ṣamān al-Daws. The latter could not resist the combined forces of the allies; he himself was slain and his army scattered. In addition, there was the intervention of foreign powers in the domestic affairs of the kingdom. Abū ʿAlī turned to the Karmāshān Buḥrān-Khan and arranged with him for a partition of the Ṣamān kingdom by which Buḥrān-Khan was to have Transoxiana and Abū ʿAlī Khaṭṭār. As a result Buḥrān-Khan appeared in Buḥrān in Bālāk in May 992 but soon withdrew and died on the way back to Turkestan [cf. the article Buḥrān-Khan]. After Nūḥ, who had had to evacuate his capital, had returned, Fīṭkī again appeared on the scene. On the approach of Buḥrān-Khan he had been sent against him, but, as we are told, presumably correctly, deliberately allowed himself to be defeated, whereupon he submitted and was rewarded by Buḥrān-Khan with the governorship of Timāla and Khaṭṭār. After the return of Nūḥ he entered into a disaccord with Abū ʿAlī and the latter was helped by the Sīmārā decided to appeal for help to the Khursāwī Sabūṭkūn [cf. the article SABŪṬKŪN]. After a time Abū ʿAlī and Fīṭkī, who had taken refuge with the Būyids Fākh al-Daws in Djiḡān, wished to return to Khāṣṣan (386 = 995). At first they had some success but when they encountered Sabūṭkūn near Thāl they were defeated and fled to Amīr. They then sent messengers to Buḥrān to appeal for pardon. The authorities turned a deaf ear to Fīṭkī's appeal but decreed themselves ready to restore Abū ʿAlī to favour. Fīṭkī therefore fled to the Karakhanids while Abū ʿAlī after many vicissitudes finally made peace with the authorities in Buḥrān through the intervention of the amir Abū ʿAmīr Maʾṣūr b. Muḥammad b. Maṣūr, the burgīdī. He was received very kindly but later thrown into prison with several of his brothers and officers. At the same time, a raid by the Karakhanids forced Nūḥ again to appeal to Sabūṭkūn who was then in Khaṭṭār. The latter at once invaded Transoxiana with a large army; but when he demanded that Nūḥ should join forces with him, Nūḥ refused on the advice of the vizier Abū ʿAlī Maṣūr b. ʿUṣāir. Sabūṭkūn was not at all pleased and Nūḥ did not want to give in but also to hand over the vizier and Abū ʿAlī, wherupon the vizier was given to Abū Nasr Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. Abū ʿAlī ʿUzair, imprisoned. But Abū ʿAlī and Ibn ʿUṣāir is Gardu. The former died in 387 (997) in prison while the vizier was afterwards released. At the conclusion of peace, Sabūṭkūn and the Karakhanids agreed that the steppe of Kafūān should be the frontier between the Samānids and the Karakhanids. Nūḥ was also recognised as governor of Samān al-Daws. Sabūṭkūn ruled as an independent sovereign in Khūṣṣan, Khurāsān, Transoxiana, and Nāṣir Nūḥ endeavoured to restore order by force but after a few months he was murdered and Nūḥ appointed his successor Abū ʿAmīr Maṣūr b. Ibn Khaṭṭār al-Burghāshī. Nūḥ died in Rudjāb 387 (July 997) and was succeeded by his son Abū ʿAmīr al-Hārīṣ Muṣāfīn.
NÜH v. MUSTAFÄ, an Ottoman theologian and translator, was born in Anatolia but migrated while still quite young to Cairo where he studied all branches of theology and attained a high reputation. He died there in 1070 (1659). He wrote a series of theological treatises, some of which are detailed by Brockelmann, G.A. L., ii. 314. His most important work however is his free translation and edition of Shahrastānī’s celebrated work on the sects, Tadhkira-ı Millâh-ı wa-Niṣābūn, which he prepared at the suggestion of a prominent Cairo cadi named Yūsuf Efendi. It exists in manuscripts in Berlin (cf. Fertisch, Not. p. 157 sq.; Gotta (Fertisch, 3rd ed. 1970)). Also printed in Cairo (cf. Rič, in Acta, p. 33 sq.; Upsala (cf. Tornberg, Ueber, p. 213), Vienna (cf. Flügel, Kat., ii. 199) etc. and was printed in Cairo in 1263. On the considerable differences between this Turkish translation and the original Arabic cf. Rič in the British Museum Catalogue, p. 356. In his Mémorial aux deux confrets gnostiques du moyen âge, du Cabinet de M. le Duc de Ricas (Paris 1855), p. 40 sqq., J. v. Hammer gave some extracts from the latter part of the work. He also wrote it in the Winter-fahr-buch, lext. p. 30 and 4. In 1850 (1741) a certain Yūsuf Efendi wrote a life of Nūh b. Mustafä which exists in MS. in Cairo (Cat. vii. 564). Bibliography: The catalogues of MSS. above mentioned and also Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 314 and Muhammād al-Muhājib, Futul lשת Himalik al-TH, Cairo 1868, iv. 458.

AL-NUKHAILA, a town in the ʿIrāq, near al-Kūfa. It is known mainly from the accounts of the battle of Kūdīsā. From the statements collected by Yāḥyā regarding its position it appears that two different places of this name had later to be distinguished, namely one near Kūfa on the road to Syria, which is several times mentioned in the time of the Caliphs ʿAlî and Muḥâjīn and another, a watering station between al-Muhājīn and al-Yūz aw, 3 mil from al-Husayn, to the right of the road to Mecca. Several encounters took place there during the second battle of Kūdīsā. According to al-Khwāja in al-Bakri, this al-Nukhaila was in the Syrian steppe (al-Šowāf); Ibn al-Fakhr also seems to be thinking of this region. Caustani assumes that the reference in both cases is to the same place on the edge of the desert. According to Maull, it perhaps corresponds to the modern Khūl ibn Nihâla about 14 miles S. E. E. of Kerbela and 40 miles N. W. of al-Kūfa.


AL-NUIRR, a plain east of the Jordà in Transjordan. The name al-NuIRR ("the cavity") is quite common here. It is applied to an area which includes the two districts of al-Bathān (with its chief town Al-Husayn) and Hâshā (a part of the hills of the same name), i.e. the whole northern half of Transjordan. In the wider sense al-NuIRR includes all the country from al-Lūdâ, al-Dhâr and al-Balâgb to the left of the Jordà, in the narrower sense only the southern part of this; in any case it stretches from al-Sanāmâ to the Jordà at Dârâ (Hâshā). To al-NuIRR belong Miṣrār and Miṣrâb, Tubâs (now Tūbâs), al-Maṣānūzî, Ouba, Ouk, al-Maṣānūzî and al-Fadiūn already mentioned in Syrian texts of the pre-Muhammadan period.


NUMAIR, an Arab tribe of (Wüstenfeld, Geneä. Tabellen, V. 15) inhabiting the western heights of al-Yaman and those between this region and al-Hima Dârya; a bare and difficult country the nature of which explains the rude and savage character of the Numair. Their name like that of their word and Arabic borne by other al-nimic groups (there are also in the list of Arab tribes a number of other clans with the name Numair among the Asad, the Tammûn, the Dârî, the Harmân etc.) is no doubt connected with that of the tribe; we know the deductions made by Robertson Smith from this fact and from other similar cases, to prove the existence of a system of totemism among the early Arabs (Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia, second ed., p. 234). His theory is now abandoned.

The geographical dictionaries of al-Bakri and Yāḥyā mention a large number of places in the land of the Numair, especially their wells, and often even record a change of ownership from one tribe to another (e.g. Yāḥyā, Muḥâjib, ill. 302; the well of the Khâlīs, which formerly belonged to the Tamûn clan of the Dârî tribe, later passed to Numair). In his theory, the Numair played an important part in the history of Arabia. It is only due to the fact that the country of the Numair is typically Beduin in its scenery and lends itself to description by poets. The Numair besides were much mixed with the neighbouring tribes (especially the Tamûn, Bûhila and Kušlu) and the boundaries of their territory were rather vague. The Numair, a poor tribe without natural wealth, have always been brigands. The part; they took in the pre-Islamic wars was a very modest one and they appear very rarely alongside of the other groups of the great tribe of Amīr b. Saʿāda (they hardly played any part in the battle of Fair al-Riḍ) against the Banū l-ʿAutah b. Ka'b and their allies, Miṣrâr, ed. Behra, p. 466-475). It is to
this isolation that they owe the privilege of being known as one of the Djamadat al-Arâb, i.e. a tribe which never allied itself with others (cf. Muharrad, Kâmî, ed. Wright, p. 372; Alâ'î, p. 340; Muâwiyâ, ed. Lyall, p. 841; cf. the different tribes to which this title is given, cf. Tâhâ al-Arâb, ii. 107); the other designation of the Numair, "the Afdâl of the Banû 'Amîr," also gives them a special place within the great tribe from which they sprang; it indicates that they were thought not only as a powerful but also as the other tribes of the Banû 'Amîr (Muâfjâlâyîn, p. 259; al-Radd, p. 112; the source is the Szchazarra of Ibn al-Kalbî, Brit. Mus., MSS., fol. 120b-121a). Neither during the life of the Prophet, nor at the beginning of the caliphate, did the Numair make any stir; they appear neither as partisans nor as enemies of Islam. It is only from the Omayyad period that the name begins to appear in histories, but only to record their intransigence to the central power or their exploits as brigands; in the caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik their refusal to pay tribute brought a punitive expedition against them (al-Baladhûrî, Jâmi' al-Tâbilîn, p. 139; cf. Aghârî, xxi. 112-113, xi. 117-119). These were the earliest tribes of the same kind but on a larger scale was that made against them by the famous general of the caliph al-Mutta-wakkîl, Bughîl al-Kâbirî, in 232 (846) to put an end to their systematic plundering; it ended in the complete dispersal of the tribe (Tâbilîn, ii. 1257-1263); a most interesting account of Beduin customs, including on p. 1261 a detailed list of the Numair clans only one of which, the Banû 'Amîr al-Numair, devoted itself to agriculture and grazing, while the others lived only by brigandage. It appears however that the Numair soon resumed their old habits and another expedition was sent against them with the same object as the earlier ones in the 10th century a.d. by the Hamânah Sall al-Dawla (Yâkût, Misâq, iv. 378).

An event of little importance in itself has given the Numair considerable fame in literary history, although little flattering to them: this is the satire directed against them by the poet Dijrî, which is one of the most famous examples of the invective of the âdâbî (especially the hemistich: "Cast down thine eyes: thou bearest to the Numair!"). The occasion of the was the unfortunate intervention of the Numair poet al-Râfi in favour of al-FarâNAâ in the celebrated feud between him and Dijrî (Alas, p. 247-251, 253; Aghârî, vii. 49-50; xx. 169b-171c). The memory of this quarrel survived for a very long time. It was probably no accident that the men who urged the emir Bughîl to the expedition against the Numair was the great-grandson of Dijrî, the poet 'Umâr b. 'Aqîl b. Shabîb b. Dijrî; the Numair moreover had slain four of his uncles (Ibn Katala, Sh Gir, ed. de Goeje, p. 824, where we must read B. Dîmâ b. 'Abd Allah b. Numair) in place of B. Ildâbî. The enmity between the family of Dijrî and the Numair was probably revived by the proximity of the latter to the tribe of the poet, the Banû Katalâ b. Yarîm.

To the Numair belonged notable poets — in addition to al-Râfi's and his son Dijrî — like Ali b. Hâjiya (in the early 'Abîzîd period) and Dijrî al-'Azîzî whose Dibân was recently published (Cairo 1350 = 1931, publications of the Egyptian Library).


(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

AL-NUMAIÎ B. BASHIR AL-ARABÎ, GOV-ERNOR OF AL-KUFA AND JIHÁM. According to some Muslim authorities, al-Numâni was the first jihâd to be born after the Hijra. He was 'Abd Allah b. Jihám b. Sa'd (q.v.), one of the most distinguished of the Companions of the Prophet, and his mother, 'Amarah bint Rawâsha, was the sister of the much respected 'Abd Allah b. Rawâsha (q.v.). After the assassination of 'Uthâm, al-tumâni, who was devoted to him, refused to pay homage to 'Ali. According to some stories which seem rather apocryphal, he brought the bloodstained shirt of the Caliph, according to others, the fingers cut from the hand of his wife Na'tila to Damascus and these relics were exhibited by Mu'awiyah in the mosque. In the battle of Siffin (q.v.) he faithfully stood by Mu'awiyah and he was always a favourite with him while the other Sayyids were kept at a suitable distance from the Umayyads. His son was Sabr b. Jihâm b. Sabr (q.v.) who succeeded his father in al-Kufr as governor of the city. He undertook an expedition against Malîk b. Ka'b al-Arâshâh, who had occupied in 'Alî's name 'Ain al-Tamar on the frontier between Syria and Mesopotamia and began to besiege it but had to retire without accomplishing anything. Twenty years later, he was given the governorship of al-Kufr. He was not really fitted for this post, because his pronounced antipathy to 'Ali and his followers did not suit the Shi'ite population of the town. In addition he did not conceal his sympathy with the Sayyids, who were attacked by Yazid b. Mu'awiyah of Kawkab al-Akhtâl (q.v.), but freely expressed his opinion on the insult offered to his fellow tribesmen. After Yazid had come to the throne in 60 (April 680), he nevertheless left al-Numâni in office; but the latter did not long remain there. Al-Numâni is described as an ascetic and he knew the teachings of the KUFSI thoroughly. But his asceticism was not of the strictest type, and his interest in musical entertainments was regarded as evidence of lack of dignity. In policy he proved very tolerant so long as it did not come to an open rising. When Muslib b. Aš'îl, Husain's partisan, appeared in al-Kufr to ascertain the feelings of the people and found a number who were ready to pay homage to Husain, al-Numâni adopted a neutral attitude and took no steps to check the vigorous propaganda.

As a result the followers of the Umayyads in al-Kufr wrote to the Caliph and called his attention to the fact that the threatening situation had attracted a man of vigour who would be able to carry out the government's orders, while al-Numâni out of real or feigned weakness was letting things take their course and only urging people to keep calm. When al-Yazid was discussing this with his counsellors, notably the influential Ibn Sârîf, the latter showed him a document signed by Mu'awiyah shortly before his death, containing the appointment of the then governor of al-Basra, 'Usâd Allah b. Ziyâd (q.v.) to the same office in al-Kufr. In spite of his antipathy to the proposal, Yazid carried out his father's wish and made 'Usâd Allah governor of al-Kufr without removing him from his post in al-Basra, whereupon al-Numâni hastened back to Syria. When the people of Medinah rebelled
at the beginning of the year 63 (658) and drove all the Usayyid out of the town, Usaid wished to see what tact would do before resorting to arms and sent a mission to Mu'tah under al-Nu'man to show the people the futility of armed resistance and to bring them to their senses. The mission was also instructed to go on to Mecca to induce the stubborn 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair to pay homage. Al-Nu'man's warnings and threats had no effect on his countrymen; however and there was nothing left for the Caliph but to subdue the rebels in the two holy cities [see the article 'Abd Allah b. Nu'man'] by force of arms. After the death of Yazid in July 64 (Nov. 638) al-Nu'man, who had in the meanwhile become governor of Hijaz declared openly for 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair. In Dhu l-Hijja of the same year (July-Aug. 638) or in Muharram 65 (Aug.-Sept. 638) however, the latter's leading follower al-Dalib b. Ka'b al-Fihri [q.v.] was defeated at Marj Rihib [q.v.] and thus the fate of al-Nu'man was also decided. He attempted to save himself by flight but was overtaken and killed. According to the Arab historians, the town of Mumarr al-Nu'man takes its name from Nu'man b. Baghir.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, vi. 358; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, see index; Ibn al-Athir, ed. Kamal, vol. 6; 1541 ii. 83; 303; 382; ii. 154, 228, 315; Annabi, ed. Voigt, vi. 9, 151, 17, 19, 75, 88, 120, 143—145; Ya'qubi, ed. Houlistan, ii. 219, 228, 278, 301, 304 sq.; al-Dinawari, al-Mu'jam al-Tasawwur, ed. Guirguis, p. 239 sq., 245, 247, 273; Mas'udi, Mar'at al-Futuh, ed. Paris, iv. 290 sq.; vi. 128, 134, 204, 227—229; Alm. Ti'fi, ed. Reiske, i. 77, 385, 393, 405, 407; Khitab al-Ash'abi, see Guldi, Thebes alphabets; Castellani, Annali dell' Islam, vii. 357; li. 333, 355; vi. 275 sqq., see also index; Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich und sein Staat, p. 47, 82, 94, 96, 110; Lammens, Études sur le siege du calife omeyyade Mé'arahir 1er, p. 43, 45, 58, 110, 116, 407; id., Le califat de Ya'qub, vol. i. 119 sq., 137, 140, 143, 207, 215, 221, 228.

AL-NU'MAN B. AL-MUNDHIR (with the names Abu Khlid or Abu Kulaib) was the last "king" of the house of the Lakhmid of al-Hira [cf. Lakhm]. He is certainly the best known to the Arabs but not by any means therefore the most important of the dynasty. He is often mentioned by the poets, according to circumstances a subject of panegyrics or of lampoons. His best known court poet was al-Nabigha al-Jughrati [q.v.]; on his relationship with 'Abd al-Malik al-Tahli see below.

His fame among the Arabs does not mean that we know a great deal about his life and activities. What we can get from the poets is of very little historical value and what the historians tell us about him is of almost no value. Arab tradition about the house of Lakhmid is generally speaking of the same nature that as of the partly contemporary houses of Ghasan and Kinda. In addition there is the complication produced by the frequent confusion of different people of the same name in the stories. What is to be found in non-Arab sources, although more reliable, is too trifling and accidental to build a historical narrative upon.

The material has been collected by Nöldeke in his Geschichte der Perser und Araber im Zeit der Sassaniden and G. Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lakhmiden in al-Hira and critically studied as far as possible.

The "kings" of al-Hira were vassals of the Persian Great Kings and were installed by them, and given the task of keeping together the Arab population of the marches and the desert Arabs, their dependents, and thus to protect the empire against raids and plunder by the Bedouins. Al-Nu'man is said to have reigned 580—602 A.D. or perhaps a little later. His father was al-Mundhir b. Hamza, one of the three sons of the famous princes of the house of Kinda, who came to the throne in succession. His mother however was of humble origin; she was, it is said, the daughter of a goldsmith named Medina, in fact a slave born of the enemy of the king made good play within their lampoons on him. After the death of his father al-Mundhir, the Great King (Homamid IV) is said to have hesitated for a time to fill the throne.

AL-Nu'man's final appointment is said only to have been made through the influence and cunning of the Arab poet 'Adi b. Zaid al-Maghzal [q.v.] who was secretary for Arab affairs to the Great King and whose family were devoted to al-Nu'man.

No really important events are known of the reign of al-Nu'man. Mention is made of hostilities with Arab tribes and anodes of his life recorded. At first a pagan, like all his male ancestors, he was baptised which did not prevent him remaining a polygamist. But this had previously been Christians in his family. His grandmother Hidu above mentioned founded a monastery (cf. al-ya'la) and his sister of the same name (others say daughter) was a nun. Towards the end of his life he had the poet 'Adi b. Zaid put to death as his enemies had imprisoned him against him. But he is said to have helped a son of the poet to obtain the same influential position with the Great King (Khuwar II) as his father had held. He himself was not long afterwards made prisoner by the Great King — it is said as a result of the incarcerations of this son of 'Adi — and died in prison. There are all sorts of legends giving details of his end.

Bibliography: Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 347, note 1, and Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lakhmiden, p. 107—120, where the rest of the literature is given.

AL-NU'MAN B. THABÍT, [See Abu Hamzah.]

AL-NU'MAN b. 'Abi 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Mansur b. Almâiq. AL-MUNAID b. 'Abd Allah al-Mahmadi, the greatest of the Isma'il 'illjusists and a protagonist of the early Fatimid id in Egypt, Nu'man appears to have been derived from a Maliki stock in Kairawan, adopting the Isma'il faith early in life. The exact date of his birth is not known, but it is probable that he was born in the last decades of the third century of the Hijra. He began his service of the Fatimid by reciting the service of al-Mahdi (first Fatimid caliph) and served him for the last nine years of his life, i.e., 338—342 A.H. Thereafter he continued to serve al-Kalif (second Fatimid caliph) for the whole of his life. During this time al-Nu'man was concerned chiefly with the study of history, philosophy and jurisprudence, and the composition of his numerous works. Just prior to al-Kalif's death, which occurred in 355 (960), he was appointed a mu'att. His rank was during the time of Mansur (third Fatimid caliph) and he reached his
AZ-

Nur (nur), light, synonym du'um, also dina (the latter sometimes used in the plural). According to some authors, du'um (du‘um) has a more intensive meaning than nur (cf. Lane, Arabic-English Dictionary, s. v. du‘um); this idea has its foundation in Koran 3. 5, where the sun is called du‘um and the moon nur. The further deduction from this passage that du‘um is used for the light of light, producing bodies (sun) and nur on the other hand for the reflected light in bodies which do not emit light (moon), is not correct, if we remember the primitive knowledge of natural science possessed by the Arabs in the times of Muhammad, nor do we find it in later literature. The works on natural science and cosmology of the Arabs in the heat-period of the middle ages (Ibn al-Haitham, Jawzi and later writers) in the great majority of cases use the term du‘um and it therefore seems justified to claim this word as a technical term in mathematics and physics.

Besides dealing with the subject in his Kitab al-Milsa (Kitab al-Milsa) Ibn al-Haitham devoted a special treatise to it entitled Jawzi al-Husan b. al-Husayn b. al-Haitham. Al-Qam‘a (The Little Book) which has been published with a German translation by J. Baarmann in the Z. d. M. G., xxxvi. [1882], 195–237, from which we take the following details:

As regards light, two kinds of bodies are distinguished, luminous (including the stars and fire) and non-luminous (dark); the non-luminous are again divided into opaque and transparent, the latter again into such as are transparent in all parts (like air, water, glass, crystal etc. and such as only admit the light partly but the material of which is really opaque, such as thin cloth.

The light of luminous bodies is an essential quality of the body, the reflected light of a body in itself dark on the other hand is an accidental quality of the body.

In the opinion of mathematicians all the phenomena of light are of one and the same character; they consist of a heat from fire which is in the luminous bodies themselves. This is evident from the fact that one can concentrate rays of light from the brightest luminous body, the sun, by means of a burning-glass, etc. and thus set all inflammable bodies alight and that the air and other bodies affected by the light of the sun become warm. Light and heat are thus identified or regarded as equivalent. The intensity of light, like that of heat, diminishes as the distance from the source increases.

Every luminous body whether its light is one of its essential qualities (direct) or accidental (reflected), illuminates any body placed opposite it, i.e. it sends its light out in all directions. All bodies whether transparent or opaque possess the power of absorbing light, the former have further.
the power of transmitting it again; that a transparent body (air, water, etc.) also has the power of absorbing light is evident from the fact that the light becomes visible in it if it is cut with an opaque body: the light must therefore have already been in it.

The penetration of light into a transparent body takes place along straight lines (proof: the sun's rays in the dust-filled air of a dark room). This transmission of light in straight lines is an essential feature of light itself, not of the transparent body; for otherwise there must be in the latter specially marked lines along which the light travels; such a hypothesis is however dispelled by admitting two or more rays of light at the same time into a dark room and watching them.

The ray is defined as light travelling along a straight line. The early mathematicians were of the opinion that the process of seeing consisted in the transmission of a ray from the eye of the observer to the object seen and the reflection from it back to the eye. Opposed to this is Ibn al-Haitham's view that the body seen—luminous or opaque—sends out rays in all directions from all points of which those going towards the eye of the observer collect in it and are perceived as the image of the body (cf. Optics, book i. 23: "et radii ut fit radiis a visu centibus" and also book ii. 23).

There is absolutely no transparent body; on the contrary, every body even the transparent reflects a part of the light; which strikes it (explanation of the phenomena of twilight). According to Aristotle, the heavens possess the highest and most perfect degree of transparency. Ibn al-Haitham challenges this statement and shows from a use of the theory of the mathematician Abū Sa'ūd al-Allī b. Schall, which is based on the well known rules of the refraction of light in passing through media of different densities, that the transparency has no limits and that for every transparent body an even more transparent one can be found.

An explanation of the origin of the halo around the face of the rainbow, its shape and its colours, and of the rainbow to be seen at night in the steamladen atmosphere of the bath is given by Kazwini in his Cosmography, i. "Abūl'Alā Makki, ed. Wüstefeld, Göttingen 1849, p. 100 and transl. Roth, Leipzig 1865, p. 205 sqq."). Kazwini in his discussion replaces the raindrops by small looking-glasses; Ibn al-Haitham, on the other hand, deals with the problem in a much more conclusive fashion by assuming a single or double reflection of light in spheres (cf. E. Wiedemann, West. Ann., vol. xxxix. 1890, p. 575).

Bibliography: References given in the article.

(Willy Hartner)

The doctrine that God is light and reveals himself as such in the world and to man is very old and widely disseminated in Oriental religions as well as in Hellenistic gnosis and philosophy. We cannot here go into the early history; it will be sufficient to refer to some parallels in the Old and New Testaments, e.g. Gen. i. 3; Isaiah, i. 19; Zech., iv. 1; John, i. 4—9; iii. 191 v. 35; viii. 12; xil. 35 and Rev. xxi. 23 sqq.

How Muhammad became acquainted with this teaching we do not know, but the Koran has its "light" verses (notably Sura xxiv. 35: "the light verse") properly; cf. with it Sura xxxii. 45 (Muḥammad as lamp); xxl. 8 sqq. (Allāh's light); liv. 8 (the light went down—revelation). The light verse runs (as translated by Goldziher, in Komm.-auslese, p. 183 sqq.): "Allāh is the light of the heavens and of the earth; his light is like a niche in which there is a lamp; the lamp is in a glass and the glass is like a shining star; it is lit from a blessed tree, an olive-tree, neither an eastern nor a western one; its oil is almost alone even if no fire touches it; light upon light. Allāh leads to his light whom he will, and Allāh creates allegories for man, and Allāh knows all things."

From the context it is clear that we have to think of the light of religious knowledge, of the truth which Allāh communicates through his Prophet and his Prophets, the light of his teaching, especially the believers (cf. also Sura xxiii. 40). It is pure light, light upon light, which has nothing to do with fire in new sense (sun), which is lit from an olive tree, perhaps not of this world, of however A. J. Wensink, Tree and Bird as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia, in Verh. Ab. Aant., 1921, p. 27 sqq.). Lastly it is Allāh as the all-knowing who instructs men and leads them to the light of his revelation (cf. Sura lxxvi. 8). It is clear that we have here traces of gnostic imagery but these rationalist theologians, who whether to avoid any comparison of the creature with God or to oppose the fantastic mysticism interpreted the light of Allāh as a symbol of his good guidance probably diverged less from the view of the Korān than most of the metaphysicians of light. Passages are very frequent in the Korān in which Allāh appears as the Knowing (Al-'alīm) and the Guiding (Al-Mużīm). One did not need to look far for an exegesis on these lines. As Abū' l-Faraj observes (Muhāṣib, ed. Ritter, iii. 554) the Muḥammad al-Hasān al-Najjdār interpreted the light verse to mean that God guides the inhabitants of heaven and earth. The Zaidīs also interpreted the light as Allāh's good guidance (cf. the article MA šī'a).

From the tenth a. d. we find references to a prophetic doctrine of MA šī'a, and gradually to a more general metaphysics of light, i.e. the doctrine that God is essentially light, the prime light and as such the source of all being, all life and all knowledge. Especially among the mystics in whose emotional thinking, being, named and image coalesced, this speculation developed. Meditation on the Kitāb, the Persian stimulus, gnostic-Hermetic writings, lastly and most tenaciously the Hellenistic philosophy provided the material for the idea of light. The Korān (d. 743) had already sung of the light emanating through Adam via Muhammad into the family of Allāh (cf. the article MA šī'a). The doctrine of light was dialectically expanded by Sahī al-Tustārī (d. 896) (see also Masmīgī, Tawārīkh tud, p. 39 and the article SAHĪ AL-TUSTĀRĪ).

The first representatives of a metaphysics of light in Islam readily fell under the suspicion of Manichæanism, i.e. of the dualism of MA šī'a and MA šī'a (darkness) as the eternal principles. The tradition of Tirmidhi that Allāh created in darkness (cf. the article MA šī'a) must have aroused misgivings. The physician Rīqīd (d. 924 or 934) although a Hellenistic philosopher, adopted ideas from Persia and was for this reason or cursed by various theologians and philosophers. Many mystics also (e.g. Hallāj; according to Masmīgī, Tawārīkh tud, p. 159 sqq. wrongly) were accused of this dualism. But the speculations about light found a powerful support from the ninth century in the monotinic doctrine of light of the Neo-Platonists (we do not
know of any Persian monism of light) which was compatible with the monism of Islam. The father of this doctrine is Plato, who in his Politeia, 506 D sqq., compares the idea of the good in the supersensual world with Helios as the light of the physical world. The contrast is not therefore between light and darkness but between the world of ideas or mind and its copy, the physical world of bodies, in the upper world pure light, in the lower world light more or less mixed with darkness. Among the Neo-Platonists the idea of the good = the highest God = pure light. This identification was also facilitated by the fact that according to Aristotle's conception light is nothing corporeal (De anima, ii, 7, 418b: [σὰρκίς]… τὸς πάντας ἐκ θεοῦ ὑπόγειον τοῦ ἁλλόν ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου ζωτικόν). From the context which is however not all clear, it appears that Aristotle regarded light as an effective force (ἐνέργεια). This is however of no importance here. Many Aristotelian forces and Platonic ideas are described by Neo-Platonists and Neo-Platonists sometimes as forces and sometimes as substances (spiritual). With Aristotle ὄλπις (darkness) was conceived not as something positive but as σκότος (privatio, the absence of light).

From this developed the doctrine which we find in the Arabic "Theology of Aristotle". Not far from the beginning (ed. Dieterici, p. 3) it is said: the power of light (ἰσχύς τῆς φωτός) is communicated by the prime cause, the creator, to the ὀφθή and by the ὀφθή to the world soul, then from the ὀφθή through the world soul to nature and from the world soul through nature to things which originate and decay. The whole process of this creative development proceeds without movement and timelessly. But God who causes the force of light to pour forth is also light (φως; occasional synonyms: ἀόρατος, ἀόιδος), the "prime light" (p. 51) or (p. 44) the "light of lights". Light (p. 51) is essentially in God, not a quality (αἴσθησις) for God has no qualities but works through his being (ὁμοίωσις) alone. The light flows through the whole world, particularly the world of men. From the supersensual original (p. 150), the first man (ἵνα καὶ ὀφθή), it flows over the second man (ἵνα δεδομένη) and from him to the third (ἵνα διδομένη). These are the originals of the so-called real men. Light is of course found in its purest form in the souls of the wise and the good (p. 51). It should be noted also that φως as a spiritual force (ρύθμον, ἀνθρωπος) is distinguished from fire (φως) which is said to be only a force in matter, with definite quality (p. 85).

Fire of course like everything else has its supersensual original. But this is more connected with life than with light.

The elevation of the soul to the divine world of light corresponds to the creative descent of light (p. 8). When the soul has passed on its return beyond the world of the ὀφθή, it sees there the physical body and the beauty of God, the goal of all mysteries.

Although the author of the Liber de causis is of the opinion that nothing can be predicated regarding God, yet he has to call him the prime cause and more exactly pure light (§ 5, ed. Bardenhewer, p. 69) and as such the origin of all being and all knowledge (in God is omniscient = omniscient; see § 43, p. 103).

The light emanated by God may, if it is regarded as an independent entity, be placed at various parts of the system. Most philosophers and theologians connect it with the ῥας or ὀφθή or identify it with them, sometimes also with life (μάρτυς), but this must be more closely investigated.

The great philosophers in Islam, Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā, connected the doctrine of light with the ὀφθή in metaphysics as well as in psychology. Fārābī is fond of using many synonyms for the light of God and the ὀφθή (βαθύς etc.; see e.g. Der Mystere von der Lichterei, ed. Norden, p. 13 sqq.). In the biography of Fārābī in Ibn Abī Thalib's Uṣūl, ed. Müller, ii, 134—140) a prayer is attributed to him in which God is invoked as the "prime cause of things and light of the earth and of heaven". Ibn Sīnā like Fārābī takes up the doctrine of light in theology and further develops it. In his psychological writings he regards the light as a link of the soul and body (cf. Saḥ al-Tustari, who places ὀφθή between ῥάς and ἐννοία in the four elements of man). In the Kitāb al-Isfārā (ed. Forget, Leyden 1892, p. 126 sq.) he even reads the whole metaphysical doctrine of the ὀφθή of the Aristotelians into the light verse of the Qur'ān. Light is the ὀφθή ἐπὶ τῆς ἐννοίας, fire the ὀφθή ἐπὶ τῆς ἐννοίας and so on. Allāh's ὀφθή is therefore like the nous of Aristotle! This discovery of Ibn Sīnā's was incorporated in the pious reflections of Ghaṣālī, al-Maqrīzī al-Kindi, peoples, passed on to Muhammad al-Najafi, Ceylon 1927, p. 58 sqq.

The best expositions of the further developments of speculation on ὀφθή, especially among the gnostics and mystics, are in Mustaggin's articles KARMAITANS AND TASSAWUF.


Nūr Allāh Al-Ṣāyid b. Al-Ṣāyid Shāhir Al-M prospective/Nūr Allāh Al-Ṣāyid b. Al-Ṣāyid Al-Māsidh Al-Ḳasāvsī Al-Shuddari, commonly called Kādī Nūr Allāh, was born in 936 (1540). He was descended from an illustrious family of the Marṣaṣ Al-Ṣayīd and settled in Shughtar. He left his native place for India and settled in Lahore where he attracted the notice of Ḥaḳ Abū ʿl-Fath (d. 997 = 1588) and through his presentation to Emperor Akbar (1563—1014 = 1566—1605), he was appointed Kādī of Lahore in lieu of ʿAlī Shāh Muḥammad (d. 997 = 1586). ʿAbd al-Ḵādīr Bādaʿī, iii, 137, says that he was, although a Shīʿa, a just, pious and learned man. He was hanged to death in 1019 (1610), on account of his religious opinions, by the order of the Emperor Dāhāṅgir (1014—1037 = 1605—1628). He is regarded as al-Qanātīsh al-Qanātīsh, "the third martyr", by the Shīʿa and his tomb in Akbarshāh is visited by numerous Shīʿa from all parts of India. He is the author of innumerable works of which the following may be quoted: Ḥiṣḥiyā šaʿla ʿl-Bayḥūdī, a commentary to al-Bayḥūdī's commentary on the Qur'ān, entitled Anwar al-Tawāwīl: Asiatic Society of Bengal MSS., List of the Government Collection, p. 16; 2. Ḥiṣḥiyā Ṣāḥib ʿAlīs ʿašrāf ʿala ʿl-Qasīfī, glosses to Kādī's commentary on Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī's Compendium of metaphysics and theology, entitled Ṣafīlī al-Kalīm: Loh, Ind. Off., No. 471, xx; 3. ʿAlīs ʿašrāf ʿala ʿl-Qasīfī, a polemical work against Sunnism written in reply to Fādī b. Ṣuḥrāsī's work entitled Ḥiṣḥiyā al-Bayḥūdī, a treatise in refutation
under his father in the siege of Kaifat Dinbar where the latter was murdered in Kahl al-I 542 (Sept. 1146). His kingdom was thus divided between his two sons, Saif al-Din Ghazi [q.v.] who took possession of al-Mawil, and Nur al-Din who established himself in Halab. Scarcely had the news of Imad al-Din’s death reached Joscelin II who lived in Tell Buqhal [q.v.] than the latter entered into negotiations with the people of Edessa, namely Armenians, the chief stronghold of the Crusaders, which Imad al-Din had taken shortly before and assured himself of their cooperation in his proposed attack on the city. He was thus able to occupy the city without difficulty and its Muslim garrison took refuge in the citadel. When Nur al-Din heard this he hurried thither by forced marches; Joscelin fled and Edessa fell into the hands of Nur al-Din who wreaked a terrible vengeance on the treacherous Christians, laid the city completely waste and left only a few citizens in it. In the following year he invaded the district of Halab and took from the Christians Aril and Kafarlakh and several other places. The news of the fall of Edessa in 539 (1144) made a tremendous impression in Europe and induced the Pope Eugene III on Dec. 1, 1145 to send a letter to Louis VII and the Kings of France in which he demanded a new crusade in the spring of 1146 to send St. Bernard of Clairvaux to preach the crusade. He was listened to with enthusiasm; on receiving the Pope’s message Louis had already declared himself ready to take the crusader’s vow and finally the Hohenstaufen Conrad III was also won over. In the first half of the year 1147 the two kings set out and after great difficulties and considerable losses through starvation, epidemics and enemy attacks, the European armies joined another one in Palestine in the spring of 1148. It was decided to attack Damascus which was then nominally in the power of the Burdi Mamluk al-Din Alau b. Muhammad although the real ruler was one of his Mamiliks named Musin al-Din Anar. In Kahl I 543 (July 1148) the Christians began the siege of the town from the southwest. The first few days were spent in heavy fighting with great losses on both sides. In the meanwhile Musin al-Din had appealed for assistance to Saif al-Din Ghazi. The latter had set out with a large army and was joined on the way by his father Nur al-Din. Before giving the hard pressed Musin al-Din the assistance he desired he sent him a letter in which he demanded the surrender of the town to his deputy in order to have a base in case of a defeat; but if he was victorious he would leave the town at once. But as Musin al-Din did not trust him completely he endeavoured not to frighten the Christians by threats and declared that if they did not retreat he would hand over the town to Saif al-Din who would certainly drive the invaders completely out of Syria. These representations, supported by the gold of Damascus, did not fail to influence the eastern leaders who were able to appreciate the situation much better than their European allies. But as they had not the courage to go so far that the siege should be at once abandoned, they suggested in the council of war held in the night of the 26th of the July that the camp should be moved from west to east because, they said, the walls on this side were not so strong and the attack would not be impeded by gardens. The besiegers followed the
advice of those possessing local knowledge but saw that they had been deceived because the terrain on the east side offered even greater difficulties in every respect and there was therefore nothing left for them but to withdraw in order to resume the siege another time. When Bertrand, the son of Count Alphonse of Toulouse who had just died, took the fortress of Al-Arjina and threatened the district of Tripoli. Count Raymond of Tripoli appealed to Nur al-Din and Ma'mun al-Din who had joined one another in Hashteb, the two Muslim leaders supported by a contingent sent by Süljüq al-Din hurried to his help. Bertrand had to surrender; the fortress was destroyed and he himself taken prisoner. The Christians then prepared to invade the district of Halabi; Nur al-Din however anticipated them, defeated them at Yaghur taking much booty, which he divided among his brother Süljüq al-Din, the caliph al-Mu'ayyad and the Süljüq, sultan Ma'mun. At the beginning of the following year (May 1149) Nur al-Din invaded the region of Ammāniya, laid waste the country with the suburbs of Hārim and laid siege to the fortress of Ianni. Prince Raymond of Antioch hastened up with a small army to attack Nur al-Din but was enticed into an ambush and fell in the fight. Nur al-Din then went with his victorious forces doing great damage as he went, close up to Antioch in order to disrupt the inhabitants with terror and on his way back took Hārim and forced the strong fortress of Fānēya (Upasna) near Hamah to surrender. About the same time Süljüq al-Din died and his brother and successor Kūtq al-Din Mawdūd prepared to fight Nur al-Din, but the dispute was settled amicably [cf. the article Mawdūd]. Soon afterwards (545 = 1151 or 546 = 1152-1153) Nur al-Din succeeded in capturing his enemy Fuscill II of Edessa. The latter had previously won a victory over Nur al-Din and treated him very scornfully. When one night he was travelling with only a few followers to Antioch he was surprised by a troop of Turkomans in the pay of Nur al-Din and brought to Hālab where he remained a prisoner till his death, while Nur al-Din gradually took the fortress which belonged to the country of Edessa. In order to split up the Christian forces and to bring some relief to the Muslims besieged in Askalan, he made an agreement with his enemy, the prince of Damascus, Mujud al-Din Abak, and in Safar 548 (May 1153) they both appeared before the walls of Baniyūs (q.v.). But when the insatiable Mujud al-Din would undertake no serious steps against the Christians, they soon abandoned the siege and separated without having achieved anything. When Askalan, was forced to capitulate after eight months' siege the Christians began to cast covetous eyes on the great and wealthy city of Damascus, especially as Mujud al-Din acted almost as if he were their vassal. In order to thwart their plans, Nur al-Din endeavoured to gain over Mujud al-Din by pretended friendship and by making false charges against them persuaded him to get rid of his chief enmity so that Mujud al-Din thus lost his most reliable friend. When Nur al-Din suddenly appeared before the gates of the city they were opened to him by his friends in Damascus as had been arranged beforehand. Mujud al-Din took refuge in the citadel and summoned the Christians to his assistance, but the city before help arrived (Safar 549 = April 1154). In compensation he received İmṣa. There he began to intrigue against Nur al-Din and the latter offered him aGalā instead; Mujud al-Din however was not satisfied, but settled in Baghdad where he remained till his death as a protegé of the caliph al-Mu'ayyad. In 551 (1156) Nur al-Din made a peace with Baldwin III of Jerusalem, whereby the latter gave up the annual tribute which Damascus had had to pay him since the time of Mujud al-Din and ceded the half of the lands of Hārim. In spite of this they were coming to the end of the year 554 (Febr. 1157) Baldwin fell upon a defendless encampment of Arabs and Turkomans in the neighborhood of Baniyūs, took the same prisoners and carried off their cattle. As a result the war broke out again and the Christians were defeated, some on the Euphrates by the governor of Damascus, Asad al-Din Shirkuh, some in the vicinity of Damascus by Nur al-Din's brother, the emir Nūr al-Din. Many prisoners were brought to Damascus and put to death by Nur al-Din's orders in revenge for the Muslims killed at Baniyūs. Nur al-Din then attacked Baniyūs and destroyed the town but could not take the citadel, retired on the approach of Baldwin. The latter rebuilt the ruined town, disposed a number of his troops and intended to return to Tiberias, but was surprised on the way by Nur al-Din and suffered a disastrous defeat (Ejoumiddi 554 = July 1157). After this double disaster Nur al-Din no longer attempted to take the town which was also unsuccessful; he again raised the siege on the approach of Baldwin. Very soon afterwards he fell very ill and a rumour spread that he had died. The Christians therefore attacked Salār [q.v.] which had been severely damaged by an earthquake, and had along with Hashteb, shortly before fallen into the hands of Nur al-Din. The attack failed however owing to the jealousies among the Frankish leaders. On the other hand, they were successful after two months' siege in taking Hālab in the following year and in inflicting a severe defeat on Nur al-Din on the Jordan (Ejoumiddi 553 = July 1158). About the same time the emperor Manuel I Comnenos appeared in Syria to chastise the rebel governor of Cilicia and to protect Raymond of Antioch who had undertaken an expedition against Cyprus. After receiving the submission of the princes, the emperor resolved to join Baldwin in an attack on Hālab at the beginning of 1159. Nur al-Din however escaped the danger which threatened him by releasing the Christian prisoners. He then concluded a truce for four months with Baldwin, took Hālab and al-Raqqa from his brother Nūr al-Din and invaded the lands of sultan Kılıç Arslan II [q.v.]; but when Baldwin began to lay waste Nur al-Din's territory, the latter hurried back to Hālab and Baldwin retired. About this time conditions in Egypt began to attract the attention of Nur al-Din and from the year 558 (1163) his history is so closely bound up with that of Saladin that it is sufficient to refer to the article on the latter for the main facts. Only the following need be added here. In 558 (1163) Nur al-Din had planned an invasion of the county of Tripoli and encamped before İlim al-Ar-Rid [q.v.] and was preparing to storm it when he was suddenly attacked by the Christians. His troops who were quite unprepared were scattered and Nur al-Din himself only escaped with difficulty. Nevertheless he succeeded in exerting all his efforts in raising a new army in a short time with which he again advanced on Hārim. After
seizing a decisive victory over the Christian relief force, he took Dharan by storm (Ramakel, 318 = Aug. 1163) and a few months later also forced Dhu al-Yaman to surrender. When the atabeg of Mawali, Nur al-Din's brother Kafth al-Din Mawali, at the end of 565 (Sept. 1170) died and his younger son Salif al-Din (Jafar was chosen successor to the caliph Amr) said that Salif al-Din should have al-Mawali but was to give Singur to his elder brother 'Imad al-Din Zangi. In 568 (1173) he invaded Cilicia Minor and took several towns; on his relations with the Svejkis until then see the article KUJAR ASKHAN II. While he was still on this expedition, an envoy arrived from the 'Abbasid caliph of Baghdad bearing a diploma recognizing Nur al-Din as lord of al-Mawali, al-Sharrar, Ishbili, Khilidi, Syria, Egypt and Cilicia. He died on 11th Shawwal 569 (May 15, 1174) in Damascus of a disease of the lymph (tlizz al-khamsabun) and was buried in the citadel; his body was later brought to the madrassa founded by him at the entrance to the Silk Khanaweyin.

With reference to Nur al-Din, Ibn al-Atir, xl. 267, 270 (1170–72), regards the death of his heir as a major point of division in the whole of the past but from the time of the legitimate caliphs and 'Abd al-'Aziz I have found some who led a better life or had greater enthusiasm for righteousness'. As a pious Muslim convinced of the truth of the Prophet's mission, he was always eager to follow out in exact detail the many prescriptions of the Koran and the Sunna regarding the conduct of believers in private and public life. He was distinguished by a remarkable love of justice which was seen for example in the fact that he never punished on mere suspicion alone and was able to check any arbitrariness in the court of the lower courts also, and avarice and selfishness were entirely foreign to his character. He never gave way to the temptation always at hand to enrich himself at the expense of the treasury; on the contrary, he applied the proceeds of the booty taken in war to pious foundations and public works for the benefit of Islam. Among the important cities of Syria the fortifications of which were renovated by him, Ibn al-Atir mentions (xl. 267) the following: Damascus, Hims, Hamah, Halah, Khirbat al-Saheb and Basbeek, and mosques, schools, hospitals and caravanserais were built everywhere. On his great activity as a builder cf. the article DAMASCUS; cf. also Fleischer, Michael Meister's Caliber-Stattön von Damascen (Kleine Schriften, iii. 306 sqq.). He was also a generous patron of scholars in whom he took great interest; on the battlefield he earned the admiration of his soldiers by his personal bravery, which was coupled with unusual talent as a general. If on the other hand he was guilty of acts which are not quite compatible with humane warfare, like the massacre in Edessa on the recapture of the town and the slaughter of the Christian prisoners in Damascus after Baldwin's attack on the defences of Muslims at Baniyas, it should be remembered that this was no breach of the practice of war of the time. The constant aim of his efforts was the expulsion of the Christians from Syria and Palestine to and to this object he remained faithful throughout his life. In the political history of Syria and Mesopotamia, Nur al-Din played an unusually important part and laid a firm foundation on which Saladin was later able to build.

Bibliography: Ibn Kathir, Waqya'.
break on which still further reduced the ranks of the
defenders; the commander therefore sent a message
to al-Kamil and declared himself ready to surrender
the town within a definite period on condition that
he was allowed to import sufficient food. Al-Kamil
agreed, but with the arrival of Nur al-
Din the people of Mardin plucked up their courage
and resolved to continue the siege. Al-Kamil
might almost have taken the town by treachery—
although Kublai al-Din pretended to be devoted
to Nur al-Din; he was really secretly attached to
al-Kamil and had promised him to take to flight
at once in case of an encounter. When the troops
were drawn up for battle he was placed in such a
position however that there was no possibility
of escape on the narrow battlefield. Al-Kamil was
defeated and fled to Damascus to his father (Sha'rawi
595 = Aug. 1195). As to Nur al-Din, he fell sick
and could not follow up his victory but retired to
al-Ma'涉及. After he had recovered from his
illness, he went to Sha'rawi 397 (May–June 1201)
with Kublai al-Din to Harran to resume the struggle
with al-Kamil. When he reached Ru'uf al-Azm
he sent a message to him from Mardin to al-
'Adil who lived in Harran to seek peace and as
he knew that the other Ayyubids wished to make
peace with al-'Adil and deadly epidemics had broken
out among his troops, he granted their request for
a return to the state quo and returned to
al-Ma'涉及. In the year 600 (1202–1204), Kublai
al-Din openly paid homage to al-'Adil and had
the gospels read in his name; Nur al-Din could
d not permit this and took possession of Nashtin
except the citadel. This also would probably have
fallen into his hands if the news that the lord of
Iribil, Mu'afar al-Din Kibla al-Din [q.v.], had invaded
the territory of al-Ma'涉及 was not heard of by his
strength; he had not forced him to return.
After he had ascertained that the accounts
had reached him was much exaggerated he turned
his attention to Tell A'far which belonged to
Sindjar and laid siege to it, but fortune did not
favor him. It is true that he succeeded in taking
Tell A'far, then a number of Mesopotamian
princes allied themselves with Kublai al-Din and
Nur al-Din could not face their combined strength.
When it came to a battle he was completely routed
and had to surrender Tell A'far and make peace
(601 = late summer 1204). The relations
between Nur al-Din and Kublai al-Din had never
been particularly friendly and matters did not
improve when Nur al-Din gave his daughter in
marriage to one of al-'Adil's sons. On the occasion
of this union of the two dynasties, Nur al-
Din's vassals proposed to him to conclude an alliance
with al-'Adil so that he might himself take
possession of Diyarbakr. Ilm omar which was under
the rule of Mu'afar al-Din Mahmut b. Sindjar Sibh
and that al-'Adil should occupy Kublai al-Din's territory.
This plan which was entirely in keeping with Nur
al-Din's desires was also approved by al-'Adil and
the latter undertook a campaign against the east.
On this campaign a short time he took al-Kibla
and Nashtin and besieged Sindjar. While Kublai
al-Din was preparing to fight to defend his capital,
Nur al-Din equipped an army which was to join
al-'Adil. Then a sudden change took place in the
political situation. The lord of Iribil, Mu'afar
al-Din Kibla al-Din [q.v.], who had promised Kublai al-Din
to interfere with al-'Adil on his behalf but had
been unsuccessful, now proposed to Nur al-Din to
join him against al-'Adil. Nur al-Din agreed and
when the Ayyubid ruler of Hahal al-Malik al-zahir
and the Seljük Sultan of Konya Kaikhusraw I b. Ilkhi
Ardaf [q.v.], joined the alliance and al-
'Adil was further ordered by the 'Abbasid caliph
al-Nasir [q.v.] to abandon his hostile plans, he
had finally to yield, especially as his emissaries
had no inclination to undertake a campaign. The end Kublai al-Din was left in by the campaign of Sindjar
and al-'Adil returned to Harran. Nur al-Din died at the end of Rajab 607 (Jan. 1211) and was succeeded by his son al-Malik al-Kahir ibn
al-Malik al-Ma'涉及.

**Bibliography**


**Nur Dahan**

The name given to Mihri al-
Nasir, the famous queen of Dişahbey, the Moghal
Emperor. She was born at Kandahar in 1577 when her
father, Ghiyath Beg, was migrating from Persia
to Hindustan (MA'tahir al-Umar, i. 120). In
the reign of Akbar she was married to 'Ali Kuli Beg, a
Persian who had rendered distinguished military
service to the Emperor and who, because of his
bravery, was known as Shih Afgan. The
assassination of her first husband will always remain
a matter of controversy, some regarding it as a
repetition of the story of Daud and Isra'il, others
holding that only a double murder could have
resulted in this disloyalty. It was not however until four
years later, in 1611, that she became, at the age of
thirty-four, the wife of Dişahbey. In the eleventh
year of that monarch's reign her name was changed
from Nur Mahal to Nur Dahan (Tahsin-i Dişahbey-
Nuri, ed. Rogers and Beveridge, i. 310).

An extraordinarily beautiful woman, well-known
in Persian literature in an age when few women
were cultured, ambitious and masterful, she entirely
dominated her husband, until eventually Dişahbey
was king in name only. The chronicles record that
she sometimes sat in the jahanshah, that coins
were struck in her name, and that she even dared to
issue farams (al-Ish'an, p. 54–57). She became
the leader of fashion and is said to have invented
the sarp-i Dişahbeyi, a special kind of rose-water.
Her style in gowns, veils, brocades, lace, and her forosh-
sadah (carpets of satinwood colour) were known
throughout the length and breadth of Hindustan.

Ably assisted in political affairs by her father,
now known as Tummol al-Dawla, and her brother,
Aas Khān, she dispensed all patronage thus
falling foul of the orderly nobility led by Mahbub Khān.
The history of the last years of Dişahbey's reign is the history of Nur Dahan's efforts at
paving the way for the succession of his son-in-law,
Prince Shahrvar. But the death of her father,
combined with the fact that Aas Khān was supporting
the claim of his own son-in-law, Prince
Khurrum, considerably weakened her power. On
the death of Dişahbey, in 1627, she was
completely outwitted by Aas Khān, her candidate
was defeated, and Prince Khurrum ascended the
throne as Shih Dahan. The last eighteen years
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of this remarkable woman's life during the reign of Shah Djihān are unimportant to the historian of Mughal India.

Bibliography: Mu'tamid Khān, 'Īsānīnā, Diwān-e-Shāh Djihān, Calcutta 1865; Sultān Khān, Shāh Nūr-Bakhsheish, in Bibliotheca sinica, i. 127-134; Bene Frasch, History of Tjahanepir, 1927. (C. Collin-Davies)

NUR MUHAMMADI, the technical term for the pre-existence of the soul of the Prophet Muhammad, is the predestined essence of all men, and each man has to become the first of all, in the form of a dense and luminous point; all the predestined souls are said to have emanated from this. Among the Sūfis, the idea first appears among the mystics in the third century A.H., then gradually begins to dominate popular worship (cf. Sahl Tirtari and Hākim Tirmidhi, in our Recueil, 192, p. 34, N° 39 and p. 395; Abu Bakr Wāsfi, whose Ḥawā Mim al-Qur'an should be identified with zh. 1. of the Tabrizz of Ḥanāfī). The most notable of these was Hākim Tirmidhi, according to Kūltu, Muhammad is "the image in the pupil which is in the centre of the eye of creation" (aš'at-i-ās-lam-uğlīd) this is what Ibn Arabī calls the nhāf a muhammadīn, the preeminent conception of which is celebrated by the poets Ṣafarī, Wūrī and the mystic Djihān; hence Muhammad's immediate predecessor since Adam (cf. the poem on the Mawṣūl). Orthodoxy has always carefully placed the doctrine of the uncreated kārin above this cult. Popular legend among the Ḥanāfīs in the eighteenth century has reduced and materialized this doctrine in showing the model of the body of the Prophet created from a handful of earth from Paradise with dirt from the spring Tasnim which makes it shine like a white pearl. But it is certain that it is a question here primarily of a guotistic pre-existence, an intellectual substance of the nature of the angels as is evident from the antiquity of the equation sūr-e-nāšī, borrowed by Tirmidhi from the Ismā'ilīs (cf. 'Avt).

A prominent image of the Shi'ah, this doctrine appears earlier and with more logical coherence among the extremists, who explain this "prophetic light," either as a "spirit" transmitted from age to age and from elect to elect, or as spiritual germ (Ismā'ilism) inherited from male to male. At the beginning of the second century Mūghirn and Djihān taught the primogeniture of the luminous shadow (nl, opposed to shāhād "dark body") of Muhammad. It is a fundamental dogma of Ismā'ilism from its beginning (al-shabīb nūr-mahīd = al-mā'in); it is found again extended through solidarity to all the 'Alids or to all the Tālibi with the gift of sinlessness among the Nusairi and even among many pious Ismā'ili writers (Kūltu, 'Aft, p. 116).

The authors of this doctrine derive it from the Kurān (ṣawt šahāda, xiiii. 35); the shāhāda; the connection between the two terms of the shāhāda) effectually interpreted by the old Ḥadīth (ṣawt šahāda, Ḥadīthiša) as proving that Muhammad is the first (by tafsīr, muhāsin, lāqī), (by Ḥādīth, muhāsin, lāqī). But it is certainly required for its development the stimulus of Christian gnostic and Manichean antecedents.


THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
time. He rejects the expedient called *vati* in dealing with deceased persons' estates, as being neither in the Kurān nor the Sunna.

3. Later history of the sect. The Madžūdīya names two successors (khālidīya) of Nūrāshī: Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yāḥyā al-Lahabūnī al-Gilīfī, called Aṣrī, the author of a *Dawān* of which there is a copy in the Brit. Mus.; this person built a *mālik* in Shirāz; and Nūrāshī's son Shāh Kāsim Fālīshāhī, first heard of in Irāq, whence by permission of the Aṣ-Ṣayyili Sultan Yāḥyā (884–906) he was allowed to go to Khorāsān to cure Husayn Mā'īn, the governor of an ailment in his arakān. His religious opinions won him the favour of Ismā'īl the Šafawī (907–930).

According to Fīrūzī, who cites the Zafar nāwī, a disciple of Shāh Kāsim, named Mir Shams al-Dīn went from Irāq to Kūshārī about 902, where he received with high honour by Fāṭimah, who made over to him the confiscated lands which had formerly fallen to the crown. In a short time many of the Kaghārsī, particularly those of the tribe Čuk, became converts to the Nūrāshī sect (Fīrūzī, transl. Briggs, Calcutta 1910). The Kaghārsī had previously been Sunnī of the Ḥanafī rite according to Mīr Hūsin (author of Tūbštī Ḥāshī, transl. E. D. Ross, London 1895, p. 435), who when he came into possession of the country asked the opinion of the *āmān* of Hindūstān about al-Fākhr al-Afṣafī, as they condemned him as heretic and endeavored to extirpate the sect (about 950). His confused and fanatical account of it has misled many European writers. It survived his persecution, and according to J. Biddulph, Tribes of the Hindoo Kōosh (Calcutta 1880) it numbers over 20,000 followers, most of whom are to be found in Shigar and Khaspūl of Bālūshīrī. A few of the sect, he adds, are now to be found in Kījarān, to which place they were deported by Golāb when he conquered Bālūshīrī.

The work last cited contains some details about their practices; its account is, however, mixed with fables, and without access to the Fākhr al-Afṣafī it is difficult to estimate the justice of the assertion that the system is "an attempt to form a sort of medina between Shīt and Sunnī doctrines.

Bibliography: references are given above. (D. S. Marcolinri)

Nūrī, a common name in the Near East for a member of certain Gipsy tribes. A more correct vocalisation would perhaps be Neũrũ (as Hava, Sti̇gian, etc.), with plural Neũrũ. Minorsky (above, i. 38) gives Neũrũ. By displacement of accent we also find the plural form as Neũrũ (e.g. in Jásava, Continents des Arabes, p. 90, and British Admiralty’s Handbooks, Syria (1919), p. 196, Arabes (1916), p. 92, 94). In Persia the current name for Gipsy is Lārī, Lārī, or Lālī (q.v.). It is not unlikely that by a natural phonetic transformation the form nūrũ derives from Lūrũ which, it has been suggested, originally denoted an inhabitant of the town of al-Rūrũ (or Arūrũ) in Sind. Quairemàdè advanced the theory (Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks, i. i, note 5) that the name nūrũ arose from the Arabic nūr (fire) [he gives the form †] because these vagrants were usually seen carrying a brazier or a lantern. Even to-day many of the Neũrũ earn their living as itinerant smiths. But it is more probable that the correct etymology is to be found in some Sanskritic dialect of N.W. India, the original home of the Gipsy tribes.

The Persian name Čingana passed into European languages under such forms as Čingana, Tāgana, Zingaro, Zinzuny, Zinghun, etc. Dony (Supplement aux Dictionnaires Arabes, ii, 95) and Moussin (Dictionnaire des Vocab. de l’Arabe, 201, 202) records the occasional use of the name Zamyun, but this is inexact [cf. art. Zanun]. The commonest names, apart from those already mentioned, seem to be Neũrũ and Kaũroũ (particularly in N. Syria and Persia), Gāhūr and Dānūm (in Mesopotamia). For other sub-divisions reference may be made to the bibliographies, and particularly to E. Littmann’s Eisegeten-Arabisch, which is an excellent summary of the whole subject, particularly on the linguistic side.

The collecting of data regarding the Gipsy tribes of the Orient is by no means easy. Even experienced orientalists and travellers have reached different conclusions regarding them. For example Lane (in his Modern Egyptians, London 1836, ii, 108) in spite of his profound knowledge of Egypt, asserted that there were few Gipsies in the land, while numbers of well-educated natives to-day, are still unaware of the presence of these tribes in their midst. The statistics of Massignon’s Annuaire musulman (Paris 1925, p. 115) however, gives the number of Gipsies in Egypt as two per cent of the population, consisting, namely, of two tribes of Gāhūr and Neũrũ respectively, and four tribes of Halab. The Gipsies as a rule seem, chameleon-like, to take their creed, such as it is, from their surroundings. In Muslim countries these tribes usually profess Islam, in so far as they may be said to profess any religious views, many of them, indeed, being very superstitious and reported to be scavengers and vagabonds. The same applies to the Muslim Gipsies of what was formerly European Turkey (Admiralty’s Handbook of Turkey in Europe [1917], p. 62). In the Balkans many of them are Greek-Orthodox.

Persian and Arabic writers preserve for us the tradition that tribes of Jāt (or Jaw) from the Pundjāb were conveyed westwards by command of the Šafānīn monarch Báhrám Gīrī (420–438 A.D.) and their descendants proved a troublesome problem some centuries later for the Caliph of Baghdad. Once more numbers of them were dispersed to the borders of Syria, where many of them were captured by the Byzantines, and thus found their way into the Eastern Roman Empire, thence to continue their migrations to other ends of the East and West. Many of them are even said to have risen to high rank, e.g. al-Safī b. al-Hakam b. Yūnūs al-Zaṭī, governor of Egypt. (200–205 A.H.), while it has been supposed that the famous Bar`mīcide family at the court of Hārūn al-Raṣīl were of similar Gipsy origin. The name Bar`mīcide is actually the designation in Egypt of a class of public dancers (Ǧarnūsī, Ǧarnāsī) of low moral character and conduct who have been regarded as of Gipsy blood. The question, however, is doubtful (see L. Bouvart, Les Barˇmīcides d’après les historiens arabes et persans, Paris 1913, p. 110, 125).

The German traveller Seetzen and the American
missionary Eli Smith gathered valuable material in the Near East regarding those nomadic peoples which proved useful to later scholars. They were followed by Capt. Newbold (1856) on the Gypsies of Egypt, Syria and Persia; von Kremer, Austrian Consul at Cairo, on the Egyptian Gypsies (1863); Sykes (1902) dealt with the Persian Gypsies, while an excellent treatise appeared in 1914 from the pen of R. A. S. Macalister on the Language of the Nawar or Zutj, the Nomad Smuts of Palestine. Macalister in this work had the rather difficult task of reducing to writing a language almost completely unknown, and interpreting and analysing the Núr stories and folk-elements recounted to him by members of the Núr settlement north of the Damascus Gate in Jerusalem. He employed several of these Nawar in the course of his excavations there. A small Syrian Gypsy vocabulary received by Miss G. G. Everest of Bairiti from a friend at Damascus was also published in the Journal of the Gipsy Lore Soc., Jan. 1890, in an article by F. H. Goosman. The philological aspect of the question has received, in recent years, the attention of scholars such as E. Galtier and E. Littmann (see Bibliography).

In Egypt the Halabi (sing. Halabî) are to be found mostly in Lower Egypt carrying on their special occupations at the various markets and melâddi, as traders in camels, horses and cattle. Their womenfolk are noted seers and medicines-women, practising all the arts of sorcery (istikhâr); samî-divination (farâk 'râsâ), shell-divination (farâk 'al-sâbîa), bâlibomancy (fâlik al-kitâb) etc. Their tribal subdivisions are variously given by Galtier (p. 7) and Newbold (p. 291). Their name suggests connection with Aleppo (Halab), but they themselves proudly claim a South Arabian ancestry their tribal chronicle being the popular broad-sheet production, Turâkh Zîr Sûlam. The Ghagar Gypsy tribe, however, have a rather unanswerable reputation, a fact that is reflected in the modern Egyptian Arabic verb g工作者 “to be abusive”. Their speech has fewer foreign ingredients and Galtier is of the opinion that they are more recent arrivals in the Nile Valley, probably wanderers from Constantinople. The argot of the Egyptian Gypsies is called al-Sim, and in modern colloquial Arabic in Egypt “to speak in enigma” is yâsikallim bi 'al-Sim.


NUŠAIRI, the name of an extreme Shi'a sect in Syria.

I. The etymology of the name is disputed: a. contemptuous diminutive from nūšr, 'Christian', in allusion to certain ritual similarities (Rancan); b. corruption of nūšr, Latin name in Flory for certain tetrarchy of the first century near Edessa (but the name is still found uncorrupted in nūsra: it is the 'Nāšr of Nušairan', which is crossed in going from Tell Kalâkî to Homs, between the bridge called 'Achash Keupuru' and the lake of Homs; cf. British G. S. map of 1/250,000, Homs-Ba'irat sheet, 1918); c. nishā from a village near Kafi, Nušairā (Barhebraeus; cf. de Saçy, Drusus, i., p. clxxvii. and Šabîr, iii. 2128); nishā from an ebena: a fictitious Shi'te martyr, son of 'All (according to the 'Alî-Ḥâṣîma), or a freedman of 'Ali's or vizier of Mu'awiyah (Dusauaud, p. 10); or rather ibn Nuṣair, i.e. Muhammad b. Nuṣair Namîr 'Abdî (='Abd of the 'Abd al-Kais, a Bahr clan), whom we shall find below as the first theologian of the sect.

As a matter of fact this name adopted from the time of Khasbih (434 A.H.) by these sectarians, previously called Na'imtiya (Nawbakht, Firas, p. 78; Asfari, Mâk., i. 15) and who called themselves nušrānī, has been applied since Samanî (v.7.) and 'Umayr b. Dârûsh (Dârûsh, p. 145, 286) not to a district only partly converted in the north of Syria, but to an extreme Shi'a sect also found in Egypt and along the Euphrates. This etymology, that of all the Muslim heresiographers, from the
Shârî Ibl-al-Ghâshî'îr (d. 411 A.H.) and the Sunni Ibn 'Harm, has been and is the most probable.

II. The term has three acceptations: administrative, social and religious.

a. Administration: it is the "mountain of the Amariye" of Syria (formerly Djabal Lukkmûn), the former site of Latakia to the east of the Orontes which has been extended to the south and since 1920 has become the state of the Alawi (6,500 sq. km; 334,473 inhabitants in 1933 of whom 213,060 are Nuşairîs, 61,817 Sunnis in the north of Şâhya and at Bâniya, 5,669 Isamîllis at Kaâlîn and Maârîf, 53,604 Christian, mainly Syriac Orthodox at Tuštân and the north of Tuštân; capital Latakia (22,000) divided into two sandjakas and 3 kazâs: Latakia, Şâhya (Hadj'a), Djabal, Tuštân, Maârîf (Banias), Imnûlûk (Tell Kallûk), Şîfûl, al-Şîfû (Mayyâl); a country of patient and industrious agriculturists (tobacco, silkworms). Its place-names studied for the north (villages, not cantons of which there is a list in [Delatour] Répertoire alphabétique, Latakia [Raghûllîb press]. Dec. 1933), show an old stratum of names, in part Aramaic and later vocational Arabic without any definite local religious traits except for modern Shi'a influences, beneath which one can hardly see the pagan or Christian culture of the substratum (cf. on the contrary, Lebanon). The study of the district from the point of view of ethnology and folklore has hardly begun; certain prohibitions regarding food have been noted (Niebuhr, loc. cit.; Dupont, in J. A. F., 1824, p. 134; Bâhûrû, p. 57), some general (cannab, bares, eski and catfish) and others specific to the Şâmûlûk (female or maimed animals, gazelles, pig, crab, shellfish, pupukins, Şâmûlûk, tomatoes). The only domestic art is basket-making.

b. Socially, the name covers tribes of different origins, almost all speaking Arabic, who have adopted the Nuşairî teaching:

1. In the state of the Alawi (213,000): the nucleus seems to be descended from Yemen clans of Hamdân and Kinûn (Ya'qûbî, in B. G. A., vol. iii. 324); Ghassân, Bahrû and Tanûkî (Hamdân, Şîfû, p. 132) early converted to the Shi'a, from the Tiburtian and the Djabal Amlû (where there are still Metwals) to Aleppo, especially by immigrants from Taîl (end of the ninth century) and from Ghassân who at the time the Crusaders were being driven back came with their emir Hasan b. Mâksûn (d. 678 = 1240, 1250), grandson of the Hadjdûm, from Mount Siddîr, and imposed on the district their ruling families, their clans and ethnic structure (M. E. Ghâlî, J. E. V., p. 356). The following is the present day list of the principal clans (ţâhîr) (map in R. M. M., vol. vii. 278; and J. E. V., p. 548-549) grouped in 4 confederations: Ka'îbîya (Ka'âbîya, with Nawâsîr, Kaâbîh, Diuulûkî, Râhûmûn, Shâlîh, Rasûllûn, Dûliyûn, Bâlît al-Shîrîf, Bâlît Mu-‘âmûd and Dârîwâsîr); Khâlîyûn (at Maƙûb with Sarâmûl, Ma’atûl, Falûqî, ‘Amûlûlûn [mixed with Abû al-Kalîs]; Hâdûtûn [clan of the emir]; Hasan b. Mâksûn: with Ma’allûlûn, Banû ‘Abî, Ya’qûbî, ‘Amûlû, Banû Ma’âlûlûn; and Ma’ta’ûlûn (with Nuşairîllûs), Sawtûlî of Aleppo, Sawtûlî, Ma’ânûrû whose claim to be Ma’alûlûs, and Ma’ta’ûlûs.

From the ninth century their political history has been a series of persecutions by invaders (the Crusaders, Balûrs who covered the country with mosques; legend of Durrât al-Şâfû, daughter of Sa’d al-Ânâr [tomb at Aleppo] who instigated Tûmiri to sack Damascus; massacres under Selîm I and civil wars, both among the clans themselves and against the Isâmîllûs of Kaâlîn (lost, and retaken for a brief period in 1808 by the Ma’ârîf) and of Maârîf, allied with the Turk;)

2. in the sandjak of Alexandria (58,000; at Antioch 1/3), Lûwâûlûs, Sawlûlûs, ‘Abîdûs, Lûlûs; with two deputies in Parliament;

3. in the State of Syria (29,693); at Hâmû and at Hûmûch with one deputy; in two quarters of Aleppo; near Djarû, and to the north of Lake Hûlû (AIR PUL 24,000);

4. in Palestine (3,000): to the north of Nablûs;

5. in Cilicia from the 16th century (at Tarûs and Adûnâ; 80,000 in 1921 now turkicised);

6. along the Euphrates. In Kurdistan and in Persia, there are ultra-Shi’a elements who have similar views and are called Nuşairîs (among the ‘Ilî-Ilhâs or Ahl-i Hâjî; q. v.);

7. in Lebanon, there were some down to the 19th century (in Kiaraûn).

III. Religion: it is the religious teaching of the Nuşair sect that we have to study more particularly here.

Cosmogony and eschatology. According to the Nuşairîs there is immediately below the ineffable divinity a spiritual world of heavenly beings (or stars), which emanates from him in the following hierarchy: Jum, Bûb and other divinities (al-Âl al-Marʿûbî [of the first seven classes]; it is the *great luminous world* (atûm abâr niyâmâl); when they appear below it is to lead back gradually to heaven the "little luminous world", fallen beings, half materialized, imprisoned in the bodies which are their tombs; this operation revives them and brings them back to heaven to form the seven last classes of the Ahl al-Marʿûbî (119,000 out of a total of 124,000 = the traditional number of the prophets); next comes the "little world of darkness" (zâmilîb), extinguished lights, souls that damnation materializes (kaṣûmân al-amaqâmîhîs) in the bodies of women and animals; and lastly the "great world of darkness" composed of all the "adversaries" (mašûkûd) of the great luminous world; demons, who after innumerable metamorphoses in corpses of murdered men or slaughtered animals still quivering after death, are reduced to inert or passive forms (forged metals etc.). Just as the fall takes place through seven stages (doubtless about divine appearances), so does the return to the heavens of the elect go through seven cycles or aḏâbâr of divine emaculations.

Theory of revelation. The pure divinity (kaṣâbîs), the object of adoration, being ineffable his first emanation is the Name (i.e.), the articulating prophetic voice (Nîyâhî), the signification (Ma’ânî) of divine authority; such was the primitive teaching, that of Abu ‘l-Khaṭṭâb, the common teacher of the Isâmîllûs and the Nuşairîs. But his disciple Mâmûn Khâdî, thinking that the enunciation by the divinity of an object which manifests him, is of greater importance than its signification which is a mute idea, detached the Ma’ânî from pure divinity, identified it with the Śîrīt (the "silent" iman; opposed to Nîyâhî) and placed it as a mere accident, below the substance, the i. e., Then, by reaction, other Khâlîyûn like Bâshâlû, Shîrû, using the equation Mâ’ânî = Śîrīt, reconciliated the Ma’ânî before the i. e. And, as Abu ‘l-Khaṭṭâb had taught that in the Muḥammadiya cycle, the
signification (mu'arad) of the ineffable divinity was expressed through five privileged Atim (Muhammad, 'Ali, Fatimah [the masculine form of Faizma], for as we have seen women have no souls; this explains why they may form part of the offering of hospitality among initiates), Hasan and Husain, announcing equivalently its mysterious Unity), this group of Five equals, in which we recognise the Five of the muhakka (q.v.; cf. our, Salan, Pkh, No. 7 of the Soc. des Etudes Islamitiques, 1933, p. 40–44) became in the hands of his pupil Maimun a descending series of five terrestrial terms (symmetrical with the five spiritual terms, and inferior to them, the Druzes say): Nabi (Allah), Ameer (Allah), Mawla, Madinah, Muthalbi: whence the Msh, the Khairidj Wardajali remarks, has the priority (cf. Sbn Muhammad). While according to Baha'i, the five were equal and became Muhammad, Fathimah, Hasan, Husain, Muhammad; 'Ali being thought to surpass them was identified by hyperbole and against all logic with the Manah. It is this last list that the Nusairis have adopted. And this is the origin of their "god 'Ali" for whom there is no need to seek antecedents in the Syrian pagan pantheon or in a Druze emigration. Baha'i and the Ulufraym (or 'Aliyya) copied by the Nusairis have simply copied the Karamanian list of Maimun, by inverting the order of priority between Msh and 'Ali, and making the Shadi (Manah) the superiors of the Nabi (Allah). The following is the double list (in italics): a. in the seven cycles (akhrar, 'aishah personified by women among the poets) of the Ishafray (khalil): 1. Abur, 2. Abur, 3. Thalat, 4. Thalat, 5. Alid, 6. Thalat, 7. Ishafray (khalil); the same list of the Ishafray (khalil) and the Munmu-mam. Khaibari allows that there were 44 (63–19) other khalil during these seven cycles; 8. in the al-Qalidim (the twelve classical imams substituted for the early list of Ibn Nusair which we shall see later) by Khaibari each of the twelve is promoted manah after having been the imam of his predecessor. The mode of appearance of the two divine entities localised behind the screw (taghyir, istighfar) of a phantomlike body (kam al-khaib, mans al-khaib, istighfar, istighfar), is a reality for the faith of the Nusairis; this body is the support of a momentary illumination for the believer; while for the Druze monomania it is only a mirage (istighfar) and for the Ishafray, a real body, transformed by a gradual sanctification.

Theory of catechesis. Abu 'l-Khaibar had taught that the five persons of the Ishafray were pointed out to the believers by one or more inspired angelic intermediaries (atakat, thahajaj): of whom the first was Salsal or al-Salim = Maimun in the Muhammadiyya cycle; cf. our study, p. 36). These initiators became, with his disciple Maimun, the five spiritual symmetricals of the Ishafray (khalil = Salim, Nabi = Miqdad, 'Ali = Abu Dhar, 'Ali = Abul, Ma'in = Khaibar, Ishafray = Abul, Yasir, cor- thus 30, 60 of the Druze catechism. While among the Nusairis, these five initiators remained equal and far below the Ishafray, became the five Atim (Miqdad, Abu Dhar, 'Ali, Allah, Kawa, Ummah, Ma'in and Kanbar), Salim (who was thought to be above them was placed the Baha after the Miqdad and the Ishafray. Such was the origin of the Nusairi triad, Abul-Miqaq-Salim = Na'mon-Ishar-Baha in which there was no need to see an original pagan Syrian triad of Sun, Moon and Sky; this astro- logical correspondence, a favourite subject with Nusairi poets, found its way into the Shi'a catechism of the Kafa under the influence of the Sabaeans of Harran; the assimilation, in the spiritual, of the sun to Muhammad and of the moon to 'Ali (the moon, like the imam, is the regulator of canonical acts; cf. our, Salan, p. 36, No. 4) appears at Kafa with Moghul (d. 119 a.h.). In any case pagan survival are at the basis of astral gnosticism, as Dussud suggests, it is not among the uneducated peasants (Djebel Lakkam) but among the town-dwellers in Harran that they have been able to survive.

The following is a list of the personifications of the Baha in the seven cycles (they are really only six, Salim, the long-lived = Ruhul: the Salani: 1. Djabrul; 2. Yahzi; 3. Ham and Kha; 4. Dafa, a Sa'dawi; 5. 'Abd Allah b. Sim'an; 6. Ruhul. In the sara al-dinma (there are only eleven): the muqaddim: 1. Salim; 2. Ka'b b. Waraka Ruhul (= Salim); 3. Ruhul Jibril (d. ca. 58 a.d.); 4. Kankar b. Abi Khallid Kahlil; 5. Yahzi b. Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Tawil (d. ca. 83 a.d.); 6. Djabrul b. Yazid Dju'fi (d. 128); 7. Abu 'l-Khaibar Muhammad b. Abi Zainab Miqdad Ansari Khadi (d. 138; cf. Kassir, p. 191); 8. Miqdad b. 'Umar Dju'fi (d. ca. 170); 9. Muhammad b. Miqdad Dju'fi; 10. 'Umar b. al-Furat (d. 205 A.D.); 11. Muhammad b. Nusr 'Abd al-Rahmân (d. ca. 245, d. 270). Beginning with No. 7; these individuals have actually played the part of party leaders (Nasir 9–10 had as rival Muhammad b. Sim'an). A nephew of No. 10, grand- father of the vizier Ibn al-Furat, was the principal supporter of Ibn Nusair.

Below the Baha are the Five Atim, whom he associates as lords of the elements (muwaddatul b-najaf al-dinma) with his role of Demiurge en- gendering souls by initiation. The list of Nusairi atim given above should be compared as well as that of the Druze hadid *wise virgin* of Salim; like the Nusairi atim are the djafradjar of the Bah al-Arak (Salim) with the lists of Garmi (Asturahād, Manjawi, p. 235) and of the Khattābiyya of the Qams (K. 1, 5, 1953, p. 442, trans. Ivanov).

IV. Initiation. This has three degrees (mujtahid, mithal, imam): the first consists of a solemn pledge ('ajad, khafidh with 'ajad al-muwallah; cf. safrad) to reveal nothing of this spiritual marriage (mujtahid al-isona) in which the word of the initiator fer- tilizes the soul of the initiate in three seances, the ritual of which is related to that of the other extreme Shi'a sects (and of the Isma'imm) and through them and the Sabaeans of Harran to the old mysteries of Central Asia (cf. Tsmar; Dussaud, p. 106–119; Baha, p. 2–7, 52). The cup of wine (called 'a'id al-akhrar, Cat. No. 94), the anticipation of Paradise, is partaken of at it.

The initiatory teaching is essentially an ultra-Shi'a symbolism (jadid): of the seven canonical rites (al-dinma) of Islam which are personified: 1. laif, the five akhrar by Muhammad (= sa'ir; the rites among the Isma'imm), Fathimah, Hasan, Husein and Mushtin (= fa'ir; among the Druses as among the Khaibariyya of the Pamirs by the mujtahid, the mujtahid, Abu Dhar, Miqdad, Salim). Similarly the 17 (then 51) rak'at; 2. qunun: the secret guarded regarding 30 names of men (days) and thirty of women (nights of Rama'an); 3. sa'irah: by Salim; 4. 'ajad: the "sacred land 12 miles around", this is the sect; Baha al imam; the Black
Stone = Mikhail; the 7 agatha = the 7 cycles; 3. ghāṣal = the malpractices upon the agathā (Rabī', p. 44) and the discipline of the mystery; 6. ṣawāt = devotion to the 'Alīs and hatred of their adversaries; 7. the ghāṣal = referred to the formula 'ain-mun-In. The Karṣa is an initiation to devotion to 'Ali; it was Salmān (under the name of ḏūrūṣyīl) who taught it to Muḥammad.

The annual festivals include: the Shīʿa lunar festivals: Fīr, ʿĀdha, Ḥādhar, Muḥābalahā, Fīrāḥ, ʿĀdhar, 9th Rabīʿ (martyrdom of ʿUmar) and 15th Shaʿbān (death of Salmān); then certain solar festivals: Nawrūz and Mīrjūmn, Christmas and Epiphany, 17th Adhār, St. Barbara. Certain liturgies (ṣıldū) pertain to these festivals and are wrongly called "masses" (kudūs al-ṯīb, al-Bāṣṭū, al-štīrā).

VI. History of the Sect. All the initiates of the sect go back from Khuṣḥīsī to the Naṣairī through two intermediaries, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Dujnālbūs and Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Ḏānānī al-Ḏānālūnīl. Of Ibn Naṣair, a notable Baṣran, teacher of ʿAlī Khuṣḥīsī, we know that in 245 a. h. he proclaimed himself the ʿākī of the tenth Shiʿa ʿimām (Naṣair, p. 144) and of his eldest son Muḥammad who died before him in 249, the year of the ʿākīs of the Mahfit, according to Ibn Naṣair (Ibn Ṣabawāh, Ghāba, p. 62, l. 12, taken from Naṣair, Fīrāh, p. 77, 83; such was still the belief of the Hamadānīs, see Ibn Ṣabawāh, Ghāba, p. 157, l. 39). It is only Khuṣḥīsī who says that Ibn Naṣair joining the eleventh ʿākī (Nūrī, Naṣair, p. 144) had already been for mahfit his son Muḥammad b. Ḥasanān.

Of the two successors of Ibn Naṣair we only know that the second, like Khuṣḥīsī, belonged to Dānānī, and was the centre of the Sandj and Karmaṭīan rebels (Ṭabarī, iii, 1147, 1925, 2185; Maḥsūl, Tabākī, p. 391), native place of Ibn Waḥṣīsī. Husain b. Ḥamdān Khuṣḥīsī (vocalisation attested by Dāhābī, Maḥṣūlī; in Persia and the Ṣaʿīd wrongly now pointed Ḥadīdī) died in 346 (957) or 358 (968) at Aleppo (tomb to the north called Shaikh Bārāk); he was the real founder of the Naṣairīs; he lived, he was his patrons the Hamadānīs, between Kuwait (in 344, according to Astārāštīd, loc. cit., p. 112) and Aleppo; he dedicated to them his Ḩidiyya; cf. his Risāla Ṣawātīhā (Ṭawālī, p. 166 sqq., 200, 257). Among his 51 disciples the best known is Muḥammad b. 'Abbās Dūlī, of Qūṣṭān near Antioch, as he is the chief of the Dūlīs, still alive. His one direct disciple was Sād Maināt Tabarrānī (d. 427 = 1035), a prolific polemicist against the chief of the Shīʿa of Latakia, ʿAbbās Dībalī b. Ḥālīlī. After him mention is made of ʿAbū al-Dabāla, Ḥātim Tabānī (c. 700 = 1300; Paris MS., 1450, fol. 117), author of the Risāla Ṣawātīhā, Hasan Anbarī, b. 'Ammān, cited Latakia in 836 (1432) (Ṭawālī, p. 217); lastly heads of parties, the Kamāriyya, Muḥammad b. Yūnus Kālānî (1011 = 1602), who lived near Antioch, 'Abbās Dībalī, ʿAbbās Naṣairī, ʿAbbās Dībalī. In connection we may note that the four alleged Naṣairī sects reduce themselves to two: that of the north (Ṣawātīhā because it is Mīṣūbī; Ṣawātīhā = Ḥadiyya, from the name of 'Ali Ḥadiyya), its head in the 19th c. (century = Ḥadiyya) and that of the south (Ḵidiyya, for it is distinct there), which is Ṣawātīhā then Kamāriyya.

The spiritual organisation is quite distinct from the political among the Naṣairīs. The four muḥadātī mentioned by ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Dīna in 1750 (at Bahlīlye near Latakia, Sīrmanī Ḵhālū, Sīrītī and Ḍāḥal Ḵhālīyā) were temporal rulers. In 1914, there were two spiritual leaders, the Ṣawātīhā (ʿAbīrīt) in Gilicia and the ʿAbīdīn ashīl al-bait (Jawārī) at Kārtā (in 1933: ʿAbīrīt al-Muḥammad of the Numālīyāts).

From 1920 the Ḍāṭarī ʿArīṣah of the south have found their way among the Naṣairīs. In the last ten years a shepherd of the ʿAmānīr, Shīrīn Mūḥāzīh, has been trying to found a new sect to the north of Masaf.
NUŠAIRI - AL-NUSHADIR

3. In Arabic the only recent studies are: Kurdu, Khatif al-Sīlah, vol. vi. (1928), p. 258-265; and Kāmil al-Zahid, al-Dhābīha (Aleppo 1342 a. d., vol. i., p. 204-205); cf. also the Bāraīt press (Aḥām, Sept. 19, 1930) and that of Dāmāsūs (Aḥām, March 29, 1933). (LAWRENCE)

NUṢB, standing stone, especially one which is held sacred. The root is the same as in the Hebrew nṣb, Phoenician nṣb and nṣb, and South Arabian nṣb, nṣb. On the explanation of the Arabic forms the philologists are not agreed. They usually regard nṣb as a singular with the plural nṣb, but others pronounce it nṣb and consider it the plural of nṣb or nṣb. In addition to these Arabic forms this root has also from the same root the substantives nṣb and nṣb. In answer to the much discussed question of the idea associated with standing stones, Arabia only makes one contribution, in as much as it is evident that the fundamental conception was that of a dwelling place of the deity (ḥaṭel'). Of several of the old Arab deities we are told that they were rocks or blocks of stone, i.e. that they were incarnate or present in them. Whether this was always so or whether this form of worship developed out of stones placed upon graves (e.g. Hamās, p. 562, 1. 8 and the use of nṣb in the sense of tombstones) where the stones were originally memorial, is a question which cannot be dealt with here. We need only mention that the theory of worship of the dead breaks down if the deity has its abode in a tree, like al-‘Uṣā of Nakhlī in a samara tree (umbrella scacia). Examples of the presence of a deity in a stone are given in the articles Dhu ’l-S̱awwar, Al-Kātā, and Mānāt. Other examples are Dhu ’l-Halaṣṣa, al-Fāsā, al-Djalas, Sa’d. The worship associated with such stones usually consisted in sprinkling them with the blood of sacrifices. Thus Zuhair, 1024 speaks of a sacrificial stone, nṣb al-ṭir, the top of which was red with blood; a wounded and bleeding man is compared to a red nṣb (Ibn Sa’d, iv. 1, 162, 4); among forbidden foods, Sūra 9, 4 includes what is slaughtered “ṣal” ṣalḥa; al-Aṣba (Morgenlandische Forschungen, p. 248) warns against worshipping a dha ‘l-nṣb, ‘ṣawwān (1 read mṣb) with sacrifices; cf. also Mutalaffīn, ed. Valler, 2. 31. The words of Sūra lxx. 43, which say that the resurrected stream out of their graves as if they were running (yādhu‘ina) to a nṣb (other readings nṣb or nṣb) refer to a characteristic feature of the worship. In view of the prominent part played by stones in the worship of the early Arabs, it is natural that Muhammad should have included nṣb among things prohibited to the believers like wine, maṣrīr, etc. (Sūra, v. 92) for the worship associated with them was one of the principal forms of idolatry.

The smearing of the nṣb with blood recalls the well-known statement in Herodotus iii. 8 regarding the ancient Arabian ceremony of concluding alliances: there is however an essential difference. In the first place there is no question of any act of worship and further we are told that the participants put their blood on seven stones lying between them, and called upon the two Gods Orota‘al and Allat [q.v.]. The stones were not here conceived to be habitations of the gods but owed their merit to the number seven which was the important thing on taking oaths.

Bibliography: Ibn Ḫīṣām, p. 51; Wellehauen, Rā‘t arabičen Hēlidinim, p. 101, 147; Baudissin, in Z.D.M.G., iv. 1890; Goldscher, Muhammadičke Studien, i. 250 sqq. (Ver. Breu.)

AL-NUSHADIR, also nsha‘dir, nsha‘dir, Sanskrit nusādira, Chín. mao-shā, sal-ammoniac. The etymology of the word is uncertain; perhaps it comes from the Pahlavi anu-sha‘dir "immortal fire" as we find the form anu-shadahr in Syriac.

The oldest references to the occurrence of sal-ammoniac in a natural state are in the reports of Chinese embassies of the viith—viiith centuries, which were the subject of very full investigation in connection with a geological problem, the question of volcanoes in Central Asia by H. J. von Klaproth, A. von Humboldt and C. Ritter, in the first third of the xixth century. The reference was to mountains of fire, Pe-Shan on the northern slopes of the Tien-Shan south of Kūlija, Ho-Chon on the south side of the Tien-Shan near Tarfan and the sulphur pits of Urumtsi. The mountain Pe-Shan was said to pour forth fire and smoke continuously; on one side of it all the stones burn, and are melted and then after flowing some miles solidify again. Nao-shā and sulphur were obtained there medicinally purposes but the stones could only be collected in winter when the cold had cooled the ground. A. von Humboldt and C. Ritter do not accept a reference to the burning of coal by which sal-ammoniac and sulphur are obtained.

The statement that the volcanoes of Central Asia produce sal-ammoniac in immense quantities is found in G. Bischoff and even G. von Richthofen still held the volcano theory. The botanist and geographer Regel, who travelled in these regions about 1879 was the first to dispute the existence of volcanoes. After Nansen, Le Coq and others had been unable to confirm the existence of volcanoes but established the fact that there were large deposits of coal on the surface, the old sources in Central Asia are now generally attributed to the burning of coal.

Almost all the Arab geographers who refer to Central Asia, from al-Ma‘ṣari, al-Iṣkhakī, Ibn Hāwīl, to Yākūt and al-Ḵazwīnī, give fantastic stories about the method by which sal-ammoniac is procured in the Buttām hills east of Samarkand. Here again the details suggest the burning of the earth rather than volcanic exhalations. The Persian traveller Nāṣir-i-Khusraw however mentions deposits of sal-ammoniac and sulphur at Demawend and Ibn Ḫawīl is acquainted with the volcanic sal-ammoniac of Etna; the latter was still exported to Spain in the xiiith century. At an earlier date they had begun to procure sal-ammoniac from the soot of camel dung. This product remained into modern times an important import by the Venetian traders and was only driven from the market by the modern cheap methods of production from gas liquor etc.

The use of sal-ammoniac as a remedy in cases of
inflammation of the throat etc. is already mentioned by Saḥūḥ b. Rabbaḥ al-Ṭabarī. Ibn al-Baṣīr also quotes from other authors all kinds of remarkable uses of it, on which no stress need be laid. Dījūbīr b. Ḥaiyān reckons sal-ammoniac among the poisons, which is true of large doses.

The part played by sal-ammoniac in alchemy is much more important. Dījūbīr b. Ḥaiyān adds it as a fourth to the three ḫidrātāt of the Greeks, quicksilver, sulphur and sulphide of arsenic (AsS or As₂S₂), and it is used by all Persian-Arab authors in cosmetics and remedies. The preparation of carbonate of ammonia through distillation of hair, blood and other materials is already fully detailed in the "Seventy Books" and other works of Dījūbīr. These methods seem to have given the stimulus to the discovery of the Egyptian method of obtaining sal-ammoniac. All these things came with alchemy to Spain and thence into Western alchemy.

In the earlier Latin translations sal-ammoniac is still called mercúder, misādīr etc., i.e. transcriptions of the Arabic name. The general term al-ʿUḏāb is also found in the forms aluẓāb, aļuẓāb or translated by aqua. The identification of this salt with the salt of the oasis of Ammon already mentioned by Herodotus is first found in Syrian authors and lexicographers.


(J. Rusa)

NUSHIRWAN. [See ANSHAKRWAR.]  
NUSRATABAD. [See SISTAN.]

AL-NUWĀIRI. SHIKHAR AL-DIN AHMAD B. ABD AL-WAHHIĐ AL-BAKRI AL-KHANĪ AL-SHARĪF, A rab historiographer, born on the 21st Dhu l-Ka‘da 677 (April 3, 1279) in Upper Egypt (probably in al-Khuṣa‘), died on the 21st Ramazān 734 (June 17, 1332) in Cairo, author of one of the three best known encyclopedias of the Mamluk period (the others are by al-ʿUmari and al-Kašshākhani). His father before him had been an official (al-tābi‘) of note (628—699 = 1231—1300); the son filled several offices at the court of Sulṭān al-Malik al-Nāṣir (Muḥammad b. Kālaṭān), whose favourite he was. He was for a time Nāṣir al-Dīn (Djāhid) in Tripolis (Syria) and later Nāṣir al-Dīn (William) in the Egyptian provinces of al-Dākhliya and al-Muḥāqqaq. His monumental work Nikāyat al-ʿArab fi Fannin al-ʿAdāb which was dedicated to al-Malik al-Nāṣir was a result of his administrative activities. As he says in the preface, at the beginning of his literary career he was almost exclusively concerned with kitāb (i. 2) and only later took up adab (i. 3); he wished to sum up in his encyclopedia all the knowledge that was indispensable for a first class kātib. The book is divided into five sections called fannin, each fann has five parts, each kitāb has a different number of chapters (about) varying from two to fourteen. The first fann is devoted to heaven and earth, the second to man, the third to the flora and the fifth to history (full list of contents: vol. i, p. 4—25; also in de Goeje, Catalogus 2, i. 5—14; cf. also Ḥādījī Khallīfī, ed. Flügel, iv. 397—398, N. 14069). The division is unequal; the last fann of the fifth fann, which is devoted to Muslim history fills almost half the work, which runs to nearly 9,000 printed pages. In addition to the division according to subjects, the book is divided into volumes: the last, the 31st discovered by Ahmad Zakī Pāšā, contains the history of Egypt down to the death of the author in 731. From the dates of the separate parts and volumes it is evident that he devoted no less than twenty years to his book (cf. e. g. de Goeje, Catalogus 2, i. 16 where the year 714 is given; vol. i, p. 416; year 721; v., p. 355; year 722 or 723, op. cit., 2v.; year 725 etc.). In the earlier parts later additions are often found (e. g. vol. i, p. 13, q.v.; 15, q.v.; 20, 61 sqq.). For contemporary history Nuwairi’s book is of the first importance; in other parts its value depends on that of his sources. Its extent and many-sidedness will only be appreciated when the edition is complete and a study like that of Björkman on al-Kašshākhani Šahīb al-ʿUḏāb has been undertaken. Nuwairi himself makes no claim to originality; like the majority of Arab encyclopaedists, he expressly says that he follows his predecessors and places the whole responsibility on them (i. 26). Owing to the existence of many manuscripts of separate parts, European scholarship early became acquainted with Nuwairi; he is already mentioned by d’Herbelot (1625—1695) in his Bibliothèque Orientale (Maestricht 1776, p. 676). In the collections made by Golius and Wares some fine copies came to Leyden (including holographs). W. M. C. Jubb, Erzähltende erwachsene Reiseberichte aus dem Arabischen in Nederlands, Utrecht 1931, p. 178; Catalogus 2, i. 5—18, N. 5) and attracted great attention in the xviii-th century. One of the first to study him was J. Heyman (d. 1737) whose Nusawirianus — not too fortunate excerpts and notes — is in manuscript in Leyden (Catalogus 2, i. 18, N. 6); on Heyman see Reiske, Prodigagurata, in J. B. Köhler’s Abhildnisse Tabulae Syriacae, Leipzig 1766, p. 233 and Jan Nat, De studiën der oosterse. Talen in Nederland in de 18e en de 19e eeuw, Purmerend 1929, p. 25—26). In general in the xviii-th and early xix-th centuries too much stress was laid on the account of pre-Musliman history in al-Nuwairi (Schultens, Monumenta, 1740, Historia, 1786; Reiske, Prodigagurata, 1766, p. 232—234, Primaire lang., ed. Wustenfeld, 1847; Rasmussen, Historia prae-quotum arabam regnum, Copenhagen 1817, p. 81—124 etc.). Later investigation showed that with the existence of older sources al-Nuwairi was only of secondary importance (see Hitwoch, Prueba arabe pagana, Berlin 1899, p. 25—30; G. Olinder, The Kings of India, Lund 1920, p. 100 etc.). Of considerable importance are the parts which deal with later, especially contemporary, history and historical geography; in the course of the xix-th century they were frequently appealed to and excerpts edited or translated by Silvestre de Sacy, de Slane, Defrémery, v. Hammer, Quentinme, Weil, Tiesenhaven, Amari, etc. One of the latest studies of a section of his work is the two volume Historia de los musulmanes de España y Africa. Texto arabe y traducción española of M. Gaspar Remiro (Granada 1917—1919; cf. Ángel González Palencia, Historia de la literatura árabe-española, Barcelona 1928, p. 162—163). Ahmad Zakī Pāšā
deserves honourable mention for the interest he
died July 5, 1934) has aroused in the study of
Nuwairits modern times. With great industry and
perseverance he has collected photographs of all
31 parts of the Nihâyát al-Árāb frequently from
autographs, and these are now deposited in the
Royal Library in Cairo. As a result of his efforts,
a complete edition was undertaken in 1923 and ten
volumes are now available in the handsome and
imposing edition of the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriya,
which affords a sound basis for the general
estimation of the value of the book.

Al-Nuwairat was not only an official but also a
fine calligrapher: he was able to copy as many
as 80 pages a day. He himself made at least
four or five copies of his own encyclopedia and
sold them at 2,000 dirhems each. He made eight
copies of the Kitāb of Bushārī at 1,000 dirhems
each. He was also famous as a bookbinder.

Bibliography: Al-Adwār, al-Tāhib al-áhdād
(c. 738 = 1337), see al-Zurūqī, op. cit.; Ibn
Hābil (d. 779 = 1377), Durrat al-Álāb, see
H. E. Weijers, in Orientalia, ii. Amsterdam,
1846, p. 358; Ibn Haḍjar, al-Durūr al-bāḥīnà,
see G. A. L. and al-Zurūqī, op. cit.; al-Šaikhtī,
al-Šaikhtī, see Quṭnāmī, op. cit.; al-Áli al-Muḥāfrak,
al-Khājat al-Tawīfīya, xvii., Cairo 1306, p.
15–16; E. Quṭnāmī, Histoire des souverains
Mamlouks de l'Égypte, ii., Paris 1845, p. 173
and note 25; G. Weig, Geschichte des Arabischen
chalifats im Ägypten, i., Stuttgart 1866, xv.;
M. Amari, Bibliotheca arabica-italic, It., Turin,
1880, p. iv.; G. Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der
Araber und ihre Werke, Göttlingen 1882, p. 166–167,
Nò. 399; C. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 139–140,
Nò. 1; A. Zecky, Mémoires sur les moudirs propres
di terminer l'Empire des renouvellements des livres
arabes, Cairo 1910, p. 8–10; C. Huart, Littérature
arabe, Paris 1912, p. 355; I. Zaydān,
Tarīkh al-Ádib al-Luḥayn al-ʿarāfiyā, iii., Cairo
1913, p. 226–226; al-Zurūqī, al-Álām, i., Cairo
1927, p. 49; J. Sarkis, Dictionnaire encyclopédique
de bibliographie arabe, Cairo (1930), coll. 1884–
1885.

(IGN. KRATCHEWSKY)

NUZHA. [See مَزَاكِف.]

AL-ÖBOLLA was in the middle ages a large
town in the canal region of the
Tigris Delta, east of al-Baṣra. It was situated
on the right bank of the Tigris and on the
northern side of the large canal called Nahr al-
Öbolla, which was the main waterway from al-
Baṣra in the southeastern direction to the Tigris
and further to 'Abḥādīn and the sea. The length
of this canal is generally given as four or five
or two lake (al-Maṣfī). Al-Öbolla can be
identified with the Árbilā (Arabic: Ārbilā),
mentioned in the Periplus Marcus Erythraei (Geogr. Graec. Minores, L. 255) as lying near the
coast. A story told by al-Maṣṭūr al-Muqaddam (1300, iii. 364) there is still a
reminiscence of the period before the foundation
of al-Baṣra, when al-Öbolla was the only seaport
in the Tigris estuary. The earlier Arab authors,
in discussing the ancient administrative division of
lower Babylonia in Sassanian times and the foun-
dations of towns by the Sassanian kings, identify
al-Öbolla with other places, such as Dast-Maṣfīn
(Ibn Khūdrālīn, al-Burāb, vi. 7) or Bahman
Árdashīr (Tabarī, i. 687), although these
provinces must be sought on the opposite bank
of the Tigris; Eutychius (in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, iii. 911) likewise makes al-Öbolla a foundation of
Árdashīr I (cf. on this question: H. H. Schaedel, in
Iti, vii. 27 sqq.). Ibn Khūdrālīn, p. 7 quotes an
Arabic poem of a contemporary of Muḥammad,
where al-Öbolla is mentioned. In the story of
the conquests the town is reported to have been
captured by Ṭūḥā b. Ṣhāwān in the year 12
(635) and this conqueror described it to the caliph
'Umar as the "port of al-Baṣra", 'Oman, al-Hind
and al-Shir" (al-Baladhuri, p. 341). This conquest
enabled the Arabs to seize the opposite bank of the
river (Dast-Maṣfīn) and the so-called Euphrates
country. After the rise of al-Baṣra, al-Öbolla became
of secondary importance, but throughout the
Asia Minor Caliphate it remained a large town. It
was further from the sea than it had been, but still
the effects of the tide were perceptible even above
al-Öbolla. All the great geographical authors of
the xii. century give a longer or shorter notice
of this place. Its environs are described in
very laudatory terms (cf. Vāqī, i. 97); the
borders of the Lake al-Öbolla were one large
garden (Ibn Hawkal, in B. G. A., ii. 160). The
part of the Tigris opposite al-Öbolla was
important for navigation; in earlier 'Abbaṣid times
there had been here a dangerous whirlpool, which
had been eliminated by sinking a large quantity
of stone in the water at the expense of an
Abbasid prince. Here was erected a beacon light
which is described by al-Ídīsī (ed. Jaubert, i.
364). Al-Öbolla was in this period even larger
than al-Baṣra, according to Maṣfī (in B. G. A.,
i. 118), and the place was noted for linen
goods and also, as appears from al-Yaḥṣāb (in
B. G. A., vii. 360), for its shipbuilding. Nūsir-
Khusraw, who visited the place in 443 (1051),
gives likewise a vivid description of its beautiful
surroundings (Berlin 1341, p. 133). On the other
hand, al-Öbolla does not seem to have been an
important strategic point; occasionally it was
occupied, as in 331 (943) by the governor of
'Umar in his action against the Barid brothers
in Baṣra (cf. Miskawāl, ed. Amedroz, ii. 46),
but as the events showed it was far from being an
important bulwark of that city. After the xii. century the general decline of those
regions seems to have brought about the gradual
appearance of the place; Ibn Batūlā (li. 17 sq.)
calls it only a village and the Nīshāt al-Kūfī

1) See also U.
AL-OBOLIA — OHOD

(p. 38) knows only the Nahir al-Obolia, but does not mention the place itself. About this time it must have disappeared; later mentions (as late as the Ḩizām-Gamlā of Ḥadžī Khalfa, p. 453) reproduce only obsolete geographical traditions.

**Bibliography:** Ritter, Erdkunde, x. 54, 177, 180; xi. 1025; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 44 sqq.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

**OCHIALY,** Turkish corsair and admiral in the eighteenth century. He was born in a village of Cilicia called Liccestrellu, about 1750, and at the time of his death in 1758, it is said to have been over ninety years old. Ochialy is the name by which he is known to at least some Italian sources of the time; the Turkish sources call him Uludji Ali, which name probably was given to him in North Africa. It may be the Arabic plural *uludji* (from *uludji*), denoting his foreign descent (Hammer, G.O. K., ii. 481, 751 gives conflicting statements). After being a captured galley slave, he became a Muhammadan and entered on a long maritime career in the Mediterranean. According to the *Sidjilli* *ʾothmāni* (iii. 502), he became Tareshe Ḫapudāni in 1654. He owed his rise to his connection with the famous admiral Ṭorqib Ṭuʾis, whose lieutenant he was. With Torquhad he was at Lepanto during Charles V's expedition against this island, and in 1565 both took part in the abortive expedition against Malta, where Torquhad was killed. Thus, until 1568, he was the successor as viceroy of Tripoli, after which he was appointed in the same capacity to Algiers, as successor of Šāliḥ Pasha. During this time he extended the Algerian territory towards the west and, in 1567, he temporarily took Tunis from the last Ḥafsīd sultan and his Spanish protectors. Cervantes mentions him as king of Algiers in chapter xxxix. of his *Don Quixote.* In the following year Uludji Ali took part in maritime expeditions against the Venetians and the Maltese. His chief exploit is connected with the battle of Lepanto [q.v.], in September 1571, where he commanded the left wing of the Ottoman fleet. His success in bringing in a part of the fleet safely to Constantinople after the defeat procured him the dignity of ʿAskar Pasha, the former grand admiral Maʿṣūdibīn-Zade. ‘Ali having perished at Lepanto. On this occasion the name Uludji Ali is said to have been changed into Kīlqīl ‘Ali. He remained in this office until his death and commanded a series of predatory expeditions in the Mediterranean, participating i.e. in the reconquest of Tunis and La Goulette in 1574, along with the *ṭalib* Sinān Pasha [q.v.]. The inner political changes did not affect his favour with government circles. His last official activity was to bring the new Kāba of the Crimea to Kaifa to install him in place of the deposed Kāba. Ochialy displayed considerable activity in ship-building, especially after the debacle of Lepanto; in addition he was the builder of the Top khanāh Džamīl at Galata, and of a hamamīn in the sultan's palace. When he died unexpectedly in his own mosque (15th Rezial 995 = June 21, 1587) he left an enormous fortune, which fell to the state.


(J. H. KRAMERS)

**OCSONOBA,** the old name of the circle (district) in al-Andalus corresponding to the present Portuguese province of Algarve, of which Silves [q.v.; Ar. *Ṣīlaḥ*] was the capital. The geographers and historians transliterate this place name in the forms Ukhānāba and Ukhāhāna. We also find the wrong forms Ukhāntya and Ukhānta, the result of graphic errors. The name Ocsunoba seems also sometimes to have been applied to a town which would be the old Santa Maria de Algarve [q.v.] now Faro. On the authority of an official geographical reference it has however been identified with Mlèru (Mlèru) by Hähner (C.I.E., ii. 3—4, 781—785).


(É. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

**OFEN.** [See BUDAPEST.]

**OGHUL,** a word common to all the Turkish languages, meaning "son," *child*; "descendant." In this connection attention may be called to certain formations, such as *oğlu*, "son of a good house"; *bulan oğlu*, which used to be applied to the sons of the janissaries. Oghul is very frequently found in family names where it takes the place of the Persian *sāde* or the Arabic *bād*, e.g. Ḥekim-oğlu or Ḥekim-zade for Ibn al-Ḥekim or Ṭuḥfat al-Khālīr for Ibn Ṭuḥfat al-Khālīr (where it should be remembered that the Arabic *bād* does not mean exclusively "son" but "descendant"). An incomplete survey of such formations in an early period is to be found in *Sidjilli* *ʾothmāni*, iv. 778—812. — The new law on family names will give rise to numerous forms where oghul is combined with names and crafts.

Cognate is oğlan, *boy*; *young man*; *servant*; a word also found in certain compounds, e.g. *oğlan*, "sultan's page"; *oğlan*, "language-boy"; *oğlan*, "interpreter."] From oğlan we also get which, the name for light cavalry.

(FRANZ BARINGER)

**OHOD,** a mountain about three miles north of Medina, celebrated for the battle fought there in the year 3 which ended unfavourably for Muhammad. It is a part of the great range of hills which run from north to south but here spreads to the east over the plain and thus forms an independent group of hills. The rocky walls surmounted by a rectangular plateau — without peaks, Yāḥyā says — "which rise like masses of iron" (Burton) above the plain are quite destitute of trees and plants and only the face of the south wall is broken by a ravine which played a decisive part of the battle. The country round is stony and covered with gravel but farther south there are a few cornfields and gardens watered by a brook, but these are sometimes flooded by sudden rainstorms so that the pilgrims coming from the town cannot reach the hill. The Meccans who had
set out to avenge the defeat at Badr were encamped at the already mentioned cornfields at al-'Irād or al-Lajur, which were then full of ripe corn and supplied food for their animals. Muhammad against his will and against the advice of the elders was forced to leave the town and meet the enemy in the open field, went unhindered past the enemy camp and drew up his troops at the foot of the hill with their backs to it: a strategy no less peculiar than that of the enemy. At first it looked as if the enthusiasm of his followers would secure him a victory like that of Badr. But when the archers, whom the Prophet had placed upon the hill with distinct orders to prevent a flank attack by the enemy and not to leave their positions, were unable to restrain themselves when they saw the Meccan camp being pillaged and hurried up to see what they could get, Khālid b. al-Walid's quick eye at once saw the weak spot and when he attacked it, the tables were quickly turned. When the rumour spread that Allah had protected his Prophet, the Meccan archers gave way, and finally the flight became general. In reality, the Prophet was only wounded, and some of his followers succeeded in concealing him in the ravine. Fortunately the Meccans, little experienced in warfare, did not know how to follow up their victory and began to go home. The Prophet was in this way saved from the worst; but he had to lament the loss of many of his followers, including his uncle Hāmza [q.v.], a loss which he felt particularly. It is not easy to get a clear idea of the treatment of the fallen as the traditions differ very much. It is said that the Medinan at first brought their dead to Medina but the Prophet soon forbade this; some mention a common grave in which those who knew the Kūfān were put in the first row; but according to others the martyrs were buried singly or in twos and threes and some authorities say that the alleged common graves of the martyrs of Oḥd are really those of beduins who died of hunger in the reign of ʿOmar (Wāṣitīd, transl. Wellhausen, p. 143). All accounts however agree in their tendency to glorify Hāmza. The Prophet is said to have uttered the ṣukūr over him first; the bodies of the other dead are said to have been placed beside him one by one and Muhammad prayed over him 70 times, as he included him in the prayer with each new corpse. Every year afterwards the Prophet went to Oḥd, to visit his and the other graves and the early caliphs did so also. Muhammad is said to have ordered that the women in lamenting the death of every Ansārī should begin with a lament for Hāmza. In this way Oḥd became one of the most prominent places of pilgrimage of the Meccan exiles. A mosque was built over Hāmza's tomb and it is mentioned by Muqaddasī; it lay behind a wall near the graves of the other martyrs. We have a brief description by Ibn Dujayr in the 11th (xith) century. He mentions first all Hāmza's mosque on the south side of the hill 3 miles north of Medina; a mosque is built at his grave with the grave in an open space to the north of it. Opposite lay the other graves of martyrs and opposite them again was the cave where the Prophet took shelter on the lower part of the hill. Around the graves of the martyrs is a low wall of red-earth ascribed to Hāmza at which the people seek a blessing. The best modern description is that of Burckhardt who visited the place in 1814 after its devastation by the Wahhabis. From his description we may quote the following: 'About one mile from the town stands a raised edifice of stones and bricks, where a short prayer is recited in remembrance of Muhammad having here put on his coat of mail when he went to engage the enemy. Farther on is a large stone, upon which it is said that Muhammad leaned for a few minutes on his way to Oḥd. To the east of this torrent, the ground leading towards the mountain is barren, stony, with a mound, on the slope of which stands a mosque, surrounded by about a dozen ruined houses, once the pleasure villas of wealthy townspeople; near them is a cistern, filled by rain water. The mosque is a square solid edifice of small dimensions. Its dome was thrown down by the Wahhabis but they spared the tomb. The mosque encloses the tomb of Hāmza and those of his principal men who were slain in the battle; namely, ʿAmār b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh (from the traditions) and ʿAbd Allāh b. Dīnār. The tombs are in a small open yard, and, like those of the Bāṣrī, are mere heaps of earth, with a few loose stones placed around them. Beside them is a small portico, which serves as a mosque. A little further on, towards the mountain, which is only a gun-shot distance, a small cupola marks the place where Muhammad was struck in battle by a stone. At a short distance from this cupola, which like all the rest has been demolished, are the tombs of twelve other partisans of the Prophet, who were killed in the battle. The people of Medina frequently visit Oḥd, pitching their tents in the ruined houses, where they remain a few days, especially convalescents, who during their illness had made a vow to slaughter a sheep in honour of Hāmza if they recovered. Once a year (in July, I believe), the inhabitants flock thither in crowds, and remain for three days, as if they were the feast days of the saint. Regular markets are then kept here: and this visit forms one of the principal public amusements of the town'. In modern times Wavell records that the opening of the railway to Medina in 1906 produced a disturbance among the beduins which resulted among other things in the Banū All, whose duty it was to protect the pilgrims visiting the tomb of Hāmza, while putting no obstacles in their way, declining to take any responsibility. The Wahhabis who now rule in northern Arabia permit pilgrimage but at all the holy places forbid actual worship.


(Th. Buhl)

ʿOḳālīds, a dynasty of al-Mawaṣṣil. The Banū ʿOḳāl belonged to the great Banū Ṣaʿṣa'ah. From their original home in Central Arabia they spread in course of time in different directions and among their better known subdivisions were the Banū Ḥaḍājī (q.v.) and the Muntasīf (q.v.). In the fourth century of the
Hidjra the Banu 'Okail in Syria and 'Utāq were tributary to the Ḥamdānids and when the latter were no longer able to maintain themselves in al-Mawṣil, the city passed to the 'Okailids. The Kūrā chief Būlāk, the founder of the dynasty of the Marsāmids [q.v.], endeavoured to bring al-Mawṣil under his rule whereas the two Ḥamdānī brothers Abū Tāhir ibn Abī ‘Alī and Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥasan presented an appeal for help to the emir of the Banū 'Okail, Abū 'I Hilāw b. Muḥammad b. al-Muṣṭayyib. The latter at once announced his readiness to assist them and was given as a reward Dhnār b. ʿOmar, Naṣūḥ b. al-'Aṣātimūn and the town of Balad. After the death of Būlāk in battle (380 = 990–991) his sister's son Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥasan continued the war with success. Abū ‘Abd Allāh was taken prisoner and when Abū Tāhir went to Naṣūḥ b. al-'Aṣātimūn to seek the protection of Abū 'I Hilāw, the latter took him, his son and several of his retainers prisoners, put them to death and then occupied al-Mawṣil. He then submitted nominally to the Būyād Baha b. al-Dawla [q.v.] and persuaded him to send a representative to al-Mawṣil. But the latter did not see any part of any importance. Baha b. al-Dawla's efforts to make his influence felt in al-Mawṣil did not have the success he desired. Abū 'I Hilāw remained the real ruler. He died in 386 or 387 (996–997) and was succeeded by his brother Abū al-Muṣṭayyib [q.v.]. The latter was assassinated in 391 (Dec. 1000–Jan. 1001) and his uncle son Karwān [q.v.] was recognized as emir of al-Mawṣil. After holding office for fifty years, he was deposed by his brother Abū Kāmil Baraka [cf. ʿAšārāt] in 442 (1050–1051) and on the latter's death in the next year 443 (1051–1052) the rule was passed to his nephew Kūrā b. Bādrān [q.v.]. The latter was succeeded in 452 (1061) by his son Muslim [q.v.] under whom the territory of the 'Okailids attained its greatest extent; their power then declined rapidly. On Muslim's death (478 = 1085) his brother Ibrahim who had been languishing in prison for years was set free and reinstated as emir of al-Mawṣil. In 482 (1089–1090) however, the Saḥīlī sultan Malikshāh invited him to come and give an account of his stewardship and as soon as he appeared he was thrown into prison and his son al-Dawla b. ʿIhilāw [q.v.] sent as governor to al-Mawṣil. Only after Malikshāh's death (Shawwal 483 = November 1092) was Ibrahim set free and returned to al-Mawṣil. In the meanwhile Muslim's widow ʿAṣiyah was also the aunt of Malikshāh, had married Ibrahim, and on the death of Malikshāh she went with 'Alī, her son by Muslim, to al-Mawṣil. But as Muḥammad, another son of Muslim's, also coveted the city, its inhabitants split up into two parties and when it came to fighting, Muḥammad had to take flight, while 'Alī occupied al-Mawṣil. As soon as Ibrahim heard of this he began negotiations with ʿAṣiyah and received from her the town of Balad which Malikshāh had given her as a gift. The Saḥīlī prince Ṭūlūn [q.v.] then demanded that Ibrahim should recognize him as saḥīlī and when the latter refused, the decision was left to arms. In Ḥabīb 1 486 (April 1093) the two armies met near al-Mawṣil; Ibrahim was taken prisoner and put to death and Ṭūlūn occupied al-Mawṣil where he installed ʿAlī b. Muslim as governor. It was however not long before his brother Muḥammad b. Muslim endeavoured to dispute his power. He asked the emir Kūrā b. ʿIhilāw [q.v.] to help him against his brother and the result was that he lost his life while 'Alī had to give up al-Mawṣil (Dhu l-ʿKhāda 489 = Oct.—Nov. 1096).

In addition to the emir of al-Mawṣil, several 'Okailid dignitaries are mentioned in history. In 479 (1086–1087) Saḥīl b. Muḥammad b. Badrān b. al-Muṣṭayyib surrendered Halāb to sulṭan Malikshāh and received in return the fortress of Dāhār [q.v.], to which al-Raṣṭī was soon added and these remained almost without interruption in the possession of his descendants until 564 (1168–1169) when his grandson Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Saḥīl ceded them to Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Zangi.

Another branch was established in Takrit [q.v.]. According to Ibn al-Athīr, c. 289, where a short sketch of the history of the city of this town is given down to the year 500 (1106–1107), the 'Okailī Rāfī b. al-Ḥasan died in 427 (1036) as lord of Takrit. His nephew Abū ʿAmmār ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ṭaghlibī then inherited his governorship. After his brother's death in 435 (1043–1044) he was succeeded by his son Abū Ghiṣḥāshīm. The latter was suddenly attacked in 443 (1052–1053) by his brother Ṭūlūn and thrown into prison and ʿAlī seized the power. In 445 (1053–1054) ʿAlī died and soon afterwards his son Nāṣr died also. ʿAlī's widow Amīra then had Abū Ghiṣḥāshīm, who was still in prison, murdered, and installed a governor named Abū ʿAmmār in Takrit but he handed the town over to the Saḥīlī Sulṭān Tughhrībīb. 'Okailī governors are also occasionally found in other towns, like ʿAṣan, Ḥadīth, Hit and ʿUkkūr. After the extinction of the dynasty in Mesopotamia and the 'Utāq the 'Okailīs withdrew to Bahrain.


OKAYL, name of an oasis situated between Ṭalīf and Nakhl. The Arab philologists derive the name from the root meaning 'to retain', in the middle forms 'to assemble' or from the meaning 'conceal'. Both interpretations are based on the fact that 'Okayl was primarily celebrated for its annual fair, which was held on the 1st—20th Dhu l-ʿKhāda and was at the same time an official occasion of mufšakha, i.e. a gathering of tribes or rather of groups and individuals belonging to the same tribe where individuals competed for honours and for the honour of their tribe.

These assemblies to which poets came to recite their poems, were also great fairs, at which merchandise was exchanged. That of 'Okayl was followed by those of Maḍīṣanah (last ten days of Dhu l-ʿKhāda), of Dhu l-Madīan (1st—8th Dhu l-Hijādī).
and those which accompanied the great pilgrimage. These weeks formed the climax of public life in pre-Islamic Arabia — the truce of the sacred months making discussion of the political affairs of the tribes of the Hijāja possible. The Tummin took no part in them. Islam by condunding hereditary and individual feuds was the cause of the decline of the nasuwim (cf. Manusim).

Muhammad was on his way to the fair of 'Oqba with a few of his companions when at Najjāl' (the qiyam) heard the Qur'ān being recited and were struck with admiration as we are told in the Qur'ān (sūra lxxxi. 1 sqq.; lxxv. 28 sqq.) and ḥadīth (Bukhāri, Addārīn, bāb 105; Tafsīr, sūra lxxxi., bāb 1; Muslim, Šafī, trad. 1497; Tirmizī, Tafsīr, sūra lxxxi., trad. 1).

'Oqba is also noted for the fighting which took place there at the beginning of Islam.


A. J. Wessinck

'OQBA b. NĀFĪ' was the son of 'Abd al-Kāsī al-Ḫaṣāṣhi al-Fīhā, one of the famous generals of the first century A.H., who endeavoured by consolidating the first successes of the Arab conquest in North Africa to put an end to the resistance of the Berbers but finally perished after a troubled career at the hands of African rebels.

The data supplied by the historians regarding the career of 'Oqba are relatively abundant but like all that regards the beginnings of the Moslem state in North Africa have frequently to be taken with caution. They come from later traditions, and W. Marquais has clearly demonstrated the particular bias which they represent (Le passé de l'Algérie mornoumène, in Histoire et Historiens de l'Algérie, Paris 1931, p. 150). It is certain as regards 'Oqba that the essentials of what the Magribi historians have preserved about him are of eastern origin and in addition the most circumstantial accounts of his career that we possess are from the pens of eastern authors: Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥašām and al-Nawawī. The only authority for the African tradition regarding 'Oqba so far known is his descendant Ibn 'Umahādjar. The information, at once detailed and new, found in a Magribi MS. (cf. Bibliography) about 'Oqba's raid into the south of Morocco seems fairly reliable up to a certain point from the very fact of its precision. Use of it after a critical study seems likely to throw doubt upon the statements hitherto regarded as reliable regarding the progress and chronology of the Arab conquest of North West Africa, such as are given in studies, already antiquated like Foundel (Les Berbères, Étude sur la conquête de l'Afrique par les Arabes, Paris 1875), or more recent and more distinguished works but also based on unchecked translations like that of E. F. Gautier (Les titres obscurs du Maghreb, Paris 1927).

This is why in the present state of our knowledge we shall here confine ourselves to tracing a sketch of 'Oqba b. Nāfī's activities in North Africa which need not be considered final on all points.

'Oqba was born in the last years of the Prophet's life and was through his mother the nephew of 'Amr b. al-Ĥāzir (q. v.), the celebrated conquer of Egypt, who shortly before his death in 43 (665) gave him the supreme command in Ifriqiya. According to a story, difficult to verify, 'Oqba at that time was directing his attention to the Sudān and establishing Islam by force of arms at Ghādāmes. But this was only a raid and not a regular occupation of the country. It was not till some years later that we find him preparing for a new expedition, no doubt better equipped than the others. This was the expedition of 50 (670) in which he founded the military stronghold of al-Ḫaṣās-ān (q. v.) in the middle of the province of Byzacene. For this expedition 'Oqba had at his disposal a force of 10,000 horsemen which was gradually increased by the accession of Berbers converted to Islam; with the help of this force he was able not only to attack the Byzantines who continued to hold out in the towns of the coast of Ifriqiya but also the Berbers. The foundation of Kairūnān, forming a strong base for the Arab troops, seems to have very much facilitated if not the occupation and pacification of Ifriqiya, at least its conversion to the religion of and obedience to the authority of the invaders. But it was not 'Oqba who gathered the fruits of this spread of Islam. Ifriqiya remained a dependency of the province of Egypt; the new governor Maslama b. Maḥhad al-Anṣārī dismissed 'Oqba in 53 (665) and replaced him by one of his own clients, Abu l-Muḥādjar, who very soon undertook a raid on Algiers, and according to Ibn Ḥaḍīdhin got as far as Tlemcen (q. v.). On his return to the east, 'Oqba is reputed to have complained to the caliph Muṭawwiyah of the way in which he had been treated by the governor of Egypt and a little later Muṭawwiyah restored him his governorship.

This second appointment of 'Oqba to Ifriqiya may be put with certainty in 62 (683). His enemy, the governor Abu l-Muḥādjar, had in the course of his raid defeated the Berber chief Kusā'īn (q. v.) who became a Muslim and it was on these two that 'Oqba wreaked his vengeance in his turn. He put them into chains and carried them with him wherever he went. At the same time he prepared an expedition on a larger scale than the previous one: the stages of which can be traced from the narrative of Ibn Ḥaḍīdhin. 'Oqba's army, preceded by an advance guard under Zuḥair b. Kaṣāl al-Balawī, advanced from Kairūnān into the Central Magrib, at first encountering in the Ṣāb and again in Tāhir Berber and Byzantine elements which he defeated and received tribute from. He then reached the region of Tangier. The chief of the Ghunārī, Iyyān (Julian) submitted to the Arab leader and became his military adviser. He dissuaded him from crossing the Straits of Gibraltar and undertaking the conquest of Spain and pointed out the danger threatening the Arab troops from the great body of still unconquered Berbers in the Great Atlas and Sīs (q. v.); 'Oqba therefore turned his attention to the Berbers. First of all he occupied the massif of the Zarhūn, took the town of Ullūt (Volubilis), crossed the Middle Atlas and advanced through the Dra (Darān) and Sīs, the inhabitants of which he pursued up to the desert of the Lamṭūn. He
then turned to the Atlantic coast, reached the land of Safl and began to subject the Berber bloc of the Maṣūmidd of the Djebel Daran (Great Atlas) then of that of the Anti-Atlas as far as Tarīddānt [q.v.]. But however brilliant they seemed these successes were nowhere. An advance no matter how brilliant through a scanty meant nothing if it was not followed by a strong occupation which 'Oqba was not able to secure. But when he and his army turned homewards, he does not seem to have realised that all would have to be done again. Kusaila escaped from him and organised resistance, making use alike of the fondness for fighting of his Berber compatriots and the discipline and technical skill of the Byzantine garrisons in the country. 'Oqba trusting to his good fortune did not see the danger. Reaching the Zab, at Thalmas (Tabnā) he went so far as to divide his army into several contingents which he sent off in succession on the road to Kairawān. Trusting the Berbers, who had submitted to him, he had only a small body of Arabs with him when he set out from Tabnā for the A'rās (q.v.). But he was soon surrounded by Kusaila's bands on the borders of the Sahara at Tahādū and fell with 500 of his companions in 63 (683). His grave and that of his companions is still placed on the same place and forms the centre of a little village which bears his name: Sayyidī 'Uqba (vulg. Sidī 'Oqba), a few miles S.E. of Biskra, not far from the old site of Tahādū.


(E. Lévy-Provençal)

AL-ʿOLAMI, Abu ʾl-ʿUmm ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad al-Muṣṭir al-Dīn al-ʿOmarī al-Hanbali, an Arab historian, born on the 13th Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 860 (Oct. 14, 1450) in Jerusalem, studied from 880 (1476) in Cairo, become in 889 (1485) kāfī in Ramla and in 891 (1488) chief kāfī in Jerusalem. He retired in 922 (1516) and died in 928 (1532) in Jerusalem.

His best known work is a history of Jerusalem and Hebron, which he began on the 25th Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 900 (Sept. 17, 1494) and finished on the 17th Ramaḍān 901 (May 31, 1495), entitled al-ʿIshāʾī (Al-Ans, which is sometimes found in the MSS. in place of it and is sometimes corrupted to Dār al-ʿIshāʾ) Bi-Tawāqūf al-ʿArabs wa l-Ḥāfiẓ. For the earlier period he takes almost everything out of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Makhdūmī's (d. 765 = 1364) Muḥāṣir al-ʿArabīn wa Ẓuyrāt al-ʿArab wa l-Ṣuwaq (cf. C. König, Der Kāfī Muṭhir etc., Leipzig Duss. 1896, p. 20) and supplements it mainly with biographical data. The work which exists in numerous MSS. (see Cat. Cod. Ar. Lang. Bag., 4th ed., N°. 957, Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 43, and also Paris N°. 4922, 5759-60, 5999, 6303; Aghnīa, N°. 2976; Killi Al Fagha, N°. 729; Bankof, xov. 1102-105, etc.) was first made known in Europe through extracts in the Journal des Étrangers, 1754, April, p. 2-45, and then through Hamburgen, i. v. From the printed edition, Cairo 1283, H. Sauvage translated Histoire de Jerusalem et d'Hebron depuis Adam jusqu'à la fin du XVème siècle, Fragments de la chronique de Meudjétredyan, Paris 1876. At the end of his work the author announces his intention of continuing it when able to do so. This continuation is found in Leyden N°. 955 down to 914 and in Oxford (see Cat., i. 853) and in the Khalīfīta in Jerusalem (see A. L. Mâmâr, in Journ. Pal. Or. Soc., xi. 1-13). Probably before he wrote his great work, he had written a general history with special reference to Jerusalem and continued it down to the year 896 (1491); this survives in a MS. in the British Museum, Suppl. N°. 488 without title and is perhaps identical with the al-Ṭawāqūf, Kāfī tarīkh fi Ṣaḥāba anwar mentioned by Hitdī Khalīfa, ii. 150; v. 619. To the Taḥkālī Ṣamīlī, ed. Fagnan, Ibn abī Ḥamīd b. Ṣamīlī, Ibn al-Radjāb (d. 793) he wrote a continuation at Manbadī al-ʿAṣr wa l-Tāhirī, M. Berlin N°. 10043, Laletli N°. 2083 (see Spies, Beiträge, 13), in the possession of J. E. Sarkis (Cat. 1948, p. 48, 13, photo in Cairo, Fihrist 2, p. 372). Kamīl al-Dīn al-Majāmī b. Muhammad Sharif al-Ghazzī (d. 1412 = 1500) wrote a continuation of this down to the year 1207 (1792-1793) and on this and the original work Muhammad Dīnī b. ʿOmar al-Ṣaţī al-Ḥabbālī in 1345 (1907) based his Muḥāṣir Taḥkālī al-Ṣaţī, Damascus 1339 (see R.A.A.D., i. 160). Whether the al-ʿOlāmī who is mentioned in Dīnī al-Maswīlī, Muḥāṣir al-Majmūʿ, p. 152 as the author of a commentary on the Divān of Ibn al-Ḥarrīd is the same as our author, is a question which it is impossible to decide without our present knowledge.


(C. Brockelmann)

OLČAṬUH KHUDĀBANDA, eightih Ilkhān of Persia, reigned from 1394 till 1317. He was, like his predecessor Ghāzūn, a son of Arghun, and a great-grandson of Hūlagū. At his acces-
tion he was 24 years of age. In his youth he had been given the name of Kharchanda, for which different explanations are given (cf. the poem by Rashid al-Din reproduced on p. 46 of E. G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, iii. p. 46 sqq. and Ibn Batūṭa, ii. 115), but E. Blochet, in his Introduction à l'histoire des Mongols (G.M. S., xii. 51), has explained the name as a Mongolian word, meaning “the third”. The Byzantine historian Pachymeres calls him Χαρχαρχά (ed. Bonn 1835, i. 459). His mother Uruc Khātūn had him baptized as a Christian, but under the influence of one of his wives he afterwards embraced Islam and received the name Mūhammad, while his name was changed to Khudābād. In addition he took the ēzāfah of Īsā and the name ʻl-Din. When Īsā died, Olcaītū was absent with an army on the Indian frontier of the empire, but there was no difficulty about the succession, as a possible claimant, his cousin Alafrank, had been killed previously. Olcaītū continued the traditional warfare of his predecessors with the Mamlūk Empire and their friendly relations with European Christian powers; some of the letters addressed by him to the Pope Clement V and the English King Edward II are still extant; these letters were brought by his Christian envoy Thomas Hucel, who, in contradiction to the facts, kept up the fiction that his master was a Christian. Olcaītū likewise sent a military expedition to relieve the Byzantine Emperor Michael Palæologus by dividing the force of the Turks in Asia Minor, but this was of little avail (Pachymeres, ii. 588). Against the Mamlūks Olcaītū himself conducted a military campaign during which the town of Rāhba on the Euphrates was besieged in vain (1315). The authority of the government in the interior was strengthened by the conquest of Dīlūn in 1307 and in the same year by the conquest of Herāt from the vassal Kūt dynasty. In 705 (1305-1306) Olcaītū made the recently founded town of Sulṭānīya [q. v.] the capital of his empire, on the occasion of the birth of his son and successor Abū Saʿīd. Prosperity was increased by the laws of Ghāzān, whose code was promulgated again by Olcaītū, and also by the able administration of the famous historian Rashīd al-Dīn [q. v.]; the latter's colleague and rival Saʿīd al-Dīn was executed in 1312 through the intrigues of ʻAlī Shāh, who took his place. The dispute which soon arose between the two ministers made the sulṭān in 1315 assign to each of them the administration of half of the empire. The attitude of Olcaītū towards Islam deserves special notice. After first showing preference for the ʻalifs (cf. the story of Mājīd al-Dīn of Shāhābī told by Ibn Batūṭa, ii. 57 sqq.), he became an adherent of the Sunna. Then, after having attempted to introduce the Sāfi instead of the Ḥanafī madhhab, he finally decided again to join the Shīʿa, after having visited the tomb of ʻAlī; one of his coins affords proof of this.

Olcaītū is described as a virtuous, liberal ruler; he showed interest in the observatory of Marāgha, where ʻAṣīl al-Dīn, Naṣīr al-Dīn's son, was appointed astronomer-royal. He likewise favoured the literary-historical activity of Rashīd al-Dīn and the historian Wāsīf. He died at Sulṭānīya on December 16, 1316; afterwards Rashīd al-Dīn was accused of having caused his death. In Sulṭānīya his tomb is still to be seen.

**Bibliography:** Contemporary sources are the Taʾrīkh Waṣīf, lith. Bombay 1269, and a continuation of Rashīd al-Dīn's Liṯāʼiʿ al-Tawārīḵh, which continuation is found in several manuscripts, but has not yet been edited. Further the Taʾrīkh-e Gūstāb by Ḥamīd Allāh Mustawfī and the later Persian works. — Of European works must be mentioned: D'Oissone, Histoire des Mongols, iv. 437—509; J. von Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der üichen, Bamberg 1843, ii. 178—251; H. Howorth, History of the Turks, ii. 534—535; E. Blochet, Introduction à l'Histoire des Mongols, in G.M.S., xii. Layden—London 1910, passim. — For Olcaītū's coins: Stanley Lane-Poole's Catalogue, vi. 322 sqq.

**J. H. KRAEMER**

**OMĀN,** a nominally independent state on the Persian Gulf under the protectorate of England. Its extent has varied considerably in the course of its history. While ʻIskāḥq, for example, who gives Omān an extent of 300 parasangs, includes the district of Makāt in it, Istīḥrī describes the latter as an independent country. In the northwest Omān was bounded by the province of al-Bahrayn or al-Hājjar, in the south by Yaman and Ḥaḍramūt. The sultanate reached its greatest extent under Sulṭān ʻAbāb Mālik b. al-ʻArābī b. Sulṭān, under whom Omān not only included the territory from Rās al-Hadd to Dīlūn, but also all Bahrein and other possessions, particularly on the African coast where his son Saʿīd conquered Kilwa and Zanzibar. Omān at the present day includes the whole south-eastern part of Arabia with a strip about 500 miles long on the south coast of the Peninsula including the land of Ḫūfār. By the decision of the International Court at the Hague in 1905 in a dispute between England and France regarding the granting of the French flag to owners of sailing-ships in Makāt, the southern boundary was fixed at Rās Sakhar and the coast as far as Khīrī Kābī reckoned to Omān, while at the same time the sultan's claim to the peninsula of Rās Masānshām from Rās Dībba to Tībdah was expressly recognised by both powers. This course does not prevent the actual power of the sulṭān barely extending beyond the coast district of Makāt and Ḫātīn. The population of Omān is estimated to be about half a million, but that of the latter proper at 34,300 only. As regards creed the ʻIṣlaḥīs are preponderant particularly in the south, but the northern districts were inhabited mainly by Sunnis. The capital is Makāt [q. v.] while at an earlier period Sulṭār [q. v.] was regarded as the most important town in the country.

The following details of the distribution of the population may be given: the thickly populated districts of Ḫātīn has 105,000, the Ẓādī Sāmāl 2,800, Makāt 10,000, Māstūrah 11,000, Sus 12,000, Ẓāhīr 7,500. Omān for administrative purposes is divided into four districts: 1. Ḫalīl, the land of the Bani Abī; 2. Omān proper from Bedu to Makīnīvā; 3. Dūrā from the latter place to al-Bureimī; 4. al-Ṭūbān, the narrow strip of coast from Shīb to Khīrī Fakkān. The characteristic feature of the orography of the country is a mountain range which runs from Makāt in a southern direction as far as Sus close to the coast but runs a considerable distance inland north of Makāt and thus leaves space for the fertile low-lying land on the coast, al-Ṭūbān, which is in
A way comparable to al-Tihama in the Yemen, although it never attains the same width, being only from 20 to 30 miles across. South of Rusṭā, just below 23° Lat., almost at right-angles to the former, is a second range, higher in its highest parts, known as Djeibel Akhdar which with 10,000 feet is the greatest height in the country. It runs parallel to the coast as far as Rās Masandam and ends off a second range which runs to Rās al-Ḥalūm. The most fertile part of Ṭūmnān is the already mentioned low-lying coast land of al-Būṣūn where in addition to intensive cultivation of the date-palm, wheat is grown and all kinds of fruits flourish. The Arab geographers praised the dates of Ṭūmnān and al-ʿAṣwāt was not wrong in comparing Ṭūmnān to a garden. Among the fruits special mention is made of bananas, pomegranates, and nebek (louj nebek). A considerable part of Ṭūmnān however is quite unsuited for agriculture; for example the part bordering on the desert zone of Arabia which however contains a few fertile oases among the mountains, for example on the way from Beni Abī All to Nerwa. These oases are watered by subterranean deposits as was long ago pointed out by Ibn al-Ṭāḥif; where the water is not too deep below the surface or there are subterranean channels, springs supply the necessary water to the fields. The climate of Ṭūmnān suffers from the great heat, which is only to some degree tempered by the refreshing winds from the sea in Maskat the maximum in July and August is °91—°88 F. The rainy season is in winter from October to March, but the rains seldom fall more than three or four days in a month; among the mountains heavy storms occur and the snow sometimes lies, in Maskat the annual rainfall is 3 to 6 inches.

The cereals grown are wheat, ẓūna, some rice, the fruits, tamarinds, mango, bananas, pomegranates, quinces, pistachio, aqrami, grapes, almonds, figs, walnuts, water-melons, apricots and cherries, while cotton, sugarcane and indigo are cultivated. Stockraising is now mainly confined to horned cattle; at one time Ṭūmnān was celebrated for its strong, swift camels and asses. The Arab geographers (Ibn al-Ṭāḥif) praise Ṭūmnān’s wealth in fish, which supplied the food of large sections of the community (especially in al-Būṣūn). Industry, once very flourishing, is now confined to weaving on a modest scale in Maskat, Neswa and ʿĪṣār, dyeing in the two last named towns and the making of weapons in Maskat. Idrist mentions the pearl-fisheries of ʿIrī below Cape al-Majdulima and in Dumār. The pearl-fisheries now produce about half the revenue of Bahrein (10-15,000,000 rupees). The Arab philologists (Ibn al-ʿArabī) derive the name Ṭūmnān from ṣamān with the meaning “to stay continually in one place”. According to others the name goes back to Ṭūmnān b. ʿAbī Ḥamīm al-Kalbī, who built the town of Ṭūmnān: this is of significance in as much as the classical writers know of a town called Omans (Pliny, Nat. hist., vi. 149) and Omâns haḏmān (Ptol., vi. 7, 36), this has been identified with Shāhār which was later regarded as the most important trading centre Al-Muḥāzdat (p. 35) compared Ṭūmnān with ‘Aden and Egypt for importance in the world’s trade and called it and Striff [n. v.] the forecourt of China (p. 426). This does not seem however to have much benefited the people of Ṭūmnān, for they were regarded as dishonest, wicked and deceitful merchants; indeed Ibn al-Ṭāḥif (p. 92) describes them in much coarser language. The prosperity coming from the trade and agriculture is evident from the huge yield from taxation, 300,000 dinars in the ʿAbbāsīd period. A dihrām a year was paid on each palm-tree (Muḥaddas, p. 105).

For the early history of Ṭūmnān, Ṣuḥrī’s account may be consulted.

The relations of England with the country have been of great importance to Ṭūmnān. They began in 1798 with a treaty between the East India Co. and the sultan by which the French and Dutch were excluded from the territory for the duration of the war, and this was followed in 1818 by the granting of permission for the E.I.C. to have an agent permanently resident in Maskat. By the treaties made by the French with Saiyid Saʿīd b. Sultan in 1807 and 1808, this resident was joined by a French Consular agent. But French prestige suffered a severe blow when Mauritius was occupied by the English in 1810. In 1839 a commercial treaty was concluded between England and Maskat, modelled on one concluded in 1833 between the U.S.A. and Ṭūmnān. In 1844 there followed a commercial treaty with France, which secured this country the most favoured nation clause and freedom to trade in Maskat for its subjects. In 1862 came the Anglo-French guarantee of the independence of Ṭūmnān, but England was able to secure a predominating influence in Ṭūmnān by vigorously supporting the sultan at his various crises and by paying him a subsidy. In 1894 the English declared in a treaty of friendship, which also regulated questions of trade and navigation between the two countries, and was binding upon himself and his successors, that he would not cede any of his territory in any way to any power other than England. When then, in 1898, the sultan in contravention of this agreement wished to allow France to have a coaling-station in his territory, he had to withdraw the concession on receiving an ultimatum from England; France was compensated with a coaling station in Mukalla [q. v.].

The dispute assumed a more serious aspect which arose out of the practice of the French consul in Maskat giving ships’ papers and French flags to Maskat ships which abused the privilege to carry arms and slaves. The dispute was settled by the International Court at The Hague, the decision being that only those ship-owners who had received permits before January 2, 1892, were allowed to retain them. The result was that in 1917 only ten ships of Ṭūmnān were allowed to carry the French flag. The result has been the practical exclusion of French influence from Ṭūmnān, and the securing of English predominance.

OMAN — 'OMAR B. ABD AL-'AZIZ

A caliph. 'Omar stands apart; he was distinguished from his predecessors and successors alike. Inspired by a true piety, although not entirely free from bigotry, he was very conscious of his responsibility to God and always endeavoured to further what he believed to be the right and conscientiously to do his duty as a ruler. In his private life he was distinguished by the greatest simplicity and frugality, although he is said to have lived no less luxuriously than other Umayyad princes before his accession. Poets who praised the delights of worldly pleasures were therefore not particularly popular at his court.

'Omar laid no special stress on military glory, and his reign which only lasted two and a half years was poor in military events. The siege of Constantinople was raised on his accession to the throne; but it is uncertain whether the Muslim army was actually withdrawn by him. In Mesopotamia he allowed the people of Jurands to evacuate their town whereupon they settled in the adjoining Malaya and Turanda was destroyed. In the far West the Muslim armies crossed the Pyrenees, invaded Southern France and returned to Spain laden with rich booty. On a later campaign which is usually but not quite certain it was attributed to the reign of 'Omar, they captured Narbonne, fortified it, and used it for a time as their headquarters. 'Omar however by no means felt obliged to spread Islam by the sword; he rather sought by peaceful missionary activity to win members of other creeds to the faith of the Prophet and in the case of conversion by this means demanded no tribute. This method proved particularly successful and suitable among the Berbers and it is even said that there was not a single Berber left unconverted to Islam in the government of Isma'il b. 'Abd Allah appointed by him. In a similar way were converted the princes of Sind when 'Omar's governor 'Amr b. Muslim al-Bihili invited them to adopt Islam and promised them complete equality with Muslims; but under Hisham they lapsed again.

His interests were primarily in home affairs. He had the untrustworthy governor of Khurasan Vastin b. al-Muhallab [q. v.] arrested and his post given to al-Djarrab b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakami. In other cases also, the most important offices were filled with men whom 'Omar thought to be capable and just. He adopted skilfully attitude to the 'Alids. The practice introduced by Mu'awiya of publicly cursing 'All in the service of the mosque was abolished by 'Omar. It is said that when he was a boy and his father was appointed governor of Egypt he begged him to forbid the customary cursing of 'All and received the reply that such a step although laudable in itself would be against the interests of the Umayyad dynasty and might give support to the 'Alids claims to the caliphate. 'Omar gave up in favour of the 'Alids the oasis of Fadak [q. v.] which had originally been the private property of Muhammad but was then declared a state domain and had finally become the property of the Umayyads. After his accession he decided that it should revert to its original use and according to one story expressly ordered that it should be handed over to the descendants of Fid'um as the heirs of the Prophet. He also restored to the family of 'Ali the property in Mecca, which 'Abd al-Malik had
agriculture lost much of the labour it required. To overcome this difficulty al-Hajjādjī had imposed the kharājī also upon Muslim landowners who were not paying tribute and prohibited immigration into the cities. This aroused general dissatisfaction but this did not worry him. Omar, on the other hand, adhered to the principle that Muslims should pay no tribute. He further propounded, no doubt by agreement with those learned in the law in Medina, the theory that conquered land was the common property of the Muslim community and therefore could not be broken up and transformed by sale to Muslims into immune private property. Consequently in the year 100 (718 719), he forbade Muslims to buy land which should pay tribute; but he did not make this legislation retrospective and he placed no obstacles in the way of the immigration of new converts into the cities. Further, just claims upon the treasury for compensation for services rendered were never refused: he granted the Mawāli in Kūfah and Medina a share in the spoils, and he paid and exemption from taxation just like Muslim soldiers. He thus furthered the amalgamation of the various elements in the caliph's empire and although his system of reformed taxation did not survive because of the principle of the inalienability of tribute-paying land could not be permanently maintained, he did his best to clear up the existing financial mess.

The historians of the older school described 'Omar as an unpractical idealist, who pursued purely Utopian ideals as a result of his theological preconceptions, without paying any heed to actual conditions, and only modern research has put his work in its true light. His reign was spared trouble from the Khāridjī but hidden forces were working in secret which were to bring about the fall of the Umayyad caliphate.

'Omar died after an illness of 20 days in Rajab 101 (Feb. 720) and was buried in Dāīr Sim'nā near Ḥalab. He was succeeded by his cousin Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik [q. v.].

Very much influenced since his boyhood by pious authorities on tradition, he was one of the authorities in this field and regarded, although wrongly, after his death as one of the first collectors of Sunna. In course of time a whole cycle of pious legends gathered round his name which were quite devoid of any historical foundation. For example we are told (Ibn Sa'd, v. 301, l. 17) that a roll of parchment fell from heaven upon the men who were filling up his grave which assured him security from the flames of hell (aμn min Allāh il-'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz min il-nār). Even the biassed historians of the 'Abbāsid period who as a rule run down the Umayyads on every possible occasion in favour of the 'Abbāsids make an exception in this case and give him the highest praise. His tomb was also left undisturbed after those of the other Umayyads were desecrated after the triumph of the 'Abbāsids.

The persons in his poems are "sensitive, animable creatures, full of individuality. They reveal their souls, they act, they speak. Dramatic scenes, full of feeling stand out vividly before the reader's eyes." (Schwarz). In the form of his verse also 'Omar is a gifted poetical genius who writes without difficulty. His verse flows easily and naturally in simple language. His prosody differs from that of the Beduin poets; although he uses the same metres, he does not prefer those most popular in the old poetry (basit or basi) but flexible and light metres (kofst, ramal, muftary, mansurai). That he did not feel himself bound by tradition is shown by some traces of strophic verse in his poems. It would be a mistake to see in 'Omar the first love-poet of the Arabs. But he was the first to bring this form to perfection. The roots of this genre are to be found not so much in the introductory parts of the old Arabic sagas as in the love-poems, which were particularly cultivated in South Arabia (perhaps not without Persian influence). A study of the surviving fragments of Waddālī-yaman, a contemporary of 'Omar which has been long in preparation by V. Ebermann, will perhaps shed new light on this point.

'Omar attained great popularity with his contemporaries and in the following generations, chiefly among singers, wits and men of letters. But his popularity among learned men was hampered by two things: his simple language offered very few "testi di lingua" in comparison with poets like, e.g. al-Farazād, and the matter of his poems was little suited for study in schools, especially in religious and historiographic ones. The study of Arabic literature in modern times has brought about a change; besides several monographs devoted to him, special chapters are devoted to him in the text books. 'Omar b. Abī Rabīʿa is now so to speak rehabilitated among the Arabs and recognised as a great poet.


IGN. KRATSKICHOWSKY

'OMAR b. AYÜB. [See ḤAMĀ and AYÜB'S supplement.]
OMAR b. 'ALI (SHARAF AL-DIIN) AL-MISJAL AL-SA'DI, generally known as IBN AL-FARID, a celebrated Sufi poet. The name al-Farid (narrow) refers to the profession of his father, who belonged to Hamid but migrated to Cairo, where Omar was born in 576 or, more probably, in 577. In early youth he studied Shari'a law and hadith; then came his conversion to Sufism, and for many years he led the life of a solitary devotee, first among the hills (al-Ma'qat) to the east of Cairo and afterwards in the Hijaz. On his return to Cairo he was venerated as a saint till his death in 632, and his tomb beneath al-Ma'qat is still frequented. The Divan of Ibn al-Farid, though small, is one of the most original in Arabic literature. Possibly the minor odes, which exhibit a style of great delicacy and beauty and a more or less copious use of rhetorical artifices, were composed in order to be sung with musical accompaniment at Sufi concerts (Nallino, in K.S.O., viii. 17); in these the outer and inner meanings are so interwoven that they may be read either as love-poems—a fact to which they owe their wide popularity in the East—or as mystical hymns. But the Divan also includes two purely mystical odes: 1. the Jamalikya of Wine Ode, describing the intoxication produced by the 'wine' of Divine Love, and 2. the Naga al-Suluk or 'Pilgrim's Progress,' a poem containing 760 verses, which is often called al-Tawfiq al-aqdar to distinguish it from a much shorter ode rhyming in the same letter. In this famous kalila, nearly equal in length to all the rest of the Divan together, Ibn al-Farid depicts his own experience as a Sufi. The result is not only a unique masterpiece of Arabic poetry but a document of surpassing interest to every student of mysticism (for a résumé of the contents, see Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, p. 195—199). Its whole character is psychological rather than speculative; though some passages are pantheistic in feeling and expression, it bears little or no trace of the intellectualism which marks the system of Ibn al-'Arabi; and the charges of heresy brought against the poet do not appear to be justified. Among Sufis the Tawfiq occupies the position of a classic, and many commentaries have been written on it.


OMAR (Abu DAFAR) b. HAFS was appointed governor of the province of Ifriqiya by the Abbadid caliph al-Mansur in 151 (768). He belonged to a family which in the time of the Umayyads had furnished a number of high officials to the state. One of his uncles, al-Muhallab b. Abi Ṣafra, had attained fame as governor of Khurasan under 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan. Omar whose bravery was celebrated had himself held a command in the eastern provinces: he had been given the Persian epithet of Haawarmad "1,000 men".

The difficult situation in Ifriqiya at the time justified the choice of an energetic governor. Barbary had gone over almost entirely to various sects of the Kharidji heresy. The chief leader of the movement was the Sufi Abi Kurra. The Arab djund showed little enthusiasm to fight the rebels and besides, it was much divided by old tribal rivalries.

Omar b. Hafs, appointed by the caliph, brought with him 500 horsemen. He cleverly won the hearts of the people of Kairawan and was able to secure the country over three years of peace. Al-Mansur having given him orders to strengthen the defences of Tobina [q.v.], an old town, the strategic position of which on the western borders of the empire was becoming so important, Omar went there with some contingents of the djund. Ifriqiya being thus demoralised, the Berbers rose and Omar's lieutenant Habib al-Muhallab was killed. This initial success encouraged the rebels who concentrated a large force around Tripoli under an 'Abdji chief. Al-Dumain b. Bashiir, who had assumed command at Kairawan after Habib's death, asked for reinforcements from Omar b. Hafs. He received them but was defeated. The insurrection now became general. Kairawan was again besieged and soon Omar himself who had only 15,500 men under him was besieged in Tobina by several Kharidji armies, 'Abdji and Sufi united under the command of Abi Kura and numbering over 73,000 (the figures given are of course not at all reliable). Omar wished to cut his way through his opponents but his companions prevented him. He then tried to bribe Abi Kurra to leave his allies and offered him 60,000 dhurams but the offer was rejected. Omar then turned to his brother (or son) and obtained for 4,000 dhurams the succession of the Sufi. Abi Kura had then to withdraw. Omar b. Hafs, thus rid of his enemies, sent a corps against the 'Abdji Ibn Rustam who had to take refuge in Tathert (Tiaret) [q. v.].

Omar was again at work in strengthening the defences of Tobina when he learned of the critical situation of Kairawan. The town blockaded for eight months by the 'Abdji Abi Hikim was in dire straits. With 700 men of the djund, he hurried to Ifriqiya but instead of marching on Kairawan he took the road for Tunis, enticing the Berbers after him. He succeeded in getting supplies into Kairawan which he then entered himself. The siege was resumed with fighting every day. Food again became very scarce. Omar b. Hafs wished to send two chiefs of the djund to procure supplies but they refused to go. He then decided to make a sortie himself which meant certain death, without awaiting the reinforcements of 60,000 men which the caliph was sending him. Throwing himself on the enemy "like a camel mad with rage" he fell on the 15th Djnu 'Hijrija 151 (Nov. 27, 771).

'OMAR b. HAFŞÜN, leader of a famous rebellion in Spain, who at the end of the ninth century A.D. held out for years against the Umayyad emirs of Cordova, has only been heard of by us in the end brought to book by the caliph 'Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâṣir [cf. Umayyad]. His full name was 'OMAR b. HAFŞÜN b. 'OMAR b. Jâfar called al-İslâmî, from his conversion from Christianity to Islam and he claimed descent from an ancestor named Alfonso who had the title of count (comes). 'Omar's father Hafs or with the specifically Spanish suffix (-ûn), Hafşûn, was thus the grandson of a Visigothic lord who had become a Muslim and lived on the income from his lands at Ismate (Hîn Awî) in the region of Ronda [q.v.] in the south of Spain in the middle of the 8th century A.D. His son while still quite young displayed a very violent temper and as a result of a crime committed by him against the person of one of his neighbours, had to escape for a time to North Africa, and spent some time at Tâhert [q.v.]. He only returned home to rebel at once against the Umayyad emir of Cordova. Having gathered around him a small body of followers he established himself in 267 (880) in a ruined fortress of Bobastro (Ar. بسطورة; q.v.), which he restored.

Duty has identified this castle with el Castilión, to the south of Campillos, between Teba and Antequera, relying on the discovery at this place of an inscription, mentioning the municipium Singmium Basbacnse, while Simontet thinks that its site corresponds to las Mesas de Villaverde, a little farther south between Ardales and Carrastraca. Excavations have recently been begun in the district in order to find the ruins of Bobastro. Whatever be the real position of the castle, we know that it commanded the valley of the Guadalhorce in the direction of Malaga and from there Ibn Hafshûn could disturb a considerable part of the territory of the Álora of Reiy, which a governor dependent on Cordova was supposed to rule. 'Omar having had several successes, the governor tried to bring him to reason but without success and he lost his post. He was no more fortunate. Soon Ibn Hafshûn was exercising complete authority over all the inhabitants of the mountainous region which extends from Ronda towards Granada, Malaga and Algeciras. The Umayyad emir Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân had to organise a regular expedition against him the command of which was entrusted to his vizier Hâshîm b. 'Abd al-'Azîz. Ibn Hafshûn submitted and went to Cordova to offer his services to the Umayyad emir in 270 (883). But his submission did not last long; in the following year the rebel had regained the mountains of Bobastro and took by storm the castle in which Hâshîm had put up a strong garrison.

From this time on Ibn Hafshûn begins to play the part of a champion in the nationalist movement in the south of the peninsula, where he put himself at the head of all the malcontents, whether Christians or neo-Muslims (musulûnîn). The rapid growth of his rebellion did not fail to disturb greatly the Umayyad emir whose position each day became more precarious. The task of bringing Ibn Hafshûn to book was given to the heir-presumptive al-Mundhir b. Muhammad, who laid siege to one of the rebel's principal supporters Hârid b. Hamlûn al-Rûfîyî in his castle of Alhama. But in 273 (886) the emir Muhammad died and al-Mundhir had to go back to Cordova to be proclaimed in his place. Ibn Hafshûn seized the opportunity to organise resistance in all the mountainous districts of Southern Spain and had himself recognised as leader of the rising by all the inhabitants.

On ascending the throne al-Mundhir found himself faced by a critical situation. But he at once took the necessary steps with great energy. There were continual encounters between the rebels and the loyalist troops; in the end al-Mundhir set out in person to lay siege to Bobastro, but after the siege had lasted forty days he died, undoubtedly poisoned at the instigation of his brother 'Abd Allah who succeeded him.

The new emir displayed no less energy than his brother. Ibn Hafshûn had profited by events to increase his influence and according to the chroniclers the land which he ruled was only separated from Cordova by a day's journey. After a truce which only lasted a few months, 'Abd Allah and Ibn Hafshûn resumed the struggle. The Umayyad emir at first directed his attention to two rebel chiefs, Sawwâz b. Hâmidûn and Sa'd b. Dûjî, whom he conquered, while Ibn Hafshûn was collecting a considerable army at Polei [q.v.]. But 'Abd Allah with a superior army defeated him, put him to flight and took Polei in 278 (891), then Esija [q.v.] and finally laid siege to Bobastro again. But the rising of the Bani 'Hashîjîdî in Seville created a diversion in favour of Ibn Hafshûn, who from now on seems to have received at least the moral support of the Fâtîmids of Ifrîqiya.

The rest of the reign of 'Abd Allah passed without any great successes being obtained. It would take too long to detail here all the negotiations followed by agreements, more or less observed, which went on during these very troubled years. But the most striking gesture of the rebel was to repudiate Islam openly and, in order to have the more complete support of the Christians of Andalusia and Cordova, to return to the religion of his ancestors. Ibn Hafshûn then took the name of Salîh and proclaimed himself not only the leader of the Spanish nationalist movement but the champion at the same time of a regular crusade against Islam.

The situation was then very critical when 'Abd Allah's successor, his grandson 'Abd al-Rahmân III al-Nâṣir, mounted the throne of the emirate of Cordova in 300 (912). Without delay the new sovereign saw that it was necessary before all else to dispose of this threat which was steadily increasing in magnitude. Not only the future of his dynasty was at stake but also that of Islam in Spain. For several years he made his preparations with the greatest care and displayed exceptional tenacity. The mountainous districts of Andalusia were blockaded, attacked and reduced in turn. Ibn Hafshûn, more and more surrounded in the Serranía de Ronda, finally died in 306 (918) leaving to his sons the task of continuing the resistance.

According to some chroniclers, Ibn Hafshûn in the last years of his life, seeing the futility of his efforts, submitted to 'Abd al-Rahmân III and even gave him one of his sons as a hostage. He is himself said to have taken part in the campaigns against the Christians of the north in the Umayyad army.

In any case after the death of the aged rebel,
the ruler of Cordova, now favoured by circumstances, set himself to neutralise completely the influence of the sons of Ibn Ḥaṣṣūn. The eldest, Dijăfar, was attacked at Isna and finally fell a victim to a plot. The second, Abū al-Raḥmān, after holding out for a time at Torrox and at Almuñecar, met his death in an encounter at San Vicente. The third son, Ḥaṣṣūn, was besieged by Abū al-Raḥmān himself in Bobastro and surrendered in 928 to serve in the Umayyad ranks in Galicia. The final capture of Bobastro marked the last stage in a rebellion of unexampled extent, the suppression of which had been the main case of three Umayyad rulers. It was the crowning achievement of the efforts of Abū al-Raḥmān III al-Ẓāhir to secure the complete consolidation of his territory before beginning the attempt to advance its frontiers to the north.


‘OMAR b. HUBAIRA. [See Ibn Hubaira, l. enprā, ii. 388.]

‘OMAR bN AL-KHAṬṬĀB, the second Caliph, one of the greatest figures of the early days of Islam and the founder of the Arab empire. Religious legend has naturally in the case of Omar, as with other heroes and saints of Islam, filled his biography with a mass of apocryphal details. Nevertheless the main characteristics of his personality are revealed to historical research with sufficient clearness for it to be possible to understand his character and assign him his place in the formation of Islam. Like many other people whose strongest characteristic is an energy of will, Omar began by being the declared enemy of the cause which he was later to support with all his strength. Legend has perhaps somewhat coloured the stories of Omar’s persecution of the early Muslims and exaggerates in representing his conversion as the sudden result of his having overheard some verses of the Qurʾān read in the house of his sister Fatimah, with her husband, Saʿd b. Zaid, had early given ear to the Prophet’s preaching. It is from this sudden reversal of his attitude as well as perhaps from the fact that it was under Omar that Islam became a world phenomenon, from the simple incident in Arabic history that it originally was, that Omar has earned the epithet of the “Stephen of Islam” which the west has given him. In reality there is nothing in common between the two, except for the stubborn energy with which they later championed the cause against which they originally fought. As with all great converts, we have in his case only an example of change of polarization of the same exclusive and uncompromising attitude which, recognising no middle course, is as impetuous in devotion as in hatred. Tradition places the conversion of Omar in his 26th year, four years before the Hijra. It is probable that the round figure of 30 which we thus get as the age of Omar at the beginning of the new era has something artificial about it. But he was in any case certainly in the flower of his vigour when he began his new career as apostle of Islam. Besides, at first his support was only personal and legend has no doubt exaggerated its importance. Omar was not able to assist the new religion through the power of his clan (he belonged to the Banū ʿAbī b. Ka'b who being only Karāsh al-Zawāhir enjoyed no influence in the political life of the merchant republic) and his position with regard to his fellow-citizens was in no way outstanding. Even if it is true that, as tradition has it, as soon as Omar joined the community of the faithful, the latter’s faith in its ultimate triumph was increased, his intervention certainly had no influence on the events which led to the migration to Medina. It is only in this town alongside of the Prophet and apparently through the prestige of his initiative and strength of will that Omar without holding any official position began to be the real organiser of the new theocratic state. His part was that of counsellor rather than of soldier; although he took part in the battles of Badr, Ohji and later ones, practically nothing is recorded of his military exploits, accounts of which are so abundant in the case of ʿAlī and other Companions. Tradition which traces to his initiative no less than three Kur’ānic revelations (ii. 119: on the worship of the wāṣfīn Ṭurābīn beside the ʿAla‘b; xxiii. 53: on the veiling of the Prophet’s wives; ivxi. 6: on the threat of punishment for stealing with (the same woman)) is probably not only true but may even record only a few of the cases in which a suggestion from Omar stimulated the Prophet’s inspiration. What is remarkable about Omar in the Medina period his perfect agreement with Abū Bakr, a concordia which is both a surprising thing and one which is a tribute to the two great champions of Islam — was never disturbed by jealousy. The fact that Omar like Abū Bakr, also became the father-in-law of the Prophet through the marriage of his daughter Haṣṣūn, did not arouse the slightest feelings of rivalry in him; on the contrary it was he who on the death of Muḥammad thrust the caliphate upon Abū Bakr. The ingenious theory put forward by Lammens (M. F. O., B. ii. 113 sq., and reproduced in Etudes sur le siècle des Omayyades) about the "triumvirate Abū Bakr, Omar, Abū ʿObaidā b. al-Djāfrijī" (these three individuals united by a bond of intimate friendship are said to have dominated and so to speak monopolised the authority of the Prophet, controlling him either by direct action or through
his wives, Khadija bint Abi Bakr and Hasa bint 'Omar). 'Omar may be to some extent correct but should not be pushed too far. It is beyond question that 'Omar, the greatest brain of the three, was able in the lifetime of Muhammad as well as during the brief caliphate of Abil Bakr to resist the temptation to come too much into the foreground. But as soon as the first caliph was dead the power naturally passed to him. The question whether the dying Abil Bakr designated 'Omar as his successor has been the subject of much discussion by the theorists of Muslim constitutional law. As a matter of fact, there does not seem to have been any formal act of investiture which would in any case have been of no value for it would have been quite out of keeping with Arab custom. 'Omar assumed power de facto and the recognition which was at once given him by the majority of the Companions assured him the exercise of it in a way quite similar to that in which the nomination of the emir in the tribes took place, who, as we know, was only firmly seated when the individual approval of the members of the tribe had been obtained after an effort and not obtained after it. The system however primitive gave no trouble, except when the feeling between two parties was acute; this is what happened at the election of Al. Against 'Omar there was only the dissatisfaction of the *legitimist* party of Al. and the Anšar who had however been defeated too recently when Abil Bakr had become caliph to feel like organizing a regular opposition.

'Omar at the beginning of his rule found that the great expansion by conquest had already begun; he had perhaps contributed more than any other to its beginning in his capacity as adviser to his predecessor. This is not the place to discuss once more the traditional story of the Arab conquests, nor to subject to a revision the well-known thesis of Castrani on their origin and character. This thesis has seemed to lessen considerably the importance of 'Omar's personal action and to take from him the glory of having been their initial and director, according to Castrani conceived in advance of the campaigns against the Byzantine empire and Persia. In reality there is reason to marvel that a simple citizen of Mecca should have been capable of controlling with an undisputed singleness of command undisciplined levies of Beduins, scattered over a vast area and should have been able to keep control over their chiefs who were practically the sole masters of the position. If the military victories were not due directly to 'Omar it was certainly to him that the credit should go of never having lost control of his generals and above all of having been able to make use of the powerful and talented family of the Omayyads, without however allowing them to have a free hand. His quarrel with Khallid b. al-Walid who, after having won the most brilliant victories for 'Isam, was dismissed and died in oblivion, gives us an idea of the political talent of 'Omar and the extent of his authority. The knowledge of the limits of his power (which is the mark of political genius) caused him to treat the wily 'Amr b. al-As with tact and to leave him the initiative in the conquest of Egypt. But he was careful at the same time to put at his side an old Companion of the Prophet, al-Zubair, as a check upon him. He was careful in general
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in the slightest degree the necessary qualities to overcome them.

While orthodox tradition reverses in 'Omar not only the great ruler but also one of the most typical models of all the virtues of Islam (cf. a list of his merits in the work of al-Muhibb al-Tabarî, al-Riyâds al-malâ'în fi Manâhîh al-Asârîr, Cairo 1927), the Shi'a has never concealed its antipathy to him who was the first to thwart the claims of 'Ali (cf. Goldziher, in W. Z. K. M., xv. 321. 1924). The ḥalâf teaching although it exalts the ascetic austerity of the life of 'Omar, has very little to do with him; besides this type of puritan lends itself very little to mystical speculations whether in its historical reality or in its idealisation in legend.

Bibliography: All the historical material is to be found collected in L. Cestani, Annali Islam, iii., vi. (Milan: 1909–1912); vol. vi. contains the historical synthesis of his caliphate and vi. the general Index. The material contained in the works on Hadith, which has only been partly utilised by Cestani, is collected by A. J. Wensink, A Handbook of early Muhammadan Tradition, Leyden 1927, p. 234–936, s.v. 'Omar.

'OMAR EFENDI, an Ottoman historian, according to popular tradition originally called Elkasović or Casević, belonged to Bosnian-Novii. Of his career we only know that he was acting as kâli in his native town when fierce fighting broke out on Bosnian soil between the Imperial troops and those of Hâkim-Oghlu 'Ali Paša (1150 = 1737). 'Omar Efendi at this time wrote a vivid account of the happenings in Bosnia from the beginning of Muhammad 1149 (May 1736) to the end of Djamâd 1 1152 (end of March 1739); written in a smooth easy style, this work is of considerable importance for social history. It seems to have been called Ghasawat-i Hâkim-Oghlu 'Ali Paša but is usually quoted as Ghasawat-i Dîyâr-i Bosna, and sometimes as Ghasawât-nâm-i Bâtalûz (i.e. Banjaluka in Bosnia). As a reward for this literary effort, 'Omar Efendi was promised to be one of the six judges (rückâl-i welâ-i ğc). Of his further life and death nothing more is known. It is certain that he ended his days in Bosnian-Novii and was buried there. The site of his grave is still pointed out but the tombstone has disappeared.


Bibliography: Sâlevedegi Balâgâh, Balâgah-i Hordzâji v i i lânmîyî kharnâmât, Sanâvjo 1912, p. 152; F. Bahinger, G. O. W., p. 276 n. 15; Mehmed Hanfî, Kâlicenînâd bosnî-kirî-
OMAR KHAYYĀM, famous Persian scientist and poet of the Seldjuk period (d. in 526 = 1132).

Biography. Although reliable information on Khayyām's life is scarce, we cannot underestimate the importance of the sources at present available.

In his Algebra he calls himself Abu l-Fath 'Omar b. Ibrahim al-Khayyām, and in his verses he uses Khayyām ("tent-maker") as his sobriquet. It is likely that this nickname refers to the profession of his ancestors. W. Litten, in his pamphlet Was bedeutet Chahājum? Warum hat O. Chajjam... gerade diesen Dichternamen gewählt, Berlin 1930 (25 p.), has suggested the possibility of a technical interpretation of Khayyām as "poet, expert in metrics" (cf. Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. Khalīṣ, Muṣījām, in G. M. S., p. 13–16), where metrical terms are explained by the names of different parts of the tent (kast in Arabic both "house" = "tent" and "verse"). However, in the well-known quatrains, such as Khāyāmī hi khāmē-khā-yī šāmat mādīkātī, the reference is evidently to "tents" and not to "verses".

Khayyām was a Khurāsānī, from Nishāpūr or its neighborhood. The date of his birth is unknown. He was already famous as a mathematician in 467 (973–974) when Abu l-Mu'āsafar Asfārā'ī and Māmūn b. Nāṣīr al-Dīn Wāṣīst (cf. Ibn al-Āthir, x, 67, under the year 467) he was invited by Malik-Shīkh to collaborate in the reform of the Persian calendar. (cf. LALN). In 506 (1112–1113) Niẓām-ī-yi Arūnd met 'Omar, who calls Husainī al-Hāfiz, in Balkh and in 530 (1135–1136) visited his grave in the Ilīta cemetery of Nishāpūr (it then being four "variant: some"") years since he died). Consequently the probable date of Khayyām's death would be 526 (1132). (On Khayyām's grave beside the shrine of Muhammad Mahūrī and see Muhammad Ḥasan, Mātri al-Shamsī, ii. [Tehran 1303 = 1885], p. 101, 173; Sir F. Sykes, A pilgrimage to the tomb of Omar Khayyām, in Travels and Exploration, London, Sept. 1900, ii. 120–138, and Williams Jackson, From Constantia to the Home of Omar Khayyām, New York 1911, p. 240–245. See also a picture in the Times, July 16, 1934). On the occasion of Fīrūz al-Dīn's millenary (Oct. 1934) the Persian government took the occasion also to erect a new monument of white marble over Khayyām's tomb.

Niẓām-ī-yi Arūndī's Čahār Maḥāla, written ca. 531 (1136), remains the oldest contemporary witness to 'Omar. The second and even more important biographer is Abu l-Hassan 'Ali Balkhāī [q.v.; died 565 (1169)]; the relevant passages, already known through quotations in Shahrārī's works, have been translated by Jacob and Wiedemann, "Zu 'Omar-i Chahājum, in Ill., ill. (1912), p. 42–62 (English transl. of the principal passage by Sir E. D. Ross and H. A. R. Gibb, in B. S. O. S., v. 467–473). Balkhāī calls 'Omar al-Destūr al-Fattāsh. Husainī al-Hāfiz Omar b. Ḫurāsānī al-Khāyāmī. He says that he had a disagreeable character and was not so nice to his pupils as for example Asfārā'ī. However, when in 597 (1153) Balkhāī (at that time only 8 years old; cf. Yānī, 13 Ḫānā’ūn al-Arūndī, v. 208) visited 'Omar, he latter examined him in Arabic poetry and geometry and expressed his satisfaction. Malik-Shāh (cf. also Čahār Maḥāla, p. 65) and the [Khāruqshī] Shams al-Mulk of Būkhārā (d. 472 = 1179) were particularly kind to 'Omar but Sandjar had a grudge against him. Among the persons who had direct intercourse with 'Omar are mentioned Abū Hāmid Muhammad al-Ghazālī and the learned prince of the Kāshgārī dynasty Fārābūr b. 'Alī b. Fārābūr. In different contexts he is called follower of Abū 'Ali b. Sinā (Avicenna). Though he was a scholar in philosophy, jurisprudence and history he was no prolific writer and of his works Bākjākī mentions only a short treatise on physics (Mukhtasar fī 'l-Takhtiyār), a treatise on Existence (fi. 'l-īnāfa) and a treatise on Being and Obligation (al-kawn wa'l-Takhtiyār). In the Khūṣūṣ al-Kār of 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kūkhī al-Īsfahānī (written in 572 [1176–1177]) Khayyām is mentioned as an incomparable scholar of his time enjoying a proverbial reputation (hihi yafrūb al-maṣīhil). Khayyām (d. 595 = 1198–1199) refers to him once in a verse. Among the later sources may be mentioned Shams al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, Miṣrī al-Ṭūsī (660 = 1222–1244) where 'Omar is called "an unhappy philosopher, atheist and materialist", Kīфт, Ta'rikh al-Hullābī, ed. Lippert, p. 243–244 (the passage first utilised by Woepcke), represents Khayyām as a follower of Greek learning (cf. Bīrāhīm). Shahrārī's Nuzhat al-Ārūndī (12th century) chiefly repeats Bākjākī. Ṭūsī al-Dīn in his Dīvān al-Ṭawārīkh is the earliest authority known for the tale of three schoolboys: Niẓām al-Mulk, Ḥasan-i-Sabbāh and Khayyām. The chronological discrepancy involved in this story was already noticed by A. Müller: Niẓām al-Mulk was born in 408 (1017) and there are no indications that Khayyām [or Ḥasan-i-Sabbāh] died at the age of more than 100 years (cf. A. Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, ii. 97, 111; Browne, A Liter. Hist. of Persia, iii. 190–193. On the different explanations of the legend see Houtum's preface to the Budārīh, p. xiv., note 2; Muhammad-Khan Kazwī in Browne's translation of the Čahār Maḥāla, p. 138 and latterly H. Bowen, in J. R. A. S., Oct. 1931, p. 721–728). However, the facts remain that Niẓām al-Mulk must have met Ḥasan-i-Sabbāh (cf. Ibn al-Āthir, x, 110 [year 494]) and that Khayyām in his metaphysical treatise dispassionately mentions the Ismā'īlī among the seekers for metaphysical truth, but the authorship of the treatise is suspect.

Khayyām as a scientist. Khayyām's scientific activities for a long time eclipsed his poetical renown and in 1848 Reinaud in his learned introduction to Abu l-Fidā'i's Geography wrote: "malheureusement, 'Omar allait avec l'astronomie le goût de la poésie et du plaisir".

On the reform of the calendar for which Khayyām is responsible jointly with his colleagues, cf. DIALI. MSS. of Khayyām's principal work on Algebra exist in Leyden, Paris and the India Office (see Woepcke, L'algèbre d'Omar Alkhayyami publié, traduite et accompagnée d'extraits de ms. inédits, p. 185). Khayyām's introduction to his researches on Euclid's axioms (Mudāhir) has been translated by Jacob and Wiedemann, in Ill., ill. (MS. in Leyden). The treatise Mudāhirī al-Dirghīr exists in Munich. G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, Washington 1927, i. 759–761, calls Khayyām "one of the greatest mathematicians of
Of metaphysical works of Khayîm a MS. of the above mentioned treatise on Existence is in Berlin and a MS. of a little Persian treatise (Dar 'Ilm-i Kulliyat) in Paris. Of the latter Christensen has translated several chapters, Un traité de métaphysique de Omar Khayyâm, in M.O., i. (1905), p. 1–16. This treatise, of the contents of which Christensen has a poor opinion, is dedicated to a certain Fâghr al-Milla wa'l-Din Mu’ayyad al-Mulk, probably one of Nišâm al-Ḫallâm’s sons.

Finally must be mentioned the Nawwâs-name of which the existence was first revealed by F. Rosen, The Quatrains of Omar Khayyâm newly translated, London 1910, p. 5–18. The text based on the unique Berlin MS. (Rosen, 1365 a.d.; Muḥammad Khân Karwini: “not later than the 11th century of the Hûjâra”) was published with notes and a glossary by Mûsâbî Mîmowî, Tbrân 1933. This treatise is a presentation pamphlet written at the request of a friend. The matters relating to Nawwâs (q.v.) occupy only 19 pages out of 77; the rest is taken up by such subjects as gold, horses, falcons, wine, beautiful faces. The treatise does not show any deep knowledge in the compiler and its authorship, for several reasons, cannot be considered as finally established. An incomplete copy of the same treatise (perhaps the first 45 pages out of 77 of the printed edition exists in the British Museum, Add. 25,568, fol. 86°–101°: Khâshât dar tâlîbi Narowûn (anonymously). For lists of Khayîm’s scientific works see Brockelmann, G. A., i. 471; Sater, Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber, 1900, p. 112; Muḥammad Khân Karwini, note to the Ābāb, p. 220–221; Caullik, op. cit., introduction (21 names are quoted of which some are only Persian equivalents of Arabic titles).

In a very detailed book Khâshât, an avâz namowzâh mu’âskin sur naqîdîn nahar, published in Hindustan by Sâyid Sulaimân Našâwi, ’Azamgarh 1933 (508 pages), the following scientific works ascribed to Khâshât have been reproduced: Risâla al-Ḵawān wa-l-Tâlîkin (with further polemics on the subject); Risâlat al-Ḫallâm (published in Cairo under the name of Ḍiyâ al-ḵârî); Risâlat al-Ḵâlîfât also called al-Ḵâlîfât a’l-Mawâqif; Risâla fî Khayîmûz wa-l-Ḫallâm (in Persian); Miṣân al-Ḫalla.”

Khâshât as a poet. Already Imâd al-Dîn ʿIsmâḥî in his Khâshât al-Ḵâṣâr (572 = 1172) mentions Khayîm among the poets of Khâshât and quotes four Arabic verses of his. Naṣîm al-Dîn Râzî cites two quatrains in Persian: Shahrûzî gives three Arabic fragments (?) numbering respectively 4, 6 and 3 verses [while the Persian translation of Shahrûzî, finished in 1011 (1602), substitutes for them 2 Persian quatrains]; that of 6 verses belongs to the same poem as the verses quoted by Imâd al-Dîn. Kifî reproduces exactly the latter’s quotation, Djuwâlî (658 = 1260), l. 128, puts a Persian quatrain into the mouth of Sayyid ʿĪsâ al-Dîn who was counting the victims of the Mongol invasion in Khwarizm in 618 (1221). One quatrain is found in the Torşâ Ḫustâ, in G.M.S., p. 518. From 741 (1340) we possess 13 quatrains preserved in the Muʿāwîa al-Ḫâṣar. The MS. edited by F. Rosen contains 134 quatrains, but its date 721 (1321) is certainly wrong. The other oldest collections of the eighth (xvth) century are:

- Stambul A.S. 1032: 861 (1456–1457) 131 quatrains;
- NO 3892: 865 (1460–1461) 315 quatrains;

Later the number of rubāʿîyât in some MSS. rapidly rises: the MS. in Vienna (Flügel, Handschriften, i. 496, No. 507) dated 957 (1550), has 482 rubāʿî, that of the Bankhäuser Public Library, dated 961 (1553–1554), 604 rubāʿî, till finally in the Lucknow edition of A.D. 1844 one finds 770 rubāʿî. Miss Jessie E. Cadell (Pracer’s Magazine, May 1879) is said to have collected from all available sources 1,200 quatrains; see the list of the MSS. in Caullik, op. cit., p. 37–39.

Already in Th. Hyne’s Veterum Persarum..., religiones historiae, Oxford 1700, p. 529–30, there is found a Latin translation of Khâshât’s quatrain Ay, râbûta-yi râbûta-yi râbhant, For the first time several Persian quatrains were published in a Persian grammar compiled by F. Dombat in Vienna in 1804. Khâshât’s renown in Europe, however, was long based on his scientific activities and it is noteworthy that his Treatise on Algebra was translated in 1851, while the first edition of Fitz-Gerald’s famous version of the quatrains was published in 1859, the French edition by Nicolas in 1867, and only since the second edition of Fitz-Gerald’s version in 1868 has the wave of admiration for Khâshât swept through western lands.

Critical studies of the text started only in 1897 when Žukowski published his article “Omar Khayyâm i stronoutynienîhli instruktûzatîhui, in al-Mawâqifîhui, a presentation volume to Prof. F. V. Rosen, St. Petersburg 1897, 360 pp., made more widely accessible in an (abridged) translation by Sir E. D. Ross, in J.R.A.S., xxii., 1898, p. 349–365. Žukowski’s merits consist in: 1. rendering accessible some old texts on Khayîm’s biography entirely unknown up to that time, and 2. shattering the uncritical belief in the authenticity of the existing collections of quatrains. Žukowski showed that 82 out of 464 quatrains included in Nicolas’ edition are found also in the studies of
39 other authors (and sometimes simultaneously in the Ḡūram of several poets). He then divided these 82 quatrains into different subject groups and thought that the proportion thus obtained would (in inverse order!) serve as a hint for the characteristics of Khayyām. For example, the interpolations of epicene character represent 33%, and those which give expression to Muslim free-thinking 29%. Therefore, the safest way is to take as a basis the least interpolated groups *of which the authenticity has been shattered the least*. Consequently Żukowski attaches a particular importance to the "mystic sūfism" in Khayyām's poetry. This theory (which puzzled Christensen, *Recherches*, p. 10, and misled Hortmann, in W.Z.K. *M.*, xvii. 367) is certainly insufficient both psychologically and statistically, for it is not the percentage of interpolations but that of the remaining quatrains which is of importance. So Żukowski's discovery of a high proportion of *wandering* quatrains is valuable only as a negative principle (cf. Barthold, in *Zap.* xxv. 403-404). The thoroughness of Żukowski's work is shown by the fact that the later researches by E. D. Ross and Christensen resulted in the raising of the total number of authentic *"wandering"* quatrains only to 108.

In his *Recherches sur les Rubū'īyat de 'Omar Ḥaŷyān*, Heidelberg 1904, Christensen went one stage farther. Stating how rapidly the number of quatrains increased since the date of the Bodleian MS. (only a century later the Bankipur MS. contains 604 quatrains!), he postulated a similar process for the time separating that MS. from Khayyām's death (over three centuries): *how many quatrains then would remain attributable to Khayyām? A diwan is transmitted tolerably intact, whereas a collection of rubū'āt is much more exposed to tampering*. Consequently *there exist no criteriā of genuineness both as regards the form and the matter* of the quatrains (p. 32). Christensen admitted only the probability that the twelve rubū'āt containing Khayyām's name were written by Nadjum al-Dīn Rāzī had some chance of being genuine. [But even one of the 12 quatrains of the first category has a variant ascribed to Aḥmad al-Kāshī!]. The more optimistic conclusions of Christensen are that those 14 quatrains *contain, so to speak, in nucleus all the rubū'īyat* and that in general the poetical and historical importance of the rubūʿīyat must be severed from the question of their authorship. As Khayyām wrote in the national Persian spirit the later addition kept "within the same cycle of ideas" (see the 14 quatrains above mentioned). Only the few mystical and erotic quatrains seem to be interpolations foreign to Khayyām's nature. In a following chapter Christensen studies the historical traits of the Persian national character and winds up by saying that *Khayyām's spirit is the Persian spirit as it existed in the Middle Ages, and as in substance it is nowadays* (p. 86). This part of Christensen's reasoning must be inevitably accepted cum grano salis, such matters admitting unfortunately no final demonstration. A further step in the study of Khayyām's text was the discovery by Muḥammad Khān Kastwīnī of 13 quatrains in the anthology *Munīs al-ḥārīr* (composed and copied in 714 = 1310; see Sir D. Ross, in *B. S. O. S.*, iv/iii, p. 433-439). F. Rosen, in the Persian preface to his new edition (1925) of the Rubū'īyat (also in *Germ. Zeit.*, p. 285-313), criticised the exaggerations of the theory of *"wandering"* quatrains but authenticated only 23 rubū'āt (those quoted by Rāzī, Ḥujawānī etc., six of those containing the name of Khayyām and 13 of the *Munīs al-ḥārīr*). Finally, after a new revision of all the materials available, Christensen in his *Critical Studies in the Rubū'īyat of Omar Khayyām*, Copenhagen 1927, offered a new criterion to ascertain the genuineness of the quatrains. He divided (p. 19) the collections of quatrains into three categories: those in which the quatrains are disposed without any alphabetical arrangement, those with single alphabetical arrangement (i.e., in groups according to the final letter of the rhyme) and those with double alphabetical arrangement (under each rhyme letter the quatrains disposed in the order of the first letter, of the beginning word). He takes the first arrangement as the oldest and of this group mentions five specimens: one bearing the apparently false date 721 (1321), one dated 902 (1496) etc. The double alphabetical arrangement is already found in the Bodleian MS. and the single alphabetical one must be presumably later. Moreover Christensen noticed that in different collections (of the first and second class) there were found series of quatrains "in the same, longer or shorter succession" (p. 13). Though the comparison of the non-alphabetical group led to a purely negative result" (p. 27) as regards the establishing of a textual tradition, Christensen suggests that in some cases (MSS. dated 1328 and 1540) the principle underlying the non-alphabetical arrangement was the disposition according to the contents. Moreover he thinks that we may "learn something by studying the total stock of the texts" (p. 27) and consequently (p. 39) lays down an elaborate system of rules based upon the number of times a given rubūʿāt is found in different groups of MSS. This system being strictly enforced entails considerable changes in the former views on the subject: the six best attested quatrains containing Khayyām's name are now considered spurious, one uncertain and four genuine (p. 40). Finally 121 quatrains which have stood the test are taken as a basis for a new characteristic of Omar.

The new method, in spite of its mathematical character, greatly depends on the materials utilised by its author. H. Ritter in his important review of Christensen's work (Zur Frage der Echtheit der Vierteiler: *'Omar Khayyām*, in *O. L. Z.*, 1929, No. 3, col. 156-163) has quoted 7 ancient MSS. found in Constantinople. Of these the two oldest (that of 861 = 1456 containing 131 quatrains, and that of 865 = 1461 containing 315 quatrains) are non-alphabetical while that of 876 (1471-1472) containing 330 quatrains is alphabetical. This fact is partially in favour of Christensen's views but the order in the two non-alphabetical MSS. is different from that of BNI (the oldest of the non-alphabetical MSS. quoted by Christensen, dated 902 = 1496-1497 and containing 213 quatrains. On the other hand, the MS. of 865, contemporary with the famous Bodleian MS., contains double the number of the latter's quatrains. Lastly two of the MSS., mentioned by H. Ritter contain each 478 quatrains in a special arrangement by Yer (ما) ʿAbd al-Raḥīm al-Tahbīzī, who in 867 (1462-1463) arranged the quatrains
in nine chapters according to their subjects. This fact, Ritter thinks, may be responsible for the traces of a similar arrangement in the two later MSS. (dated 1528 and 1549) mentioned by Christensen [on Tabrizi's redaction a paper was read by M. F. M. Köprüülu-nâde at the Orientalist Congress at Oxford; it was also known to Jussein Dânî; v.l.]. So H. Ritter falls back upon Christensen's conclusions of 1904 and in a somewhat modified form insists on the practical impossibility of authenticating this or that of Khâiyâm's quatrains. The rubûd-yâh have been transmitted by methods typical of popular songs (typische Volksliederlieferung); they express the popular feeling of the masses (Volksempfindung) which opposed the official religious and literary spirit of foreign origin. As now we happen to speak of a truly "Khâiyâm" quasiuran, so historically the particular genre must have been associated with the great savant, and Christensen's attribution of his selection of quatrains to "Omar" can be understood only in the sense of a collective name for all what is looked upon as a manifestation of a peculiar tradition (Einzelfiederlieferung).

Finally must be mentioned the discovery of a MS. dated 1423 and containing 206 quatrains announced by Maftûh al-Hâfî at the meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, on April 5, 1932, and H. H. Schäfer's paper "Der geschichtliche und der mythische Omar Châziyâm, read at the Orientalistenstag held at Bonn at the end of August 1934. Schäfer is extremely and perhaps excessively sceptical as regards the attribution of the quatrains to Omar Khâiyâm. He concludes by saying that "Khâiyâm's name must be struck out of the history of Persian literature". He also doubts the authenticity of the treatise published by Christensen and the Nasrûn-nâma. Schäfer's paper will appear in book form. For a summary see Z. D. M. G., xlii, 2, 1934, p. *25—*28.

Conclusive. The upshot of the preceding study is that we possess nothing approaching a roccentric receipt of Khâiyâm's poetic works. What should we say if for characteristics of a historical personality we had his correspondence in which scarcely a single letter could be authenticated and many were decidedly spurious? Taking for instance, the important point of "mystic-Sufism" we find that Zakowsky makes a strong point of it in Khâiyâm's poetry, while Christensen denies its importance, though in support of this insufficiently attested tendency one could quote Khâiyâm's metaphysical treatise in which the most honourable place is reserved to the Shâtí seekingers of Truth (cf. Rosen, 1926).

The striking contradictions in the ideas and feelings expressed in the rubûd-yâh have struck all those who have written on Khâiyâm and the characteristic trait of the "type associated with Khâiyâm" seems to be precisely the alternation of sarcastic pelasgism and epicurean hedonism, of the consciousness of frailty of our contingent existence and the joyful motto of "carpe diem". Nevertheless it must be admitted that the pessimistic side of Khâiyâm's poetry is better attested by the quotations in the older biographers and, what is more, by the Arabic verses of Omar Khâiyâm which may have suffered in transmission but which certainly could not be imitated by popular tradition (F. Rosen has utilized the Arabic verses in his penetrating study of 1926).

FitzGerald's version. Khâiyâm's popularity among large circles of the public is chiefly due to the English version by E. FitzGerald (1809—1883). This paraphrase of exceptional poetical merits, consisting in the second edition of 110 quatrains [third edition: 105], cannot be taken for a translation in the strict sense of the word. E. Heron-Allen who most carefully compared the English and Persian texts (Some side-light upon FitzGerald's poem "The Rubûd-yâh of O. Khâiyâm", 1898) has established that 49 quatrains are faithful paraphrases of single rubûds; 44 are traceable to more than one rubûd; 2 are inspired by the rubûd found only in Nicolas' edition; 2 reflect the "whole spirit" of the original; 2 are traceable exclusively to 'Attâr; 2 are inspired by Khâiyâm but influenced by Hâfî and 3 (only in the first two editions) could not be identified. As manifestations of the almost religious feeling with which the admirers treat FitzGerald's version may be mentioned the 'Omar Khâiyâm Club, founded in London in 1892 (and its numerous editions in the U.S.A.), as well as J. R. Tuth's book, A concordance to FitzGerald's translations, London 1906.

Bibliography. See the works mentioned in the present article. For the older bibliography see H. E. H., in G. F. P., ii. 275—277; Browne, A Literary History of Persia, 1906, ii. 248—259; Krusny, Istoriya Peresi (Trudi po novoevostvovaniyu, xvi, tome i, No. 4, Moscow 1909, p. 358—390. Last in date and very complete is A. G. P. Potter, A bibliography of the Rubûd-yâh of 'Omar Khâiyâm, together with kindred matter in prose and verse pertaining thereto [second edition], London 1929, 314 pp. [contains 1,368 printed items and mentions 50 principal MSS. and 35 editions of the text].


not only in his verses, but also in many passages in his letters. As regards subject, his poems are mainly çâgasla of praise or lamentation. Satires (hâijkâ) are rare as he had once promised his father never to insult a Muslim (Dowson, ii. 791). This of course did not prevent him from mocking officials of Christian origin in epigrams which are quite obscene (Dowson, i. 342, 334); in keeping with the taste of his time we frequently find in his Dowson pornographic lines (i. 333, 353; ii. 421, No. 343). The form of his poetry follows tradition in matter and composition; only a few muwahhadât are attributed to him (Dowson, i. 388-391; to be added in M. Hartmann, Das arabisch-ägyptische Gedicht, i., Weimar 1897).


OMDURMAN (umm DURMAN), a town of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan situated on the west bank of the main Nile immediately below the junction of the Blue and White Niles. A seven-man steel bridge built in 1925-1928 connects Omdurman with Khartum (q.v.), and the two towns (together with Khartum North on the right bank of the Blue Nile) form for practical purposes a single city; but whereas Khartum as the seat of the government and the centre of foreign commerce has acquired a European character, that of British and Levantine elements Omdurman remains the focus of native life and the internal trade of the Sudan. The inhabitants number some 110,000, of whom the great majority are natives drawn from every part of the country.

The importance of Omdurman is of very recent origin. It started as an insignificant village in the territory of the Fintu (a branch of the Ummiyya tribe) and is first mentioned as the dwelling-place of an ascetic and holy man, Humad ibn Muhammad generally known as Humad. Walâd Umm Maryûm, who lived from 1649 to 1728 A.D. (see MacMichael, History of the Arabs in the Sudan, i. 277). The site first became important when it was fortified by Gordon for the defence of Khatum against the Dervish army of Muhammed Ahmad (q.v.) who captured it on January 15, 1885, ten days before the fall and sack of Khatum. Under Muhammed Ahmad's successor, the khâlif 'Abd Allahi, Omdurman was the capital of the Mahdist state and the religious centre of the new sect. The Mahdi's tomb, a domed building designed by an Egyptian captive, was erected in the middle of the new settlement which henceforth was known as Buq'at al-Mahdi, the [holy], place of the Mahdi, and by the khâlif's ordinance the duty of visiting the tomb was substituted for the orthodox pilgrimage to Mecca. In order to consolidate his personal rule the khâlif induced large numbers of his fellow-tribesmen, the Ta'âlgha and other Buq'ata from the western Sudan, to settle in Omdurman where they could support themselves only through the spoliation of the riverain population; this migration was described as hujjar in accordance with the Mahdist practice of establishing analogies between the life of Muhammed Ahmad and his companions and the early history of Islam. The population of Omdurman was further swelled by the enforced settlement of large numbers of tribesmen from all parts of the country whom the khâlif desired to concentrate at his own headquarters for political or military reasons. The town grew up in a haphazard fashion and, apart from the houses of the khâlifs and his principal amirs, consisted of a straggling mass of straw huts covering a length of about six miles from south to north. The khâlif's "mosque" was a vast open space in the centre of the town enclosed by brick walls. For a graphic description of Omdurman under the khâlif's rule see Sir Rudolf von Slattin's Fire and Sword in the Sudan.

The reconquest of the Sudan by the Anglo-Egyptian forces under Sir Herbert (later Lord) Kitchener was completed by the battle of Omdurman on September 2, 1898, the scene of which was near the village of Karima a few miles to the north of the town. Under the new administration the town has acquired such modern features as regularly laid-out streets, tramways and electric light. The houses of the well-to-do townsmen and the government buildings are built of brick and stone, but a large part of the town still consists of the rectangular mud buildings which are characteristic of the northern Sudan, and the life of the busy markets preserves its Oriental and African character. Associated with the principal mosque there is an institution known as al-mud'dar al-dînî, presided over by a shâlik al-全县î (religious guide), which provides instruction in the traditional subjects of Muslim learning. The khâlifs employed in Muslim law courts are however drawn from students of the Gordon College in Khatum. For secular education Omdurman possesses a government intermediate school and several madrasahs (government elementary schools) as well as a number of schools maintained by missionary societies and by private enterprise.

often reprinted); Report on the Administration, Finance, and Condition of the Sudan (H. M. Stationery Office, London 1925, and annually).

(S. HILLIETSON)

ORĂMĂR, UMKAR. The administrative geography of Turkey speaks sometimes of the şahâ of Orămăr containing two nâşiyâ, Džihan and Ilptâkim, with 32 townships and 25,910 inhabitants (cf. Cuinet, Turquie d’Asie, ii. 759), sometimes of a nâşiyâ of this name forming part of the şahâ of Gawar, in the sandjak of Hakkarî, in the wilâyet of Van [q.v.]. We incline rather to the second definition, having visited this district, lost in the middle of Central Kurdistân. Not only has Orămăr not the importance of a şahâ but the two nâşiyâ attributed to it are inhabited exclusively by Nestorians [q.v.] the one, Džilî, being autonomous while Orămăr is at present at least purely Kurdish and an appanage of the house of Mâla Mîrî, a tribe of Duskânî Zhûri and not Herikî (Cuinet, op. cit.): a further proof of the inaccuracy of the Turkish statements regarding this part of Kurdistân. The boundaries of Orămăr are on the north Işhtân and Gawar; on the south Rehân; on the west Džilî, Bâz and Tghûma [cf. NESTORIANS] and Arûtşâ; in the east Sâr [cf. SHAMÂMIN]. Orämăr situated at a height of 5,920 feet (cf. Dickson) is a group of hamlets scattered on the two sides of a rocky mountain spur above the Kûhârî Şîne. On the spur itself which is called Gaparâni Zher, at the place named Gire Bîli, is the capital of the group and the residence of the qâla, the Naw Gund or *middle of the town*. A large cemetery occupies the promontory at the end of the spur. The name Gire Bîli which we explain as the "hill of the idol" seems to indicate the antiquity of the settlement. The fact that the slopes separated by the Gapara are very carefully cultivated and present a complicated system of little terraces: each of which is a field or tiny kitchen garden, leads one to believe that man chose this site for habitation a long time ago, perhaps simply on account of its extreme isolation in the centre of a wild country.

Orography. On the general character of the country see the article NESTORIANS. Orămăr is at east end of the curve traced by the system of the Džilî Dîgh. According to Dickson, the chains and valleys of Turkish Kurdistân run roughly along the parallels of latitude and take a south-eastern direction as they approach the Persian frontier and at the point where they change their axis form a complicated system of heights and valleys. The most complicated part near the centre of the change of axis in question may be called Harkî-Orämăr.

Road system. Although they are really nothing but tracks used for intertribal communications, it is nevertheless interesting to indicate the directions to connect the routes in the road-system which we have studied at Rawânî and Shamâmin [cf. these articles] which must have played a much more prominent part in ancient times. Orämăr is connected with Gawar via Shamsîkî, the pass of Buthazîn, ‘Ali Kânt, Bûlîrî and Dîza. It is a road which shows traces of works undertaken at the more dangerous places. To the south the road going through a very narrow defile leads first to Nerwa (cf. below) where it forks: 1. to the west, by the district of Arûtşâ, via Bîri-Éti-Tîtim and the district of Nerwa via Willa and Dîri Hîlâmî, this last place being on the left bank of the Great Zûb opposite Sûriya on the road from ‘Akra; 2. to the east, by the district of Rekânî, via Bezâlî-Şahdîa and Asî Marîk (water course) to Bazzan and Bahîr Râs on the left bank of the Great Zûb opposite Bira Kepran, also on the road from ‘Akra. A third road goes from Nerwa to Nehîrî, the centre of Shamâmin, via Raga, the heights of Peramî (frontier of the three tribes — Rekânî, Harkî, Duskânî), Dëri, desile of Harkî (Shîwa Harkî), Begor, Mâza, Nehîrî. — It is to be hoped that with the final delimitation of the boundary between Turkey and the ‘Indê, this region will be properly surveyed and mapped and will no longer at present show so many blanks and inaccuracy on the maps (cf. Asia Francaise, Oct.—Nov. 1926, treaty of delimitation)."
that the saint Māri Māmtī escaped from martyrdom in the time of Jullān the apostate at Caesaarea in Cappadocia and took refuge in the mountains where he collected the reptiles and shut them up under a flagstone over which was built the church which bears his name (cf. Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum, ed. Bedjan, vi., 1896). The life of the saint however contains no mention of Orāmār or other towns but it does attribute to him certain powers over wild animals. The version collected by Dickson seems to differ too much from the life of the saint. Dickson thinks that the church was erected on the site of an Assyrian sikhurāt. In any case the following is the description of the sanctuary which is guarded by the Nestorian family bearing the title of Sardar Bi Māri Māmtī. Were it not for a very little door adorned in the upper part with a Nestorian cross and two circles within which is the same cross, one would not suppose that the building of rough stone in the form of a parallelepped was a church. In the semi-darkness of the interior one can see that a quarter of the area is taken up by the sanctuary while his separated from the nave by a wall in which are two doors. Through that on the left one approaches an altar proper represented by a stone over three feet high and about two broad half built into the wall with rounded edges and narrowing towards the top. Above this altar is an embrasure which admits a little light; on the left in the wall is a small niche. From the sanctuary a door through a stone wall leads into another chamber in which there is a primitive baptistery carved out of the rock and a little lower on the same base a hearth (tuma) for the preparation of the unleavened bread. In front of this part set aside for the divine offices there are two pulpit also in stone for the liturgical books and for the Gospels and the cross. The bells are replaced by two metal plates hung from a rod connecting the two walls at the bottom of the vaulting. There are no sacred images. The dimensions of the church are 40 feet long, 17 broad and 16 high. According to the legend, the reptiles shut up beneath the altar would come out if the family of guardians were deprived of their sacred privileges. The dust from the walls possesses virtues against the bites of mad dogs, the stings of snakes and scorpions, etc. — We have very little certain information about the Nestorian churches of Kordištān, some of which, that of Mār Bihūn on the Persian frontier (Tergwar), that of Mār Zaia at Djīlī that of Mār Sawa at Ashīta as well as the ruins at Kučanīs mast with Mār Māmtī go back to a high antiquity between the 4th and 5th centuries, for it is to this period that we are told we must put the coming of the first missionaries, Mār Avgīn, Mār Bihūnt etc. The plan of Mār Māmtī may be compared with that of Mār Bihūnt given by Hearst (Aurēt and Christians), while in W. A. Wigram (The Assyrians and their Neighbours, London 1929) is a sketch of the interior of the church of finally Shālihu at Kučanīs. In any case there is reason to believe that Orāmār was once inhabited by Christians. A local tradition even suggests that the ancestor of the modern Zadīs came long ago into this Christian district and by stratagems and intrigues succeeded in driving out its inhabitants. The toponymy of Orāmār seems to confirm this. The etymology of the name Orāmār itself would also seem to be Aramaic. — We owe to Mgr. Goceia, the interpretation of the name as Ur-mār, "citadel of the master" (cf. Ur-ṣḥallūm). This explanation would be corroborated by the inaccessible character of the region. It would confirm at the same time our supposition that this district was inhabited at a very early date. — There are similar place-names elsewhere in the region: Ora Bihūnt, one of the slopes of Kiria Tawka (cf. above); Orānī, a village beyond Gelia Nu; Uri, a Nestorian clan; finally Urumīa itself. Bibliography: The only works with which we are acquainted are listed in our joint study with E. B. Soane, Suto and Tato, a Kurdish text with transl. and notes, in B.S.O.S., iii., p. 1. — In the review of the Geographical Society of Paris appeared in 1953 our study on Le système routier du Kurdistan, containing besides many geographical details a general view of Orāmār from a rare photograph. (B. Nikitine) ORAN (WAHRAW), a sea-port town on the coast of Algeria (33° 44' N. Lat.; 0° 39' W. Long.). The anchorage which is protected on the west by the heights of the Aïdour, the extreme end of the little range of the Marjada, and the bay of Mars al-Kahir, 10 miles distant, was probably the Portus Divini mentioned in the Itineraire of Antoninus. According to the Arab writers however, the town was founded not by the Arabs but by other towns on the same coast, by Andalusians: at the beginning of the tenth century (c. 290 a.H.) a band of these émigrés came there under the leadership of two chiefs in the service of the Umayyads of Cordova, Muhammad b. Ahi 'Awn, and Muhammad b. 'Abdūn who concluded a treaty with the families of the Berber tribe of the Aṣūdja settled in the district. Seven years after its foundation, Oran, which the agents of the Umayyads had no doubt wished to make a base for the enterprise of their masters, felt the repercussions of the rivalry between the Umayyads and the Fātimids of Kairouān. A body of soldiers sent by the latter and supported by the Aṣūdja Berbers seized the town and burned it. Rebuilt, Oran was placed under the authority of the Fātimid governor of Tīyāret. Throughout the fourth century (tenth a.H.) it was held alternately by the Fātimids and Umayyads and was taken and re-taken and destroyed (notably in 910 and 954) and rebuilt by expeditionary corps or Berber chiefs representing the two rival caliphs. In spite of these vicissitudes, the town enjoyed great economic prosperity as a result of its position on the coast. The geographer Ibn Hawkal, who visited it in the second half of the tenth century, thought that there was not a more sheltered port in the whole of Barbary. The commercial relations with Spain were considerable. (The town however at this date was under the authority of sīfāt al-MAḤMD [cf. XABAD], a vassal of the Fātimids). Large quantities of wheat were exported from it. The country around was well cultivated. The river (Wāḍt Reh, now covered over in its passage through the town) served to irrigate the fine gardens. In the eleventh century, Oran belonged to the Banū Khater, a branch of the Maghrībi Zenāts who ruled in Tlemcen. It was from them that the Almoravids Yusuf b. Tashīfī took the town when he conquered the Central Magrib in 472 (1081). 63 years later it was to be the scene of the dramas in which Almoravid power met its end.
On Ramadam 27, 539 (March 23, 1145) the second last emir of the dynasty, Tashfin b. All, defeated near Tlemcen by the Almohads, died there. Three days later the town passed to the Almohads.

Under its new masters the town prospered. Idriest described it as surrounded by a good wall of earth and possessing well-furnished bazaars. The harbour which was supplemented by that of Mars al-Kabir was within easy reach of Almeria. It had a naval arsenal and 'Abd al-Mu'min built ships there.

The part which it played in commerce with Spain became still more important when the 'Abd al-Wadid [q.v.] replaced the Almohads in the Central Maghrib. Oran was, along with Honain, to the east of the modern Nenours, a port of Tlemcen. The wealth of the capital depended on the possession of these ports and on the safety and liberty of traffic on the roads which led to them. This explains why throughout the 14th century when the Marinids came to besiege Tlemcen, they sent a force against the coast to try to take Honain and Oran. In 748 (1347) the Marinid Abu'l-Hassan built two forts there.

At the beginning of the 15th century, the Castilians, continuing the work of the Reconquest on the Berber coast, endeavoured to take Oran, which had now become a dangerous centre of piracy. They were only able to take Mars al-Kabir in 1505 and Oran in 1509. On May 17, Pedro Navarro entered the town, massacred 4,000 Muslims and sent off 8,000 prisoners. Cardinal Ximenes who had organised the expedition came in person to take possession of the new conquest. Wishing to develop their success the Spaniards interfered in the quarrels of the last 'Abd al-Wadid kings of Tlemcen. They gave their support to one of these princes who had lost his throne and this provoked the intervention of 'Arud [q.v.], the Turkish comair of Algiers. The latter having been defeated and killed, the 'Abd al-Wadid Abu 'Abd Allah was restored to the throne of Tlemcen by the Christians in 1543 and became their vassal. The other expeditions from Oran as a base produced little result and were ended by the disastrous expedition of the Count Alcañiz against Mostaganem in 1558. The Spaniards were at Oran, as elsewhere, practically confined within their walls, badly supplied by their Berber allies (los Moros de Par), exposed to famine, plague and the attacks of the Berbers supported by the Turks; they nevertheless held it till 1708. After a siege of five months, they capitulated and the Bey of Mascara, Bil Shalgham, took possession of it in the name of the Bey of Algiers.

At the end of twenty-four years of Turkish rule the Spaniards re-entered the town. The Count of Montemar, having routed the Arabs who held the coast, entered the town which was undefended in 1732. Bil Shalgham tried in vain to re-take it. At last in 1791 after a terrible earthquake in which almost 2,000 perished and which was followed by an attack of the Bey of Mascara, Muhammad al-Kabir, the king of Spain Charles VI agreed to surrender Oran to the Bey of Algiers; some 70 or 80 Spanish families remained in it however. The town restored to Islam became the residence of the Bey of the West and remained so till 1830. On Jan. 4, 1831, the French, already masters of Mars al-Kabir, entered Oran.

The town has developed immensely since then.

The population, which was 3,800 in 1832, is now over 166,000. Of this total the Muslims number at least 25,000. They live mainly in the southern quarter known as the "village noir". Among the Europeans the element of Spanish origin is considerable.

There is little trace of its Muhammadan past in Oran. The Spanish period has left more, notably the old fortress with its gateway adorned with vigorously carved coats of arms.


ORFA (Greek Edessa, Syr. Orthos, Armen. Urhay, Ar. al-Ruhâ), an important town in Dijar Mudar, the ancient Osrhoene.

The origin of the town, which must have existed before the Macedonian conquest, is lost in obscurity. Repeated attempts to prove the existence of the name in Assyrian times (E. Honigmann, Urfa Kellinierschrift nachzuweisen, in Z. A., N. F., v. 1930, p. 301 sq.) have so far failed. The original name was probably ʿOrpha which has survived in that of the spring Kahlisf, which lay below the walls of the town, and in that of the district of Osrhoene (cf. ʿOrha in Isid. Charac., i., ed. Muller, in G.G.M., i. 246; ʿUluma, Steph. Bry., s. ʾūluma; Arabes Orient., Plin., Nat. Hist., v. 35; vi. 25, 129; in inscriptions Osrhoeni, C. I. L., vi. 1797; their land was called in Syriac Bith Orhaβ; Cureton, Spiss. Syr., p. 20). A derivation of the Syriac Orhaβ from the Arabic Wurhāl (a familiar form from warhāl, "rich in water") has been proposed by Markwart (in E. Herford, in Z. D. M. G., Ivxv., 1914, p. 865 sq.) and can hardly be accepted; as little probable is that from Orhaβ, the alleged first ruler and eponym of the town.

Edessa was refounded by Seleucus I on the site of an older settlement (Koseh-Hieron, Chron., ed. Helm, p. 127) and renamed by Antiochus IV (Antochia ou Kahlisf, Plin., Nat. Hist., v. 86); Edessa was the most important自从 the formation of the city in the 3rd century BC, coins in Babelon, Reis de Syrie, cii.; Head, Hist. Comm., iii., p. 274 and Hill, Greek Coins of Arabia in the British Museum, London 1922, p. cxxiv.-cxlvi. and 91-119). It received its Hellenistic name very probably from that of the capital of Macedonia (the ancient Aigai, now Voedena) and the wealth of water may have contributed to the choice of the name (Steph. Bry.: ʿEdesa, πολλας ζωος, διὰ της θεωρ, σομαν σταφυλαν ςικτης μετα της της Μακεδονικος; Nöldeke, Hermes, v. 459, wished to extend ʿEdesa to Ṭepa, but cf. Ṭepa from ʿtd: ʾṭepa, ʾṭepa, from which Voedena is derived: G. Hoffmann, Die Makedonen, Göttingen 1906, p. 257; J. Marquart, loc. cit., p. 665 sq.; W. Tomasek, in S. B. A., Wiesbaden 1920, p. 61 sq.) The city was destroyed by Almanzor in 1021 and was never rebuilt.
According to Malalas, the town was also called 'Avtazias (Avtazias) (p. 418 sq., ed. Bonn).

In the pre-Christian period Edessa, like Harran, was the centre of a planet-cult. Edessenses called Venus "Bath Nikkal" (Doctrina Adadii, p. 24), i.e. "the daughter of Ningal" (G. Hoffmann, in Z.A., xi, 1896, p. 235-260, § 11; Winckworth, in Journal of Theol. Stud., xxx. 402).

Before the foundation of the Osrhoene kingdom, the town seems to have been an unimportant place under the Seleucids (to 153 B.C.). Its earlier history is quite unknown. The kings of Osrhoene, whom the Romans regarded as Arabs (Tacit., Ann., xii. 12, 14; Plin., Nat. Hist., v. 85; Arabum Oriboeum), bore Nabataean (Ma'nati, Bakrit, 'Adud, Sahrun, Gebar, 'Arju), Arabic (Abab, Ma'ur, Wilp) or Parthian (Parhad, Pharnagat, Pharnagastes, Parhagastes) names. From the end of the first century A.D. the dynasty was closely related by inter-marriage with that of Adiabene (Duval, Hist. d'Edesse, p. 27 sq.) which then ruled Nisibis also (Josephus, Ant. Jud., xx. 68).

The names and chronology of the kings of or, as the Greeks called them, toparchs or pharaohs of Edessa (Osrhoene) are known from the *Edessene Chronicle* (composed about 540 A.D.) and the *Chronicle of Zuksini* (near Amid; preserved in the same Cod. Vat. Syr. 162) written about 775 A.D. According to the *Edessene Chronicle*, the dynasty ruled for 352 years, and began in 133-132 B.C. with Orhul bar Hawwiya, but according to Y. Gutschmidt, rather with Arju (Doct. Adadii, ed. Phillip, p. 47), whose name is not to be regarded as Iranian (v. Gutschmidt, in Mem. de l'Acad. Imp. de Scienc. de St. Petersb., series vii., xxxv., 1887, p. 19) but as Semitic (*'Lión*) (Duval, Hist. d'Edesse, p. 26 sq.).

The list of toparchs which has been corrected by von Gutschmidt from historical references and coins is as follows: they were under Parthian suzerainty (first (down to 87 B.C.) Arju (132-131 B.C.); 'Abad, bar Ma'ur (127-120); Phrahad, bar Gebar (120-115); Bakrit I bar Phrahad (115-112); Bakrit II bar Bakrit (alone 112-94) together with Ma'nat I 94 with Abgar I Pek'a 94-92; Abgar I alone 92-68, in whose reign the kingdom passed for a short time to Tigranes of Armenia; Abgar II (Ariamis) bar Abgar, of the family of Ma'nat, hence in Florus III, 117, and Ruf. Fest., Brev., 17; Mazor, Mazaras, with in friendly relations with Rome about 65-64. After the battle of Carrhae there was an interregnum of one year (53-54). Ma'nat II Allath (Theon, 52-34); Pakuri (34-29); Abgar III (29-26); Abgar IV Samish (26-23); Ma'nat III Saphuri (23-4 B.C.); Abgar V Ukkmii (4 B.C.-7 A.D.); Ma'nat IV bar Ma'nat (7-13 A.D.) Cumont found in the citadel of Birejlik an epitaph in Syriac of 6 A.D. (7) of Zabirian, commandant of Birjah and governor for the toparch Ma'nat bar Ma'nat (Kugener, in Rel. G. Cond., 4, 1908, p. 587; Cumont, Etudes syriennes, Paris, 1891, p. 144); Abgar V Ukkmii (for the second time 13-50); Ma'nati V bar Abgar (50-57); Ma'nat VI bar Abgar (57-74); Abgar VI bar Ma'nat (75-91), under whom the Semnian Ma'nat bar Ma'nat had a sepulchral tower built for himself in Sorin on the Euphrates (H. Moritz, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mosopathien und Ktesiphon, ed. Oppenheim, Leipzig, 1913, p. 163 sq.), interregnum of 18 years (91-109); rule of Sanatruces of Adiabene, nephew of Abgar, over Edessa!; Abgar VII bar Ira' (109-116).

After the great rebellion of 116 the town was taken by Lucius Quietus and burned. There followed a brief interregnum under Roman rule (116-118). Iur (or Valad) and Pharnagat (118-122), then Pharnagat alone (122-123); Ma'nat VII bar Ira' (123-139); Ma'nat VIII bar Ma'nat (139-163). In the Parthian war of Lucius Verus, Edessa was besieged by the Romans in 163-164 and surrendered to them after the murder of the Parthian garrison. During the war the ruler was Wilp bar Sahrin (163-165). After the conclusion of peace (165) Edessa passed under Roman protection; Abgar VIII (165-167); Ma'nat VIII Phorapma'ra (for the second time 167-179); Abgar IX bar Ma'nat on coins: A. Akabos Ewamia Miasa Abarara (179-214), under whom occurred the first great insurrection of Edessa (Nov. 281) which destroyed his palace; a winter palace was replaced in the Tcheric quarter. The official account of the catastrophe and of the measures taken by the king is preserved in the *Edessene Chronicle* from documents in the royal archives. Abgar was in Rome perhaps in 202 where he was received with all honour by Septimius Severus. Christianity is said to have been made the state religion in his time (which has however not been proved: Gomperz, Archael. Epigraph., Mitt. aus Oesterr.-Ungarn, xxx. 154-157) according to legend Abgar V Ukkmii had become a Christian in the year 29 or 32 (K. A. Lipsius, Die oesterrische Abgaragekritisch untersucht, Brunswick 1880). A friend of Abgar IX was the Christian scholar Bardaisan (Babkhas, 154-222 A.D.); Sex. Julius Africanus is also said to have spent some time at his court (Ps-Amos Epop, Hist., II. 10). The cult of Theraius was exterminated by Abgar IX with great rigour. Abgar then ruled along with Severus Abgar X bar Abgar as co-ruler (214-216); both were put in chains by the emperor Antoninus Caracalla in 216. The emperor spent the winter in Edessa which was now created a Roman colonia and on Apr. 3, 217 he was murdered on his way from there to Carthage.

After the fall of the kingdom of Edessa according to the *Chronicle of Zuksini*, Ma'nat IX bar Abgar ruled for another 26 years (216-242), but he probably lived during this time in Rome and was only nominal ruler.

The Sasanians Ardashir and Shapour I disputed Osrhoene with the Romans, Gordian III again set up a member of the old family as king in Edessa. According to the coins, Abgar XI Phrahates reigned from 242-244; he was probably a son of (Antoninus) Ma'nat. Returning to Rome, he erected a tombstone there to his wife Hudda with inscription (C.I.L., vi. 1797).

After the royal house had adopted Christianity, Edessa became along with Adiabene the centre of literary activity in Syriac (east Arami.) (cf. Duval, Hist. d'Edesse, p. 107 sq. and the histories of Syriac literature by Wright, Duval and Baumstark).

Edessa became a Roman city from the time of Gordian (314); after his death, it is true, Philip the Arabian handed over Mesopotamia as far as the Euphrates to the Parthians; but the Roman garrisons remained in the country (Mommsen, R.G., 7, 422). Shapour I besieged Edessa in 260, and the emperor Valerian was taken prisoner by the Persians not far from here about this time. The
town then belonged for a time (till 273) to the kingdom of Palmyra under Odaïnath and Zenobius.

After the peace of 363 Aphon (Ephraim; d. June 9, 373) of Nasibin moved to Edessa and founded there the "Persian school"; the emperor Valens banished the Orthodox from Edessa as Arians in Sept. 373 and they only returned after his death in 378. The monasteries on the sacred hill at Edessa were plundered by the Huns in 396 and Aphon's nephew Abasaniy composed laments upon this.

It is only from the beginning of the third century that we know the names of bishops of the town; these begin with Palaia (c. 200) and among them are Rabbané, the enemy of the Nestorians (411—435), his opponent and successor Hibb (435—457) and in the sixth century the founder of the Severian "Jacobites", James Baradad (Yašbāb Sarābān, d. 578), but later persecutions of the Christians led to the martyrdoms, much embellished by legend, of the "Edessa professors" Sharbil and Baram (550 a.d.), Shemāb, Girāb, and Hayb (509—310). The legend of the "man of God from the city of Kōne" (St. Alexius) is put in the period of Rabbané.

Edessa became the capital and ecclesiastical metropolis of the eparchy of Osroene. There were seven bishoprics under it in 451: 

- Makrīn (Syriac Hikār Je-Sajāt, "temple of the hunter"),
- Kafrān (Harrān),
- Kāqalān (Bāza, now Byblija),
- Yēn Yēfand, Kūt Yīmaw (Tepa, Tell Kāmaw),
- and that of the Yējāy (Schultheiss, in Abk. G. W. Gött, N.S., x., 1908, No. 2, p. 134). Later were added Bātān (Sārāddī), Fālāmā (Tellmārīn),
- Ḥimarı (Syriac Ismāl),
- Dāštān (Arab. Kāl at Dāštār),
- Nūd Ṣamāli and Maqārī (Syriac Mārātāh; cf. B.Z., xxviii., 1924, p. 73 sq., 77 sq.).

The emperor Zenon (489) finally closed the "school of the Persians" after the Nestorians had already with their leader Nasrī been driven out of Edessa in 457 (Baumstark, Gesch. u. syr. Lit., p. 104, note 12, p. 109, note 10).

The war with the Persians (502—506) in the reign of Anastasius is described in the Syriac chronicle by an Edessene, the author of which is wrongly said to be Joshua (Iyšb) Stylyites. After Amida had fallen in 503, Kawāph besieged Edessa but could not take it (Procopius, Bell. Pers., i. 15). The undisciplined Gothic troops, who were to defend it, plundered it like enemies and practically the whole of Osroene was depopulated. After the fourth inundation of the town (525 a.d.; see below) the emperor Justin I restored it and gave it the name of IÎmätan (Malaias, ed. Bonn, p. 419; Eusebius, Hist. ecc., iv. 8); Haller's quite unfounded doubts, Texte u. Zeichen, i. 1, p. 130, are repeated by Ed. Meyer, R. E., s. v. Edessa, No. 2, etc.). Khāraw I in May 540 on his way back from Syria encamped in front of the city but retired on receiving 200 pounds of gold (Chr. of Edessa, ch. 105; Nidāl, Tabāri, p. 235). His sulfurstein siege in 544 proved without success. According to a late legend, the wondrous powers of the edessa Sādurās, which were rediscovered at this time, saved the city from the enemy.

In the sixth century the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia was won for the Monophysites. In Edessa Stephanos bar Sūdalā, who, influenced by Origen, preached a pantheistic doctrine, found many followers. In 380 Hormizd IV sent the general Adharmahan against the Byzantines but he retreated after a three days' siege of Edessa. Khosrow II who had been previously in Edessa on his flight to Mauricius, conquered the town in 609 (Chron. Pasch., ed. Bonn, p. 699; Cedren., ed. Bonn, i. 714; Theoph., contin., ed. Bonn, p. 432) after it had previously gone over to him for a time under the Byzantine general Narses, and deported a large number of Jacobites to Kūfārān and Sidjafna (Barthelme, Chron. ecc., i. 125). After his victories over Persia, Heraclius in 628 restored orthodoxy in Edessa, and banished the prominent Jacobite families.

On the topography of the town Syriac and Greek authors supply us with a good deal of information. Edessa lay at the intersection of the road from Samosata (Samit) to Carrhae (Harrān) with the great trade route between east and west from the Euphrates at Zeugma-Balṣâs and Bitlis-Birejik via Mardin and Naṣibin to the Tigris. The Antoninus Itinerary (p. 184—192) gives two roads from Germanyia via Zeugma, and the one via Samosata and one from Callinicum to Edessa. The town lay in a hollow surrounded on three sides by mountains and open on the southeast on the river Tigris (Syriac Dalazik, "the Leaper"), the modern Kara Kaytun or Naher El-Kat. This river which with the Djīlāb flows into the Balīth, in the past, according to the Eusebius Chronicles, four times inundated the town and wrought great havoc (in Nov. 201, May 303, March 18, 413 and April 22, 535) until the emperor Justinian had a canal dug to drain off the flood-water north of the town (Procopius, De aed., ii. 7, 8 sq.; Aneida, i. 18, 38). We hear again in 668 and 743 of floods however (Thyreg. Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 537; Chronicles of Cæsarea, under the year 743). The town was surrounded by a double wall. This enclosed on the southwest the citadel which stood on a spur of the Nimrud-Dagh and was overshadowed by this mountain; Justinian therefore there had walls strengthened on this side. At the western end of the citadel are two columns one of which, according to its inscription, was put up by queen Shalman, the daughter of Manūt (Sachau, in Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. 153 sqq.). On a large open place in the citadel called Bēth Tebrā, Abgar IX after the inundation of 501 had a winter palace built (cf. above) and the aristocracy of the town moved their quarters to the adjoining upper market called Bēth Saĥrāy. There was also a large altar there which was still standing in Christian times, and probably also the royal archives (şyram; Bēth 'Udīša). Below the citadel there were two ponds inside the town. The larger fed by a spring, the fish in which were considered sacred like those in the lake of Baniyse (Manbij), corresponded to the old spring Kalash, the modern Birket Ibrahim. South of it lay the smaller pond 'Ain Zilka. In the town stood the council house (bātīk), a gallery built in 497 (espascas), several public baths (tējan), a theatre and a hospital and a hospitium. The six gates were called: the Gate of Beth Shemesh and the Gate of Barbalē (Babarēh ša'ar: Procop., Bell. Pers., ii. 27, 44) in the north, the Gate of the Caves which led to the catacombs in the west, the Gate of the Hours (Shīkā, probably the Šēkā ša'ar of Procopius, Bell. Pers., loc. cit., cf. Duval, Hist. d'Edesse, p. 207, note 1) in the southeast, the Great Gate in the south and the Gate of the Theatre in the east (Duval, p. 14).
At a later date, the Arabs only mention four gates: that of Ḥarrān, the Great Gate, the Gate of Ṣab'a and the Water Gate. The "Old Church" several times destroyed by floods stood near the "Tetrapylon" and the square of Bēth-Shabāt (Barhebræus, Chron. eccl., l. 359). The Syriac authors mention many other churches within and without the town (Duval, loc. cit., p. 16 sq.; Baumstark, in O. C., iv. 164—183).

In the Nimråd-Dagh west of the town coves were hewn out of the rock in very early times; there also were the manorships of the kings, that of the church of Ašīb al-Masūr, and 2, 1/2 hours from the town, that of Amathānīmēšētī (Ἀμαθηνημεσητι), wife of Ṣalāmē, son of Māṣē. Numerous anchorites had their cells in the "sacred mountain" and many monasteries on it. It is probably γυμναῖος (read γυμνάιος "Cross Hill" as at Antioch) πέρα, on which the monk Aswānī (Ἀσσώνιος) had his visions (Philoxenus, Letter to Patricius, under the wrong title: İĢik of Ninive, Letter to Symeon from Hasmukha, in New Patrum Bibliotheca, ed. Angelo Mai, vili., Rome 1871, p. 186, ch. 39; cf. Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 29, 132, note 10; 225, note 2). Another hill was called in the Christian period Rāmāthā-šbēt Alishā Ḫūdā (Symeon Metaphrastes, Migne, Patr. Greci, cvii., col. 141: Ἱσμαὴλ) in the vicinity of Edessa were the villages of Bokhān, Serru, Kūštā and Kafar Śelem or Nępāhla. Two aqueducts restored in the year 505 brought down from Tell Zām and Mawštād the spring water (Ps.-Joshua Styli, col. 59 sqq. 62, 87).

The position of these villages and of the buildings in Edessa can as a rule no longer be ascertained exactly (plans of ancient Edessa by G. Hoffmann, who corrected the old sketches by Carsten Niebuhr [1788] in Wight, Chron. of Joshua Styli, 1882; better in F. C. Burkitt, Ephesians and the Getha, London 1913, p. 46).

Abū ‘Umayda in 637 sent ‘Iyāḥ b. Ḥassan to al-Djaţa. After the Greek governor Jean尼斯 Kates, who had endeavoured to save Oshoïne by paying tribute, had been dismissed by the emperor Heraclius and the general Petronius put in his place, al-Ruḥā (Edessa) had to surrender in 639 like the other towns of Mesopotamia (al-Ikṣik/Ishāq, ed. de Goër, p. 172—173; Ibn al-ʿAṣir, ed. Tornberg, ii. 414—417; Yahyā, t.v. al-Djaţa; Ḥwārimmi, ed. Baethgen, Fragmenta syr. u. arach. Historien, Leipzig 1884, p. 16, 110 = Abb. K. M., viii., Nr. 3; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, p. 517, 521). The town now lost its political and very soon also its religious significance and sank to the level of a second rate provincial town. Its last bishop of note, Jāchob of Edessa, spent only four years (684—687) and a later period again of four months in his office (708). The Maronite Theophilos of Edessa (d. 785) wrote a "Chronicle of the World" and translated into Syriac the "two Books of Homer about Ilios".

Al-Ruḥā, like al-Raṣṣa, Harrān and Karkāsia, is usually reckoned to Diyar Mudar (Ibn al-ʿAṣir, viii. 218; al-ʿAṣir, l. 1777; M. Hartmann, Beiträge, p. 68; note 2 and 3 = M. F. A. G., 1897, p. 28). In 667 (684) a rebellion (al-Ruḥā), Harrān and Summaštāl formed the rebellion, which Bahšām b. al-ʾAṣir, great-grandson of Ḥsām b. al-ʿAṣir, grandson of Ihbīm b. al-ʿAṣir, grandson of Ĥūmir b. al-ʿAṣir, grandson of Ihsān b. al-ʿAṣir, grandson of Ibn al-ʿAṣir, iv. 218).

The "old church" of the Christians was destroyed by two earthquakes (April 3, 679 and 718). In 737 a Greek named Ḥabšūr appeared in Harrān and gave himself out to be "Tibérias the son of Constantine"; he was believed at first but was later exposed and executed in al-Ruḥā (Barhebræus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 119). In 133 (750—751) the town was the scene of fighting between Abī Djaţār, afterwards the caliph al-ʾAṣir, and the followers of the Umayyads, Iṣāq b. Musālim al-ʾUṣfālī and his brother Bakātār, who only gave in after the death of Marwān (Ibn al-ʾAṣir, v. 333, sqq.). But continual revolts broke out again in al-Djaţa (Ibn al-ʾAṣir, v. 370, sqq.); in the reign of al-ʾAṣir, for example, the governor of al-Ruḥā of the same name, the builder of Ḥsām Manṣūr, was executed in al-Raṣṣa in 141 (758—759) (al-Balāḏūrī, p. 192). When Ḥāfīz al-Rašīd was put through al-Ruḥā, an attempt was made to cast suspicion upon the Christians and it was said that the Byzantine emperor used to come to the city every year secretly in order to pray in their churches; but the caliph saw that these were forlorners. The Gāmārī (from al-Djama, the valley of Afriṃ in Syria), who, with the Tlemlārē and Rusāfī, were one of the leading families of al-Ruḥā, suffered a good deal however from his covenants (Barhebræus, Chron. syr., p. 130). In 812 the Christians were only able to save the unprotected town from being plundered by the rebels Naṣr b. Shabān and 'Amr by paying 5,000 zārā; Abī Djaţār therefore fortified al-Ruḥā at the expense of the citizens (Barhebræus, p. 136). At the beginning of the 16th century, the Emir of Edessa sent his general Thābir to al-Ruḥā, where his Persian soldiers were besieged by the two rebels, but offered a successful resistance supported by the inhabitants among whom was Mārz Dionysios of Tellmārī (Barhebræus, p. 139). Thābir, who himself had fled from his mutinous soldiers to Kallinikos, won the rebels over to his side and made Abī al-ʾAṣir governor of al-Ruḥā; he oppressed the town very much (Barhebræus, p. 139, sqq.). Muḥammad b. Thābir, who governed al-Djaţa in 825 persecuted the Christians in al-Ruḥā as did the governors under al-ʾUṣfālī and his successors.

In 331 (942—943) the Byzantines occupied Diyarbārk, Arsan, Dīrāz and Rū b. A’in, advanced on Nāṣūbīn and demanded from the people of al-Ruḥā the holy picture of Christ called μᾶρτασ (al-ʾUṣfālī) with the approval of the caliph al-ʾUṣfālī. It was handed over in return for the release of 200 Muslim prisoners and the promise to leave the town undisturbed in future (Yahyā b. Sa’d al-ʾAzmātī, ed. Krčkovský-Vasil’ev, in Patriol. Orient., xviii. 730—732; Thābir b. Sinān, ed. Baethgen, op. cit., p. 90, 145). The picture reached Constantinople on Aug. 15, 944 where it was brought with great ceremony into the Church of St. Sophia and the imperial palace (cf. in addition to Yahyā, op. cit.; al-ʾAṣir, Muḥāfīz al-ʾAṣir, ii. 331; Ibn al-ʾAṣir, viii. 302 and an oration ascribed to Constantine Porphyrogentus on the ὁ θάνατος του Ἰησοῦ οὗτος or De imagine Edessana, ed. Migne, Patriol. Graec., xxiv., col. 432, better ed. v. Dohsehütz, Christusbilder, in Texte u. Unterw. xviii.). But by 336 (949—950) this treaty was broken by Saif al-Dawla who together with the inhabitants of al-Ruḥā made a raid on al-Maṣṣūn (Yahyā, op. cit., p. 732). Under the Domesticus Leon the Byzantines in 348 (959—960) entered Diyar Bakr and advanced on al-Ruḥā (Ibn al-ʾAṣir, viii. 393). The emperor Nicephorus Phocas towards the end of 357 (967—
ORFA 997

908) advanced on DjiyrMuṣṭar, Maiyāşirḵin and Kafartūḡī (Yahya, p. 813). According to Ibn al-As'ūr (viii. 454 in infra), al-Ruḫā's was burned to the ground in Muḥarram 361 (Oct.-Nov. 971) and troops left in al-Dżatra. One should rather read Muḥarram 362 and take the reference to be to the campaign of John Trimicosis, unless there is a confusion between Edessa and Emesa (Himy) which was burned in 969 (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 190).

Ibn Hawkal in 978 refers to over 300 churches in al-Ruḫā and al-Maṣkilisk reckons the cathedral, the cellings of which were richly decorated with mosaics, among the four wonders of the world.

Down to 416 (1025—1026) the town belonged to the chief of the Banū Numair, ʿUṯair. The latter installed ʿAbd al-Muṭṭasim b. Ṭūrāghlam in al-Ruḫā there but afterwards had him assassinated. The inhabitants thereupon rebelled and offered the town to Nasr b. ʿAlawī, the Marwanid of Djiyrābrak (Greek Ανανάρχικος), who had occupied by Zangi. After the death of ʿUṯair and the death of Zangi (418 = 1027), Nasr b. ʿAlawī gave ʿUṯair's son one tower of al-Ruḫā and another to Shisbal b. Ibn al-As'ūr, ix. 244). The former (according to others a Turk Salūm, Ẓalāwād, appointed governor, who was hard-pressed by ʿUṯair's widow) then sold the fortress for 20,000 daries and four villages to the Byzantine Protospatharios Georgios Maniakes, son of Guedelos, who lived in Samostait; he appeared suddenly one night and occupied three towers. After a vain attempt by the emir of Maiyāşirḵin to drive him out again in which the town, which was still inhabited by many Christians, was sacked and burned (winter of 1030—1031), Maniakes again occupied the citadel and the town (Ibn al-As'ūr, ix. 281 in); Michael Syrus, ed. Chabot, ii. 147; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 234; Aristakes Lastiveteč, c. 7, p. 24 syr.; Matthaeus Ruyathī, ed. 1898, c. 43, p. 58—62 = transl. Dubisart, p. 46—49; Kedren-Skilitz, ed. Bonn, ii. 501; the accounts of the events preceding the surrender differ very much). Edessa under Maniakes seems to have enjoyed a certain amount of independence from Byzantium, as he sent an annual tribute (Kedrenos-Skilitz, p. 502).

In May 427 (May 1326) the Patriotics of Edessa became a prisoner of the Numairi Ibn Watthāb and his many allies; the town was plundered but the fortress remained in the hands of the Greek garrison (Ibn al-As'ūr, ix. 305; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 217). By the peace of 1037 the emperor again received complete possession of Edessa which was retaken (Ibn al-As'ūr, ix. 313; Barhebraeus, p. 221).

According to the Armenian sources, Maniakes was followed by Anuqat Ṭuṣ or Lūn Anuqat Ṭuṣ, then by the Iberian Maraβartw as strategos of Edessa, in 1059, Tiranos is Διονοφην των Ἱπποδιωτων was Kepațeno of the town. In 1065—1066 and 1066—1067 the Turks under the Khašan-Silār attacked the town and Alp Arslan besieged it for fifty days in 1070; it was defended by Waṣil (son of the Bulgar king Alōšian?). After the victory of Mamikrint Edessa was to be handed over to the sultan but the defeated emperor Romanos Diogenes had no longer any authority over it, and its Kapetanos Paolos went to his successor in Constantinople (Sklitzes, ed. Bonn, p. 703). In 1081—1082 Edessa was again besieged by an emir named Khushraw in vain. After the death of Waṣil the Armenian Sunbat became lord of Edessa and six months later (Sept. 23, 1083) Philarétos Brachemios succeeded him. But he lost it in 1086—1087 when in his absence his deputy was murdered and the town handed over to Sultan Malikšah. The latter appointed the emir Buṣūn governor of al-Ruḫā and Hārān. When the latter had fallen in 1094 fighting against Tūsūb, Alyāṣr, general of the sultan of Dimaṣhqi and Hālāb, occupied the town but it was not plundered by his army as he was poisoned by a Greek dancing-girl called Gali. Then the Armenian Kuropalates Toros (Thetaslouky), son of Hētum, took the citadel. When in 1097 Count Baldwin captured Tell Bishār, Toros asked him to come to al-Ruḫā to assist him against their joint enemies and received him with joy but was shortly afterwards treacherously murdered by him (Mattesos of Edessa, ed. 1898, p. 260—262 = transl. Dubisart, p. 218—221; Anonym. Syriac Chronicle of 1202—1204 in Chabot, C. R., Acad. Inscr. Letr., 1898, p. 453 sqq.).

From 1098 the Latins ruled for half a century the "county of Edessa" to which also belonged Sümāsip and Sarṭṭij (1098 Baldwin I; 1100 Baldwin II; 1119 Joscelin I; 1131 Joscelin II). The town suffered a great deal under them. On Dec. 25, 1144 Imād al-Dīn Zangi of al-Mawsil took it (a detailed description of these events in the Anonymos Syriac Chronicle of 1203—1204, ed. Chabot, in C. C. O., series iii, vol. xv, p. 118—126; transl. Chabot, Une époque de l'histoire des Crusades, in Milange Scolenberger, i., Paris 1924, p. 171—179). Under Joscelin II and Baldwin of Kaisīn the Franks again attempted to retake the town in Oct. 1046 and succeeded in entering it by night, but six days later Nur al-Dīn appeared with 10,000 Turks, and soon occupied and sacked it; the inhabitants were put to death or sold into slavery. Baldwin was killed and Joscelin escaped to Sümāsip (Barhebraeus, p. 311 sqq.). The fall of this eastern bulwark of the Crusaders aroused horror everywhere; in Europe it led to the Second Crusade. The Syrian Dionysios bar Šalhī as Dionicon wrote an "oration" and two poetic mirmel about the destruction of the town. Three similar pieces were written by Basilius Abu l-Fasāḏ b. ʿṢūmānī, the favourite of Zangi; he had also written a history of the town of Orbā (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 293, 295).

After the death of Nur al-Dīn his nephew Saif al-Dīn Ghārī took the town in 1174; in 1182 it fell to Saladīn who later handed it over to al-Malik al-Mansūr. When Malik al-Adīd died in 1218, his son Malik al-Asghar Sharaf al-Dīn Mūsā became lord of al-Ruḫā, Hārān and Khāṭīb. In June 1234 the town was taken by the army of "Ali" al-Dīn Kaškūbād and its inhabitants deported to Asia Minor (Kamīl al-Dīn, transl. Blochert, in R.O.L., v. 88; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 468). But it was retaken within four months by Malik al-Kūnī. In 1244 the Tatār passed through the district of al-Ruḫā and in 1250 the Mongols under Hūlagū. The people of al-Ruḫā and Hārān surrendered voluntarily to him but those of Sarūj were all put to death (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 509; Chron. arak., ed. Baurit, p. 486).

In the time of Abu l-Fidāʾ al-Ruḫā was in ruins. Ḥamd Allāh al-Mustawfi about 1340 could still see isolated ruins of the main buildings. According to al-Kalqashandī, the town had been
rebuilt by his time (c. 1400) and repopulated and was in a prosperous state. In connection with the campaigns of Timur, who conquered al-Jazira in 1393, al-Rahwāl is repeatedly mentioned in the Zafar-nāmas of Shāraf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī (written in 828-845).

The Ottomans finally took the town, to which they gave the name of Orfa, in 1637 during Murād IV's war with Persia.

To-day Orfa (Urfa) has nearly 30,000 inhabitants. It is the capital of a wilāya of the same name numberiing a little more than 200,000 souls. The town is 550 m. above sea-level.


**ORIHUELA,** Arab. Urvīla, a town in Eastern Spain (Levante), 15 miles N.E. of Murcia, the capital of an administrative area (província) and the see of a bishop, contains with its adjoining country, which is thinly populated, 35,000 inhabitants. It was conquered by the Muslims in the same time as the other towns of the a fazer of Todrud [q. v.] and was for a long time the capital of this a fazer before it had to give way to Murcia. Its history was that of the latter town as long as it remained Muslim. It was however for a very brief period in the middle of the 12th century A.D. (middle of the 12th century A.D.) the capital of a petty independent state ruled by the Kāḥid al-Mu'min 'Abd al-Rahmān b. ʿAlī b. Ṣamīq.


**ORISSA (Odra-dega), a part of the modern Indian province of Bihār and Orissa, has an area of 13,706 square miles and a population of 5,306,142, of which only 124,463 profess the Muslim faith. For administrative purposes it is divided into the five districts of Cuttack, Balasore, Puri, Angul and Sambalpur. There are in addition twenty-four native states, the Orissa feudatory states, with a population of 4,465,585, the Muhammadans numbering only 1,700 (Census of India, 1931).

Modern Orissa, which embraces the deltas of the Mahanadi and neighbouring rivers, extends from the Bay of Bengal to the borders of the Central Provinces and from the river Subarnarekha to the Gīkā Lake. In the past its inaccessibility proved its salvation for, while the coastal state was sometimes conquered, the highlands of the interior remained under semi-independent or tributary chiefs. It was included in the ancient kingdom of Kalinya, the sole conquest of the peace-loving Ačoka, but, with the disintegration of the Maurya empire, once more passed to the Kalinya kings. Until the eleventh century the history of this area is extremely confused. Those interested in the solving of chronological puzzles would do well to consult the first volume of Banerji's History of Orissa.

Certain parts of modern Orissa were annexed to the empire of Muḥammad b. Tughluq and were included in the province of Džādinagar. The real conqueror of Orissa, however, was Akbar's famous general Rājā Mān Singh, who took it from the Afghans of Bengal, who had obtained a temporary footing in the country. Under Akbar it was administered as part of the ūbār of Bengal, for it was not until the reign of Džāhinīr that it became a separate province. With the decline of the Moghal empire Orissa fell into the hands of the Bhūnlī Mārāths of Nāqpur [q. v.]. Although it nominally passed to the British by the division grant of 1795 it was not finally conquered until the year 1803.

With the exception of the district of Sambalpur, the territory now known as Orissa was administered along with Bengal until October 1905, and with
West Bengal until March 1912, when Bihār and Orissa were formed into a separate province. Orissa has always been a stronghold of Hindustan and the temple of Dījanath still draws thousands of pilgrims to the sands of Puri.


(C. Colin Davies)

**Orkhān or Orkhan (Ur-Khan?)** was the eldest son of the emir 'Othmān [q.v.], the founder of the Ottoman dynasty. His mother was Mulkshāna, the daughter of Shaikh Ede-Rah, of the village of Ithrum near Eski-Shehr. The year of his birth is not known and indeed the whole chronology of his reign leaves much to be desired. Ottoman sources say he was born in 687 (beg. Feb. 6, 1288); according to others, he was born as early as 680 (beg. Apr. 22, 1281). The first date which probably goes back to Hājjidji Kháilifāt's *Tabārik* has most in its favour. We know very little about his youth. When barely ten years old he was married in 699 (1299) to the daughter of the lord of Yār-Hisār named Nurīfar-Khatun [q.v.], a Greek girl, who was betrothed to the lord of Belokoma (Bilecik). From this union were born among others his son Murād, who succeeded him, and Sulaimān Pasha. Orkhān was nearly 40 when he ascended the throne in 730, that is, Ramañja 7 (Aug. 1326). According to tradition, Orkhān offered his brother 'Ali al-Dīn ʿAli (usually called 'Ali al-Dīn only; cf. *Iṣṭ.*, xi. 20, note 3) a portion of the ancestral possessions but the latter is said to have been content with the vizierate. This story strongly resembles that of Moses and Aaron as given in the *Kūrān* (xx. 30) and is probably intended to give a historical foundation for the office of vizier. 'Ali al-Dīn ʿAli was also the first to bear the title pākta [q.v.] which then passed to Orkhān's son Sulaimān and was inherited from him by Kārā Khaṭīb.

Orkhān's rule may be divided into two periods: that from 1326 to 1344 when he was establishing the Ottoman power in Asia Minor, creating the army and becoming the founder of the Ottoman empire, and the period from 1344 to his death in 1359—1360 during which he was preparing to gain a foothold in Thrace and Macedonia and to extend his rule on European soil. He laid the foundations for the later empire of the Ottomans and is to be regarded as its real creator.

Orkhān had already shown his ability as a conqueror in the lifetime of his father. Shortly before the latter's death of gout at the age of about 70 he had taken Brassa without bloodshed. It now became the capital of the kingdom. Nicaea and Nicomedea were now the next objectives of Ottoman arms. He was assisted by a number of able leaders of whom the best known were Köse Mihāl [see Mihāl-Oğlu], Aḵtā Kudja, Köetur-Alp, ʿAbd al-Rahmān Ghūtrī, Kārā 'Ali, Kārā Mursal. With their help he carried through all his enterprises with the greatest success. Before taking these two cities, Orkhān first of all secured possession of the most northerly peninsula of Bithynia, which is enclosed on the north by the Black Sea, on the south by the Gulf of Nicomedea and on the west by the Bosphorus. The two strongly fortified fortresses of Semendra and Aidos which guarded the military road from Constantinople to Nicomedea were taken. The town and district of Semendra were given in feudal tenure to the general Aḵtā Kudja and henceforth known as Kudja-İli. The fall of these strong places was followed by the subjection of most of the little towns on the coast on both sides of the Gulf of Nicomedea, of which the fort of Hereke offered most resistance. Kārā Mursal conquered the land on the southern coast by occupying Yalova, famous for its medicinal baths, and the district of Kārā Mursal which bears his name. As Orkhān's vassal, he pledged himself to maintain a small fleet to protect the coast so that the communication by sea between Constantinople and Nicomedea was entirely stopped. Orkhān now took the field against Nicomedea in person. The town was taken without any special difficulty after the hill fort of Kūyun-Hisār had fallen. While the emperors Andronikos abandoned Nicomedea, he prepared to defend the old capital of the Palaiołoi, Nicaea. At the beginning of 1335, the Byzantines moved over to the Asiatic shore and in the vicinity of the little coast town of Philokrene in Mesopotamia, now Tavşanlı, a battle was fought about which there are no records in the Ottoman sources while the Byzantine historians (Kantakuzenos, ed. Bohn, l. 349 sq.; Nikephoros Gregoros, ed. Bohn, l. 434; cf. thereon Phrantzes and Chałcocondyles) show obvious errors and deliberate perversions of the facts. The defeat of the Byzantines at Philokrene meant the end of any hope of saving Nicaea. The inhabitants did not even attempt a serious resistance but hurried to swear fealty to Orkhān. The city, upon which Orkhān lavished all kinds of endowments, soon became one of the most flourishing and prosperous towns in the Ottoman empire after its period of tribulation. Nicaea, now İsmih [q.v.], became celebrated as a centre of Muslim intellectual life especially through its madressas. In 1333 Orkhān's son Sulaimān undertook a campaign into the still independent country north of the Sangaria (Sakarya) with the towns of Goinik, Modren and Tarakdji, which he occupied almost without striking a blow. All Orkhān's victories and conquests had so far been won at the expense of the Greeks and there had been no warlike encounters with the little principalities which had arisen in Anatolia out of the Seljuk empire. The adjacent country of Karšā [q.v.] where in 1335 the succession had given rise to a dispute between two brothers, the youngest of whom, Tursun, was living at Orkhān's court, came first. Orkhān's help was called upon by Tursun against his older brother (named Timürkhan?) and he invaded Karšā on receiving certain assurances. On the way he took Ushak, Kırımsı [q.v.] and Mihāl-ud-dīn, and along with the castles of Koibos and Ailacs. Balikessi was surrendered to Orkhān.
without a blow and the resistance shown was limited to Berghama. This town also soon passed into Ottoman hands as a return for the leniency shown by Orkhan to the lord of Karasè when the latter had treacherously disposed of his younger brother (736 = 1336). Hëjdëjë Il-beghi, the vizier of the last prince of Karasë, was entrusted with the administration of the newly won territory, and as his councillors Edje-Beg and Erenos (q.v.) were appointed. After the fall of Berghama Orkhan was engaged in consolidating his rule by systematic regulations and arranging for the administration of the now considerably enlarged Ottoman kingdom. He seems to have been the first to organize his rule on Anatolian soil (on this cf. the full account in Zinkeisen, G.O.R., i. 118 sqq.), in which his brother "Alì" al-Din "Alì played a prominent part until after his death in 1333 his place was taken by his nephew Sulaiman. In 729 (1328) "Alì" al-Din is said to have induced his brother to set up the first mints (according to Sà'd al-Din). In this year the first gold and silver struck in Orkhan's name and replaced the Saldjûk coins which had previously been current throughout the Ottoman empire. A regulation regarding dress produced a strict distinction between ranks and classes, and the army was completely reorganised in keeping with the new conditions by Cendereili Khatîl (q.v.). In 1330 the corps of janissaries (q.v.) was founded, the Turkish infantry composed of youths of Christian birth and associated with Hëjdëjë Bektashi (q.v.). But the irregular infantry also, the "Azâb", was put on a better footing and the feudal cavalry (aşgâf) developed in keeping with the objects of the new empire. At the same time Orkhan founded numerous mosques, monasteries and schools, and the foundations which he endowed everywhere in the newly conquered territory bear witness to the great attention which he gave to matters of religion. The dervish system which at this time was at the height of its development, the order of the Bektashi, seems to have arisen in the reign of Orkhan — had undoubtedly a great patron in Orkhan as is seen by the number of cells and monasteries of holy men in his capital Bursa, who had come from the east during his reign to find asylum in the Ottoman empire. The religious life of Islam under Orkhan, which had a marked 8ulûd, not to say Shîa", stamp, is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of religion and still requires elucidation in essential points through special studies.

In Orkhan's reign we have the beginnings of friendly and peaceful intercourse between Ottomans and Byzantines, although we also have an alternation of peace and war, of enmity and alliance (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 126). Ottoman troops were repeatedly summoned to the assistance of the Byzantine emperors and when Orkhan ascended the throne, Turkish hordes had already crossed the straits three times, without success it is true, and without leaving the slightest trace on European soil (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 120 sqq. and Zinkeisen, G.O.R., i. 184 sqq.). There obviously was no idea of establishing Ottoman power on the other side of the Dardanelles in these raids and the Byzantine emperor paid very little attention to them. But in course of time there arose out of these casual enterprises more and more regularly organized expeditions by the petty dynasts of Anatolia. For example the ruler of Ahiu-eli (q.v.),

Urûm-Beg, one of the most brilliant, if very little known, figures of the time, had undoubtedly intended to develop systematically his repeated raids into Europe. Orkhan himself is said in 1333 to have concluded a treaty with the emperor Andronicus on the time of the siege of Nicomedia, by which he bound himself not to disturb further the towns of Asia Minor which were under Byzantine suzerainty (cf. Kantakuzenos, ed. Bohn, ii. 446). The increasing weakness of Byzantium and the growing power of the Ottomans soon however deprived any such agreement of its binding force. Already in 1337 Orkhan had tried to effect a landing near Constantinople with a fleet of 36 ships; his intention must have been to attack the capital and establish himself in Thrace. The Ottomans suffered a disastrous defeat and escaped with one ship only. The dynastic troubles which broke out soon afterwards in Constantinople when the Grand Domestikos Kantakuzenos became emperor and joint ruler with John Palaeologus, brought about a rapprochement between Orkhan and Kantakuzenos. Urûm-Beg renewed his efforts to gain a footing on European soil, but, in spite of the expenditure of men and ships, they remained unavailing. Orkhan maintained an attitude of watchfulness. The empress Anna, mother of the emperor John Palaeologus, induced him to send a force to help her against her rival Kantakuzenos. The latter saw the increasing danger and after this force had come to a miserable end endeavoured with all his power to win Orkhan over for his own plans. In return for 6,000 soldiers he offered him his daughter Theodora, who was still a minor, as a wife in January 1345 (cf. Kantakuzenos, ii. 31; ed. Bohn, p. 408; Dukas, ed. Bohn, p. 33 sp.; Chalcoc., i. 24) and in May 1346 the wedding was celebrated with great splendour in Seljukaria (Kantakuzenos, iii. 95. p. 585 sp.; Nikeph. Gregor., xv. 5; p. 762 sp.; Dukas, 9, p. 35; according to Nikeph. the bride's name was Maria, cf. i. 762, certainly a mistake). It is worth noting that Orkhan's bride did not abandon her religion but remained obedient Christian (cf. Kantakuzenos, ed. Bohn, p. 588; Zinkeisen, G.O.R., i. 201 sqq.) and acquired great merit by purchasing numerous Christian slaves and sending them home to freedom. The prince Khâlîl Celibi, who later became a prisoner of the Genoese and when very young married a daughter of the emperor John V, was probably the result of this union (cf. Jorga, G.O.R., i. 201). The alliance with the Ottomans was to cost Kantakuzenos dear. When, shortly after the wedding, Orkhan sent him 10,000 men to help in his fight with the Serbian prince Stjepan Dušan, the Turks turned against the Byzantines and returned with vast booty from Europe to Asia. This breach of faith did not deter Kantakuzenos from again asking for assistance from his son-in-law in 1349. But this time also the army of 20,000 men, summoned unexpectedly back to Anatolia, recrossed the Dardanelles after burning and plundering all the way. Besides these two invasions of Europe by request the continual raids of the Anatolian hordes went on and the sufferings of the people of Thrace became intolerable. Orkhan took advantage of this uncertainty to carry out his long cherished plan of establishing the Ottomans permanently in Europe. His son Sulaimân Pašha in 1356 was ordered to cross the Dardanelles. The crossing was successfully carried through at the fortress of Taympe (the modern
Djumenlik). In 759 (1357) Kallipolis (now Gallipoli) was taken by the Ottomans. The sudden death in 760 (1358) of the conqueror Sulaimān Pasha, who was buried not in Brusa but in Bursa on Thracian soil, put an end to the any further advance by the Ottomans. Hādjiğıl-ı-beğhi and Edje-Beg conducted raids into the interior, it is true, but no effort was made to extend Ottoman power. Orkhan died very soon after Sulaimān. The date of his death is not exactly known. The most probable statement is that which says he died at the beginning of 761 (beg. Nov. 23, 1359). The statement (taken by K. J. Jiricke from a Slav chronicle) that Orkhan lived till March 1362, after the capture of Adrianople, has no claim to credence (cf. Archief voor slav. Phil., xiv. [1892], p. 260, although Oskar Halecki, Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome (Warsaw 1932 — Travaux historiques de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie, vol. viii.), p. 74, note 3, based on C. Jiricke, loc. cit., and Byza. Zeitsehr., xxviii. [1909], p. 583 sq. is inclined to accept the year 1362. That the Byzantine annals (cf. especially p. 392) edited by F. J. Müller, in Situations, d. k. k. Ak. d. Wiss., Vienna 1853, is, are in favour of such a supposition cannot be disputed as well as the fact that the Florentine chronicler Maestro Villenti (cf. Maratorgi, Rerum Ital. Script., xiv., p. 672 sq.) puts "Orkam" as their first action in November 1361. If Musjid-i-Gizā is justly called the "conqueror of Adrianople" the year of his father's, i.e. Orkhan's death must be fixed earlier as the taking of this town in spring 1361 (cf. theor. F. Baehinger, in M. O. G., ii. 311 sqq.) can now be taken for granted (cf. theor. the fact noted not in M. O. G., that, according to O. Halecki, loc. cit. p. 75, the capture of Adrianople became known in Venice on March 14, 1361). — Orkhan was buried beside his father in Brusa (cf. j. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 157 sq. with a description of what his personal appearance is said to have been).

Bibliography: Contemporary Ottoman sources have so far not come to light. Of the Byzantine chroniclers the most important is Orkhan's father-in-law Kantakuzenos although his bias makes it necessary to use him with great caution. Nicephorus Gregorios is much more to be believed. The crossing of the Ottomans into Europe in the sixteenth century has been critically studied by Joh. Draesecke, in the Neue Jahrbücher für das classische Altertum, vol. xxiii., p. 7 sqq. The whole period of Orkhan's reign has recently been dealt with in not always reliable fashion by H. A. Gibbons (d. 1934), The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916, p. 54—109. Further sources are indicated in the works of J. v. Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

(FAZNE BAHISERICI)

ORMUZ. [See Hormuz.]

ORTOKIDS (Urtukids), a Turkmen dynasty, branches of which ruled in Mardin, Hızın Kafka and Khwarazm.

When the Saljūq sultān of Damascus, Turuq, conquered Jerusalem in 479 he appointed the town his officer Urtuğ b. Aksab, who had already served under Malikshāh and had taken part in the siege of Amid in 477. He was succeeded in 484 (1091) by his son Sukmān and his son Khwāja. After the Holy City had been taken for the Fatimids in Şamāna 489 (1096) by al-Afdal b. Badr al-Djamāli, Sukmān went to Ṭūrid and Mardin to his lands in the Īrāk. In 495 (1010) Sultan Muḥammad made Ilghāz his commissioner (Shaḥūn) in Baghūdād.

A. Hijin Kafka, Muʿān al-Dawla, Sukmān I (cf. iv., p. 510) assisted Mūsā when he was besieged by Dżakariya in al-Mawṣil and as a reward received from him in 495 (1010), 10,000 dinars and the town of Hijin Kafka (Ibn al-Āthir, ii. 234—236). He had already owned Sarāṣij since 488 and in 498 or shortly before, Mārādīn also fell into his hands (Abu l-Fādil, ed. Reiske, iii. 350—353). Along with Dżakariya, Sukmān took Count Baldwin and his brother Joscelin prisoners at Hārān. After his death in 498 his son İbrahim ruled in Hijin Kafka while Mārādīn passed to his brother Ilghāz in 502. In Hijin Kafka, İbrahim was succeeded first by his brother Ruku al-Dawla Dāwūd (who is mentioned in 508 and again in 511; Ibn al-Āthir, x. 352 sq.; xi. 73), then by the latter's son Pācir al-Dawla Khāza-Masāfīn who ascended the throne about 543 and probably died in 562 (or perhaps not till 570) (van Berchem, in Abk. W. G. E. W., N. S., iv/vi., 1907, p. 143, note 3). He ruled over Hijin Kafka and a considerable part of Dijārābādr (Ibn al-Āthir, xi. 217) to his father or his father we probably owe the bridge over the Tigris at Hijin Kafka [q.v.]. After his death he was succeeded by his son Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad. When Sālūṣ al-Din in 578 came to Dijārābād, Nūr al-Dīn was ready to pay homage to him and to assist him at the siege of al-Mawṣil. As a reward he was next year given the town of Amid (579). He died in 581 and was succeeded by his son Kuḫ al-Dīn Sukmān II who lost his life in 597 from a fall (Ibn al-Āthir, xii. 112). Before his death he had designated as his successor a Mamlūk named Aya, as he had his brother al-Malik al-Salih Nāṣir al-Dīn Māmūt, whom strict Sunnis condemned as a philosopher and heretic. But Māmūt seized Amid when the emirs asked him to do so (Ibn al-Āthir, xii. 112). He recognised the suzerainty of the Ayyūbids Ḍīdī and Khāmil and of the Saljūqī Khākūs. On an Ayyūbi inscription of the year 605 (1208—1209) he calls himself sultan of Dijārābād, al-Rūm and al-Arman (van Berchem, cf. ibid., p. 147). After his death in 619 he was succeeded by his son al-Malik al-Maṣʿūd Māwūd (Ibn al-Āthir, xii. 260). According to a coin of 628, Hijin Kafka then belonged to the ruler of Mārādīn. The lands of the Ortokids had already been much diminished by the attacks of the Saljūq sultāns of Rūm when in 629 (1231) the Ayyūbī al-Kāmil advanced against Amid and took it with the towns that belonged to it, including Hijin Kafka (Abu l-Fādil, iv. 393), which, if this statement is correct, had therefore again been taken by Māwūd from his relative. Al-Kāmil's son, al-Malik al-Salih, remained in possession of Amid and Kafka. In 639 he had to evacuate Amid to the allied armies of Halah and Rūm, while he retained Kafka (Kamāl al-Dīn, History of Aleppo, transl. E. Blachet, p. 219 = R. O. L., vi. 16). Māwūd remained in prison until the death of al-Kāmil in 635; then he escaped and found refuge with al-Muṣaffar of Ḍamān until his death probably during the Tartar incursions (Abu l-Fādil, iv. 393).

B. Mārādīn. On the death of its governor Luṭʿ the city of Halab submitted voluntarily in 1117—1118 to Najm al-Dīn Ilghāz I [q.v.], who had since 502 (1108) been lord of Mārādīn. Ilghāz...
gave it to his son Timürtaş (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 372). When in 515 the latter was sent by his father to Sulaimān, Maḥmūd to intercede for Dubais b. Sabāyya, the sułṭān gave his father Iğhāzī Māiyāfārīkīn (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 418) which hecneforth remained Ortokid until Sulaimān annexed it in 581. After the death in 516 of Iğhāzī, the most dangerous enemy of the Crusaders among the Ortokids (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 426), he was succeeded by his sons Shams al-Dawla Sulaimān in Māiyāfārīkīn and Ḥusam al-Din Timūrtaş [q. v.] in Mardin, and in Halab by his nephew Badr al-Dawla Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Djahār b. Iğhāzī (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 426) who had already in 515 been appointed governor of it by Iğhāzī, when his son Sulaimān had attempted to stir up a rising against him there (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 417 sqq.). As a fighter against the Crusaders his other nephew Balak b. Bahrūm followed his uncle’s example: in 497 (1103-1104) he occupied ‘Ana and al-Haddātha after the Franks had taken Sarūdū from him in 494. In 515 he brought Joscelin de Courtenay Count of Edessa and his brother Galeric prisoners to his fortress of Khartabīr (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 418 sq.), and defeated Baldwin king of Jerusalem at Gargar and brought him prisoner to Harrān [see BALAK]. He had taken this town in 517 (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 433). In the same year he took Halab from his cousin Badr al-Dawla Sulaimān, as he did not seem fitted to defend it against the Franks. At the siege of Man-

Genealogical Table of the Ortokids

(From Lane-Poole and van Berchem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A. Ḫiṣn Kaifa]</th>
<th>[B. Mardin]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urtuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Sukmān I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>III. Dāwūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Sulaimān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Timūrtaş</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Nūr al-Din</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Sukmān II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Maḥmūd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Māwiyya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Dāwūd</td>
<td>X. Ghiṣṭ I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. ʿAlī</td>
<td>XII. ʿĀṣīb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Maḥmūd</td>
<td>XIV. Dāwūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Maḥmūd</td>
<td>XV. Dāwūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. Maḥmūd</td>
<td>XVI. ʿĀṣīb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bolūj in 518 Balak received a mortal wound from an arrow (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 436). In Halab and his other possessions he was succeeded by Ḥusam al-Din Timūrtaş but the latter lost Halab as soon as he went to Diyarbakr as the city, besieged by the Franks, opened its gates to the Crusaders [cf. As sonqor al-baṣmāy]. After the death of his brother Sulaimān in 518 Timūrtaş inherited Māiyāfārīkīn also (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 441) and at his death in 547 (1152-1153) was lord of Mardin and Māiyāfārīkīn (Ibn al-Adhrā', x. 115). He was succeeded by his son Nadīm al-Din Alpī. During the lifetime of his father he had received al-Bura from the Franks in 539; they had given him the town out of fear of Imād al-Din Zaγalt. At a later date (before 565), we find ruling there Sulaimān b. Iğhāzī who had distinguished himself in fighting against the Crusaders. His son was besieged in 577 (1181-1182) in al-Bura by ʿAbd al-Din Iğhāzī II of Mardin (cf. ii, p. 456), who had succeeded his father Alpī in 572, and appealed for help to ʿĀṣīb al-Din; at the latter’s command ʿĀṣīb al-Din retired to Mardin (Ibn al-

Adhrā', xi. 313). After his death in 580 the guardian of his sons ʿĀṣīb Arman Sulaimān of Akhšūd, then after the latter’s death in 581 (1185) ʿĀṣīb al-Din, took possession of Māiyāfārīkīn (Ibn al-Adhrā', xi. 335; C. Defrémery, in JA., ser. iv. 1, 1843, p. 72—

78). In Mardin ʿĀṣīb al-Din was succeeded by his son Ḥusam al-Din Yūluk-Arslān (var. Bulaq, Bulūk-Arslān) who again in 587 regained Māiyāfārīkīn for a short time; the next successor was the latter’s brother Nasīr al-Din Urtuk-Arslān al-Mansūr (from c. 596—598). In his time Mardin was besieged in 599 by al-Asḥafī by order of al-ʿĀdīl. At the conclusion of peace the Urtukīs recognized the suzerainty of al-ʿĀdīl (Ibn al-Adhrā', xii. 117; col. 45). The later Urtukīs of Mardin are given by Abu l-Ḥiṣṣā`ī (v. 295) down to his time (715 = 1315). Urtuk-Arslān was followed in 637 by his son Nadīm al-Din ʿĀṣīb al-Su′ādī, in 648 by the latter’s son ʿĀṣīb Arslān al-Muṣafar, about 691 by his son
Shams al-Din Dāwūd, about 693 by his brother 
Nadīm al-Dīn Ghārī II al-Mansūr, in 718 by his 
son Imād al-Dīn 'Alī al-Adīl, then by his 
brother Shams al-Dīn Sālih, in 765 by his son 
Ahmad al-Mansūr, in 769 by his son Maḥmūd al-
Sālih, in 769 by his uncle Dāwūd al-Muqaffar, 
in 778 by the latter's son Maḍīd al-Dīn Taṣ al-
Zahrī, and lastly by the latter's brother Sālih (809-
811 = 1406–1408). After Tūmīr had taken Mār-
din, the ownership of the town passed to the 
Kārī-Koyunlū. 

To the territory of the Ortokids of Mārdin 
belonged at least down to the time of Nadīm 
al-Dīn Ghārī II the town of Dūnamīr (q.v., now 
Kūs Ḥisar), according to coins found in the 
neighbourhood near Tell Ermen (E. Suhaim, in 

C. Khatābīr (Khātābī). Khatābīr was found 
as early as 515 in the possession of the Ortokids 
Balak b. Bahāsh, who held it till 318. His 
relative Sulaimān then occupied it but he seems to 
have sold it down to 1259. Then it belonged 
successively to Dāwūd b. Ḥān Kāfy and his son 
Mārān b. Aḥmad of Damascus. There is an 
inscription (dated 516 = 1165–1166) of Fakhr 
al-Dīn Kāfī al-Ashāfī commemorating a building in 
Khatābīr (van Berchem, in Abb. G. W. Gött., 
phils.-hist. Kl., viii., 1897, p. 142 sq.) as that of 
his brother's death he was in Ṣalāb al-Dīn's camp before al-Mawsīl and at once set 
off for Ḥān Kāfyf on hearing the news to claim 
his inheritance. But his nephew Sūkān II had 
already taken possession of the fortress and had 
been recognised by Ṣalāb al-Dīn. The uncle had 
therefore to be content with Khatābīr (Ibn al-
Affīr, vii., p. 339). Aḥū Bakr must have died in 609 
at latest, for Maḥmūd of Kāfyf and Aḥūd 
unsuccessful abandoned his son Nāṣir al-Dīn in 
Khatābīr in 601 (Ibn al-Atbīr, xii., p. 123). This 
last Ortokid of Khatābīr is said to have been 
called Nāṣir al-Dīn Aḥū Bakr; according to the 
inscription on a bronze mirror in the Blacas 
collection in Paris, his name was more probably 
Nāṣir al-Dīn Ibrahim, unless we have to see in 
Aḥū Bakr a (childless) brother of Ibrahim (van 
Berchem, op. cit., p. 144, note 1). Ibrahim had two sons: Iṣār 
al-Dīn Aḥmad mentioned in a manuscript of 685 
written in his reign and al-Kāfīr named on the 
above mentioned mirror, father of Nāṣir al-Dīn 
Aḥū Bakr, who ruled as an unknown time 
and unnamed place. Khatābīr probably 
remained in possession of the Ortokids only down 
to 63. At least the town was taken in this year 
by Sulām Kāfībād. 3

Coins. Four mint-dates are named on the coins 
of the Ortokids: al-Ḥān Kāfyf, i.e. Ḥān Kāfyf, 
Aḥūd, Mārān and Dūnamīr. The strong influence 
of trade with Byzantium is seen on the coins in a 
remarkable fashion; we find on them not only 
rebel's heads taken from ancient coins and no 
longer understood but also the Virgin Mary, Christ 
and the Greek inscription Emmanuel on them.

Bibliography. The Arab historians of the 
Crusades and the Syriac chroniclers, such as 
Michael the Great and Barhebræus; Stanley 
Lane-Poole, Coins of the Urtubū Turkomans, in 
Marsden's International Numismatist Orien-
talis, vol. 1, ii., London 1875; 4to., Catalogue of 
Oriental Coins in the British Museum, iii., 1877
(The coins of the Turkomans House of Seljūk, 
Urtubū, Zengis, etc.), p. 115–176; in. 18, Zengis 
(Additions), p. 209–302; x (Index), s.v.; do., 
The Mohammedan Dynasty, Paris 1925, p. 166– 
169; Stokvis, Manuel d'histoire, de géographie 
e de chronologie, Leyden 1888, t. 21, 97 sq.; 
Ismail Ḥāfīzī Edhem, Catalogue des monnaies 
turco-mongol, Stambul 1894; M. van Berchem, 
Arabische Inschriften, in Abb. G. W. Gött., 
(esp. p. 142–146; No. 9, Bauinschrift des 
Ortokiden Fakhr ad-Dīn qān-Aḥū Bakr in 
Khatābīr, p. 146–152: Bauinschrift des Ortok.
Mārān Maḥmūd in Amīd); Kātīb Firdūsī, Mārān 
Muḥāmmed b. Yūnus Urtubū Taṣhīlī, written in 944– 
957 (ed. by 'All Emīr Efendi, Stambul 1331; 
further, Bahinger, G. O. W., p. 83, note 1); further 
references in the articles DĪVĀN BAKR, HĀLAV, 
HĀN KĀFYF, KHĀFĪRĪ, MAḤMūD, KĀFĪ, MĀRĀN, 
(ENGELMANN)

OMAN DIGNA [see 'OTTOMAN ARAB BAKR 
DIGNA.]

ORSÛSHANA, the name of a district in 
Transoxania. The form Orsûshana is the best 
known, although Yūḥūt (l. 245) says that 
Osrûshana is preferable. In the Persian 
version of the text of al-Iṣṭakhri and in the Persian text 
of the Ḥudūd al-Alam (ed. Barthold) we find 
more often Surshūna while Ibn Khūdsūdshūn 
sometimes has Shurshūna; the original form may 
have been Sūrshāna. This district lies to the 
north-east of Samarqand between this town and 
Khojand, to the south of the Sir Daryā (Sālāb) so that it 
forms the approach to the valley of Farghānā; 
the north west it is bounded by the steppes. 
The southern part is occupied by the mountains 
of Khorasan which run almost the upper course of 
the Zīr-Afghān; these hills are generally regarded 
as forming part of Osrushana. The geographical 
information about this region is based almost 
exclusively on the geographers of the tenth century; 
the later geographers down to Ḥādīdī Khālīfīs 
only repeat what their predecessors have said: it appears 
therefore that the name Osrushana had fallen into 
disuse before the end of the middle ages. As a result 
of its numerous streams, which flow into the 
Sir Daryā, it was at one time a rich country visited 
by many travellers because the route to Farghānā 
lay through it. The geographers describe several 
routes from Samarqand to Khojand all of which 
passed through the towns of Šāhīt and Zāmīn, the 
name of which still survives. The principal town — 
in which in the tenth century the governor 
lived — was in all probability called Na wān gi-
a kāt — this must be the basis of the more 
or less uncertain readings of a number of manuscripts 
(cf. especially Hālāshūrī, p. 426); the form Nūšīlīgat 
given by Yūḥūt (l. 744); but see also iv. 307 where 
the name is Kūnī) and adopted by Barthold is 
a late corruption; it lay a little to the south 
of the great road and was identified in 1384 by 
W. Barthold, with the ruins called Sharihristūn 
to the south of the present town of Ura Tūb; these 
ruins were examined a little later by P. S. Skvarkis. 
The geographers describe the town in detail. Two 
other towns of some importance were Zāmīn 
and Dīnak, and a number of other places are recorded;
there were also rural areas without towns, while al-Ya'qūb (R.G.A., vii. 294) says that there were 400 fortresses in the country. In the tenth century there was an important market-place called Marsamunda. There is some further geographical information about the country in the Khurusmānu.

At the time when the first Arab invasion of the country took place under Kūthab b. Muslim (712—714), Osrushana was inhabited by an Iranian population, ruled by its own princes who bore the title of afshin (Ibn Khurdadbeh, p. 40). The first invasion did not result in conquest; in 737 the Turkish enemies of the governor Assā fell back on Osrushana (Tabarī, ii. 1613). Naqīr b. Sāyār (q.v.) subdued the country incompletely in 739 (Bālājūri, p. 429; Tabarī, ii. 1694) and the Afšīn again made a nominal submission to al-Ma'mūn (Ya'qūbī, Tarāṣī, ii. 479). Under al-Ma'mūn the country had to be conquered again but soon a new expedition was necessary in 822. On this last occasion the Muslim army was guided by Haidar, the son of the Afšīn Kāwūs, who on account of dynastic troubles had sought refuge in Baghādād. This time the matter was completed; Kāwūs abdicated and Haidar succeeded him, later to become one of the greatest nobles of the court of Baghādād under al-Mu'taṣim where he was known as Afšīn (q.v.). The dynasty of the Sādīds of Āshābadị̄jān was descended from the royal family. His dynasty continued to reign until 893 (coin of the last ruler Sa'b b. Abī Allāh of 729 [932] in the Hermitage in Leningrad); after this date the country becomes a province of the Sāfawīs and ceases to have an independent existence while the Iranian element was almost entirely replaced by the Turkish.

**Bibliography:** The geographical descriptions (Ibn Khurdadbeh, al-Ya'qūbī, al-Iṣḥāqī, Ibn Hawkal, al-Ma'mūn) have been analysed and utilised by W. Barthold, Turkistan down to the Mongol Conquest, 2nd ed., in G. M. S., N. E. S., London 1928, p. 165—169. — The second part of the same book contains all the historical references (cf. under); cf. also: Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 473 sqq. (J. H. Kramers)

**OSTĀD (P.), master, teacher, artisan.** This word has passed into Arabic, with the plural ostādīn, uṣṭādīna. It also means munific, musician, merchant's ledger, in the modern language particularly teacher. Combined with dārb the form ostādar, "master of the house", major-domo, was applied to one of the great dignitaries of the Mamlīk sultanīn (q.v.). We also find the abbreviated forms uṣṭā, uṣṭā, uṣṭā, plural ustūr, uṣṭāwanī, ustāwanī, which in Cairo is applied to coachmen.

**Bibliography:** the lexicons of Ullīs, Lane, Deyy; C. A. Nallino, L'arabo parlato in Egitto, second ed., Milan 1911, p. 105—186. (A. J. Wensinck)

**OSTĀDĪS, the name of the leader of a religious movement in Khurāsān, directed against the 'Abūbidās. The rising began in 150 (767) and spread rapidly in the districts of Herāt, Bāghi, Gāndān-Rustān, and Sidjijiston; the sources say that it had 300,000 adherents. The first opposition it met with was at Marw-kūb the rebels killed the rebel leader al-Adīmī with a number of his followers. Hearing this, the caliph al-Mansūr sent his general Kshūm b. Khuzaima to his son al-Maḥān at Khurasan and the latter ordered Kshūm to attack the rebels with 20,000 men. After several checks due to the treachery of subordinates, Kshūm entrenched himself in a camp at a place, the name of which is not given, and by a number of strategic movements and with the help of reinforcements from Tukhārātān succeeded in defeating the rebels, of whom large numbers were slain. Ostādīs escaped to the mountains but was captured in the course of the following year. The 30,000 who accompanied him were set free but he and his sons were sent to Baghādād and executed. The rising of Ostādīs was of a religious character; he represented himself as a prophet and exhorted the people to kūfī (Tabarī, ii. 773); he was one of a series of heretical rebel leaders who appeared in Khurāsān after the death of Abū Muslim [q.v.] like Sinbād, the Magian, Bihārīfrīd [q.v.], Vīsūsī Bārm, and al-Ma'kānānī. It is probable that his views were based on Zoroastrian doctrines. The name of the leader is given by Tabarī as Ustādī-Sīn, "Lord Sīn"; the name Sīn is found in several Iranian names (cf. Juṭi, Altīran, Namūnbūb, p. 336; Manī's successor was called, according to Tabarī, p. 334: Sīn al-Imām and in the Greek sources: Sīnūsūs). On the other hand this heretic numbered amongst his adherents, according to the Kūshīštānī-Bidūrī and al-Turāṣī (ed. Huṣainī, vi. 86), a large number of Ghūza Turks, as was the case also with the rebel Iṣḥāq b. Thālab, who saw in Abū Muslim an incarnation of the deity. In al-Ya'qūbī's story it is said that Ostādīs declined to recognise al-Ma'mūn as his apparent, but the most astonishing statement is that of Ibn al-Abīrī, who says that Ostādīs was the father of Marāqīlī, wife of Hārūn al-Rašīd, and mother of al-Ma'mūn, and that Gāthālī, son of Ostādīs and maternal uncle of al-Ma'mūn, assassinated the latter's vizier, the famous al-Faḍīl b. Sahl known as Dhu l-Riyāsātān. It is impossible to say what can be at the basis of this story but perhaps we may see in it a tradition from a Persian source the object of which was to give al-Ma'mūn a royal or even saintly pedigree. The rising of Ostādīs broke out about half a millennium after the foundation of the Parthian dynasty and one of its bases was Sīdūrān which may have made this leader be regarded as one of the "saviours" (sawagīyān) expected in Zoroastrian religious tradition (cf. G. van Vloten, Recherches sur la domination arabe, in Verk. Ak. Amerl., i. 3. 1894, p. 68).

**Bibliography:** al-Ya'qūbī, Turāṣī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 457; al-Tabarī, iii. 334—338; Ibn al-Abīrī, v. 452 sqq., Wett, Geschichte der Chalifen, ii. 65. (J. H. Kramers)

**OTĀB B. GHAZWĀN B. AL-ḤĀRĪTH B. DIYĀR B. WAḤĪ (OF WAḤIR) B. ṢUḤAYB ALLĀH OR ABŪ GHAZWĀN AL-MĀZIRI** belonged to the tribe of Kābā 'Allān, half of the Nāfūrī or of the 'Abd Shamā, one of the oldest Companions of the Prophet, "the seventh of the Seven", i.e. the seventh to adopt Islam and one who had shared in the sufferings to which the first believers had been exposed in Mecca. He took part in both hijras, the battle of Badr, and in most of the battles and expeditions of the Prophet.

**He is best known as the founder of the Bāṣrī. In the lifetime of 'Umar he first of all conducted an expedition which ended in the capture of Obohla. 'Umar then appointed him agent (ṣāfīr) in the "country of India", i.e. the borderland between Arabia and Persian territory with orders to begin a campaign in the Sāwād [q.v.]. He made**
his headquarters at a hamlet called Kharaita, where he built all that was necessary for a military base: a mosque (cf. iii., p. 318), a residence for the governor, quarters for the soldiers, their families and all that goes to make a rising town. This was the nucleus of al-Bayza [q.v.]. The order of events and the chronology generally are far from being settled; the years given vary between 14 and 17. The years 15 and 17 are given for his death. Having performed the pilgrimage, he asked Omar to be allowed to resign his governorship but Omar refused to permit it. He then prayed God to spare him from returning to Bayza. On the way back he fell dead from his camel at the age of 57. Another tradition is given by Ibn Sa'd [cf. Bih]. He was succeeded by al-Maghra b. Shu'ba [q.v.].


'Otsman I

OKBA B. RABI'A b. 'ARD SHAM'I b. 'ARD MANAF ABU L-WALID, one of the chiefs of the tribe of Kurnā, who refused to follow Muhammed. He met his death in the battle of Badr. His daughter Hind was the wife of Abū Sofān [q.v.].

Shocked by the number of adherents of Muhammed Otha having consulted the other chiefs of the Kurnā, went to the Prophet to offer him anything he would care to ask if he would only abandon his propaganda. According to the traditional story, Muhammed in reply only repeated a part of Sūra XLI, which made such an impression on him that the effect was still visible when he rejoined his friends, whom he advised not to importune Muhammed any more. — Tradition puts him in a similar light when it represents him as one of those who on the eve of the battle of Badr endeavoured in vain to persuade the Kūraistic to withdraw. He himself was mortally wounded in the battle and his body was thrown into the common ditch (żalūd). Muhammed is said to have thought highly of his gifts.

Bibliography: Ibn Hīšām, Sūra, ed. Wüstenfeld, index; Tahart, ed. de Goeje, index; Ya'qūbi, ed. Houtsma, ii, 6, 19, 30; Buhl, Das Leben Muhammeda, Leipzig 1930, p. 183, 191, 242, 252; Lammens, La Mosquée à la veille de l'hégire, Brux, 1924, p. 69, 75. (A. J. Wessinck)

'Othman I, very often called 'Othman al-Ghūrī, founder of the dynasty of Ottoman sultans and the first in the traditional series of the members of the dynasty. We are only imperfectly acquainted with the life and personality of this founder of a great empire but we may conclude from the fact that his name has remained attached to the dynasty of the 'Othman Oghūlīyat or Al-i 'Othman and is later found in the description of the empire and its inhabitants as 'Othmanī or 'Oghūmīn that behind the name of 'Othman the line is a powerful personality. The most extensive source of information about him is Turkish historical literature and particularly its ancient chronicles, the Tārīkh-i al-ʿOghūmīn, representing the oldest tradition, along with a few poetic compositions of an epic nature dating from the end of the sixteenth century, like the latter part of the Kečdrar-nīm of Ahmâlt. The study of the ancient chronicles reveals to us that although they certainly contain some good historical traditions, they are loaded with additions of a legendary character. These additions are explained by the enormous expansion of the power of the earlier Ottoman princes within less than a century of the death of its founder. As often happens in such cases the obscure history of the ancestor was embellished with details of a legendary character foreshadowing the greatness of his descendants. On the other hand, all the chronicles show a tendency to establish a historical connection between the power of the Seldjūks of Asia Minor and that of the first Ottoman rulers by making Ertoghul or 'Oghūmīn be invested with certain powers by Sultan al-Min. The relations are more than doubtful. A third feature of the traditional accounts of 'Oghūmīn's career, which we find in all the chronicles, is the explanation of a number of geographical names by connecting them with events which took place in the glorious period of the founder of the dynasty. There is further the tendency which we find, pushed to its greatest extent in the chronicle of 'Asli̇ Fāṣaḥ Zāde, to attribute to 'Oghūmīn events which belong to the tradition of Ertoghul, like the prophetic dream regarding the greatness of the posterity of 'Oghūmīn and the daughter of Shaikh Edeballı̇, and the capture of the castle of Karadja Hı̇at; in the same way the chronicles put many feats of arms of Orkhan like the taking of Brusa and even the conquest of Köđa to the reign of 'Oghūmīn, who had then long been an invalid "with a disease of the limbs". While in the chronicles we can still distinguish with some probability the non-historical features, pragmatic Ottoman historiography, with which 'Asli̇ Fāṣaḥ Zāde and Idris Bidilī̇ form the transition, represents these traditions as historical facts. Among the Byzantine historians, Pachymeres and Nicephorus Gregoras alone have preserved historical features independent of the Ottoman tradition, which clearly shows its influence in the later Byzantine writers (Phrantzes, Ducas, Chalcocondylas). Quite legendary stories of 'Oghūmīn are also found in the biographical literature (cf. Das Volksh-Nümme des Ḫāğı Bekis, transl. E. Gross, in Türk. Bh., xxv., Leipzig 1925, p. 133).)

According to unanimous tradition, 'Oghūmīn was one of the sons of Ertoghul [q.v.], whom he succeeded as chief of a semi-autonomous Turkish clan which had its winter camp at Soğd [q.v.] in the valley of the Kāra Su. The date of Ertoghul's death is uncertain; later sources vary between 1245 and 1282. At this time Karadja Hı̇at and Eski Şeḫir [q.v.] situated considerably to the south of Soğd were perhaps already in the possession of this clan. They formed the frontier district bordering with the lands of the Germiyān-
Oghān, 'Othmān in the first phase of his career extended this cradle of Ottoman power to the north, by taking the fortresses of Inegöl, Kharmandjik, Bilecik, Yar Hısr and Körprü Hısr, which had hitherto been in the hands of the Byzantine feudal lords. This country consists of mountains and valleys lying to the west of the course of the Sakarya (q.v), and ends in the north in the plain of Yeni Şehir; the capture of the last place seems to have been of great military importance as it became a base of operation for future conquests (cf. the map Das Stammgebiet der Osmanen, attached to the article Anatolische Forschungen, by F. Tauscher, in Z.D.M.G., N.S., vii. S. 397). Von Hammer, G.O.R., ii. 69 thinks the enumeration by Pachymeres (ed. Bonn 1835, ii. 413) of the fortresses taken by the Turks corresponds pretty well with the conquests of 'Othmān. It is perhaps to this first stage of conquests that belongs the first recital of the khanğâ at Karajli Hısr in the name of 'Othmān by Bursa Fākīh. The chronicles put this event in 689 (1290). During this time the newly conquered territory seems to have received an increase of population from the side of the Germiyân (‘Aşğık Paşa Zade, ed. Gran, p. 20). The second phase in 'Othmān's career is that in which he was at his base at Yeni Şehir: he continued his conquests in the westerly direction towards Brusa and in a northerly direction towards Iznik. The Turks were not strong enough to hold these towns but they ravaged the country round. According to the chronicles, there was a battle between 'Othmān's Turks and a confederation of lords (jašid) of Brusa, Iznik and several other places at Koyun Hısr, near Iznik, in which the Turks were victorious; this battle has been identified since von Hammer's time with the battle of Hafisa in, which, according to Pachymeres (ii. 337), the hetarch Mouzallon was defeated in 1301 as a result of the impetuous onslaught of the Turkish cavalry. This victory enabled Lefke and Ak Hısr on the Sakarya to be taken and in the west Trissokia between Iznik and Brusa (Pachymers, ii. 337). In connection with this last victory (in 1298) Pachymeres mentions a personal feud between 'Othmān and the Byzantine princess Maria, sister of the emperor Andronicus, who was living in Nicæa. She had been promised in marriage to the Ilkhan Oltai Khudâbanda (q.v.) and had threatened 'Othmān with the latter's intervention. In this second period the Turks extended their conquests as far as Ulubâd (Leopoldia) to the west of Brusa. The third phase is that in which 'Othmān no longer took part personally in the military expeditions although, according to tradition, he was still alive. It was Orkhan (q.v.) and his companions in arms who continued the conquests. The first enterprise of Orkhan was the expulsion of a horde of Tatars who had invaded the district of Eski Şehir (perhaps sent by the Mongol allies of Byzantium). In the latest stage, 'Othmān devoted himself to the closer encirclement of Iznik and Brusa. This last town finally fell in 726 (1326), according to the chronicles, shortly before the death of 'Othmān who is said to have received the good news just before he died in Sogûd. The sources are not agreed as to whether 'Othmān was buried at Sogûd or Brusa. This last town has however for a very long time claimed to have a mosque of 'Othmān.

From the very beginning of his reign 'Othmān was surrounded by a group of devoted followers, consisting in part of his brothers and their sons and in part of allies like Shâhêk Edebali — whose daughter Mâlkhatân (in the two versions of Urdûj Beg her name is Rabîa) became the wife of 'Othmān and the mother of his sons Orkhan and ‘Ali al-Dîn — and the Byzantine lord of Khrimendjik, Köse Miğâl (q.v.) who later became a Muslim. The chronicles record how 'Othmān divided among his friends the civil and military administration of the places he conquered, As to 'Othmān's foreign policy, it seems that his relations with the Germiyân Oghâ and were not very friendly; it was from their territory that Eski Şehir was exposed to the invasions of the Turges. The chronicle of 'Aşğık Paşa Zade tells us that he had other independent Turkish allies like Şamsûna Ca'nûsh with whom he made raids across the Sakarya.

The chronology of the career of 'Othmān is uncertain. It is a pure fiction to say his reign began in 700 (1300); this is connected with the popular belief that at the end of each century a new conqueror makes his appearance (cf. ‘Ali, Kusâr al-Adâb, v. 3). Neither does the statement made by several chronicles that at his death 'Othmān had reigned nineteen years (urusit 393) agree with other records. Perhaps however it gives a hint that his death took place long before the traditional date. The importance of the career of 'Othmān has attracted research into the true nature of the expansion of the little Turkish clan and the period of its first chief. It has been suggested (Gibbons) that it was the conversion of 'Othmān to Islam which gave the first impetus to expansion, but that is little probable as most of the available facts suggest a millen already Muslim; 'Othmān did just what a number of other Turkish chieftains were doing in Asia Minor about the same time. 'Othmān's name, which looks strange among the Turkish names of the members of his family (the name of his grandfather Sulâmaiân Şâh excepted), has also been the subject of study. While the chronicles all write 'Othmān (like the few coins of Orkhan, cf. T.O.E.M., viii. 48 and an inscription of 'Othmān at Brusa; cf. T.O.E.M., iii. 318 sqq.), Pachymeres has the form ʿArşān and Nicephoros Gregoras (ed. Bonn 1849, i. 539) ʿArşān. Some Arabic sources (ibn Barḳût, i. 321; ibn Khâhidn, ʿIbar, v. 562) give ʿArshaḏudjik (Ibn Faṣl Allâh al-ʿUmari, however, has Taman) and the Italian historian Donato da Lezze (Historia Turcica, Bucarest 1910, p. 4) says that Ottoman was the son of Zâhih. Now some traditions make the founder of the dynasty be born in the town of 'Othmānlıdâjik to the south of Siâne (Ewliya Čelebi, ii. 179) which may be a hint of the origin of the name. Moreover, the text of the chronicle of Urdûj Beg (p. 6), taken in combination with other texts, shows that Ertequrî had three sons with Turkish names which might even make one suppose that 'Othmān was not a son of Ertequrî (cf. J. H. Kramers,Wer über Osman I., in A.O., vi. 242 sqq.; W. L. Langer and R. P. Blake, The Rise of the Ottoman Turks and its Historical Background, in American Hist. Review, 1932, p. 496). 'Othmān (ʿIṣhr) then may have belonged to one of the corporations of ʿIṣhrî or ʿIṣhrî as did several members of his entourage like Edebali and his nephew AḥrîHaṣan (ʿAṣğık Paşa Zade, p. 28), corporations which at this period represented a Muslim element more civilised
and more orthodox than the semi-nomad Turks.


Othman II, sixteenth sultan of the Ottoman empire, was born on the 19th Disma'd 1102 (Nov. 15, 1603; cf. Stiljil-i othmanii, i. 56), the son of Suliman Ahmad I. After the death of his father in Nov. 1617, the brother of the latter had been proclaimed sultan as Mustafa I [q.v.], but Othman, taking advantage of the weak character of his uncle and supported by the mufatt Es'ad Efendi and the Khalil Agha Mustafa, seized the throne on Feb. 26, 1618 by a coup d'etat. The youth of the new sultan at first assured the promoters of the coup d'etat of considerable influence. To them was due the replacement of Khalil Pasha as grand vizier by Okliz Mehmeh Pasha [q.v.] in Jan. 1619. Khalil had just concluded a treaty of peace with Shah 'Abbas I of Persia, after a campaign which had been indecisive. The relations with the other powers, Austria and Venice, with which the capitulations were renewed, were also peaceful. But after, in Jan. 1620, Mehmeh Pasha had been replaced by the very influential favourite Guezelci 'Ali Pasha [q.v.] who removed from the court all possible rivals, the chances of war increased. This time it was a war with Poland, which broke out through the intrigues of the voivod of Moldavia. In the battle of Yassy on Sept. 20, 1620, the Polish army was annihilated by the serasker Iskender Pasha. The grand vizier, who held office mainly by satisfying the avarice of the young sultan, never lost an occasion to irritate and provoke the enmity of Austria and Venice. He died on March 9, 1621 and under his successor Husain Pasha of Okhri, Othman II took part in person in the campaign of 1621 against Poland. This campaign ended in a check for the Turks and the Tartars, who, with great losses, had in vain tried to storm the fortified Polish camp on the Dnieper near Choczim. A preliminary peace was signed under the same conditions as before under Sulaiman I and the sultan appointed a new grand vizier Dilkewar-Zade Husain Pasha. Since the time when Othman, still considerably under the influence of the Khalil Agha Sulaiman and his Khodja Molla 'Omer, had begun to act independently, he had not been able to gain the sympathy of the army on account of his brutal treatment of the Janissaries, nor of the people chiefly, as a result of his avarice, nor of the 'islimiyye. The latter was particularly horrified at the sultan's wish to take four legitimate wives from the free classes of his entourage; he actually married the daughter of the Mufti Es'ad. His unpopularity increased still further when he wished to put himself at the head of an army to fight Fakhri al-Din, the Emir of the Druzes, and to go on and make the pilgrimage to Mecca. Preparations had already been made for this expedition when on May 18, 1622 a mutiny broke out among the Janissaries and Sipahis who plundered the house of Molla 'Omer. Next day the rebels secured the cooperation of the chief 'islimiyye and demanded the heads of the Khalil Agha, the Khodja, the grand vizier, and three other high officials. Othman at first refused but after the rebels had forced the third wall of the palace he had to sacrifice the grand vizier and the Khalil Agha. But in the meanwhile his uncle Mustafa had been brought out from his seclusion in the harems to be proclaimed sultan. 'Othman tried during the night to secure his throne through the influence of the Agha of the Janissaries, but the latter was killed on the following morning and he became the prisoner of the Janissaries who took him to their barracks. The rebels had no intentions against his life but in the meanwhile the direction of affairs had passed to Dawud Pasha, the favourite and son-in-law of Mah-Feke, the mother of Sulaiman Mustafa. Dawud Pasha being appointed grand vizier had 'Othman taken to the castle of Yedi Kule where he was put to death in the evening of May 20, 1622. He was buried in the turbe of his father Ahmad I. — 'Othman is praised for his skill as a horseman and for his intelligence. He was also a poet with the snubbed of Farsi. He was the first of three sultans to lose his life in a rising, the others being Ibrahim and Selim III.

Bibliography: The Turkish sources are the works of Na'im, Pechevi, Hasan Bey Zade, the Ruyat al-abhar of Kara Celabi Zade, and the Pehleke of Haji Iskender. — The Wagij-i Sultan 'Othman Khah of Tugh is specially devoted to the deposition of 'Othman (transl. by A. Galland; cf. G.O.W., p. 157), while his whole reign is described in a Shahnameh by Na'dir (G.O.W., p. 169). Among contemporary western accounts: the Relazioni quoted by von Hammer, in the note on p. 506 of G.O.R., ii. and that of Sir Thomas Roe. Cf. also the general histories by von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jord. (J. H. Kramers)

Othman III, twenty-fifth sultan of the Ottoman empire and son of Mustafa II, succeeded his brother Mahmud I on Dec. 14, 1754. He was born on Jan. 2, 1699 (Stiljil-i othmanii, i. 56) and had therefore reached an advanced age when he was called to the throne. No events of political importance took place in his reign. The period of peace which had begun with the peace of Belgrade in 1739 continued; at home only a series of sedition outbreaks in the frontier provinces indicated the weakness of the Empire. In the absence of any outstanding personality the sultan was able to rule as he pleased, but his activities were practically confined to changing his grand vizier frequently (six times). His favourite Setlildar 'Ali Pasha, grand vizier from Aug. 24 to Oct. 22, 1755, had his career terminated by execution. The appointment on Dec. 13, 1756 of Raghib Pasha [q.v.] was an important one, as for five years this great statesman showed himself an excellent administrator of the empire under Mustafa III. Othman III's other activities were the suppression of cafés, of the liberty of women to show themselves in public and the regulation of the dress of his non-Muslim subjects. His name is associated with the great mosque of Nur-i 'Othman, which had been begun by Mahmud I and was solemnly opened in Dec. 1755. The reign of this sultan is remembered.
for the great fires in the capital in 1755 and 1756. He died on Oct. 30, 1757 and was buried, like Mahmud I, in the tomb of the Yelî Dīvān. Bibliography: The Ta'rikh of Waqf is the principal source. The reign is described in the great histories of von Hammer, Zinzinseh and Jorga. (J. H. Krämers) OTHMÂN III. AYFÂN, the third caliph (23—35 = 642–654). He belonged to the great Mecan family of the Banû Umayya and to the branch descended from Abu 'l-Asā, whose grandson he was (cf. the genealogy in Wüstenfeld, Geneal. Tabelle, u. 23). This makes his prompt acceptance of the teaching of Muhammad quite noteworthy; he became a convert, if not at the very beginning of the Prophet's mission, at least not at a very early date, several years before the Hijra. Othmân was a rich merchant and an accomplished man of the world; tradition, which likes to represent him as a model of beauty and elegance and deals to a degree which borders on exaggeration with his toilet, may be correct, simply because it is unusual. Whatever was the exact motive that induced him to embrace a cause of which no one could then have possibly foreseen the success is a question that can never be answered with complete satisfaction. The set of historical traditions concerning his conversion with his marriage to Muhammad's daughter Raṣṣiyā but other sources, probably with more justice, put this marriage after his conversion. The conversion of Othmân, the first Muslim of high social rank, must have made a sensation and contributed to the success of the new religion, but his personal efforts on behalf of Islam were never remarkable. His indolent character, which was however accompanied by a very living faith and great good nature, is another feature ascribed by tradition to Othmân and it is unlikely that we have here an invention intended to excuse the inaction of this caliph against his lying officials; just because lack of energy and initiative is evident in Othmân from the very beginning of his career, this defect is ascribed to his conversion, which is to be inferred to have taken part in the migrations to Abyssinia and then joined the mukāfātān in Medina; but he did not take part in the battle of Bair (it is alleged that he had to attend to a sick wife; the Prophet however regarded him as present and allotted him his share of the booty). After the death of Raṣṣiyā the Prophet's alliance with Othmân was renewed by his marriage with another daughter, Um'm Kullāh; the doukas raised by Lammens (Rajma et les filles de Mahomet, Rome 1912, p. 3—5) regarding the actuality of this marriage do not seem to be justified; there is no reason to think that Muhammad did not lay great stress on this alliance with the only member of the Mecan aristocracy of whom the Muslim community could so far boast. During the lifetime of the Prophet and those of the caliphs the Bâk and 'Omar, the part played by Othmân was of very humble importance; how did it happen then that the council (jâmi'a) appointed by 'Omar on his deathbed chose him as successor to the second caliph? The sources dealing with the history of this laborious cause have been minutely analysed by Castani, but it is only too evident that the mysteries of these secret deliberations are never destined to be revealed to historical criticism. What it seems possible to affirm is that, as often happened in the papal conclaves, the most outstanding candidates ruled one another out; for example 'Ali whose election would have meant the negation of 'Omar's policy; or al-Zuhair and Taḥša, also it seems opponents of 'Omar and whose ambition and covetousness was feared. If among the three who remained, Sa'd b. Abî Waṣṣâ, Abî al-Rahmân b. 'Awf and 'Othmân, it was the latter who was chosen, it may be thought that even more than his relationship to the Prophet it was his being a member of the Umayyad clan that proved the decisive argument in his favour. The Umayyads had already regained in the lifetime of the Prophet, and especially during the caliphate of 'Omar, a part of the position they held during the Dâhilîya. There is no need to think as some one has done that Abî Sufayn, the head of the family, was the dies a machina of policy during the first twenty years of the caliphate, and it would be naive to represent the Umayyads as having formed a kind of secret committee dealing with the Islamic state as it pleased. In reality it was not so much to their noble birth as to a real talent for affairs possessed by several of their members that the Umayyads owed their influence. But this was counterbalanced in the time of 'Omar by the efforts made by other elements and especially by the oldest Companions. The strong personality of the second caliph had been able to maintain equilibrium among a number of heterogeneous elements, often in opposition to them.

It was otherwise with 'Othmân. In reality, as Wellhausen pointed out and Caetani has expounded at length, 'Othmân only followed and developed the policy of 'Omar. The difficulties he encountered were only the results of the policy of his predecessor. But it was just here that the difference in their talents became apparent. The tragedy which put a bloody end to the reign of 'Othmân and opened up the period of civil wars has caused the greatest embarrassment to the Arab historians, for it raises such a mass of grievances which Othmân raised against his rule and faced with the alternative of either acknowledging that the caliph had sinned against the laws of Islam or that his accusers, among whom were some of the most venerable patriarchs of the faith, had either lied or been deceived. It is owing to this painful dilemma (out of which orthodox tradition extricated itself by means of the theory of the "excusable error" and other subtle distinctions) that there has been preserved for us the long list of these grievances (which are given in great detail for example in Muhîth al-Dîn al-Tabârî, al-Riyâḍ al-mufrîd âl Manûbhî al-Ashârâ, Cairo 1327, ii. 137—155). The first and perhaps the gravest charge against him is that he appointed members of his family to the governorships in the provinces; if Syria had already been long in the hands of the Umayyad Mâwiyya b. Abî Sufayn, 'Othmân replaced Abî Mâzâ al-Asârî and Sa'd b. Abî Waṣṣâ by Basra Kûfâ respectively by his two relatives Abî Allâh b. 'Amr b. Kûraîh and al-Walîd b. 'Ukba, his half-brother; when the latter was dismissed, having been involved in a scandal, he was replaced by another Umayyad, Sa'd b. al-Asâ, to whom is attributed the celebrated saying: "The Surâd of Kûfâ is the garden of the Kûrahîb." Egypt, the first conqueror of which, 'Amr b. al-Asâ, seemed to deserve the right to hold the governorship for
life fell to 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abi Sarh, who was not an Umayyad, but whose Islamic past was, to say the least, suspicious. Finally the caliph's intimate adviser to whom tradition likes to ascribe a beneficent influence, was Marwān b. al-Hakam b. Abī l-‘Āṣ, first cousin of the caliph, who had recalled his father from the exile to which the Prophet had condemned him. It cannot be denied that these measures of 'Othmān were not entirely free from nepotism; but we must recognise in them a deeper motive, the intention of establishing unity of government and administration, which was being threatened by the excess of independence which the governors enjoyed. It was practically the same end that 'Omar had had in view but the latter had succeeded by his energy and prestige in imposing his authority even on governors who belonged to other tribes and clans; 'Othmān thought he could obtain the same results by using officials connected with him by ties of blood; he was not successful; the parts were reversed and it was the caliph who was under the influence of his relatives (perhaps however to a less extent than the official historians say); besides, popular discontent ascribed solely to this cause the troubles that arose, which were probably quite independent of the personality of the officials. Indeed (and it is one of Castracane's great merits that he has called attention to this) the 'āwil system instituted by 'Omar demanded that the plunder taken in war should increase steadily in perpetuity, the regular receipts from the taxation of the Abī al-Dāhima not sufficient for the new recruits who hastened to the provinces from the depths of Arabia. From this came the stimulus to the expeditions which in the caliphate of 'Omar never ceased to push forward the frontiers of the Arab empire: such were the conquest of the last provinces of the Sasanian empire (the dynasty of which became extinct with the murder of the last king Yazdagird III), the occupation of Armenia, a series of expeditions along the north coast of Africa, into Nubia, into Asia Minor, and by sea into the eastern basin of the Mediterranean. If we sum up the conquests made or begun by the Arabs in the caliphate of 'Othmān we shall see that if they do not show the swift expansion of those that took place under 'Omar, they are nevertheless impressive as they mark on one side the conclusion of the initial stage of the Arab empire and on the other the preliminary to the second period of expansion, that of the Umayyads.

Nevertheless the booty produced by these expeditions was perhaps not so great as had been hoped; besides, 'Othmān — this is another of the grievances against him — instead of assigning it entirely to the soldiers, reserved a share for his governors and for the members of his family, by developing the system of sīfāt (ṣāfatīs), which 'Omar had already made great use of. In this again, we should recognise not a simple scheme for enriching his relations but perhaps rather a conscientious attempt to form domains for the state in contrast to the communistic system of dividing all the booty among the combatants. The Islamic empire was tending from an innate necessity to give itself a regular administration, for which the Byzantine and Persian afforded models. What 'Omar had already begun, what the Umayyads to some extent accomplished, and the 'Abbasids realised, the transformation of the incoherent and anarchistic grouping of the tribes into an absolute monarchy of oriental type, was also 'Othmān's programme. He may be reproached with not having chosen the means best fitted to realise it and described as not being fit for a task of this magnitude; but his plan was a reasonable one and only meant following up 'Omar's ideal. Besides, the economic crisis, the inevitable consequence of the sudden enriching of the Arab masses, very soon forced the state to make economies and to cut down the military pensions; this not unnaturally increased the number of malcontents.

One of the steps which contributed very greatly to stirring up against 'Othmān the religious element, formed of the old Companions of humble or even servile origin (such as 'Amr b. Yazīr, Abī Dharr, 'Abd Allah b. Mas'ūd etc.), whose influence upon the masses was very strong, was the official edition of the Qur'ān (cf. Noldede-Schwally, Geschichte des Qur'āns, ii. 47–119). What was found most odious in the process was the destruction of the provincial copies. 'Othmān was no doubt urged to this step by considerations of a religious and liturgical nature, but nevertheless the determining motive may have been a political. The jāhili, who were the receptacles of course also the expositors of the sacred text, exercised for this reason a tremendous influence on the masses, which made them to some degree independent of the central power, the latter having no way of checking whether the Qur'ānic passages used by the jāhili were authentic or not. In depriving them of this weapon and making itself the monopolist of divine revelation, the government was endeavouring to realise unity and to establish its absolute power over the state; but it is only very natural that the opposition to this tendency should have accused the caliph of having matallated and destroyed the divine word.

'Othmān therefore made himself enemies in every different quarters: the turbulent elements of the amārīs [see maṣla] faced with economic difficulties and disposed to accuse the caliph of confiscating, for his own benefit the property of the Muslims; growing parties in which the assertion of the authority of the state seemed a breach of the principles of equality laid down by the Prophet; lastly the former governors who had been dismissed and the great Companions who, removed from power, were striving for it with all their might: such were Taḥif, al-Zubair and 'Alt. It may be asked if 'Othmān, while following the line of conduct imposed upon him, as we have seen, by the necessities of state and the example of his predecessor, could have avoided the fate which overtook him and which so profoundly disturbed the unity of Islam. Although the answer to this kind of question cannot be a definite one in the field of history, it may be supposed that a more intelligent mind and a more energetic temperament than that of the third caliph (or to be more definite a real political genius such as Mu'awiya would undoubtedly have revealed if he had then been at the head of the government) might perhaps have overcome these difficulties.
The course of development of events can only be briefly indicated here. Tradition divides quite artificially the caliphate of 'Othmān into two periods of equal length, six years (33—39) of good government and six (30—35) of illegality and confusion. The change is represented symbolically by the loss of the seal of the Prophet which 'Othmān, according to the story, dropped into the well of 'Ara in the year 30. It is in any case a fact that it was just at this period that the first movements of rebellion began in the 'Iraq, the region which was suffering most from the economic crisis and the one where the turbulent elements were the most numerous. The episode of Abī Ubayy, one of the precursors of asceticism in Islam, sailed to Syria with several of his companions, and later sent to Raballā to die there in destitution, although embellished by legend is characteristic as showing the attitude of the growing piecism to the secular transformation of the caliphate. Much more serious troubles however were in store for the 'Abd al-Mu'mīn, himself a pietist and opponent of 'Othmān; Kufa was henceforth no longer under the central government. Similarly in Egypt, Ibn Abī Sarh had to yield to the violence of a group led by the young Muhammad b. Abī Ḫulafā who although an adopted son of 'Othmān took the side of his opponents. It seems that the wily 'Ali b. al-Aswād al-Turaḫi who had retired to Palestine after his dismissal was secretly encouraging the revolutionary movement in Egypt. The storm which had been brewing for some time burst at the end of the year 35 when bodies of rebels advanced on Medina from the provinces. The first to arrive were the Egyptian; dramatic interviews took place between them and the caliph; the grievances against 'Othmān were expounded with great bitterness of language. But the rebels were disarmed by the humble and conciliatory attitude of the caliph who gave in to all their demands, promised to annul his previous measures and to change his governors; the Egyptians left satisfied. But suddenly, on the way back at the halting-place of al-ʿArīṣ, a messenger of 'Othmān's was seized and a letter found upon him from 'Othmān to Ibn Abī Sarh confectating which contained an order to put to death or mutilate the leaders of the movement on their return. The latter turned back furious and retraced their steps to Medina, determined on vengeance. 'Othmān denied that the letter was genuine, and even insinuated that it had been forged by his enemies in order to ruin him. Although official tradition shows a tendency to attribute this forgery to Marsān, there is also the trace of other versions and even of one (preserved by al-Ṭabarī alone), which says that 'Othmān suspected 'Ali; this, by the way, is what Caetani had suspected without knowing of this text (Annali, vii., p. 359). Whatever may be thought of this suspicious episode (we know well that the manufacture of false documents intended to bring ruin upon an adversary who cannot be defeated otherwise has been regularly practised in ancient as well as modern times), it is certain that, while it was the immediate cause of the tragic end of 'Othmān, events had already begun to move. A regular siege of 'Othmān's house was set up; the conduct of the old Companions who remained in veiled opposition was of the most hypocritical character; without having the courage to share in the deposition of the caliph by violence, and without the desire to help him against the rebels, they, 'Ali in particular, maintained an attitude of malevolent neutrality. 'Aṣārī, the widow of the Prophet, who had conducted a violent campaign against 'Othmān, preferred to slip away at the last moment on the pretext of a pilgrimage to Mecca. Reduced to the last extremity, 'Othmān masted all his dignity and refused to abdicate. After a siege, the length of which is given differently in the different sources, a number of men penetrated into the house in the last days of 35 (June 656) led by Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr (the son of the first caliph and brother of 'Alī) who raised his hand against 'Othmān. We do not know if it was he or another (tradition gives several names and it is evident that the exact details were supplied from the first) who gave the final blow to the caliph. His blood flowed, it is said, upon the copy of the Korān which he was reading when attacked; his wife, the Khaib Nāʾīra bint al-Fūrāfās, was wounded. The house was pillaged. During the night the body was buried with the greatest secrecy by his wife and some friends. The troops sent by Muʿāwiya from Syria (too late, says tradition, accusing him of duplicity) received the news of the murder when half way there and quickly returned home.

We know how the new caliph was elected in the midst of tumult and terror (cf. Caetani, Annali, iii., 321—342); it shows, the author of this article thinks, that there was not only the arrangement among the principal Companions, each of whom probably thought he could deal with events as they arose. The election of 'Alī was without doubt due, even more than to the prestige given him by his close relationship and alliance with the Prophet, to the support of the Āmār who in the confusion in the Umayyad party had resumed control over their own town. But the new government from the first was destined to be challenged either by the unsuccessful rivals or by Muʿāwiya, the only one of the Umayyad governors who had remained master of his province. Political unity, and soon also the religious unity, of Islam was now at an end and the period of schisms and civil wars had begun. The caliphate of 'Othmān and its bloody end mark a turning point in Muslim history and give to the third caliph an importance which his true personality, a somewhat mediocre one at best, would never have merited.

Bibliography: The sources and earlier works are collected and summed up in Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, viii. and viii., Milan 1914—1918 (cf. also by the same author Chronographia Islamica, p. 279—388). The only historical text of importance still unpublished, the Amār al-ʿAbhrāf al-Balāghūrī, is in course of publication by the University of Jerusalem. The part relating to 'Othmān, edited by D. S. F. Gootie (who has lent the writer proofs) mirrors and complements on many points the material already available but does not supply much that is new. We may also expect shortly the publication of the long biography of 'Othmān in the Fāṭimī
in the army and in the administration. Ahmad Digna and Madani both fell in fighting in the Eastern Sudân.
Down to the outbreak of the Mahdist rising, 'Othmân was a trader, dealing especially in slaves between the Hâjj and the Sudân. The prohibition of the slave-trade by the Egyptian government in 1877 affected not only his livelihood and his liberty - he and his brother 'Ali suffered a period of imprisonment in Ëd-dâr - but also his religious conviction that the slave-trade was a permitted one. Even then his religious fanaticism displayed itself in his joining the ecstatic begging order of the Madžûrûh. On hearing of the coming of the Mahdi Muhammad Ahmad [q. v.], "he migrated to him" (âd-dârâ), met him shortly after the fall of el-Obeid (al-Ôniyâl), in 1883 and took the oath of obedience to him (ațâr). Henceforth he was blindly devoted to the Mahdiya and retained his allegiance to it until his imprisonment.

It is evidence of the Mahdi's keen judgment that he at once recognised 'Othmân's extraordinary abilities and in a proclamation to the tribes of the eastern Sudân on May 8, 1883 (in Sh. 1301, ii. 201 yajûz) appointed him governor-general (âdami 'âmim) over the till then provincial tribes of the Bej'dja, between the Athbara and the Red Sea (with the towns of Sawâkîn, Tôkar and Kassala). These tribes who did not speak Arabic and had never been ruled by an Arab, readily gave obedience to their kinsman 'Othmân who was not only well known to them through years of friendly commerce but also knew their language and ways.

'Othmân's activity from 1883 to 1900 falls into two periods. In the first (1883–1891) as leader of the Mahdist rising in the eastern Sudân he carried out the important task of protecting the eastern frontier of the Mahdiya against the Anglo-Egyptian government, which made it possible for the Mahdi to concentrate his forces on the Nile. In the second period (till 1900) after the loss of the eastern Sudân, he was still general of the Mahdiya along with others in the service of the Khalîfah 'Abdûlâhî against the English under Kitchener.

1. The events of the first period which he opened from Erkowit with the encounter at Sînkât on Aug. 5, 1883 were at first concerned with Sawâkîn. The details of this fighting are given by Shukûr, iii. 300 yajûz, 323 yajûz, 300 yajûz, 538 yajûz, 601 yajûz. The main object was not so much the taking of Sawâkîn and other towns as the command of the roads between Sawâkîn and Berber, the shortest and most convenient route to the Nile. 'Othmân is entitled to the merit of having for seven years successfully closed this road to the government. In contrast to this, the results of the actual fighting were of little significance on either side. 'Othmân defeated the Egyptians under Mahdûlûh Pâshâ at el-Têb (Nov. 5, 1883); destroyed an Egyptian expedition at al-Tamânî (Dec. 1883), undertook the siege of Sînkât, Sînkât and Tôkar, defeated Baker Pâshâ in a second battle at el-Têb (Feb. 4, 1884), on Feb. 8 forced Sînkât to surrender and on Feb. 24 Tôkar, but on Feb. 29, 1884 suffered a severe defeat at el-Têb and again on March 13 and 27 at Tamâm at the hands of General Graham, which checked him for a time but did not cause him to withdraw. It was not till March 1885 that he began new operations from Tamâm, Tell Hashîm and Tôkar, with little success.
because the tribes which composed his army threatened to disperse, fearing English intervention. Nevertheless, he succeeded again and again in inspiring the unlimited confidence with which the Mahdist leaders flattered him, not least by the fact that he transferred the centre of his activities to Kassala and Abyasnia. The years 1884—1885 mark the zenith of his career. He incited the people of Kassala by Mahdist pamphlets; after the death of the Mahdi on June 22, 1885 and the fall of Kassala he was sent there by the Khalífa 'Abdullahí, as the only higher official of the Mahdi (not related to the Khaliifa) who had remained in his position, and from there waged war on the Amárí and the Abyasnis. He compensated himself for the failure of his Abyasnisian campaign by a savage treatment of the people of Kassala. As he was continually threatening Sawáikín and even went so far as to draw trenches round the town and begin a regular siege from Handuíb, Kitxenher, who was then in command at Sawáikín, forced him after a series of defeats to retire to 'Tokarí. 'Othmán's popularity now began to decline. The tribes became dissatisfied with his viciousness and severity and the continual warfare. The exhaustion of the Mahdísts was so great that the Khalífa allowed 'Othmán to resume trading between Sawáikín and the Mahdíya via Handuíb, but this was stopped on the opening of the final struggle between the Mahdísts and the Anglo-Egyptian government, and the result was famine among the Mahdísts. The oppression of Kassala by Muhammad Fáíl, sent there as emir by his uncle 'Othmán, induced the Khalífa to summon 'Othmán to Omdurman [q. v.]. He returned with full approval of his conduct and with new military powers but was completely defeated by Hollid Smith Bálighí who finally took 'Tokarí in Feb., 1887. The tribes scattered; 'Othmán fled abandoned by everyone to the mountains between Kassala and Berber. The country between the Atbara and the Red Sea was lost to the Mahdísts; Berber and Kassala were open to the English and Italians. 'Othmán was banished by the Khalífa to Adíríma on the Atbara, where in addition to buying himself with agriculture he endeavoured to raise a new army which was to hold the Atbara line.

II. When at the beginning of the decisive campaign against the Mahdísts, Kitchener conquered Berber in 1889, 'Othmán came to the front again. He led an army over the Nile at Shendi and joined his fellow-general Mahmúd. They were both defeated and Mahmúd was taken prisoner. In the battle that followed at Omdurman (Sept. 2, 1898) he attempted in vain to check the flight of the derelicts with a strong force between the Súrghásmí and the Nile. After the defeat he accompanied the Khalífa on his flight until the latter's death at Gádíd (Nov. 24, 1899), refused to surrender, escaped across the White Nile and Atbara into the Werríbi mountains and endeavoured with the help of the Shálik of the Djamálti to cross the Red Sea into the Hijáz. Through the treachery of the Shaikh he fell into the hands of the authorities of Sawáikín on Jan. 18, 1900, and was sent to prison in Damietta where Shakúr saw and spoke with him in 1903 (see Bibliography). To the kindness of the British and Egyptian Embassy in Berlin I owe the following details of 'Othmán's later life: 'Othmán's imprisonment took place on Jan. 12, 1900; he was brought to Rosetta, from there to Tárus near Cairo, finally, out of climatic reasons, to Wádi Halfa. After some years his lot was relieved; he was allowed to retain his property in Berber, but did not take any interest therein. In 1924, at a great age, he made the pilgrimage to Mecca; after his return to Wádi Halfa he settled outside the town, where he died in 1926; he was buried there.

'Othmán Digna was the model of a primitive unbroken nature. He was the type of the fanatic Mahdist, noteworthy as the only non-Arab to hold high office in the Mahdístya. He was an imposing figure as described by Shukír [q. v.], iii. 200 (German by Dietrich, p. 49). Not only did he know the languages of the tribes placed under him but he also spoke and wrote Arabic fluently (a specimen of his concise style is given by Shukír, iii. 212 sqq.). Courage verging on foolhardiness and cleverness which seized upon the slightest advantage, strictness to the verge of cruelty, and a stubbornness in following up his goal, from which even the severest defeats could not turn him, were combined in him with an artistic piety. Shukír described his ecstatic fits in prison (iii. 669) — and an ascetic mode of living. From the time of the coming of the Mahdi he went without sandals and shoes and used riding-boots only for longer journeys. He was therefore, along with wind Na'djumí and Abu 'Andúja, the most important Mahdist general and the most dreaded enemy of the government.

Bibliography: Na'tím Bey Şukúr, Turíbí al-shíli, ii., Cairo 1905; E. L. Dietrich, Der Mahdi Mühannam Ahmed vom Sudán nach arabischen Quellen, Berlin 1924, p. 49 sqq. (with further literature). — Cf. also the article Mu'hannam Ahmidí by Ernst Ludwig Dietrich)

'OTHMÁNÍDJÍK, the chief town in a nádi of the zauqá jí of Amásia in the wilayet of Siwas [q. v.] in Turkey in Asia, lies in a picturesque position at the foot of a volcanic hill which rises straight out of the plain and is crowned by a castle which formerly commanded the celebrated bridge said to have been built by Bâyázíd I. The settlement is probably very old as is evident from the numerous rock chambers cut out of the cliffs. The number of inhabitants according to Maercker (1893) was about 5,000 and they lived in 920 houses. It is connected by road with Meraflin in the east and with Tosia in the west. The importance of the place however lies entirely in the part it has played in history. The name 'Othmánídjík is connected with that of 'Othmán [q. v.], the Ottoman dynasty, and it is said that 'Othmán I took his name from this place which had been granted him by the sultans of the dynasty, which is found as early as the 14th century (probably for the first time in the Geschichte von der Turckey of Meister Jörg v. Nürnberg, Memminger n. d. but about 1496, and again in Spandugino, van Beuseck etc.), has little claim to credibility although it has been revived in modern times e.g. by Cl. Huart, in J.A.A., ser. ii, vol. ix., 1917, p. 345 sqq. and by J. H. Kramer, in Acta Orient., vii., 1927, p. 242 sqq.; of the soon W. L. Langer and R. P. Blake, in American Historical Review, xxxvii. (1932), 496, note with other references. It is probable that 'Othmán is the arabised form of a Turkish name which may have sounded something like Atmán, Arman and we must not forget Ibn Bajífíja's assertion that the founder of the dynasty called himself 'Othmánídjík, i.e. a Little 'Othman' to distinguish himself from the third caliph. The
Turkish sources are contradictory: Hüdudü Khatifah says that the town of "Othmân-zâde" took its name from the fact that in the 9th (1) century, a leader named Ožhmân conquered it, Evliya Celebi (1645–1683) says (in ii. 130 eve.) that many see in Othmân-zâde the birth-place of the emir Othmân. This opinion had become the current one about the middle of the 18th century, as may be seen from a passage in "Les Voyages et Observations of François le Gouz" Paris 1653, p. 65). The place does not appear in the clearer light of history till 1726 when it was taken by Bayazid I from the lord of Kastamuni, Bayazid Kofarium, and definitely incorporated in the Ottoman empire. The fact is worth mentioning that there was evidently a considerable Bektashi settlement here at an early date and the tomb of the famous Bektashi saint Koyun Baba [q. v.] in "Othmân-zâde has always been much visited. The inhabitants according to Hüdudü Khatifah belonged almost entirely to the order of the Bektashis. Cf. on this point in 1546 Le Voyage de Monseigneur d'Avrançon, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1887, p. 66 (where Cochin-Baba should be read Koyun-Baba). — Makarios of Antioch mentions a place called "Othmân-zâde" near Marash. He visited the site where there was said to have been formerly a large town of this name also called Osman Dada (= "Othmân-Dede") (Travels, ii. 453 eve.).

"Othmân-zâde Ahmed Tâhir, a notable Ottoman poet, scholar and historian of the end of the 18th and first third of the 19th century. The son of the "Othmân-zâde (müevne

teosörü) of the pious foundations, "Othmân Emir, he took up a theological career. The year of his birth is not recorded. From 1099 (1687) he held the post of Müddérvis in various mosques in Constantinople. At intervals he also worked in other places. For example in 1107 (1695) he went to Damascus with Kemal Efendi Mehmend Pasha when the latter was appointed governor there. In 1124 (1712) he was appointed müddérvis at the Sulaimâneye, a post he had aimed at from the very beginning. He then went as chief judge (Hâcî mue得多) to Aleppo in 1126 (1716) and lastly as Miyy müddérvis (chief justice of Cairo) to Cairo, where he died at the end of his year of office on the 2nd Ramadân 1136 (May 25, 1724). According to Brusel Mehmend Tâhir, there is in existence a biography of "Othmân-zâde composed by Ibn al-Emir Mahmut Kemîl Bey.

"Othmân-zâde was regarded by his contemporaries as the most important poet of his time. He was particularly celebrated for his chronograms (aşrîka) and hifa. A chronogram on the birth of prince Ilhâmî (1133 = 1720–1721) made such an impression on Sultan Ahmet III (1115–1143 = 1703–1730) that he gave "Othmân-zâde the title "king of poets" (mülâk sulûn âl-âsârî) and granted him a special hatta. "Othmân-zâde left behind him a dinsâr of the usual type (mârrettet-dinsâr) which consists of 12 kâtidas, 32 chronograms and 77 charas. Along with these are isolated poems, e. g. a satire (hâflâr) on Thâkib Efendi composed in 1124 (1712). He also wrote in verse a commentary on the 40 hadîths entitled Şarî-ı Hadîth-i ar-Rahîl, which is also known as Şihhat-ul-âdâb; it was written in 1126 (1715).

It is however to his prose works that he owes his fame with posterity, especially his historical works, some of which are still popular and valuable at the present day. The most important in his biographical collection Hadîthat al-Wunûrî (a most estimable and still important collection of lives of the first 92 grand viziers of the Ottoman empire, from "Ali al-Din "Ali Pasha to Râmi Muhammed Pasha who was dismissed in 1115 (1703). The work was composed six years before his death. It was printed at Constantinople in 1271 (1854). "Othmân-zâde's idea was later taken up by others. His biographical collection was continued by: Dâlver Ağa-Efendi ("Ömer Wahit), a friend of Râghib Pasha's who wrote a Dâlverî-ı Hadîthat al-Wunûrî, also called İdâmî-i Mûmitsî- Wunûrî-i-tâmir or Gûli Zîbâ, which covers the period from the grand vizier Kowânas Ahmed Pasha to Sa'îd Muhammed Pasha; also by Ahmed Îlîkî Bey, who compiled a continuation entitled Wird al-Muvağrî which covers the period 1172–1217 (1758–1802) from Râghib Pasha to Ye'âfî Zîbî Pasha, the conqueror of Egypt; finally by 'Abî al-Fatâh Şîkâhî b. Bağhâdî entitled Burhân-ı selû, covering the period 1217–1271 (1802–1854), from Zîbî al-Din Ye'âfî Pasha to 'Alemdar Muâsif Pasha.

All three continuations are printed as an appendix to the Hadîthat of "Othmân-zâde, while the later continuation by Iyfat Efendi: Wird al-Fâtâhî appeared in a lithograph separately while the continuation by Ahmed Sa'id Şehrî-ı Efendi entitled Dâlverî-ı Hadîthat al-Wunûrî 2 or Gûli Zîbâ or Gûlshen-i Mûlim which deals with 31 grand viziers from Niâhûdî Ahmet or Şihhdâr Muhammed Pasha to Sa'îd Muhammed Pasha, is still only available in MSS.

The two sketches of Turkish history by "Othmân-zâde also attained great popularity. The longer: İdâmî-ı Mûmitsî (or Teyrîkî-ı Selûnî-ı Ahî "Othmân deals with the first 24 Ottoman sultans, from the founder of the dynasty to Ahmet III. The shorter version: İsmet-ı Şebîhî or İsmet-ı Şebîhî-ı Ahî "Othmân or Muhammed-ı Teyrîkî-ı Selûnî or Ye'âfî-ı Selûnî or Hâfızat-ı Muâsif or Hâfızat-ı Muâsif covers the period from "Othmân to Muşaftî II. The number of varying titles shows the popularity of the work. The book, sometimes quoted as Fâdîî-ı Ahî "Othmân, dedicated to Dâmûl Ilhâmî Pasha, seems to be only a variant title of one of these books.

In the year of his death (1136 = 1724) "Othmân-zâde wrote a history of Fâdî Âlî Ahmed Pasha entitled Teyrîkî-ı Fâtî Ahmed Pasha, which like most of his works is only accessible in MSS. The Munâmûrâd Devletînî (struggle between the two kingdoms) in the form of questions and answers is also dedicated to İhrahil Pasha (MS, in Vienna).
and is an interesting contribution to the very highly developed matnārā literature.

As further independent works may be mentioned: 

İşân Nameğî al-Yahwâni and Tâbûsul al-Nûmnîn. Here we may mention his anthology Şâmi al-

Laçîfî (a collection of anecdotes, jests etc.). His stylistic collection Münşârî-i Tâbiî Efendi was intended for practical purposes; it is a collection of letters in three fasîl and a concluding chapter.

His extract from and editions and translations of other works are very numerous. The larger part of his work is collected in his Kullüyeti with an introduction by Âjmâd Hanîfe. Some titles cited by Von Hammer and himself Mehmâd Tâhir which apparently go back to Hanîfî, the continuator of the Âjmâd al-Zûnîn of Hâdidh Khalîfa, are probably not correct and refer to double or subsidiary titles. — Translations by him are: Mâhadîr al-Awârû and Mâhadîrî Şerîf, the latter entitled: Taiwîl al-Maşîlî on hâdît. — Extracts from or versions of other works are: Ablhâlî-Muhsîn (or Muhsînî-Ablhâlî Muhsînin or Ablhâlî al-Hâlahî) from the Ethics of Humain b. 'Abî Kâfî, who is known as Wâlij al-Herelî (d. 910 = 1504). The actual work which was written in Persian for Mîrzâ Muşânî b. Humain al-Bâlîkara was translated by 'Alî Mehmâd known as Ghûramî, with the title Âmîr al-Ârsîn in 747 (1636). Ablhâlî-Mubârî, an extract from the work of 'Abî b. 'Amr Allah, known as Ibn Hâdî (Isrâlî-kâdî) which was written for the Emir al-Âmîr of Shîm, 'Ali Pâchî, and therefore called after him the Âmîrî-kâdîn, i.e. of 'Abî Hâdî. We also have from his pen a synopsis of the Humâyûn-nâmâ. The Âmîrî-kâdîn, the Persian version of Ibn Muşûfî's Arabic version from the original Indian (Pahlawi) of Bûpatâ it was the work of Hûsin Wâlij Kâfî, court-preacher to Hûsin Bâlîkara of Herât. This Âmîrî-kâdîn was translated into Ottoman Turkish by 'Abî al-Wâlij 'Abî Mu'în 'Ali Celêhi b. Şâlijî, known as 'Abî Wâlij or Şâlijî-kâdîn with the title Humâyûn-nâmâ and dedicated to Sultan Sulaimân. 'Othmân-zâde abbreviated the Humâyûn-nâmâ to about a third of its length. This version was printed in Constantinople in 1526 under the title Tûbîyîn al-Âmîrîn. In the Tûbîyîtî this extract is entitled Zohîet al-Nâşîfî.

The version of the Nâshîfî (Nâshîfî al-Mulüb) of Reîs Elandî Sarî 'Abî Allah entitled Tûbîyîn al-Hikâm is also described as a synopsis of the Humâyûn-nâmâ. A synopsis of the Muşîfî-kâdîn of 'Abî is also attributed to 'Othmân-zâde.

Bibliography: Selim, Teheran, Constantinople 1314, p. 178—185; Farîî, Teheran, Constantinople 1271, p. 32; Hâdidh Khalîfa, Kâibî al-Zûnîn, ed. Flügel, esp. under Ayhâm Hanîfe, Numa'î, Numa'î-kâdîn, n. 245; Muşûmîlî Nândî, Edûni, Constantinople 1308, p. 92; Sâmî, Kâmûa al-Âlim, ill. 1301; Brausz Mehmâd Tâhir, Othmânî Mû'âlibîn, ill. 110—117; Hammer, G. G. É., lxx. 238; d. G. O. D., l. 120—131; Bablinger, G. W., p. 244 æ, æ, æ, æ. the MS. Catalogues by Flügel (Vienna); Fennel (Berlin); Aumer (Munich); Rien (Brit. Museum); Uppala, No. 202.

Otrâr, a town on the right bank of the Sir Dârî (Salûnî), a little south of its tributary the Arîs. The name is found as a geographical term for the first time in Yâkût (i. 310) as Utrâr but Tâhir (iii. 815—16) already knows of a prince called Utrâr-band as a rebel vassal of the Caliph al-Ma'mûn. The place that Ma'âdisâ calls Tarâ Târâ (i. 263, 274) in the district of Isfâhâni must be quite a different place. Otrâr may perhaps be the same as the capital of the district of Farûb [q.v.], a town which replaced the older one of Kadar (mentioned by Isâkî and Ibn Hawkâl) and called Farûb by Ma'âdisâ (Farûb on p. 273). The town of Otrâr acquired a melancholy fame through the part it played at the time of Cîngis Kâhân's invasion. It was then a frontier town of the empire of the Khâwarîmshahr (Mahmûd, who had captured it in 1210) from the Kâna Khitâb. The town was at that time under the command of Tâdî al-Dîn Ilhâm Kâhân who was giving trouble to his new ruler. In 1218, there came to Otrâr a great caravan of 450 people (Djwâisi, all Musulmân, sent by the conquering Mongol to open up commercial and peaceful relations with the Mahommâdian empire. Detailed at first by the commandant Inshâkî, either because he thought they were spies or simply because he coveted their wealth, they were later all massacred and the commandant seized their merchandise. One source (Nasawît) throws upon the âlîfî a part of the responsibility for this deed; in any case when an ambassador came from Cîngis Kâhân to complain of the outrage and demand the surrender of Inshâkî, he refused to hand him over and put the envoy to death. This made war inevitable. In 1219, Cîngis Kâhân appeared with a Mongol army on the Sir Dârî and laid siege to Otrâr. The town was taken after several months' siege and Inshâkî was captured and sent to Kâna Khitâb to be executed. It was from Otrâr that the Mongol armies set out which conquered the empire of the Khâwarîmshahr. Otrâr still existed at the beginning of the 15th cent. for Timûr Lang died there in 1405 (Allî Vardi, Zafar-nâmâ, ii. 645). The site of Otrâr is now only indicated by ruins.


(J. H. Kramer)

Oudh (Awaux), a district now forming part of the United Provinces of modern India, has an area of 24,154 square miles and a population of 12,794,979, of which 11,870,266 are to be found in the rural districts (Census of India, 1931).

From very early times Oudh and the neighbouring countries of the great alluvial plain of Northern India have been the peculiar home of Hindu civilization. The ancient Hindu kingdom of Kosala corresponded very nearly to the present province of Oudh, its capital, Ayodhya, the modern Adiyodhy on the river Gûjût, is supposed to have been the residence of Dârâshâh, the father of Rûmâ whose
expulsions are recorded in the Rāmāyaṇa. Here too arose a number of religious reactions against the asceticism and the social exclusiveness of Brahminism.

Apart from plundering raids, such as Mahmūd of Ghazni’s attack upon Manṣūr and the doubtful exploits of Sālār Maḥdūt Ghāzī recorded in the Mīrābz bars of 'Aḥī Abū Rāyān Cāhī, it was not until the last decade of the twelfth century, in the days of Kūth ḍīn-Dīn Abūlak [see above], that the Muslim invaders established themselves in Oudh and annexed it to the Dīl Shāhī state. It definitely formed a province of Muhammad b. Tughlāq’s extensive empire, but, towards the close of the fourteenth century, it was absorbed by the Shāfīī kingdom of Dīwānpūr [q.v.]. Under the Lodis’ [q.v.] it was once more part of the Shāhī state.

In the days of Akbar [q.v.] it formed a ḍāla of his empire, extending from the Ganges on the south-west to the Ganges on the north-east, and from the river Sāi in the south to the Tarāl of Nepal in the north. According to Aḥī l-Fadl, it was divided into five sākārs and thirty-eight parganas [Aḥī Abāḥī, in Bibliotheca Indica, ii. 170—177 [tr. Jarrett], 1891]. Local traditions in Oudh however, conflict with the Muslim accounts and declare that the Rājput chiefs maintained their authority practically intact throughout the Moghul period (W. G. Bennett, The Chief Clans of the Roś Buriyā District, 1895). The weakness of the central government under Aḥmar’s successors gave the nawabs of Oudh an opportunity of asserting their independence, although nominally they still acknowledged the authority of the Moghul emperor.

Sa‘īdī Khān Barhān al-Mulk, the real founder of the Oudh dynasty, was descended from a respectable Sāyiid family of Nīṣābūr (Mansūh b. Abū Ḥaṣūb al-Luḍāb b. Kāhī Khān, ii. 902). During his naṣṭīshīb (1732-1739) he both maintained internal order and extended his dominions so as to embrace Benares, Ghāratpur, Dīwānpūr and Āmār. His successor, Sa‘īdī Dāng (1739—1754), was appointed waiz of the empire in the year 1748. It was he who invited the Marāṯa to assist him against the Rohillas, the engagements entered into at that time forming the basis of later Marāṯa claims on Rohillând. His son and successor, the nawab-waizī Shāh Bādur (1754—1775), came into conflict with the rising power of the English East India Company and was totally defeated at Bāksar in 1764. This left Oudh at the disposal of the Company. By the treaty of Allahbād (1765) Oudh was restored to Shāh Bādur with the exception of Kora and Allahbād, which were given to the emperor for the upkeep of his dignity. British relations with this buffer state between Bengal and the Marāṯas were placed upon a firmer footing by the treaty of Benares (1775) which fixed the subsidy for British troops at 210,000 rupees per month. At the same time Kora and Allahbād were sold to the ruler of Oudh for fifty lakhs of rupees, because the emperor had deserted the Company and surrendered these districts to the Marāṯas.

The accession of the incapable 'Aqīf al-Dawla (1775—1797) enabled the hostile majority on Warren Hastings’s council to raise the subsidy to 250,000 rupees per month, and to force the new nawáb to cede Benares, Dīwānpūr and Ghāratpur in full sovereignty to the Company. At Āmār, in 1781, Hastings attempted to reform the waiz’s administration and to afford him relief by reducing the number of English troops in Oudh. His share in the resumption of the jāhrs and in the sequestration of the treasurers of the bégams of Oudh formed one of the charges against him on impeachment.

In 1801 Lord Wellesley forced Sa‘īdī ‘Ali Khān (1798—1814) to cede the whole of Rohillând and part of the Dīl, the revenues of which were devoted to the payment of the subsidiary force. Sa‘īdī ‘Ali Khān was succeeded by his eldest son, Ghāzī al-Dīn Haidar, who was the first ruler of Oudh to assume the title of king. The remaining kings of Oudh were Nāṣir al-Dīn Haidar (1827—1837), Muhammad ‘Ali Shāh (1837—1842), Asjad ‘Ali Shāh (1842—1847) and Wajīd ‘Ali Shāh (1847—1856). It was a provision of the treaty of 1801 that the ruler of Oudh should introduce into his country a system of administrative conductive to the prosperity of his subjects and calculated to secure their lives and property. In spite of repeated warnings nothing was done and misgovernment continued unchecked. On these grounds Oudh was annexed by Lord Dalhousie in 1856. Wajīd ‘Ali Shāh received a pension and was allowed to reside at Calcutta where, he died in 1857, his title expired with him.

On annexation Oudh was controlled by a Chief Commissioner, until, in 1877, both Agra and Oudh were placed under the same administration who was known as the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces and Chief Commissioner of Oudh. The title of Chief Commissioner was dropped on the formation of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in 1902. It was not, however, until 1921 that this administration was raised to the status of a Governor’s province.

The first land revenue settlement after annexation was carried out with a lack of consideration for the great talukdārs of the province, who were ousted from the greater part of their estates. This was reversed after the Mutiny when Canning reverted to a talukdār settlement and confirmed the rights of the talukdārs by sanads.

Today in Oudh Muslims are to be found chiefly where they held away in the past, their preference for urban life explaining their presence in the chief towns. Although the population is predominantly Hindu it is interesting to note that in the late decade Muslims have increased nearly twice as rapidly as Hindus. This is largely the result of social customs which permit Muslim widows to remarry and do not favour early marriages. Conversion has not affected these figures, for the jāhrī movement on the part of Muslims was countered by the shuddhī and sanyāsan movements on the part of Hindus.


(C. COLLIN DAVIES)

OUJDÁ (WADSA), a town in Eastern Morocco, eight miles from the Algerian frontier in the southern part of the vast plain of Augd. It was founded in 384 (994) by Zīr b. Ṭāṭīya, chief of the great Zenāta tribe of the Maghrības [q.v.]. We shall give a résumé of the events that led up to its foundation. In the course of the fighting between the Šanāţā and the Zenāta, the latter had been driven towards the extreme Maghrīb. Supporters of the Umayyads of Cordova, they had long defended their imperial policy in Barbary, especially in the time of the great minister Ibn Abī Ḥamīda al-Malik. Zīr b. Ṭāṭīya al-Maghrība, who had proved himself a particularly valuable ally, was allowed to occupy with his tribe the environs of Fās. He seized the opportunity to expel from the city the Bani Ḥran, another family of the Zenāta who had established themselves there. Not however having full confidence in the Umayyad minister, of whose policy he disapproved, and not feeling secure in the vicinity of or in the town of Fās, and wishing to be in touch with the central Maghrīb which was the real country of his tribe, he founded the town of Oujdā and garrisoned it with his troops; he brought his possessions there and put one of his relations in it as governor. The foresight of the founder was justified; in 424 (1033) the Bani Ḥran having reconquered Fās, the emir Ḥamīma, one of the successors of Zīr, took refuge in Oujdā.

According to al-Bukhārī, about the middle of the 9th century (after 440 = 1048), a new quarter surrounded by a wall was added to the original nucleus by a chief of the Oautaghīna tribe. The great mosque was outside of the two towns.

During the period of Umayyad expansion Yûsuf b. Ţāṭīrīn occupied Oujdā in 472 (1079). In the middle of the 9th century it became an Almohad town. In the reign of the Almohad al-Ḥā凭证, when the Bani Ghānīya, hoping to restore the power of the Almoravids, came from the south of Tunisia and extended their ravages into the region of Tiemcen, the fortifications of Oujdā were repaired and strengthened (Rāfi, p. 203; transl. p. 194).

It was however mainly after the installation of the ʿAbī al-Walīd in Tiemcen [q.v.] that the town of Oujdā, the bulwark of the frontier which separates the central from the extreme Maghīb (Ibn Khaladun) was summoned to play an important strategic part. Belonging to the kingdom of Tiemcen, it was the only place occupied by the Marinids of Fès when they invaded the lands of their hereditary enemies and the first victim of their attacks. In 670 (1271) the Marinid Abī Yūsuf having defeated Yaghmurān, the king of Tiemcen, near Oujda, laid the town in ruins. In 695 (1296) the Marinid Abī Yaḥyā having fortified his own frontier town of Tahtīr seized Oujdā and destroyed its defences. In the following year he seems to have wished to make Oujdā a base for his future expeditions. He rebuilt it; he erected a palace there, a citadel and a great mosque (probably that which still exists) and began the siege of Tiemcen which lasted eight years. In 714 (1314) the Marinid Abī Saʿīd delivered a fierce attack on Oujda which resisted and, presumably leaving troops in front of it to immobilise the garrison, he went on towards Tiemcen. In 735 (1335) Abī l-Ḥasan besieged Oujdā: it was taken and the fortifications dismantled. In 772 (1372), Tiemcen being occupied by the Marinids and Oujda being also in their hands, the Arab tribes of the region took the side of the dispossessed ʿAbī al-Walīd and laid siege to the town.

If these Arabs, the Dhāwī ʿUbaid Allāh of the great tribe of Maʿṣūl, were on this occasion supporting the cause of Tiemcen, it was not always so. They were for a long time on the side of the Marinids and were a serious danger to the ʿAbī al-Walīd on whose frontiers they were.

The tribes of the region, Arab as well as Berber, were also closely involved in the fighting in the 9th century between the Turks of Algeria and the Moorish sultān. In the town itself there were clans which supported each side. Authority passed from one side to the other, but it was only a relative authority, enjoyed precariously and intermittently. When peace reigned in the Maghīb and the sultān's orders were fully carried out, Oujdā formed part of his empire; if on the other hand the country was troubled and the power of the sovereign weakened, Oujdā went with the province of Tiemcen and belonged to the Turks (Voino). One of the few periods during which the authority of the sultān was firmly established in this remote province was the reign of Milīk ʿIsā (1053-1139 = 1647-1727), who brought to Oujdā Arabs from the south of Marrakesh, transformed them into a ʿAlīfī tribe [q.v.], strengthened the defences of the town, built several čalāq around it and organised the tribes of the plain. After his death the country lapsed into insecurity and anarchy. The Turks reappeared. Finally in 1795 a Sherifian force again took possession of Oujdā which henceforth remained under Moorish rule. An ʿAmmār (governor) represented the sultān in it.

In 1844 after the battle of Iflay, the town was temporarily occupied by the French as a punishment for the help given to ʿAbī al-Kādir by the sultān. The French troops reappeared there in 1859 and finally occupied it in 1907.

Oujdā, a town of old Morocco, where local government was non-existent had become a haunt of smugglers and fugitives from Algerian justice; it has been cleaned of all suspicious elements. The town, surrounded by its wall which however only dates from 1896, is surrounded by modern suburbs and beautiful gardens. The population is now about 30,000 of whom half are European.
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PADISHAH, the name for Muslim rulers, especially emperors. The Persian term padis
ah, i.e. (according to M. Bittner in E. Ober
hammer, Die Turken und das Osmanische Reich, Leipzig 1917, p. 103) "lord who is a royalty" in
which the root pad is connected with Sanskrit pal, lord, husband, son, pmn, Greek παῖς
boy, Lat. pānis (G. Curtius, Griech. Etymol., p. 377), was originally a title reserved exclusively for
the sovereign, which in course of time and as a result of the long intercourse of the Ottomans
with the states of the west also came to be approved for certain western rulers. In the correspondence
of the Porte with the western powers, the grand vizier Kayadja Murad Paşa (4. Aug. 5, 1612)
probably for the first time applied the title padishah to the Austrian emperor Rudolf II. At the conference
of Nemitow (1737) Russia demanded the title for its Czar (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., vii. 488) and
claimed it again at the negotiations at Bucharest (1773; cf. ibid., viii. 412). When padishah came to
be applied to the sultan, the padisba-i dev Oğham, does not seem to be exactly known. In
case it is found in conjunction with all kinds of rhyming words as early as the beginning of the xvi
century in Ottoman documents. Padishah therefore may have come to be used towards the end
of the xvi century, presumably instead of ābhāid (from ābāhid, i.e. S. of Padisba-i dev Oğham, and was regularly used till the
end of the sultanate (cf. the cry of padishahs tob or no paşa with which the sultan was until quite lately greeted by his troops and subjects).

Bibliography: St. Kekulé, Uber Tittel, Amter, Rangstufen und Anordnungen in der offi
ciellen osmanischen Sprache, Halle a. d. S. 1832, p. 3 and P. Horn, Grundriss der neupersischen Etymology, Strassburg 1893, p. 61, N. 99, 266
(where however another derivation is given, from Old Persian pad, protector, and xsh, ruler; cf. threcon Horn, in G. L. P., l. f. 274).
least. In 1785 a spiritual leader came down from the mountains with some thousands of followers and disciples in order to circumscribe the Christian population of the port of Padang, then the principal possession of the Dutch, and force them to adopt Islam (T. R. G. A. W. v. 55). The Minangkabauans managed to combine a strong Mohammedia outlook with the retention on a large scale of their old popular institutions. Matriliney still prevails among them. The administration of a village is conducted by the leading heads of families, the various sibis, i.e., union of families of different descent in common council. The form of government is republican. Every matter of any importance is considered by all the prominent families, their chiefs and other leading men (musaphah, At. musafah). It is a wearisome process, not calculated for speedy decisions. A society organised on these lines is naturally at a disadvantage against vigorous and powerful attacks.

In the beginning of the 16th century three Minangkabau pilgrims came home. They had seen Wahabhi rule in Mecca (after 1806). Filled with the puritan zeal of the Wahabhi, they set out to purify the religion of their own land. They were able to win over to their views a prominent theologian of the central district of Agam named Tanuku nan Rentiüh (Tanuku is a title for a theologian). He at once set to work. He first of all insisted on the exact observance of the law, particularly in ceremonial. Popular customs which in his opinion were contrary to the shari'ah were attacked, such as cock-fighting, which was associated with betting and was the most popular pastime of the people, dice, drinking of palm-wine, opium-smoking, betel-chewing, filing the teeth, wearing long nails, smoking tobacco. All these were forbidden. The prohibition of interest was insisted upon. The men were to cut their hair, let the beard grow and wear white clothes in the Arab style. The women were to wear veils. Finally the Padriis dealt a blow to the matriarchal institutions by taking their women into their houses with them (do Stuers, I. 185, footnote 3). The prohibition was to be strictly taken from Wahabhi practice, while the other prohibitions and commands all find a place in the Shafi'i school. It is also evident from Tanuku nan Rentiüh's attitude that he did not intend to institute Wahabism. In the same district of Agam lived a highly respected and very influential teacher: Tanuku Kothi tas; he was guru scharbat (At. tasbat), a master of mysticism; to what order he belonged is not known. Mysticism of a popular kind is much cultivated in Minangkabau; Tanuku nan Rentiüh turned to him, not to quarrel with him but to seek his cooperation. The Tanuku Kothi tas agreed that a strict observance of the law should be aimed at; but when Tanuku nan Rentiüh insisted that if any one did not perform the sabbah correctly he was a murtadd and was liable to the penalty of death as hadd, Tanuku Kothi tas met him with the milder doctrine that the murtadd should not be put to death, unless every effort to bring him to the true faith had failed, a case which however did not exist and was not to be expected. Tanuku nan Rentiüh now went his own way. After the Minangkabau custom, he summoned an assembly which was to approve his views. He met with enthusiastic approval from the theologians but with opposition from the chiefs; for the latter recognised at once that the Padri demands attacked their positions and would overthrow the whole social system. Tanuku nan Rentiüh went vigorously forward. With his own hand he stabbed his mother's sister whom he caught smoking; the body was thrown into the forest and not allowed to be buried. The effect was considerable; his followers applauded the deed, his silent or open enemies shrank back; he who had done such an unprecedented thing as not to heed the bonds of blood must be acting under a higher inspiration; it was not cruelty but self-sacrifice; the reformation went on with fanatical zeal. Whoever omitted a sabbah had to pay a fine; for a second offence the punishment was death. Opponents were overcome by force, their villages burned, themselves killed or made slaves or at least made to pay an indemnity. Soon the greater part of Agam and of the district of Tanuku Kothi tas were in his power. Several villages which had already yielded to pressure and adopted the stricter teaching of Tanuku Kothi tas were also plundered and burned. In the end the doings of his followers were too much for the leader and he retired after about eight years. It was only at a later date when the Dutch troops entered the country that he again placed himself at the head of the movement. He died in 1832.

The procedure adopted by Tanuku nan Rentiüh was as follows: after a village had been taken, he appointed on his own authority an imam and a haddi (At. haddi); the former was head of the mosque and had control of all religious matters; the sphere of activity of the haddi is not quite clear. In any case, this proceeding was revolutionary; by constitutional law the offices were hereditary with certain limitations; important decisions could only be made by musaphah (see above).

Another teacher, Ta in ku Pasaman also called Tanuku Linteau, was active in the south east in the district of Lintan. Less well known than Tanuku nan Rentiüh he in no way yielded to him in fanatical ardour. Linteau was soon in his power. He then entered the adjoining territory of Tanah Datu's. Here in the old capital lived in a faded glory of their former greatness the descendants of the royal house of Minangkabau. Well led, their power might have resulted in a restoration of their former greatness. Tanuku Linteau had them all murdered, except one who escaped across the frontier. Burning and murdering, he brought the whole land under his rule.

A third centre of Padri activity was Alahampandjang in the north. The movement began here at the same time as in Agam and Lintan. Very soon there came to the front here a man who is best known by his later name of Tanuku Imam, first as an adviser and then as the leading figure. We possess exceptionally a native source for the life and deeds of this important figure. Quite recently a Malay work, a kind of biography written by one of his sons, has been discovered and published (see Konkel, Indische Gids, 1915). The Padris of Alahampandjang began by building a fortress which they called Bondjo. Here the strict doctrine was observed and it was the central position of their power from which they sent out expeditions in all directions. Invited by sympathisers they would go to a village and subject it to a haddi, as Tanuku nan Rentiüh did, and return to Bondjo with rich booty. The bio-
graphy relates that campaigns were undertaken 

tervals of about a year. This was the period 
of Tumak Imam’s rise to be known for many 
matters he was invincibly insistent in 
all matters requiring intelligence and reflection 
so that all quarrels and disputes were finally brought 
to him." - Four men were sent to Mecca 
to guarantee the purity of the doctrine. After a long 
time they returned, even more strict. There was 
not yet regular spiritual intercourse with Mecca. 
Pilgrims were very few in number.

As soon as the Padris had overcome or driven 
away the supporters of the Adat, the latter tried 
to involve the English who had occupied Padang 
in 1795 in their agitation, but they could get no 
help from them. It was not until 1818 that the 
first post was established in the highlands by Sir 
Stanford Raffles. But its weak garrison could effect 
nothing, it was attacked by the Padris but without 
out success. When in 1819 Padang was again 
besieged over to the Dutch, they maintained 
and strengthened this post. In 1822 the offensive 
was assumed and lasted with some interruptions for 
15 years. The Dutch colonial government troops 
were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting 
but the attacks of the latter were continually 
assumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris 
stopped. Tumak Imam, who had till then held 
out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly 
paid for a rising which broke out in the beginning 
of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops who were 
distributed in small detachments over the entire 
country were almost wiped out. It soon became 
clear that members of the party who had invited 
the foreigners into the country were on the side 
of the Padris. Historians have shown that errors 
of policy by the military leaders and the not always 
tactful conduct of officers and men contributed 
to produce this misfortune. The truth of this cannot 
be disputed, but it should be pointed out to 
explain the altered attitude of many Malays that 
the strict rules laid down by the Padris of the 
early period became less rigid in course of time. The strength of the movement had been 
weakened by internal quarrels. Tumak Ketik 
fall, at one time attacked by Tumak nan Rendja’s 
successors, was revered as a saint in 1827, soon 
after his death. Padri and non-Padri made pilgrimages 
to his tomb. With the presence of the Dutch- 
Indonesian troops the Padris could no longer deal so 
harmfully and arbitrarily with their fellow-countrymen. 
Their popularities had increased. It is said in the 
biography of Tumak Imam of Bondjol, the bulwark of extremism: “the country was governed 
always according to the sayat-sayat; the tribal chiefs relied 
upon it, when disputes arose the matter was 
brought before the four legists, in matters of 
common law however, the decision was left to the 
chiefs”, Tumak Imam a little later told his son: 
“the authority of the common law shall be 
recognised by you, and follow as faithfully as possible 
the adat!” [q.v.]. During the pauses in the siege 
of Bondjol the Padris used to exchange tobacco with 
the soldiers; Padri and non-Padri had drawn 
money to one another. When the Padris summoned 
their compatriots to fight against the unbelievers, 
the appeal found an echo in wide circles.

After the rising the colonial troops again assumed 
the offensive. Gradually the conquerors enforced 
their authority. Only the Padris of Bondjol still 
resisted, they now formed the war party; any one 
of like views joined them. When the fortress 
was finally stormed in 1837, the Padri movement came 
to an end. Tumak Imam finally surrendered 
and was banished. The object which the Padris had originally aimed 
at was not attained; the matriarchal institutions 
still survived. If the movement had exerted any 
influence at all, it was in the direction of a more 
accurate and general observance of all the law especially 
of ceremonial. Nothing very definite can be said 
about it. We have no information about the 
situation in the country before the rise of the 
Padris. The movement can hardly have passed 
without leaving any trace at all.

Bibliography: De Soete der Padarins in de Padengische bovenlanden, in Indisch Magazine, 1844, ii. 21 sqq. (illuminating); P.C. van 

PAHANG. [See MALAY PENINSULA.]

PAI5 (Hindi), anglicised, the smallest 
Indian coin of British India = 1/12 of 
an anna. Originally, in the East India Company’s 
early experiments for a copper coinage, the pie 
as its name implies, was quarter of an anna 
or pie [cf. PAIS5]; since the Acts of 1835, 1844 
and 1870, however, the pie has been 1/3 of a 
anna.

(P.A. ALLAN)

PAIS5 (Hindi), anglicised, pie, a copper 
coin of British India = 5 pies or 1/4 of an 
anna. Under the Moghuls the name paisa became applied to the 
older dinar, introduced by Shih Shih, 60 of which 
went to the rupee, as the unit of copper currency; 
the name found on the coins however is usually 

called the official name for the extensive copper coinage coined in the 
seventh and eighth centuries by the numerous native 
states which arose out of the Moghul empire (cf. 
J. Plimpton, Urdu Table, ed. E. Thomas, London 
1858, p. 52 sqq.)

(P.A. ALLAN)

PAHENG, PALLIENG (v.), lit. string, rope, 
halter, cord, is applied to the cord worn 
by dervishes around the neck, at the end of 
which hangs a many-rayed star of cornelian, 
the size of a crown piece, called tezlim bâg, 
which is given to the young dervish at the end of 
his discipleship. With some, especially the 
Bektashi dervishes [cf. BEKTASI], a number 
of olive-shaped, whitish-grey, transparent stones 
are strung on the cord; these are found in Mesopotamia 
and called dûrâ-Neftî ("Pearls of Neftî"). The jumper 
(Turkish şişem) from which the tezlim 
stones of the Bektashi monks are made is said 
to be found in the neighbourhood of the town of 
Hajdari Bektash.

Bibliography: Th. Uppe, Shatari und 
die nordalbanische Kürsehendel, Sarajevò 1907,
Pālāheng — Palmyra

p. 78 (with reference to the Bektašt of Krnu in Albania); John Potter Brown, The Derivatives or Oriental Spiritualism, ed. H. A. Rose, London 1927, p. 214. (Franz Bähinger)

Pālānprū, a Muslim state in India now included in the Western India States Agency. The territory incorporated in this agency includes the area formerly known as Kāthikwār together with the Cutch and Pālānprū agencies. Its creation in October 1924, marked the end of the political control of the Government of Bombay and the beginning of direct relations with the Government of India. The old Pālānprū Agency with its headquarters at the town of Pālānprū was a group of states in Gujārat [q.v.] lying between 23° 25' and 24° 41' N., and 71° 16' and 74° 46' E. It was bounded on the north by the Rājpūt states of Udaipur and Siroh; on the east by the Mahārāṣṭrā Agency; on the south by the state of Baroda and Kāthikwār; and on the west by the Rāmm of Cutch.

The state of Pālānprū was conquered towards the end of the sixteenth century by Lohānī Pathāns, subsequently known as Dīthlorī. A short account of its history, under the Mughal emperors will be found in the Gazetteer of Bombay, v. 328—324, and in the Mirābī Alamī, (Ethē, N.B. 3599, fol. 741). British relations with this state date back to the year 1809, when, through British influence, arrangements were made for the payment of tribute to the Gāskwār of Baroda (Alīchīsīn, vi., ixxix.). This engagement was further strengthened by an agreement signed on November 28, 1817 (C. U. Alāchīson, vii., 24), in which all rights and liabilities assumed from the Gāskwār were abolished and the finances of the state remained under British supervision until 1824 when the ruler of Pālānprū was entrusted with the management of his own finances. Pālānprū is still ruled by Lohānī Pathāns. It has a population of 354,179, of whom 254,000 speak Gujāratī. The distribution of population according to religion is as follows: Hindus, 223,714; Muḥammādians, 28,690 and Jains, 12,542.


(C. Collin Davis)

Palmyra, Tadmur, now Tadmur, the ancient Tadmōr, called Palmyra by the Greeks (probably a corruption of the older name by a popular etymology; cf. Hommel, in Z.D.M.G., xxiv., 547; M. Hartmann, in Z. D. P. V., xx/ii., 128-190) lies northeast of Damascus in the great desert in an oasis watered by two springs. The water is sulphurous but drinkable after it has settled. The climate is unfavourable, having great differences of temperature between day and night and being unbearable but in summer and sometimes having snow in winter. What it lacked in climatic conditions was compensated for by its situation which made Tadmur an important junction on the caravan routes connecting east and west, notably that from the Emirates to Damascus. The natural supposition that the place was already of importance and settled in very early times has been confirmed by several inscriptions of Tīglat—Pileser I of the 11th century B.C. because the "town of Tadmur in the land of Amurru", which the Assyrian kings mentions, can hardly be anywhere else (R. Meisner, in G. Z., 1923, p. 157; Darrieu, in R.B., 1924, p. 106). Otherwise the city is not mentioned till shortly before the beginning of the Christian era and in the Old Testament only in a peculiar quid pro quo. While in I Kings 18 in the accepted text it is said that Solomon built Tamar (in southern Palestine) among other towns, the Chronicler (ii. 8, 4) followed by the variants and by Josephus, Archaeology, viii. 6, 1, gives Tadmor instead. From this it appears that the latter in his time must have been of some fame and size and also that the later widely known legend according to which Solomon built the wonderful city was already in existence. This story was known at a later date to the Arabs among whom it was related, in keeping with the fantastic elaboration of the legend of Solomon, that the djinn helped the king in the work (cf. Naqšīb, 190, v. 32; W. R. W. Gruffydd, p. 514 and several of the Arab geographers mentioned below; according to Ibn Al-Āthir, ed. Tornberg, i. 166 the queen Bilkis visited Solomon in Tadmur and is buried there).

Its incorporation in the Roman empire was of the greatest importance for Palmyra. It's already busy trade increased enormously and great wealth poured into the town, surrounded by the dreary desert (on the roads connecting Palmyra with the outer world see Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale, 1927, p. 248—270). From this period dates the brief but accurate account of Palmyra by Pliny (Hist. nat., v. 25). The merchants were able cleverly to maintain connubium between Rome and Parthia for their own advantage, and the conditions, when the emperor Hadrian, by the clever stroke of policy of leaving Assyria and Mesopotamia to the Parthians, inaugurated a long period of peace, contributed still more to the prosperity of the town. The custom of the year 136 written in Aramaic and Greek gives a vivid picture of the business life of the Palmyrene republic in this period, while the splendid ruins of the temple of the sun and of several other fine buildings show how highly developed was the artistic sense of its citizens under Greek influence. In the third century, further prospects opened up which induced the Palmyrenes for a brief period to dream of a new power in the east with their city as its centre. At the beginning of the third century arose the new Persian dynasty of the Sāsānians which revived the ancient bitter feud with the Romans so that the Palmyrenes again had an opportunity to use their diplomatic ability. The Palmyrenes under Odenathus (Udbina) II at first wanted to join the Persians under Shāpūr (224—272) but, when his offer was rejected, he joined the Roman general Ballista in Asia Minor and inflicted a heavy defeat on the retreating Persians. Under Gallienus he became the actual ruler of the whole of the east and was given the title Augusta by the emperor. When in 266—267 he was murdered, his dignity passed to his son Vaballathus, but the real power was in the hands of his widow Zenobia (Zainab), a highly gifted lady who extended her kingdom, notably by the conquest of Egypt. This was done with the approval of the emperor Aurelian, but Palmyra soon rebelled against the Romans and in 270 a battle was fought in which Zenobia was
defeated. Palmyra then surrendered. When it rebelled again, Aurelian had the city with its fine buildings destroyed. Zenobia died, was captured and brought to Rome. This queen, distinguished alike for her beauty and intellect, made a great impression on her contemporaries and her memory survived among the Arabs under the name of al-Zubaydah although only in fabulous tales in which little of history remains. She is said to have enticed the Arab king Najdil, [q. v. and the article q. a.] to her and then killed him by opening his arteries. Her nephew 'Amr b. 'Abd wished to avenge his blood. But was forced by the cunning of the king to do so and when the latter by stratagem got the cunning queen in his power, she took poison which she always carried in a ring she wore, in order not to be put to death by him.

With the fall of Zenobia, Palmyra lost its importance. The walls however were rebuilt although not on the former scale but the trade, the source of the town's livelihood, began to dry up. In this period Christianity began to spread in the town; bishops are mentioned and Justinian among others built a church there. Palmyra remained under Roman rule for about 31/2 centuries until the Arab conquest put an end to it. When Khalid b. al-Walid approached the town on his celebrated campaign, the inhabitants thought of defending the town against him but abandoned the idea and capitulated voluntarily in order to secure the status of dhimmi. [q. v.] they seem however to have rebelled again for it was only when Yazid sent Dhibay against it, after the taking of Damascus, that it was finally subjected.

Palmyra never regained its former prosperity under Muslim rule. It was inhabited mainly by Kalbids and was one of the towns which rebelled against Marwan II who set out with an army against it. An agreement was come to however but according to Ibn al-Fakhr (298 = 902), Marwan had a part of the walls destroyed. According to the legend, he abandoned the idea of destroying the town completely when he came upon the corpse of a richly dressed woman on whose forehead was a plate of gold with an inscription warning him against doing so.

Several Arab geographers mention Tadmur but very briefly. Some of them speak of the wonderful buildings and ruins, and as a rule they repeat the old legend that the town was built by Solomon with the help of the djinn. Ya'qub makes the intelligent observation that people are everywhere inclined to attribute great buildings to this king. The terrible earthquake of 1357 affected Palmyra. Benjamin of Tudela (1173) makes the rather remarkable statement that no fewer than 2,000 Jews able to bear arms lived in the town. Dimishki mentions along with incomparable ruins the djinni, the roof of which was forched of 13 stones. The strong citadel of Ka'atat al-Mansur north of the town is ascribed by the inhabitants to the famous race king Fakhr al-Din [q. v.]. But this is doubtful. Palmyra disappeared in the period of great decline in the east; its inhabitants flocked to the, then enriched village built on the temple of the sun, quite forgotten by the west. Not till 1675 was the once so famous city again discovered by members of the English factory at Aleppo and in 1751 it was more closely explored by Robert Wood and described in a handsome volume. When traffic began to revive again, Palmyra resumed its importance as a station on the caravan routes and in quite recent times new life has been given it by the motors, the new means of transit across the desert; these give a rapid and comfortable connection between Palmyra and the cities of east and west.


(FR. BÜHL)

PAMPOLUNA, Sp. Pamplona, Al. BANJALUNA, a town in the north of Spain, capital of the province of Navarre, has at the present day about 30,000 inhabitants. It was conquered by the Arabs in 1011 (728) during the rule of the waal Oghba b. al-Hajjâl. But the occupation of the town and its territory was of very short duration. It soon became the capital of the province of Navarre when García Ilúgo tried to found a small independent state; later at the beginning of the tenth century, it was the capital of the first king of Navarre, Sancho Abarca. Several expeditions were sent against Pampeluna by the Umayyad emirs of Cordova, in 228 (843), 246 (860), and 260 (874). Abd al-Rahman III succeeded in taking it for a time in 312 (924) in the course of his campaign against Navarre and destroyed it. Other attempts against Pampeluna were made by the Muslims in 322 (934) and during the rule of the two Amisil Al-Hajjis al-Mansur [q. v.] and al-Mu'tasim [q. v.].


(E. LEY-PROVENCAL)

PANDJÂB, the land of the five rivers, is a province of modern India which, together with the North-West Frontier Province and Kashmir [q. v.], occupies the extreme north-western corner of the Indian Empire, and, with the exception of
the recently-constituted Delhi province, comprises all of British India north of Sind and Rajputana and west of the river Jamma. Geographically therefore it includes more than its name implies, for, in addition to the country watered by the Jhelum, Chenab, Rawal, Beas, and Satlej, it embraces the table-land of Sihind between the Satlej and Jamma, the Sind-Sagar Doab between the Satlej and the Indus, and the district of Dera Ghaz Shāh. Administratively the province is divided into two parts, British territory and the Panjab States. British territory, which has an area of 93,665 square miles and a population of 23,582,552, is divided into 49 districts, each administered by a deputy-commissioner. These districts are grouped into the five divisions of Ambalā, Dīllīnagar, Lāhore, Rāwālpindi, and Multān, each under a commissioner. The Panjab States have an area of 37,699 square miles and a population of 4,910,005. The conduct of political relations with Dīllīnagar, Pātawādī, Kalsia, and the 27 Simla Hill States is in the hands of the Panjab Government. The remaining states of Lohārī, Sīrūr, Bhāispur, Mandi, Suket, Kupurthāl, Malār-Khāla, Fānīkūt, Čambī, Rāwālpindi, and the Pūlīkāns of Pattālāh, Dīllī, and Nāthā, are directly under the Government of India.

The history of this area has been profoundly influenced by the fact that the mountain passes of the north-west frontier afforded access to the Panjab plain. For this reason it is ethnologically more nearly allied to Central Asia than to India. The recent excavations at Harappa in the Montgomery district are evidence of a culture which probably flourished in the Indus valley about 3000 B.C., and which bears a general resemblance to that of Elam and Mesopotamia (Sir John Marshall, Mohenjo-Darā and the Indus Civilization, 3 vols., 1931). But the first migration of which we have any evidence is that of the Arya-speaking peoples who established themselves on the Panjab plain in pre-historic times. Centuries later successive waves of invaders swept like devastating torrents through the mountain passes of the north-west. Persian, Greek, and Afghan, the forces of Alexander and the armies of Mahommed of Ghazni, the hosts of Timūr, Bihār, and Mirābī Shāh, and the troops of Aḥmad Shāh Durrāntī [cf. these articles], all advanced by these routes to lay waste the fertile plains of the Panjab. All these migrations and invasions added to the heterogeneity of the existing population in the land of the five rivers. The history of invasions from Central Asia proves that the Panjab and the frontier zone from the banks of the Indus to the Afghan slopes of the Sulaimān range have never presented any real barrier to an enterprise-minded. The Sulaimān range itself has seldom formed a political boundary, for the Persians, the Persians, Manṣūrā, the “Mogul” line, the Kāshmir valley of the Yūsuf and the Himalayas all beset this mountain barrier.

The capture of Multān [q.v.] by Muhammad b. Khāsim [q.v.], in 723 A.D., extended Arab power to upper Sind and the lower Panjab, but the same threat to Hindustān came from the direction of modern Afghanistan. The Ghurāwal invaders found the powerful Hindūkush dynasty of the Dinarīd family ruling between Lāmāchān and the Čingh. The power of this Hindu state was completely destroyed by Mahommed of Ghzān who annexed the Panjab, which became a frontier province of his

extensive empire and the sole refuge of his descendants when driven out of Ghzān by the Shāsābātī Sulṭān of Ghūr [see Shāsābātī]. Multān and the surrounding country had remained in Muslim hands since the days of the Arab conquest, but the fact that its rulers were heretical Karmājians [q.v.] was one reason for Mahommed’s attack in 1006 A.D. Muhammad Ghzān annexed the Panjab in 1186 A.D. and on his death in 1193 it definitely became a province of the Sulṭānate of Dīllī under the rule of Khūlī ad-Dīn Ālab. With the exception of occasional rebellions and raids from Central Asia it remained under the Sulṭānate of Dīllī until the death of Ibrāhīm Lodi [q.v.] in 1526 A.D. paved the way for the foundation of the Mughal empire. Under Akbār [q.v.] the modern province of the Panjab was included in the sīkhs of Lāhore, Multān, and Dīllī, a detailed description of which will be found in the Alā’-ul Akbār (trans. Jarrett, II, 278–341).

The persecuting policy of Akbār’s immediate successors led to the growth of Sikh political power in the Panjab and transformed a band of religious devotees, founded by Guru Nānak in the second half of the fifteenth century, into a military commonwealth, or Khāṣhā animated with an enduring hatred towards Muslims [cf. the article Sikh]. The weakness of the central government and the unexploited condition of the frontier provinces under the later Mughals exposed Hindustān to the invasions of Nādir Shāh [q.v.] and Aḥmad Shāh Durrāntī [q.v.]. On the bloodstained field of Panipat, in 1761, the Marāñjas, who were aspiring to universal sovereignty, sustained a crushing defeat at the hands of the Afghan invader. In the following year, at Bārnālī near Lūthānā, Aḥmad Shāh disastrously defeated the Sikhs who had taken advantage of his absence in Kāth to possess themselves of the country around Lāhore. The Sikhs, however, soon extended their sway to the south of the Satlej and ravaged the country to the very gates of Dīllī, but their further advance was checked by the Marāñjas who had rapidly recovered from their defeat at Panipat. It was the Marāñjas who led by Lord Luitzen, in 1803, which facilitated the rise of Ranjit Singh and enabled him to found a powerful Sikh kingdom in the Panjab. His attempts to extend his authority over his co-religionists, the Ghīr-Satlej Sikhs, brought him into contact with the British, and, by the treaty of 1809, he pledged himself to regard the Satlej as the northwest frontier of the British dominions in India (Altchison, viii., III, 2). After the death of Ranjit Singh, in 1839, his kingdom rapidly fell to pieces under his successors. Revolution succeeded revolution, and during the minority of Dalīp Singh the Khāṣhā soliety became virtually rulers of the country. Unprovoked aggression on British territory produced two Sikh wars which ended with the annexation of the Panjab in 1849.

At first the newly-conquered territories were placed under a Board of Administration. This was abolished in 1855, its powers and functions being vested in a Chief Commissioner. In 1859, after the transfer of the Dīllī territory from the North-Western (now the United) Provinces, the Panjab and its dependencies were formed into a Lieutenant-Governorship.

The annexation of the Panjab by advancing the British administrative boundary across the Indus
brought the Government of India into closer contact with the Pathan tribes of the north-west frontier and the Amir of Afghanistan (p. v.). Because this frontier was too long and too mountainous to admit of its being defended by the military alone, much depended upon the political management of the tribes. At first there was no special agency for dealing with the tribal races, and relations with the tribesmen were conducted by the deputy-commissioners of the six districts of Haskell, Peshawar, Kohat, Bannu, Dera Isma'il Khan, and Dera Ghazi Khan. In 1877, the three northern districts formed the commissionship of Peshawar, the three southern ones that of the Deradjat. The system of political agencies was adopted until 1878, when a special officer was appointed for the Khyber during the Second Afghan War, Kurram became an agency in 1892, while the three remaining agencies of the Malakand, Tochi, and Wazir were created between 1895 and 1896. The Malakand was placed under the direct control of the Government of India from the outset, all the other agencies remaining under the Pandjâb Government. This was the arrangement until the creation of the North-West Frontier Province in 1901.

The Pandjâb attained its present dimensions in 1911 when Dihl became a separate province. It was not however until 1921 that it was raised to the status of a governor's province. To-day it contains 14,930,000 Mahommadians, 3,600,000 Hindus, and 4,072,000 Sikhs. Unfortunately the spirit of communal antagonism has been fostered in the province by the activities of the Zeenat Islam, and Shudh movements organized by Muslims for the purpose of combating the proselytizing activities of the Hindu community known as the Shudh movement. In 1926 Swami Sharanand, a leader of the Shudh movement, was murdered in Dihl by a Muslim. Communal relations were further embittered by the murder in Lahore of a Hindu book-seller who had published a libellous attack on the character of the Prophet of Islam in his book entitled the Rangila Rasul. Far more serious than this communal strife were the political disturbances culminating in the Dhillawala high incident of 1919 (Sir M. O'Dwyer, India At & After the, 1925).

At least 90 per cent. of the total population live in villages and 60 per cent. is supported by agriculture, for the Pandjâb is a country of peasant proprietors. But the bulk of the cultivators are born in debt, live in debt, and die in debt. Almost the whole of this money has been advanced by Hindus and Sikhs who are not debared by religion from the taking of interest, but, unfortunately, well over half of this debt has been incurred by Mahommadians. No community can hope to thrive under so great a handicap and some organisation to combat this evil is essential to the prosperity of the Mahommadian community.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the standard works on the history of India: C. U. Atchison, Travels, Engagements, and Sojourns, vol. viii., 1903; M. H. All-Al,din, Dpurana (India Office, No. 3241); Census of India (1921), vol. xvii., 1933; J. D. Cunningham, History of the Sikhs, 1918; M. L. Darling, The Punjab Peasant in Prosperity and Debt, 1925; C. C. Davies, The Problem of the North-West Frontier, 1932; C. Gough and A. D. Innes, The Sikhs and the Sikh War, 1897; L. H. Griffin, The Rajas of the Punjab, 1873; Dr., Pandit Singh, 1892; Indian Statutory Commission, vol. 3., 1932; S. M. Lalit, History of the Punjab, 1891; Dr., Laskar, its history, architectural remains and antiquities, 1892; M. Macauliffe, The Sikh Religion, 6 vols., 1909; Ghulam Mahdi ?, Durrani, ?r?h-i-Pandjâb (India Office, No. 3244); Muhammad Khan, ?irh Singh ?amma (India Office, No. 3241); T. C. Powel, ?all?h-i-Afghani, 1875; H. Priestley, Hayati-Afghani, 1874; Punjab Administration Reports (published annually); H. A. Rose, A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province, 3 vols., 1939.

(C. Collin Davies)

**PANDJÎH, (Pendjih)** a village in the Turkoman republic of the U.S.S.R., situated to the east of the Kughâh river near its junction with the Murghâb at Pâlì Kîght. The fact that the inhabitants of this area, the Sarik Turkomans, were divided into five sections, the Sokhit, Harkhâh, Khorshâh, Baliz, and the All Shih, has been put forward as a possible explanation of the origin of the name Pendjîh, but it carries no weight as the Sariks were only nineteenth century immigrants whereas the name was in use in the fifteenth century.

This obscure name owes a somewhat melancholy importance to the “Pendjîh Incident” of 1883, when an Afghan force suffered heavy losses in an engagement with Russian troops. History proves that an ill-defined boundary is a potential cause of war. It was a knowledge of this and the Russian occupation of Merw, in 1884, that gave the necessary impetus to negotiations which ended in the appointment of an Anglo-Russian Boundary Commission for the delimitation and demarcation of the northern boundary of Afghanistan. Trouble immediately arose in this quarter for while the Russians contended that the inhabitants of Pendjîh were independent the British held the view that they were subjects of the Amir of Afghanistan. According to the British, the district of Pendjîh, which comprised the country between the Kughâh and Murghâb rivers from the Band-i Nadir to Ak Tepê, together with the rest of Badghis, formed part of the Herat province of Afghanistan. During the first quarter of the nineteenth century Pendjîh had been occupied by Djamgidis and Hazaras. Towards the end of this period some Turkomans of the Erarti tribe, whose settlements were scattered along the banks of the Oxus between the Çardij and Bâlkh, moved to Pendjîh and obtained permission to settle there. Salor Turkomans had also settled in this area. About 1857 the Erartis migrated from the coast of Pendjîh and soon afterwards the Sarik Turkomans, forced southwards by their more powerful neighbours, the Turkestânis, occupied Valatan and Pendjîh and compelled the Salor families to migrate elsewhere. Although therefore, Pendjîh had from time to time been occupied by various tribes, they had all, whether Djamgidis, Hazaras, Ersis, Sarors or Sariks, acknowledged they were on Afghan soil, and paid tribute to the Amir or deputy of the Afghan governor of Herat. The Sarik Turkomans had even supplied the Amir with troops. The British therefore contended that the district of Badghis, of which Pendjîh formed a part, had long been under Afghan rule (Foreign Office MSS. 65, 1205).

The Russians on the other hand contended that
the people of this oasis had always enjoyed independence. Lessar, a Russian engineer, who visited Pendjeh in March 1884, discovered no trace of Afghan authority, but a Russian doctor, Dr. Regel, who visited it in June of the same year reported the presence of an Afghan detachment. In their opinion therefore Pendjeh had only recently been occupied by Afghan troops.

The fact that the Afghans had not permanently garrisoned this area was no proof of its independence. On the contrary, it was only natural that, after the Russian occupation of Merw and Pul-i-Khatun, 'Abd al-Rahman Khan should have taken steps to indicate his sovereign rights over this area. When, therefore, an Afghan garrison occupied Pendjeh, the Russian Government immediately protested and disputed the Amir's claim to the territory. While negotiations were taking place, between London and St. Petersburgh, events moved swiftly on the frontiers of Afghanistan. On March 29, 1885, General Komarov sent an ultimatum demanding the withdrawal of the Afghan garrison. The Afghans resolutely refused to withdraw whereupon the Russians attacked them driving them across the Pul-i Kighti with the loss of some 900 men. It must be admitted that the posting of Afghan troops in Pendjeh, and the Russian advance to Yelatan on the Murghab and to Pul-i-Khatun on the Hari Rud, were regrettable actions almost certain to precipitate war. The whole incident should have been avoided, but the confusing reports of Lummis, the British Commissioner, to the Foreign Office, and the delay of Zelenoi, the Russian Commissioner, in arriving at Sarakhs complicated matters still more.

At the time this incident seemed likely to embroil Russia and Britain in war, but, fortunately, the good sense of the Amir, who was at this critical moment as a visit to the Vicerey, and the diplomatic skill of Lord Dufferin prevented this, for even the pacific Mr. Gladstone had proposed to Parliament that £11,000,000 should be expended on preparations for war.

It was finally agreed that Pendjeh should be handed over to Russia in exchange for Dhu'-l-Fihr, and by the treaty of 1886 the northern boundary of Afghanistan had been demarcated from Dhu'-l-Fihr to the meridian of Dukki-i-Sulaim, a distance of forty miles of the Oxus. After a dispute as to the exact point at which the boundary line should meet the Oxus, the process of demarcation was completed in 1888. This recognition of a definite frontier between Russia and Afghanistan led to a decided improvement in the Central Asian question.

Bibliography: Delimitation of Afghan, Negotiations entre la Russie et la Grande-Bretagne, 1872-1875, 1886; Parliamentary Papers, Central Asia, 1884-1885, xxxvii, c. 3873-3894, 4478; Public Record Office, London, Foreign Office MSS., 65, 1205; 1238-1245; C. C. Yate, Northern Afghanistan, 1888.

PANGULU (Jaw., pangulu (Sund.), pangole (Madur.)), literally "headman, district officer" used in the eastern Indian Archipelago as the name for secular and religious chief administrators in the islands of Java and Madura, the name of a mosque official, usually the chief in his area. The official representatives of religion are organised there on the same scheme as the native administrative officials. Alongside of the regent, the highest administrative official, is the pangulu of the regency, alongside of the head of the district is the pangulu of the district, called the pangulu adat, or briefly adat, and so on. The officials of the mosque are ranked in a hierarchy: the pangulu at the capital of the regency is at the head of all the personnel of the mosques of the regency. The village official in charge of the mosque services is of a different origin. He is a member of the village authority for attending to the religious requirements of the village and does not belong to the staff of the mosque. This man is exceptionally called pangulu in Bandung (Western Java); elsewhere he is known by other names.

The pangulu is the director of the mosque and the chief of its personnel; according to adat law, he is appointed, like the rest of the staff of the mosque, by the regent, usually being chosen from the staff of his own or another mosque. This procedure does not always guarantee that the man appointed is specially qualified (see below).

Theological training is quite free from special prescriptions. The student of theology, whether he intends to take up an official position or remain a private student, studies at schools (all private institutions of which there are many in the land). Each student, as he pleses, for shorter or longer periods, is therefore to an extent to attend lectures at several schools.

The functions of the pangulu are very varied, but not uniform throughout the whole regency. The office of director of the mosque has already been mentioned; in larger villages, especially at the capital of the regency, the staff is large; there the pangulu does not himself take part in the work. The pangulu has charge of marriages which are concluded in his presence: jil'at and rind'at are pronounced by him and marriages are registered by him. The pangulu of a regency only performs this office in the case of very prominent families; in this case: it is the custom to conclude the marriage in the house of the family. The pangulu also performs the ceremony when the mabri signs the marriage register, a regular custom, observed by the majority without the reason being quite clear to them; to the popular mind the pangulu is the person who signs the marriage. It is therefore a very old custom to have the marriage performed in the mosque by the pangulu: this unwritten custom has now been given the force of law by a colonial enactment (since 1895, the law in question is of 1929). This law also regulates fees to be paid at marriages, pronunciations of jil'at and rind'at, taking the old customs as the guiding principle. These fees form the most important part of the income of the pangulu and his staff; the latter also receive their share; if properly qualified, they frequently act as deputy for the pangulu at marriages. Women who have no mabri are married by the pangulu as wali jil'at. The number of pangulus with this qualification is always less than the number of officials appointed to perform marriages. In some districts the regent appoints himself wali jil'at in practice; he leaves the exercise of his rights to the pangulu.

The djakat (Ar. jā'ah) is of course not collected in Java and Madura by the authorities; it is, if it is levied at all, a free-will offering and in many places insignificant. Only in Western Java was the collection at one time organised and in the
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p. 8349, l. 12, instead of Saliz, to be read Salitis;
p. 9404, l. 87, instead of Leipzig, to be read Upsala.
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The pangulus in the native states are appointed by the princes; their sphere of activity is the same. Whenever a new pangulus is appointed he is given his appointment as ṣaḥāf by an edict "in confirmation of my oral command", as the phrase is, in order to comply with the demands of the ūmarā'. In this edict the pharaology suggests that the ruler may give the ṣaḥāf in the name of the pangulus.

The Netherlands Indies colonial law requires the presence of the pangulus when Muslims appear in the government courts as accused in civil or criminal cases. A number of such assessors are attached to each court according to its requirements. They are appointed by the government and chosen from the personnel of the mosques. It is arranged that the director of the mosque is at the same time an assessor. The right of appointing pangulus lies thus gone out of the hands of the regents into those of the colonial administration. As the pangulus is usually chosen from the lower staff, the government has been able to secure influence over the appointment of these minor officials so far as they are capable of being pangulus. The object is to choose as competent men as possible, so that the prestige of the pangulus has increased in the Muslim community. This is less true of their position as assessors at the courts; the colonial law intended that the court should be addressed according to the adat (tritional law). The choice of the pangulus was therefore a mistake, as the latter goes by the ṣaḥāf books.

The word pangulus as the name of a mosque official is not unknown outside the islands of Java and Madura. In some places there are pangulus whose work resembles that of the pangulus of Java, e.g. in the centre of the former sultana of Palembang (Sumatra). The colonial authorities have retained the name; they have also given the name to the court assessors appointed by the regents in the districts where the name was not previously in use.
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PANIPAT, a town and ṣaḥal in the Karnal district of the Panjab (q.v.). On three occasions has the fate of Hindustan been decided on the plain of Panipat: in 1526, when Bihur (q.v.), the Barī Tank, defeated Ibrahim Lodi in 1556, when Akbar (q.v.) crushed the forces of Hemū; and lastly, in 1781, when the Marāthas whose defeated by Ahmad Shāh Durrānī (q.v.). The geographical factor combined with internal decay and a weak system of frontier defence has been chiefly responsible for this. From the strategic background of Afghanistan the path for invaders lay along the lines of least resistance, the Khyber, Kurram, Tochi, and Ginnal passes, on to the Panjab plains, for the Indus has never proved an obstacle to an enterprising general. Checkered on the south by the deserts of Rājputana, invading armies found on the Jumna and Djamna valleys through the narrow bottleneck between the north-eastern extremity of the desert and the foot of the Himalayas.

Bihur's success over Ibrahim Lodi, in 1526, has long been regarded as resulting from the extensive employment of artillery. The source of this error is to be found in an inaccurate translation of the word अयुर. It is true that 700 अयुर were used
by Bibur, but it is incorrect to regard these as gun-carriages, for the word simply means "carts". There is no textual or circumstantial evidence for supposing that Bibur had guns in such numbers as to demand 700 gun-carriages for their transport. Indeed, from Bibur's "Autobiography" it may be inferred that he possessed two guns only and Bibur himself makes his victory a bowman's success. The importance of the first battle of Panipat is that it decided the fate of the Lodi dynasty. Far more formidable was the resistance offered by the Rûjpâts at Khânsa in the following year.

The second battle of Panipat, in 1556, when Akbar defeated Hemû, is of outstanding importance in the history of India, for there was no Moghul empire before Akbar only the attempt to create one.

After his victory over the Marâthâs in 1761, Ahmad Shah Durrzâd made no attempt to consolidate his position in Hindustân but returned to Afghanistan. The Marâthâs were only temporarily crushed, for they rapidly recovered from this defeat and, by 1774, were able to menace the peace of India. The importance of this battle is that it facilitated the growth of British power.


**Pâra,** a Turkish unit, originally a silver piece of 4 aher, first issued early in the sixteenth century; it soon replaced the aher as the monetary unit. The weight, originally 16 grains (t. 10 gramma), sank to one quarter of this weight by the beginning of the sixteenth century and the silver content also depreciated considerably. The multiples of the silver para were 5 (beqîlî) pâras; 10 (amûd) 15 (amûd), 20 (amûd), 30 (zolda) and 60 (zolda) or piaster. Higher denominations were also issued.

When Serbia became independent it retained the name para for its smallest coin as did Montenegro also. The name survives in Yugo-Slavia, where the nickel 50 para piece has the smallest coin issued. During the Russian occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia in 1773-1774 copper coins were issued with the value in para and cepeka.


**Pargana,** the Indian name for an aggregate of villages. The first reference to the term in the chronicles of the Sultanate of Delhi appears to be in the Twelfth-Fifteenth Shâhî of Shams-i Shâtî 'Attî (Bibliotheca Indica, 1851, p. 95), for it is not used by Hassan al-Nisâî in his Târîkh al-Mu'inî or by Mînâbilî al-Dîn in his Târîkh-i Nâzîrî. Although it first came into prominence in the sixteenth century partially supplanting the term gâzâh, it is, in all probability, based on still more ancient traditions in existence before the Muqâm conquest. The exact date of its creation is therefore uncertain.

An account of the internal working of a pargana occurs in the chronicles of the reign of Shîh Shâtî who learned the details of revenue administration in the management of his father's two parganas of Sârarîn in Bûrû. When he became ruler of Hindustân he organized his kingdom into administrative units known as carâvâns which were divided into collections of villages termed parganas. Each pargana was in charge of a diwârî or military police officer who supported the amâr or civil officer. The amâr had for his civil subordinate a fuwarî or treasurer and two birkhâms or clerks, one for Hindi and the other for Persian correspondence. It does not seem correct to hold the view that in this respect he was an administrative innovator for the provincial officials and institutions which he has been credited with creating were already in existence before he ascended the throne. This remained the administrative system until Akbar organized the Moghul empire into sâhar (provinces) which were divided into avâns or districts. The smallest rural unit under Akbar was the pargana or mukâlah. Thus, for example, the mukâlah of Oudh was divided into five carâvâns and thirty-eight parganas (Afûn-i Akbarî, in Bibliotheca Indica, ii, 170-177 [al Janrett, 1894]).

Under the Moghul emperors the chief pargana officers were the amâr, the amir and the birkhâm, who were responsible for the pargana accounts, the rates of assessment, the survey of lands, and the protection of the rights of the cultivators. Similarly in each village a fuwarî or village accountant was appointed whose functions in the village resembled those of the amâr in the pargana. It must not be imagined that the pargana had a stable and uniform unit. Not only did it vary in area in different parts of the country, but often a land settlement was followed by a fresh division and re-distribution of the original units. The co-extensiveness of a parish with the possessions of a clan or family has given rise to the suggestion that it was not only a revenue-paying area, but that it was founded on the distribution of property at the time of its creation.

The Twenty-four Parganas: a district of Bengali lying between 21° 31' and 22° 57' N. and 88° 21' and 89° 06' E. It derives its name from the number of parganas comprised in the nominal area ceded to the English East India Company in 1757 by Mr Dañfar, the Nawâb of Bengal. This was confirmed by the Moghul emperor in 1759 when he granted the Company a perpetual heritable jurisdication over this area. In the same year Lord Clive, as a reward for services rendered to him by Mr Dañfar, was presented with the revenues of this district. This grant which amounted to £50,000 per annum, made Clive both the servant and the landlord of the Company. The Company continued to be paid to him until his death in 1774, when, by a deed sanctioned by the emperor, the whole proprietary right in the land and revenues reverted to the Company.

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(C. COLLIN DAVIES)
PÅRŚIS. Under this name (Pahl. ꞌ(ab) bāz) Mod. Pers. Šāhī literally "inhabitant of Šāh"") are known the Zoroastrians (Trzánas), who, after the Arab conquest, refusing to accept Islam, fled and after various vicissitudes finally settled in India in Gujrat, where they now form an ethnical and religious group of 100,000 persons (101,778 according to the census of 1921). At the present day the name Parsi is beginning to be used also for the Zoroastrians remaining in Iran instead of fire, the somewhat contemptuous, signification of which (cf. Sanskrit) is so long ago in keeping with the spirit of tolerance which is increasing every day in Iran.

What we know of the wanderings of the Parsis before their arrival in their present abode in India is based principally on two narratives: Kshathra-\textit{Sanjâj}苗, written in verse by a Zoroastrian priest named Bhumun Kâ Shô [sic] of Nâvâsi in the year of Yazdângird 966 (1680 A.D.) and Kshathra-\textit{Zoroastrian Hinduismu-wa-Nâvâsi-\textit{Abâ.hû Shâhrah}} Nâvâsi a work written at the end of the xviii century by the Dastar Shâhùjî Mânuchîr Sânjâj (1735–1805).

According to these sources, the first group was composed of Zoroastrians who about a century after the Arab conquest went from Khurâzûn, where they had sought refuge, to the south, reaching the island of Hormuz at the mouth of the Persian Gulf (751 A.D.). After a short sojourn there they crossed to Diu on the Gulf of Cambay to the south of the coast of Kâthikâvar (766) and remained there 19 years. Continuing their journey southwards they landed at Sânjâj (783) and installed the sacred fire there. According to the tradition of the Parsi priests, before obtaining permission to settle there they drew up for the lord of Diu, Djalââ Bâusht, a series of 16 articles of their faith. In these \\textit{articles}, of which several versions exist in Sanskrit and Gujarati, several points of contact between Hinduism and Zoroastrianism are clearly brought out. At Sânjâj they were twice joined by other bodies of refugees and these formed a community which prospered rapidly and spread to Cambay, Bassein, Blackwater and Anakalvar. After the year 1000 Parsis are also found in upper India, but it is probable that these were isolated bodies who came directly from Iran.

In 1490 A.D. the Parsis who had made common cause with the Hindus were forced by the troops of Sultan Muâmmâr Bigzarn to abandon Sânjâj and take refuge with their sacred fire among the mountains of Barhût. When the Muslim pressure ceased, the Zoroastrian community resumed its development. According to the date given in Kshethra-\textit{Sanjâj}, the sacred fire was installed at Nâvâsi in 1491 after the sack of Sânjâj, and after a brief period at Barhût and Bandhâlah, it was brought back in 1516.

The sacred fire was installed at Sânjâj in 1733 as a result of the raids of the Pindârres but the settlement of the Parsis in the town dates from the second half of the xviii century. We do not know the exact date when the Parsis went to Bombay, which is now the principal centre of the Parsi community in India.

The Parsis were able to settle in India without meeting any opposition mainly owing to the excellence of the moral principles of the Mazdean religion observed in the threefold rule of \textit{huma}, \textit{havrsa}, and \textit{avarsa} — "good thoughts", "good words", and "good works" — which is found in the Avesta. Although they have always abstained from any proselytising activities, they had the good fortune to attract the great emperor Akbar to the Mazdean religion. Trustworthy and active, assisted by the fact that the social character of their religion does not prevent adaptation to the forms of Western life, they are at the present day flourishing and well organisiied community much appreciated for the high standard and dignity of their lives.

The old religious inheritance of Zoroastrianism has been preserved by the Parsis with remarkable piety. In the xvii century, on the initiative of the \textit{Abâhû Shâhrah} of Nâvâsi, a mission was sent to Persia to obtain from the Zoroastrians who had remained there information regarding certain details of their religion. As a result the study of the manuscripts of the Avesta and of the exegetical literature was intensified and at the present day Pârsi scholars are displaying a parallel activity in the publication of the old texts.

The sacred fire still occupies a prominent place in the community, its hierarchy (\textit{dastar}, \textit{shâhrah}, \textit{avirâsh}) is a hereditary one.

The interests of the community are managed by a committee (\textit{yâdâyât}) composed of 8 or 12 \\textit{shâhrah} and 12 \textit{avirâsh}) but with incorporation in the public life of British India the functions of such a committee are gradually diminishing.

The mass of the faithful (\textit{haavâr}) conform — with a few concessions to the demands of modern life — fully to the ritual prescription of Zoroastrianism. Birth must take place on the floor of the house to show detachment from the things of the world. At the age of 7 there is the investiture with the \textit{aavûrd}, the sacred cord formed of 72 threads which winds three times round life. The funeral rite consists of exposure of the corpse on the tower of silence which is frequented by vultures (\textit{kavûrd}). In the ceremony of marriage, which tends more and more to monogamy with the marriage of full rights (Pahl. \textit{shâhla, sâshto-shâhla}) to the exclusion of secondary marriages, Hindu customs have prevailed.

The prohibitions regarding contamination of the sacred elements of fire, water, earth are still scrupulously observed and the greatest care is taken in purification after contact with impure objects, especially corpses. The Zoroastrian principles of morality are faithfully observed in all activities of life; hatred of falsehood, honesty in all dealings, assistance of the poor are the regular rules of piety.

The Zoroastrian community in India is keenly interested in the lot of their coreligionists in Iran and it was through the intervention of the Parsi "Persion Zoroastrian Amelioration Fund" that the "aavûrd" paid by the Zoroastrians of Yazd and Kirman was abolished in 1873 by the Persian government. As a result of the decline of religious intolerance in Persia, there has been increasing intercourse with the Zoroastrian communities still existing in Iran and the Parsi community has frequently sent appeals to the Muslims of Persia to ask them to return to the ancient religion.

While as regards doctrine perfect harmony still exists in the community, so regards religious controversies, have not been wanting and are not lacking within it. In 1686 the question of precedence was raised between the priests of Nâvâsi and those.
of Sandjan. Another question which has been a subject of controversy even since the sixteenth century, is the question whether the use of the padan — i.e., a kind of vehicle placed in front of the mouth to prevent the spread of fire from being contaminated by the breath — should also be put on the dying, thus violating the laws of piety.

Much more serious however is another controversy, that regarding the calendar; it goes back to the sixteenth century and divides the community into two sects: the Shahenshahis and the Kadianis. According to the Avestic calendar adopted by the Parsis, to make up for the loss of a quarter of a day each year, a month is added every 120 years but this system was not observed during the period of persecution following the Muslim conquest. In 1745 a group of the faithful felt the need for a reform of the calendar; but this group, which took the name of Kadianis, was opposed by those who wished to adhere to the Hindu system of calculating the months and who took the name of Shahenshahis. The result is that the calendar adopted by the latter is a month behind that adopted by the Kadianis. The Parsis follow the era of Yazdigird which dates from the accession of the last Sassanid (June 16, 632).


PARWANA. (See MUKH AL-DIN SULAICHAN.)

PASANTREN. Javanese "sandine" "ministry for students of theology" (sandari). The students on the islands of Java and Madura, Madur, pansantren, Sandi, usually pondo, i.e., the lodgings of the students of the school ("to go to the pondo" = to attend a pondo). — Elementary education i.e., reciting the Koran and the elements of a knowledge of sacerdotal law is given in the East Indian Archipelago whenever there are Muhammadans by teachers, who confine themselves to these subjects, in their own houses. In the larger villages and towns of Java and Madura there are also teachers who collect pupils around them in a mosque, in their own house or in a special building. If their reputation increases it often happens that students come from a distance and live in the place for a time to enjoy their instruction.

The pasantren however are institutions for advanced theological training. They consist of several buildings and when they are not built-out in the country, form in at least a separate quarter of the village. Javanese princes have from time to time issued edicts making villages "free," i.e., the taxes and services which they have to yield are given up in perpetuity to the teacher of the pasantren founded there. Pious individuals also have endowed stituk in favour of pasantren. The others are private institutions which owe their origin to the initiative of a learned man who establishes himself as a teacher. Their foundation and prosperity or decline is therefore bound up with the personality of the teacher and the estimation in which his learning is held; even pasantren which are regularly endowed are influenced by this factor.

The pasantren consists in the first place of the houses of the teacher and his assistants, then of lecture-rooms, a chapel, rarely a Friday Mosque, the lodgings of the students (pondos), rice-barns, all of which occupy a considerable space. The pondo alone possess a peculiar form of architecture not found in other buildings. A pondo is a quadrangular building built of the usual materials. The interior is divided by two walls into three long compartments of about equal breadth, the central one of which forms a corridor running from an end of the wall to the other. The two outer ones form the living rooms; each of them is divided into cells of equal size by partitions. The door of the pondo is in the centre of one of the shorter outer walls; it opens into the corridor. Only blank walls are seen on right and left as one enters; then it is noticed that very low doors are let into these walls, made of the same material as they are; these admit to the cells. The little doors are at irregular intervals in the two walls, two always being opposite one another. The cells are lit from the outside by little windows in the wall; they are so low that the occupant can only sit or lie on the floor; for the students study in a recumbent position.

Several students live in one cell; in very popular pasantren, the pondo may have two stories. The number of students may amount to several hundreds. It may also be quite small. There are hundreds of pasantren in existence. In each pondo discipline is maintained by one of the older students or by a junior teacher. In spite of this, cleanliness leaves much to be desired. The head of the pondo is at the same time tutor and assists the students under him in every way. We also find women sharing in the instruction given in a pasantren but it is very rare for them to live in one.

The pasantren have a life of their own. Great activity prevails even before dawn. After the poldar al-uth, which the teacher himself conducts and which is followed by a gudir, the lectures begin. The teacher takes the beginners one after the other and after their lesson they return to the pondo; here they go over what they have learned by themselves or with a more advanced student or with the head of the pondo until noon. The students
then have their midday meal, the santri of each pondok forming one mess; this is practically speaking their only meal. All then go to chapel to the salat al-juhur. They are summoned to three further salat in the course of the day. The intervals between them are devoted to lectures and study. The more advanced students are taken together by the teacher; he reads the Arabic text, translates it and adds any necessary notes of explanation.

After the salat al-gharib, the day's work is over and the students retire for the night. Some santri may still be engaged on little tasks which may bring them in something, soon these also stop and quiet reigns over all. Friday brings a variation in this monotonous round; all go to the nearest Friday mosque to attend the salat al-jummah. Harvest is also a busy time for the santri; they work in the rice-fields or beg for salat. Many santri go home in the month of the fast.

Fikih is the primary subject of study in the pasantrens; the Arabic works used are those in use in other Shafi'i lands. There are also a large number of Javanese works; those based on Arabic sources or theological works taken from Arabic are known as kitab. Javanese is the language of the pasantrens; in the Sundanese speaking districts (western Java) Javanese works are more and more replaced by Sundanese. At the same time dogmatics are also studied. Here no particular maqatib is followed, nor are the works used written only by Shafi'i. Orthodox mysticism is less studied. There is, it is true, a popular form of mysticism tinged with pantheism; but this is less and less taught in the pasantrens. The Santri calls the main fikih book used by him in the pasanten kitab fikih without further qualification (he hardly knows its title) and work on dogmatics kitab nusul. Small books for elementary instruction on the distinct of religion and dogmatics are also called kitab nusul.

The method of instruction is one peculiar to the pasanten. As soon as he has finished the elementary text-books, the student is introduced to more important Arabic texts. He reads them, sentence by sentence, under the supervision of the teacher who himself has perhaps never studied Arabic properly and has only his memory to rely upon for the vocalisation. The sentence is translated into Javanese and paraphrased by the teacher. Finally the student is so far advanced that he can translate easy texts from Arabic into Javanese (a list of the texts most used at the time is given in T.B.G.K.W., xxxi. [1886], p. 518 seq.). This takes a long time; the joy however at seeing his knowledge steadily increasing and the pleasant feeling of being able to read texts in the original spurs the student on. Under Mecan and Hadramaut influence, however, this method is being gradually driven out by another which begins with Arabic grammar. It certainly seems the more logical; one disadvantage, however, is that the study of Arabic offers so many difficulties to the Indonesian that many lose heart before they succeed in reading texts.

Study at the pasantrens is quite free. Diplomas are neither sought nor given. The student comes and goes as he pleases. The majority when they enter the pasantrens have already had an elementary education at home. The desire to increase their knowledge of the faith, the wish among rich and prominent families to see one of their sons devoting himself to the study of religion and among others the hope of gaining a livelihood, bring young men into the pasantrens. The santri endeavour to attend the lectures of a number of teachers, each on his special subject. They therefore go from one school to another; some indeed travel about all their lives studying. Others when they think they have acquired sufficient learning settle somewhere, but not in their own districts, as teachers or become assistant teachers in a pasantren or they may prefer to remain "independent scholars". There are no offices for which study in a pasantren is a requisite preliminary; in general the theologians are averse from anything official or belonging to the state but the higher mosque officials have usually studied for a time in a pasantren.

It is considered very reprehensible to give instruction in sacred learning for an agreed fee. Nevertheless, most of the teachers are well to do. Pious gifts are liberally given to them on account of the blessing they bring. The teacher is a most welcome guest at religious feasts, of which there are many in Javanese life. All appeal at all times to his learning or for his intercession; gifts accompany these appeals. New arrivals among the students, if they can afford it, make their offerings to the sons of the better situated parents bring back presents when they go home, and poor students work in the teacher's fields.

The majority of the students are poor and indeed live by begging. On certain days they go round the district; their begging is not considered a nuisance; they are assisted readily for they are acquiring sacred learning; to give to them brings a blessing. Work on the land, the copying of Kur'ans etc. also bring them in the little they require for their frugal life. The colonial government only troubles about the pasantrens so far as it exercises a general supervision over them; the foundations of new ones are reported to the authorities and the principal has to keep a register of the names of the students and of the titles of the books used.

The spread of schools on the European model has dealt a blow to the pasantrens in recent years. Only the pasantrens could give religious instruction as the public schools instituted by the colonial authorities gave none. On the other hand, only the latter prepared for everyday life. This has resulted in the growth of private schools intended to do both. These are called madrasah and are intended to be schools for all. Attached to the madrasah are schools for higher education; in these religious instruction plays a very prominent part. In these schools, which owe their origin to circles influenced by modern ideas, the method of instruction is taken from European models; but their outlook is not by any means broader than that of the old pasantrens. The name madrasah points to Egypt or perhaps Arabia; the organisation, apart from the religious instruction, is modelled exactly on the government schools.

In the country of the Minangkabau Malays (Central Sumatra) there are theological seminaries which correspond on the whole with the pasantrens; they are called surau. A name also given to elementary schools, chapels, houses for men, and also to the separate buildings of the institution called surau. The students' houses are not divided into cells; the occupants have a common lecture- and sleeping-room.

Ateh also has seminaries comparable with the
Javanese. The method of instruction however, which in Java may be called the mere one, is the only one here; Malay takes the place of Javanese there; a knowledge of this language is therefore indispensable for students in Atjeh. The lodgings of the students (rangbhang) have the same plan as the pondoh of Java; just as the pasanteens are also called pondoh, so the name rangbhang in Atjeh is also applied to the whole institution.


PASE, the name of a district on the north-east coast of Atjeh (Sumatra) which according to the prevalent native view stretches from the Djamb-Aje river in the east to the other side of the Pasé river in the west. The whole area is divided up into a number of little states each with an ulitabalang or chief.

Pase at one time was a kingdom known throughout eastern Asia. The north coast of Atjeh was in the middle ages one of the trade routes from Hindustan to China. Islam followed this route and firmly established itself from India on the coast, the most important point in the east Indian archipelago which it reached. In the sixth century we know there were already Muslim rulers here. One of these was Malik al-Sabih (d. 1297), according to native tradition founder of the state and the man to make the country Muslim; his tomb was made of stone imported from Cambay (India) has been discovered along with several other gravestones on the left bank of the Pasé river, not far from the sea. The capital of the kingdom is said to have been here. A second capital rather more to the west was Saumara; it was the royal residence when Ibn Battuta in the middle of the sixteenth century twice visited the land, on his way to China and on the return journey. The present name of the island of Sumatra, by which it is known in the west, comes from Saumara — in Ibn Battuta; Sumatra, Pasé was then a flourishing country on the coast; the ruler was king of the port, who himself sent out trading-ships; a ship belonging to him was seen by Ibn Battuta in the harbour of Ch'anghsu (Fukien) in South China. Life at the court was modelled on that of the Muhammadan courts of India. The ruler at this time was an ardent Muslim, who took a great interest in learning. He waged a victorious jihad on the natives in the hinterland. Lead coins struck in the country and Chinese crude gold were the means of exchange. The chief food was rice.

Shortly after Ibn Battuta left the country the king had to recognise the suzerainty of the Javanese Hindu empire of Madjapahit (before 1365). A tomb of a queen or princess of the Lho' Sukon has an Arabic inscription, dated 791 (1389) at the top of the stone and at the bottom an inscription in much weathered old Javanese script. It has not yet been read. The Chinese envoy Chang Ho remarked in 1416 that the land was involved in continual war with Nago (Pidie). He mentions rice, silkworms and pepper as its products. The last-named attracted the Portuguese there. From 1521 they had a fortified settlement in Pasé but in 1524 they were driven out by the sultan of the rising kingdom of Atjeh (i.e. Great Atjeh). Henceforth Pase was a dependency of Atjeh. The tombs of the rulers of the former kingdom were still an object of pilgrimage to the most famous sultan of Atjeh, Iskandar Thani, as late as 1928 (1638-1639); at the present day even the memory of the old kingdom is extinct. The mouth of the Pasé river is silting up and the place where the capital stood is no longer recognisable.

Pase exercised through the years a considerable influence in the Malay Archipelago through its Muslim scholars and missionaries. Javanese and Malay tradition have preserved their memory.


PASHA (T., from the Pers. pasgah, probably influenced by Turkish batbaha), the highest official title of honour (wali or taba) in use in Turkey until quite recently and still surviving in certain Muslim countries originally parts of the Turkish empire (Egypt, Iraq, Syria). It was always accompanied by the proper name, like the titles of nobility in Europe but with this difference from the latter, that it was placed after the name (like the less important titles of bey and efendi). In addition, being neither hereditary nor giving any rank to wives, nor attached to territorial possessions, it was military rather than feudal in character. It was however not reserved solely for soldiers but was also given to certain high civil (not religious) officials.

The title of pasha first appears in the thirteenth century. It is difficult to define its original sense exactly. The word had in any case early assumed and lost the vague meaning of 'seigneur' (champagne) (cf. Ertugrul sikht-i Sulaiman Welid, p. 14; text of the year 712 = 1313, where the main is invoked in the phrase ‘Ey Pasha!’). At this same period the title of pasha like that of sultan was sometimes given to women (cf. Ismail Hakki, Kilicler, 1927, index). The Kudum pasha, Seljuk pasha), a practice which recurs only once again, and then exceptionally, in the xiiith century in the case of the mother of the Khedive (cf. WILHELM INZER) 1924).

Under the Saldjaks of Anatolia the title of pasha (in as much as it was an abbreviation of padişah and always by analogy with that of sultan) was given occasionally to certain men of religion who must also have at the same time been soldiers and whose history is not yet well known. To judge from the genealogy which Agha-peş-fasa-rade claims for himself, the title of pasha was already in use in the first half of the xiiith century. Al-Malik ibn Mulj Baha, alias Shaikh Makhkades, alias Makhkades Pasha had, according to Ali Efendi, seized the power before the Karamanoğlu and in the same region, before the defeat of the Saldjaks Sultan Ghiyath al-
In the provinces they were, and became, more numerous, and two classes of pahas were distinguished: 1. The pahas of 3 horse-tails (ľahk) or ġalb (a rank which became more and more one of honour and extending to the provinces gradually absorbed that of ġelyerbi), 2. the pahas of 2 horse-tails or muš-mirān (rank at first the Persian synonym for the Turkish ġelyerbi and the Arabic amir al-umara but gradually became a lower rank). Besides, the old sefār-bāș having in principle a right to only one horse-tail were promoted muš-mirān and thus became pahas in their turn.

After the Tanzimat the title of paha was given to the four first (out of 9) grades of the civil (1. ġevār, 2. kāša, 3. ābā, 4. īsdīy ābīs esewa) or military (1. mušhūr, 2. bī-ringī fereh, 3. fereh, 4. ṭēne) hierarchy and to the nobles (3. ġelyerbi, 4. mušmīrān, with in practice unjustified extension to the fallen muš-umara, in this case to the purely honorific rank of the sixth grade).

The table of ranks having been abolished after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish Republic retained the title of paha for soldiers only. It has just been abolished by the Grand National Assembly of Ankara (Nov. 20, 1934). Instead of paha one now uses general and in place of mušhūr, usābiy.

In western usage the word was at first pronounced başha (the pronunciation paha does not appear till the xviiith century): Ital. baxia, Low Latin baxia, Fr. baixa or baxia, Engl. baxian, to say nothing of variant spellings. In Greek on the contrary, the form pasha is the oldest (xvith century) but probably under western influence we also find basha (xvith century); cf. Duclage, Glossaire médieal et inédit de Grecitélatt, s. v. μαχαιά.

The pronunciation as basha by Europeans is due either to the influence of Arabic in Egypt or to a confusion with the old Turkish title of baş (cf. at the end of the article).

Etymology of the word paha: we shall examine the various etymologies that have been proposed.

1. Pers. pāshī-čehr "foot of the sovereign". This explanation, which was based on the fact that in ancient Persia there were officials called "eyes of the king", is found already in Trevoux's Dictionnaire (s. v. bacha) and was revived by G. v. Hammer. It is to be rejected.

2. Turk. başha "head, chief" already suggested by Antoine Genfrroy (Breviers description de la Cour de Grand Tarse, 1542) and by Lenaclius (Löwenklaa, Pandectes historiae turcicae, suppl. to his Annales (1588). Cf. also Trevoux's Dict. and Barthier de Meynard, Suppl. — It is to be rejected.

3. Turk. bash-yagh taken (for the purposes of proof) in the meaning of "elder brother". This is the etymology accepted in Turkey until lately (Meşhed Ţahresisi, Siyāsil-i 'Oğlumün, iv. 738; Şams al-Din Şânu, Ālimî-i turkî, s. v. pasha) and is based on the fact that Sultanmāna Pasha and Allah al-Din Pasha were the elder brothers of Orhan and 'Oğlumün respectively. All Etendu in his Kâna al-Abkhar, written in 1593—1599 (v. 49, 20) and 'Oğlumün-źde Ahmed Tâlib (d. 1724) called attention to this use of the word pasha among the Turkomans (Hadith al-Wasâlm, Istanbul 17271, p. 4, 10). Heilborn (Manuel de Droit Public et Administratif Ottoman, Vienna 1908, p. 186, note u) also says that pasha...
means "elder brother" among the Greeks of Kar- 
manis, but there seems to be nothing to com-
pare these isolated statements. Some Turkish lexi-
ographers like Ahmad Weftik (under "ğlab") and 
Şahî, have admitted this etymology but by two 
stages: pasha comes from the Turkish title bahşî 
which is for başîch. The title of bahşî to be 
discussed below does really seem to come from 
başî as such but, contrary to what I at first thought, 
has nothing to do with pasha.

PASHA

1. Pers. pâshâh "sovereign." — Etymology, the 
only admissible one (with however the possibility 
of the influence mentioned under 5), proposed by 
the Turkish-Russian dictionary of Bougakov (1869) 
and later revived by the Russian Encyclopaedia 
of Brockhaus and Efрон. It had previously been 
proposed by D'Hulchel (under pâche, a propos of 
the spelling with final s). This explanation is based 
on the use of the words vâsîf and pâshâh, as the 
titles most often placed after the names when applied 
to individuals of high rank in the religious world 
(dervishes). Cf. Giese, in Türkisch-Moslemischer, i., 
1925, p. 164. It seems that one can even explain by 
pâshâh the obscure phrase used by Orhan to 
Ali: al-Din Pašha in Ağbî-şeyha, (see 
Giese, p. 34–35) before the latter was to 
retire (cf. above). Orhan says "You will be pasha for 
me." Now a few lines earlier he had asked him to 
be a vâsîf pâshâh, i.e. a shepherd for his people.

On the other hand, it will be noted that the 
title of pasha is often used not only as an alter-
native for pâshâh but also for pâshâ. Here are 
some examples:

Shudâja al-Din Salihânâ, of the dynasty of Khiy 
Ahmudî, is called Sulaimân Pâshâ in Ibn Ba-
ûta (ed. Dhârây and Sânciûnu, i. 343) 
and Sulaimân Pasha in Şahîh al-Din b. al-Omari 
al-Taşrîf, ed. L-Mu'asîb al-şarîf, Cairo 
1312, p. 4: written pasha, following the Arabic script 
and in Munzîdûn Başî (iii. 30). The son and 
successor of this ruler, Ibrahim, is called Şahî 
in Ibn al-Omari and Paşa in Munzîdûn Başî. — 
In the Dîwân-nâmè Esmûrî (ed. Mârrûmî, Marâkîs, 
p. 83–84) Sulaimân Pasha, son of Orhân, is called 
Şahî Sulîman with poetic inversion.

— Ali b. 
Cîchî (Čeçek), the Ilkhanian governor of Baghdad 
(d. 1336), is called "Ali Pâsha" by Ibn al-Omari. 
According to Nâzîrî (Caşmî-i Kâfûlayî, Con-
stantinople 1143), he is also found in some MSS. 
as "Ali Şahî. He is also called "Ali Pâshî (Či-
Hart, Histoire de Bagdad, p. 10). — In the oriental 
dialects the title of pâshâh is given to petty 
local leaders where it has taken the form, not of 
pasha but of pâche (Kârîmî) and pâsî (Ozbek).

5. Turk. başîch (variants basîch, basîçan) 
"government, chief of police" (Dictionary of Patv de 
Courteille and under basîch in that of Bougakov). 
This word of the "Khârâzimian language" according 
Vullers came into use in Persia (Ikhbâlî). 
Among the Mongols it meant the commissioners 
and high commissioners sent by them to the con-
nquered provinces (of the west only), notably in 
Russia. The accepted etymology is from the verb 
basîch, "to press, crowd, oppress, impress," whence 
the meaning "oppressor, extorter" for başîch, an 
official, it is noted (cf. the Russian and French 
encyclopedias), whose main duty was to collect 
taxes and tribute. However extraordinary such an 
explanation of an official title may appear it seems 
to be confirmed by the parallelism with the Mongol 
equivalent of bašîch which is darwûsh or darogî 
[q. v.] and which may be compared with darûsh, 
a Mongol word, synonymous with kâmâsh in the 
sense of "to impose". These may however be pop-
ular etymologies.

Schaff in his edition of the Voyage de M. d'Ancre 
(p. 238, note 3) says "The etymology of the 
word pasha given by Gesnroy (from the 
Turkish basîch) is wrong. Pasha is a softened form 
of the word basîçan or pashû which means 
a "military governor." 

Carpi, in his edition of the 
Voyage de M. d'Ancre (p. 238, note 3) says "The etymology of the word pasha given by Gesnroy (from the 
Turkish basîch) is wrong. Pasha is a softened form 
of the word basîçan or pashû which means 
a "military governor." 

It is not impossible that there was actually some 
confusion among the Turks themselves between 
pâshâh (pâsha) and the title basîch, the synonym 
of the Mongol darwûsh. We had thought of this 
even before we saw the notes of Schefer and 
Hakluyt. It may be noted that the title of pasha 
(which is not found in Persian sources, as Mu-
hammed Karwânî kindly informs us) was applied 
either to Anatolians, subject in fact or in theory 
to the Mongols, or to officials of the Mongol 
Idkhan (like the governor of Baghdâd mentioned 
above); cf. also Kürbî: "Ali Paşa" alluded to 
in the Beaumâtre work of Ansû b. Ardashîr 
Asâr- 
ashali (ed. Köprüli, p. 249, 9). The confusion 
could be explained the more easily as one finds 
(rarely it is true) the term basîch (Djawâin, 
Tâbrîzî Dâkânû-Ghûtû of 1260, ed. Muhammed 
Karwânî, i. 83, note 9; in this passage there is a 
reference to a Khârâzimian official of 609, i.e. 
before the Mongol conquest).

It may be suggested that this was the influence of the 
confusion of the title basîch that of pasha would never have attained such importance. 
The Turkish title of basîch. — This title which is 
not to be confused with the preceding, nor with the 
Arabic or old eastern pronunciation of it, was 
also put after the proper name but was applied 
only to soldiers and the lower grades of officiers 
(especially janissaries) and, it seems, also to ministers in the provinces [Meninski, Théâtre, i. 662 
and 294, i. 18: Omématîon, coll. 427; d'Herbethî, 
v. paschâ; Vignes, Éléments de la langue turque, 
1799, p. 218, 309, 327: Zerker, p. 214, coll. 2 
(probably following Meninski) De La Mottraye, 
Voyages, 1727, i. 130 note 7; cf. Ewlysh Celebi, 
v. 107, 218; Na'imus, v. 711; Imamûl Hâkî, 
Kûurîbî (p. 16 and 81). De La Boulaye-Le 
Goum (Voyages, 1657, p. 59 and 552) also 
distinguishes the title from basha and translates it 
by *momier*. Meninski, loc. cit., also notes the 
pronunciation bashî (bashî) which is not to be 
taken as the word bash followed by the possessive 
suffix of the 3rd pers. -î; Meninski knew Turkish 
too well to make such a mistake. As to the 
pronunciation bashîb (given by Chloros, v. v. pasha) 
it comes from the spelling bashî which is not 
used as a suffix (cf. e.g. Ahmad 
Weftik Paşa, Zorakî Tâshî, act i, sc. 2, ironically 
applied to a woman) but Meninski pronounces 
bash, even with this spelling.

As the lexicographers have sometimes confused
PASHALIK (v.), means 1. the office or title of a pasha (q.v.); 2. the territory under the authority of a pasha (in the province).

After some of the governors called samedi-beyi (or sani-bey) had raised to the dignity of pasha, their territories (samedi or ifitum; q.v.) also received the name of pashallik.

Early in the 18th century of 158 pashallik 70 were pashallikas. These 25 were pasha samedi-fiti, i.e. samedi-fiti in which were the capitals of an eyalite, the residence of the governor-general or walli of a province. For further details, cf. Mouradizes d'Ollsson, Tableau général de l'Empire Othoman, vii. 307.

PASHTO. [See AFGHANISTAN, l. 149 sq.]

PASIR. The sultanate of Pasir in S. E. Borneo comprises the valley of the Pasir or Kendilo river, which, rising in the north on the borders of Kutei runs in a southerly direction along the eastern borders of the Berautu range and turning east finally reaches the straits of Malacca through a marshy district. The country, about 1,125 sq. km. in area, is still covered by primitive forest, in so far as the scanty population, which is founded mainly in Pasir, the residence of the sultan, and in Tanah Grogot, that of the official administration, has not cleared the trees to make ricefields. Although some gold, petroleum and coal are found in Pasir, Europeans have not exploited them, still less do they practice agriculture. A European administrative official was first stationed in 1901 at Tanah Grogot at the mouth of the Kendilo river. Pasir is therefore a good example of the Borneo coast state which as regards Islam has developed independently of European influence. The population of the sultanate is estimated roughly at 17,000. It consists of Dayaks who live by growing rice, of immigrant Bandjarase and Buginese from Celebes, who control the trade; they are found chiefly in the flat country at the river mouth. On the coast the Badjos, a people of fishermen, live in their villages built on piles in the sea. Of the 9,000 Dayaks, about 4,000 have adopted Islam, while 5,000 in the highlands are pagans. The 5,000 Buginese have a predominant influence in view of their large numbers and their prosperity; the 4,000 Bandjarase are of less importance. There are very few Europeans and about 50 Chinese and Arabs in Pasir.

Half of the population are therefore foreigners, but like the Dayaks they belong to the Malay race and mix with one another.

Pasir is despotically ruled by the sultan and the members of his family; the people have no voice in the government. Alongside of the sultan and his presumed successor there is a council of five notables, which the sultan consults on important occasions; this is also the highest court of the country. These notables and a number of other members of the sultan's family have estates as fiefs. Since 1844 each sultan on his accession has concluded a treaty with the Netherlands Indian authority. In 1908 they declared themselves vassals of the Netherlands Indian government. In 1900 the right to collect duties on imports and exports and taxes, as well as the monopoly of opium and salt, was ceded to the government in return for compensation. This amounts to 16,800 golden yearly of which 11,200 go to the sultan and 5,600 to the notables.

The sultan still collects the following taxes: a poll-tax from adult males; 1/40 of the yields of the rice-fields and forest products; 2 coconuts from each fruit-bearing tree; also military service. He also has an income from the administration of justice in the capital.

From the very legendary history of the country it may be gathered that this despotic government which is foreign to the Dayak was introduced from eastern Java. Under the ruling caste are the chiefs of lower rank, priests and landowners and freemen as a middle class. At the beginning of this century there were still slaves and deltor-slaves as the lowest class in Pasir; although slavery had long been abolished in other states of the Indies under Dutch influence. As is usual among other Dayak tribes, slaves go about like free men, take part in all festivities and games, may own property and are not even distinguished by dress. If their debt is paid to their master by some one, they go over to the latter. Slaves are not sold.

As the social condition of the MuslimBuginese, Bandjarase and Badjos have already been described elsewhere, the following remarks are confined to the pagan Dayak and their Muslim relatives, the Pasirese.

According to tradition, an Arab (Tuan Said) brought Islam to Pasir. His marriage with the daughter of the reigning chief did much to further the progress of Islam in the country.

As to the Pasirese, their social life was only superficially affected by Islam. In their daily life, a pagan conception of the worship of the deity and of the world of spirits still prevails. The old belief in the important influence of spirits on the fate of man and reliance upon their signs are evidence of this. The fact also is significant that throughout Pasir there is only one mosheir and a few smaller places of worship. The number of Muslim priests and hajjaj is also small nor is the enthusiasm to make the pilgrimage to Mecca great. On important occasions appeal is made for assistance to the spirits; this is particularly the case with illness among the Pasirese, who hold the pagan ilam feasts, which are also celebrated in Southern Borneo. Among a great din of gongs and drums which can be heard far away off; the pagan priest (hajlam) becomes possessed by the spirit which then communicates to him the remedy for the illness. Even in the capital Pasir, exclusively inhabited by Muhammadans, the advice of the hajlam is sought; only during the month of Ramadan the sultan forbids this,

How attached the upper classes of Pasir still
are to animistic views is evident from the legend still current according to which Sultan Adam in the middle of the last century used to isolate himself several days in the year on the mountain of the spirits, Gunung Melkat; he had concluded, it was said, a marriage there with a female djinn from which a son named Tendang was born. This son, who has the gift of making himself invisible, is said to live on the island of Madura where he married a princess of the djinn. He appears from time to time in Pasir, when he is invited by a great sacrificial feast (formerly also human sacrifice). These feasts are still celebrated occasionally, especially in order to free the land from misfortune and sickness. In the village of Bunni a house has been built for Tendang with a roof in three parts, which is built on a large pole and thus resembles a dove-cote.

The revenues of the priests consist of what they collect at the end of the month of fasting in sukała and pita, everyone giving what he can and the chiefs ex Press no pressure. A priest also receives a small fee at a marriage or divorce.

The calendar now in general use in the sulphinat is the Muḥammadan. As elsewhere among the Dayaks the sowing of the fields begins when a particular constellation becomes visible in the heavens.

The family life of the Pasirese has developed to some extent according to Muslim ritual. Among the followers of Islam, marriage is performed through the intermediary of a priest, with the father or another man as wali, but only after an agreement has been come to about the very considerable dowry. This is paid to the parents of the bride; she herself only receives a small part of it. According to Dayak custom young people are allowed to meet very freely before marriage. A marriage feast is marked by a very considerable consumption of palm-wine. The man remains at least a year in the home of his parents-in-law before he can take a home of his own. Divorce is very frequent because attention is seldom paid to the wishes of the woman in the negotiations between the parents. Man and woman retain their properties after marriage; after a divorce she goes back to the family. Property acquired during marriage is divided into two equal portions between husband and wife. After the death of one or the other the survivor inherits all. Only a few families follow the Muslim law. The followers of Islam are buried with Muḥammadan rites.


PASSAROWITZ. [See POŻAREVAC.]

PASWAN-OGHLU (written بسان أوغلو; cf. Kama of Al-Adam, ii. 1467) or Paswan-oghlu (پا سو ان اوغلو) in 'Abd al-Rahman Sharaf, Tarīkh, ii. 280 et, according to the new orthography, Pasvantoglu (Hussein Msheen, Türkiye Tarıhi, p. 423) but classed as Turkic 'Pasvand-siye Oğlu' (in Ordoñez, see Biblioth., the rebel Pasha of Vidin (1735–1807). His family originated in Transylvania in Bulgaria, but his grandfather Paswan Agha, for his services in the Austrian wars, was granted two villages near Vidin in Bulgaria about 1739. Oğlu's father 'Omar Agha, Paswan-oghlu not only inherited those villages but as haidarlar etc. was also a rich and prominent man (Syden), on account of his defiant attitude, however, he was put to death by the local governor.

'Oğlu himself only escaped death by escaping into Albania, but after taking part in the war of 1787–1789 as a volunteer, he returned to his native town. Very soon he was in the field again and fought with distinction, returning to Vidin in 1791. From there he organised with his men raiding expeditions into Wallachia and Serbia. When the sultan wanted to punish him for this he cast off his allegiance in 1795, took to the mountains and at the end of 1794 captured Vidin with his robber band and became the real ruler in the pashalik there. Vidin, which he fortified again, thus became a meeting-place for robbers and discontented janissaries who were driven out of Serbia in 1793, and he himself became the popular leader of all those who opposed the reforms of Selim III.

In 1795 Paswan-oghlu even attacked the governor of Belgrade, Hıdır Mehmed Paşa, a supporter of the reformers, who had been given the task of disposing of him; strong bodies of troops were sent by the Porte but without success. In consequence negotiations were begun at the end of 1795 but Paswan-oghlu remained practically independent in the whole of Upper Bulgaria.

But since the Porte did not also formally recognise him, Paswan-oghlu drove the official governor out of Vidin and in 1797 attacked the adjoining pashaliks: in the east his forces occupied or threatened a number of places in Bulgaria (but they were defeated at Varna) and in the south they attacked Nish (December) without success; in the west they advanced up to Belgrade, occupied the town but were driven back by its fortress by the resistance of the Turks and Serbs whom Hıdır Mehmed Paşa had armed. As a result of this and because of Paswan-oghlu’s negotiations with France and Russia the Porte in 1798 sent an army of 100,000 men against him under Admiral Küçük Hüsnü Paşa. He besieged Vidin in vain until October and had to withdraw with heavy losses. This defeat and Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt induced Turkey to come to terms, nominally at least, with Paswan-oghlu and give him the rank of Paşa of three tails (1799).

Nevertheless he declared himself against the reforms, against the central government and even against Selim III; he also sent several expeditions to plunder Wallachia (1800 and 1801) and invited the janissaries who had in the meanwhile returned to Belgrade to occupy the fortress (in the summer of 1801) and to murder Hıdır Mehmed Paşa (at the end of the year).

At this time he repeatedly asked the Czar to number him among his faithful subjects and also offered his services to France. The Porte, which previously before had forgiven Paswan-oghlu everything, from 1803 declared war on him again, but the Serbian rising of 1804 diverted their attention. Paswan-oghlu himself had to fight in the western part of his territory against Pintzo’s rising (1805). The appearance of the Russians on the left bank of the Danube (1805) induced him to offer his services to the Porte but the latter instead gave the supreme command to the commander of Rusčak. This embezzled him so much that he resolved to defend only his own territory against the allied Russians and Serbians but he died soon afterwards on Jan. 27, 1807.
That Paswan-Oghlu was able to hold out so long was due to the state of the Ottoman empire at the time, to his personal ability and foresight (he never abandoned Vidin!) but for the most part to luck. Within his area he collected customs and taxes, ruled strictly and despotically, although not entirely without mildness and justice. Although his health was rather poor as a result of too great a mental strain, ambition led him to aim at independence as evidence of which we have the coins struck by him and known as Paswantea.


FREHM BAJZAKTAREVIĆ

PATANI, an administrative district of Siam in the extreme south of the kingdom on the east coast of the peninsula of Malacca; it is bounded on the south by the Malay states of Kêlaitan and Kêdah, both under British protection. The whole district is made up of seven Malay petty states, each with its own native chief who is assisted by a Siamese official. Malay forms of government are allowed to remain. In the capital of the same name resides the Siamese High Commissioner of the district. His advice has to be obeyed by the rulers of the states.

The native inhabitants are Muslims. Friday and other mosques are distinguished. The latter are called surau and have their own staffs. All the states have law-courts: the sharia is followed in matters of family law, Siamese law in other cases.

Patani is a very mountainous country. There is only a strip of plain on the coast. The area is about 13,000 sq. km. and the number of inhabitants about 350,000; the great majority are Malays, the remainder being Siamese and Chinese. There are few roads. The railway which connects the Siamese Southern railway with the English lines in Malacca cuts through the country a short distance from the coast. Agriculture is of little importance; only in the environs of Patani and in Nwag-

Chik rice is cultivated. A large number of the people live by fishing; the fish caught are salted with salt obtained locally. Tin-mining is increasing. The exports include dried fish, salt, cattle, elephants and tin. Intercourse with Bangkok and Singapore is maintained by small steamers. The revenues amount to £45,000, of which one third is allotted to the Malay rulers as private income for themselves and their families, one third goes to administration, and a third set aside for special purposes, is also as a rule used for administrative purposes.

Fra Odontigo de Formentino in 1525 mentions a place called Patani in this region, which he identifies with Thalassany. It is doubtful whether the reference is to Patani. The first certain occurrence of the name is in the 17th century when the Portuguese began to come here to trade. Patani has for centuries belonged to Siam. Advancing southwards the Thai reached Ligor about 1384 (on the coast, a little N.W. of Patani; Sukhotai inscription); in 1356 the whole of the peninsula of Malacca was under Siamese rule; the conquest of Patani took place between those dates. The Ngarukrithāgama in 1366 mentions Dijre, the modern Djiring, one of the seven states of the district; with its capital on the sea, a little east of the town of Patani, as conquered by the Javanese king of Majapatt. Soon after the conquest of the town of Malacca in 1511, the Portuguese began to trade in Patani. Many Portuguese settled here. About 1600 the Dutch and English appeared; Patani at this time was a prosperous centre of trade, a station between Malacca and China and a spot for the exchange of goods from China on the one side and the most important harbours of the East Indian Archipelago on the other. When this last activity began to decline about 1620, the place lost its importance and the Europeans abandoned their settlements.

It is not definitely known when Patani became converted to Islam. About 1600 it was a Muhammadan country; the queen ruling at this time had succeeded her husband fifteen years before; in all probability the country was already Muslim at an earlier date when Mendez Pinto (1534, 1540) visited it. According to native tradition, the conqueror of the land, Chaw Srig Bangs, a son of the Siamese king, converted the country to Islam, after adopting it himself and taking the same and title of Sultan Ahmad Shah. He is said to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Malacca; this suggests that Malacca was the power that caused the conversion. Malacca, as is well known, was during the 16th century the predominant power in the Malay Peninsula.


(R. A. KERN)
PATHAN. [See AUSTRIANIST, i. 149, sqq.]

PAULÁ, the name given in the Moghul Emperor Akbar's monetary system to the 1/4 dam (1/4 jawh.).

(See A.A.)

PEČENEGS, a people of Turkish stock of the middle ages. Their name occurs in numerous variants (Ujadzak, Pauchak, Nar-Chezer, Nar-Chez, Patent Easte, Patentacse, Pircingi, Pincenakiti, Petegem, et al.; also Byessen, Besi, in Hungary, Besenoy, et al.). There is no longer any doubt that they were a branch of the Turkish race. Rashid al-Din (xivth century; see Geographia) and Maḥmūd Khoshghar (1073) number them among the Ghuzis [q.v.], the latter (Dictam Lughāt al-Turk, i. 87; cf. K. Č. A., i. 36) puts them in the northern group of Turkish peoples, to which the Kipchaks, Oghuzs, etc., belong and describes them "as next to the Rhomans" i.e. the most westerly Turkish tribe.

In all probability the Pečenegs separated very early from their brethren in the original home of the Turks in Turkestan. Their earlier home is said to have been the Emna-Ural-Volga region, which according to Baktr and Gardner was a 30 days' journey in length and breadth. There they remained probably for a considerable time, their neighbours being the Khasars in the S. W. and the Oghus in the S. E., and they traded with Persia and Khorasan.

But by 860 the Oghuz began to move westwards and to drive the Pečenegs from the Ural region. Towards the end of the xth century the Oghuz (Uzen, Oguza) came to terms with the Khasars and drove the main body of the Pečenegs from their old home, so that in 922 Ibn Haškan found only a small remnant of the Pečenegs there; according to De administrando imperio (p. 166), the latter remained there of their own accord.

The fugitive Pečenegs came up against the Magyars, drove them into Hungary and occupied their lands, at first the territory between the Don and the Dnieper and later as far as the Danube. Constantine Porphyrogenetos (c. 950) says that they took place "fifty years ago", but the chronicler Reginio (d. 915) dates it exactly to 889. The power of the Pečenegs in the end extended from South Russia over Bashkaria and Moldavia up to the Eastern Carpathians.

Warlike and powerful as they were the Pečenegs were a constant danger to their neighbours. Here however we can only briefly mention their relations with Hungary, Russia and Byzantium. In the course of the xth and xih centuries they frequently attacked Hungary from the Eastern Carpathians or settled peacefully in various Hungarian districts (cf. the map of their settlements in Németh, Die Inschriften der Schatzes von Nagy-Szent-Miklós, 1. Beilage). In the xih century the Pečeneg settlements in Hungary still enjoyed certain special political privileges. They finally became merged in the Koman.

With the Russians, the Pečenegs were early on friendly terms (according to the De adm. imp., p. 69, they sold them cattle, horses and sheep); sometimes they were their allies against Byzantium and Bulgaria. In the time of Igor (941), but more frequently they were attacking the Russians. In the year 968 they besieged Kiev. In 971 they killed the Grand Duke Sviatoslav on his way back from Bulgaria and the Russians had to build a number of fortifications against them. Their last attack (1034) was completely repulsed. A little later (1065) they were being hard pressed by the advancing Uzen and moved more and more towards the Danube and later also back to the Balkan peninsula.

The Byzantine imperial historian in De adm. imp. (p. 65) recommends the maintenance of peaceful relations with the Pečenegs and there was actually an alliance with them but by 970 we find them fighting with the Russians against Byzantium. Henceforth the Pečenegs were continually at war with the Byzantines until the emperor Alexius I in 1091 routed them completely at the mouth of the Maritsa and in 1122 John II inflicted another heavy defeat upon them. Of the remnants of the Pečenegs some were taken into the military service of the Byzantines and some settled in the Balkan, especially in Bulgaria. The Gagauz (q.v.) are sometimes regarded as what was left of them but their present language gives very little evidence of this (cf. vol. iv., p. 992). Nevertheless a number of Balkan place-names still recall the fact that the Pečenegs were once there.

With the nomadic nature of the Pečenegs it is obvious that the tribal organization was an important factor. According to C. Porphyrogenetos the Pečenegs were divided into eight tribes (four beyond and four on this side of the Dnieper) with as many great chiefs and into 40 clans with petty chiefs. The names of the tribes according to Némethe were mainly derived from the names of horses and from titles of the supreme chief e.g. Tepaio = Kukh-bey, i.e. the tribes of Kukh-bey, with grey horses. The three great tribes who were prominent for bravery and distinction are called Kogari (Kagyares) by Porphyrogenetos. Of the names of chiefs that of the tribe of Julas (Yasa), namely Körtu (q.v.), is probably the most remarkable. In the time of Kedrenos (ii. 581—582) there were thirteen Pečeneg tribes "each of which had inherited its name from its ancestor and chief".

We know very little about the religion of the Pečenegs. According to Baktr they were formerly fire-worshippers (Magians) but according to other sources there were already a considerable number of Muslims among them by the beginning of the tenth century.

As to the Pečeneg language, Anna Comnena (xih century) already asserts its identity with that of the Koman (see Čiši). Until recently its scanty remains consisted almost entirely of the names of the Pečeneg tribes, chiefs and fortresses handled by C. Porphyrogenetos. But from 1931 Némethe succeeded in deciphering the inscriptions of the treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklós, it became evident to him that the gold and silver vessels contained in it belonged to the Pečeneg chief Bota-of-Cahan (c. 900—920) and that we had here further specimens of the Pečeneg language; from these he concluded that the language of the Pečenegs was closely connected with that of the Koman in Hungary and that of the Codex Cumanicus. The characters of these inscriptions may be called Pečeneg runes, which belong to the family of the Köl-türk script and are closely connected with the Hungarian runes.

In conclusion, from the fact that there are two baptismal fonts in the treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklós it may be assumed that several Pečeneg chiefs were converted to Christianity. Very
little more is known of the Pečeněg; cf. however the Index to K. Dieterich (s. Bibl.).

Bibliography: The earliest Arabic (Ilm Rusta and Bakti) and Persian (Gardizi) records of the Pečeněg are based on Ujahlîn (tenth century) and on a source of the first half of the 16th century so that they only refer to the earlier home of the Pečeněg; Mas'ud's account however includes the period after they were driven from the Volga region. Both groups of sources however have been used by J. Marquart and W. Barthold. — Also: Constantinios Porphyrogenitos, K. Bonn, vol. iii. (1840) see Index historici (the whole of ch. 37 deals with the Pečeněg); P. Gollnower, Pečenge, logoi kai polisai de nakhastv- tis, Kies 1884; Sh. Saiti: lêyî, ãbat al-Asim, ii. 1306; K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur 5, 1897, p. 1105; G.; Enzle, Der Splitter, Brockhaus-Efron, vol. xxiii., St. Petersburg 1898, p. 538 sq.; J. Marquart, Osterrussische und ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig 1903, a. index; René Nagy, Lettmann, vol. iii., Budapest 1911, x. v. Bisznyoky; K. Dieterich, Byzantinische Quellen zur Länder- und Volkskunde, 1912, part ii., esp. p. 51-58, 147 and 186; N. Asim and M. Arif, Omdanum-Türk, vol. i., Constantinople 1835, p. 75 sq.; E. Oberhumer, Die Türkischen und das Osmanische Reich, Leipzig and Berlin 1917, a. index; Z. Gomboc, Uber den Verbreitungs- und besessen, in Türkei, Budapest 1918, p. 209-215; W. Bang, Uber den Verbreitungs- und besessen, in Turkei, Budapest 1918, p. 479-487; G. Peis, Die Petxenenga und die ungarnszungs hunger, in K. C. A., i. 143-144 (assumes among other things that the royal family of the Abas is descended from Caba or from the Pečeněg tribe Tzâqû); G. Crebe, Turco-byzantinische Missellen (J.), in K. C. A., i. 209-210 (rejects Pecher's hypotheses, approves Német's linguistic deductions and analyses once more the Pečeněg chapter in Porphyrogenitos); W. Barthold, Orty Asya Türk Türkçine xabînda Dersler, Istanbul 1927, p. 23 and 92 sq.; J. Német, Zur Konstanz der Petxenenga, in K. C. A., i. 219-225 (on, Die petxenengischen Statutenster, in Ungarische Jahrbücher, vol. x., 1930, p. 27-34; (on, Die Inschriften der Statteten der Nagy-Szent-Mihály, Budapest-Leipzig 1930, especially p. 36 and 45-59; Huseyn Namik, Polenekler (Turkish), Istanbul 1933.

(Fejih Baharattakévić)

PECIEWSI, Ibrahim, Ottoman historian. Ibrahim was born in 982 (1574) in Fürnkirchen (Hungary, Hung. Pécé, Turk. Polévi, i.e. Polenek) whence his epithet Polenek (of Pečew, Török, i. 286 and ii. 453; also J. v. Hammer, G. O. R. A., iv. 5, note). His ancestors were holders of fiefs in Bosnia and Hungary. Pečewsi has not recorded his father's name (cf. Török, i. 87); he was in any case already domiciled in Fürnkirchen. His mother was a member of the celebrated family of Sokolović (Sokol). Of Pečewsi's early years, we know that at the age of 14 he was taken as an orphan into the house of his uncle Ferhad Pasha, governor of Ofen, and later went to another relative Lala Mehmed Pasha (cf. his Török, ii. 323); he spent 15 years in the latter's entourage. In 1602 (1593) he joined the army, took part in the Hungarian campaign of Sinan Pasha, an eye-witness of the siege of Gran (cf. Török, ii. 136, 150), of the Erzurum campaign and the siege of Peterwardein. The next few years he spent mainly on the staff of Lala Mehmed Pasha who had been grand vizier since 1613 (1604). He gives a detailed account in his history of the various offices which he held. After the death of his patron Lala Mehmed Pasha (1624 = 1615) he was sent by his successor to Anatolia where he had to prepare a description of several saulaks. He was next deşertär for a short period in Tokat, went in the capacity of Rumelia and finally was given the office of Anatolia as "alme". He spent the rest of his life in his native district. He became mustafâris of Stuhlweissenburg, then deşertär of Tenevârî. In 1651 (1641) he retired from office and went to Ofen. He spent his last years here and in his native town engaged in writing his history. The date of his death is not exactly known. He must however have died about 1660 (1650).

Ibrahim Pečewsi, who from his youth upwards displayed a marked turn for history, is the author of a work which is one of the best Ottoman sources for the years 926-1049 = 1526-1639. While for earlier events he relies upon the accounts of his Turkish predecessors, and as N. v. Istvánffy and K. Iñitali have shown, also Hungarian sources, for the later period he writes from his own observation or information. His work, which is written in lucid and simple language, survives in numerous manuscripts (to those detailed by Babiński, G. O. W., 194 may now be added two others in Upsala, University Library, cf. Zetteteéen, Katalog, p. 331 and a manuscript in Rhodes in the possession of Hâdiz Ahmed, No. 446), but so far we have no critical edition. Several preliminary drafts seem to exist which vary considerably in the periods covered and were presumably later expanded. The Stambul printed edition of the Török-Polonek in two parts (10-1504 pp. and 7-487 pp., printed 1635; cf. Török, 1688, i. 471 and 484 and F. v. Kraelitz, in III., viii. 239) covers the period from the accession of Sulaiman the Magnificent to the death of Murad IV in 1549.


(Franz Babiński)

PECHINA, Arab. Bâdîjâma, formerly an important town in the south-east of Spain, to the north of Almeria [q. v.] (originally Marçat Badîjâma), from which it is about six miles distant. Towards the middle of the ninth century it was the centre of a kind of maritime republic founded by Andalusi sailors, who had also a colony on the Algerian coast at Tenes [q. v.]. It consisted of several quarters separated by gardens; becoming the capital of a kawa of its own, Pechina was later supplanted by the same neighbour Almeria, to which its inhabitants soon migrated.


(F. E. Lévy-Provençal)
PEHLEWAN, MUHAMMAD B. ILDIRIZ, SHAMS AL-DYN, ATABEG OF ADBARBA'IDIYAN. His father Ildiriz [q.v.] had in course of time risen to be the real ruler in the Seldjuk empire; the widow of Sultan Taghril [q.v.] was Pehlewans mother and Arslan b. Taghril [q.v.] his step-brother. In the fighting between Ildiriz and the lord of Marjigh, Ibn A's Sa'udar al-Ashraf, Pehlewans played a prominent part [cf. the article MARJIGH]. From his father he inherited in 568 (1172—1173) Arslan, Adbarba'idiyan, al-Dhijal, Hamadhan, Isfahan, and al-Raiy with their dependent territories and a few years later also took Tabriz, which he gave to his brother Kilil Arslan [q.v.]. Like Ildiriz, Pehlewans also became the real ruler. Sultan Arslan b. Taghril was completely under his control as was also his young son Taghril [q.v.], whom Pehlewans put on the Seldjuk throne, after Arslan had been disposed of by poison. Pehlewans died in Dhu 1-Hijjah 581 (February-March 1186) or the beginning of 582 (1186) and his brother Kilil succeeded him.

Ibn al-Altijr (xi, 346) pays a high tribute to Pehlewans statesmanlike qualities and during his tenure of office peace and prosperity prevailed in his government. After his death, however, bloodshed and unrest broke out. In Isfahan the Shahris and Hanafites fought one another and at al-Raiy the Sunnis and Shi'a until order was gradually restored.


(K. V. BETTERSTEIN)

PENDJIHLI. [See PANDJIHLI.]

PERA. [See CONSTANTINOPLE.]

PERAK. [See MALAY PENINSULA.]

PERSEPOLIS. [See ISFAHAN.]

PERSIA.

I. HISTORICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHICAL SURVEY. (J. H. KRAMES)

II. LANGUAGE AND DIALECTS. (H. W. BAILEY)

III. MODERN PERSIAN LITERATURE. (E. BERTELS)

I. HISTORICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHICAL SURVEY.

Name. The name Persia is of Western origin and probably only in the Middle Ages began to be used for the countries occupying the Iranian plateau (in Ptolemaic Persia is found once instead of Persia). It is derived from the Greek-Roman appellation "Parase" for the Achemenids, an appellation that goes back to the name of the region of Persis in the south-west, named in its turn after a tribe that is probably identical with the Parsis, known by the Assyrian inscriptions as having occupied formerly a part of Media (oldest mention 844 B.C.). The name Pars (New Persian: Pārs) in Muhammadan times is applied to the same region of Persia only, but Pārsī was already at an early time used for one of the types of language spoken in the Iranian provinces (cf. Fārsī, ed. Flügel, p. 13), which language since the 6th century became the written literary language that we call Persian. Equally the appellation al-Fārisī found in early Arabic literature sources, denoted the whole of the people of Persia, but was restricted in use to the Persians of pre-Islamic times or to those who had kept to their ancient traditional and religious views. This meaning is often synonymous with the Arabic expression al-`Adwān.

The term Iran is of Persian origin and goes back to an earlier form Aryan, originally an adjective (airyana in the younger Avesta) meaning "Aryan". It was the name of the core of the state of the Sassanids, who styled themselves "kings of Iran and Anērān" and it occurs in the early Arabic historical and geographical sources in the form Irān-`aḥr, meaning the country of Iran (cf. i.e. Vakāli, i. 417 sqq.). In Muhammadan times the name became popular again by the revival of the ancient traditions in the Shī‘ā, but the use of the word Iran for the modern kingdom of Persia is probably not older than the 6th century, when the Persians began to call themselves Iranīyān (about 890 there existed already a newspaper called Iran). Nor does the use of the words "Iranian" and "Iranistic" in scientific publications appear to be older than the second part of the 6th century (Spiegel's Ernste Altertumskunde was published since 1871, and Darmesteter's Études Iraniums in 1883).

Geographical Survey. Throughout the Middle Ages Persia was neither a geographical nor a political unity. In the eastwards its citizens lived there must therefore exist an arbitrary delimitation of the country, namely the territory comprising present Persia, Afghanistan and Baluchistan and in addition the region of Merv as far south as the present Persian frontier. The territory thus circumscribed may represent the actual Achemenids and later the Sassanids, excluding the territories of al-`Iraq, Mesopotamia and Armenia, which during both periods belonged to those empires; Babylonia was called even in Sassanian times Dih-`Irānshahr (B. G. A., vi. 5).

The greater part of Persia thus circumscribed consists of a plateau, very mountainous in parts, with the coastal regions of the Caspian and the Persian Gulf. With the exception of these coastal regions the waters of Persia have no outlet to the sea. The consequence of that is that there are only narrow small streams, the only rivers deserving the name being the Hīmānd, which flows, like many smaller streams, into the depression of the Siāh lake, and the Heri-Rd, which ends in the northern steppe. The many small streams allow only a limited cultivation in the mountain valleys and on the fringes between the mountains and the deserts. This circumstance gives even to the inhabited mountainous stretches of the plateau the character of a series of oases, which are larger or smaller as the irrigation system (most effectively by the subterranean aqueducts called kohers), is more or less developed. The territory between the oasis towns and villages is steppe, which, in central Persia, become real desert, the soil of which is more or less saltish. The steppes, as also the higher mountain regions, support nomad life only, as they are only habitable during certain periods of the year, to which cause is added the very considerable variation of temperature in many regions. Nomads or semi-nomads have therefore
always lived together on the Iranian plateau with the settled population; the proportion has considerably varied on account of the frequent invasions of nomadic peoples. Persia consists of a number of regions of very different character, which accounts for the lack of political unity during long periods of history. Each of these regions has formed occasionally an important political and cultural centre and the Islamic geographers in describing Persia give for each of them its own description. Their division is mainly traditional and at the same time geographical, but disregards the very variable and ephemeral political frontiers.

The regions may be divided into a western and an eastern group, separated by the great central Iranian desert, which extends from the Caspian Sea south-eastwards practically as far as the Indian Ocean in Mekran. This desert, called by the geographers Mafṣūrat Khurāsān, Mafṣūrat Fāris, Mafṣūrat Kirmān or Mafṣūrat Sistan, depending on the parts particularly taken into consideration, varies in breadth and character. Its level is on the whole considerably lower than the eastern and western parts of the Iranian plateau. The northern part is a large salt desert where vegetation is hardly possible. Further to the south, to the east of Fāris, begins the region called on modern maps Dasht-i Lūf; here, and further to the south-east there are not a few oases, which form important resting points on the many caravan ways that have linked up since old times Fāris and Kirmān with Khurāsān and Sistan. In the southern regions of Ῥaṣāl and Mekran, with which is linked the large desert to the south of the Hīlmand river, the desert or steppe character is prevalent. This series of deserts, though not forming an impassable barrier between east and west, has often coincided with political frontiers; only in the north in the region of Ḳāīūr, east of al-Ra‘i, (later Teheran) and along the Caspian coast, a more continuous cultivated stretch links up Media with Khurāsān.

The central part of the western regions is Media, called al-Dījāl in Muhammadan times and later ‘Īrāq-i Aḏjam, consisting of a plateau all covered by mountain ranges running mainly from N.W. to S.E. and bordered on its north-western side by the Zagros mountains; the most important towns are here Hamadān and Iṣfahān. To the north-west Aḏharbāḏjān forms a continuation of al-Dījāl, from which it is separated by the desertlike region of Ardabīl. Aḏharbāḏjān is still more mountainous, being a transition to the Armenian and Caucasian mountain systems; it is also richer in water-courses; the river Araxes (Araç) may be considered its northern boundary. Its chief geographical feature is the big salt lake of Urmiya. In early Muhammadan times Ardabīl was here the most important place, succeeded in modern times by Tabriz. The small coastal border to the east of Aḏharbāḏjān belongs to the South Caspian regions, known in Islamic geography as al-Dījīl, al-Da‘īla, and further Tabaristan, now Gilān and Māzandarān. This region consists of a narrow coastal stretch, widening somewhat towards the east and contrasting with the rest of Persia by its moist climate and rich vegetation; to the south it slopes rapidly upwards to the high range of the Elburz that forms the northern border of the central plateau; alongside the southern slope of this range stretches a narrow cultivated and inhabited area, in which al-Ra‘i was the most important town and through which ran the main route to Khurāsān, passing, after al-Ra‘i, Samān, al-Dīnābād and Biṣṭān. At the south-eastern corner of the Caspian the route passed south of the mountainous region of Dūr Ṭafīrah, which region, owing to the fact that its waters — the river Dūr Ṭafīrah and Atrek — flow towards the Caspian, does not belong geographically to Khurāsān.

In the south of al-Dījīl the Karstīn mountains are a transition to the low country of Ḳhūrāsān, the ancient Elam and the modern Ardabīl. It is very similar to al-Ṭarā‘, from which it is separated by desert stretches. The river of Ahvāz, now the Kārūn, fed by its tributary the Kerīkht, in the early Middle Ages flowed directly into the Persian Gulf, and later into the Shatt al-‘Arab. To the east of Khūrāsān and south-east of al-Dījīl begin the mountain ranges of Fāris with their many mountain lakes and their fertile valleys, which find their continuation in the similarly shaped mountain region of Kirmān where, however, the desert areas are more numerous. The chief town of Fāris in mediaeval and modern times, Shīrāz, has replaced the ancient towns of Dīrj and Isfahān, while the mediaeval towns of Kirmān, al-Ṭabī‘īn and Dīrj, have disappeared, the present town of Kirmān being comparatively young. The coastal region of Fāris and Kirmān is barren; here were the very important ports of Tawwādī, Sinīr, Shīrāz and Harmān, now replaced by Būshir and Bandar ‘Abbās. The geographers distinguish in Fāris and Kirmān a southern hot zone (qurād, qarṣe) and a northern colder zone (qurād, sevērd), a distinction important to the nomads and pertaining to the climate and vegetation; “hot regions” are found, however, also in the north-eastern parts of Kirmān, where the land descends to the level of the central desert. The oasis of Yezd and environs is generally counted a part of Fāris. The country east of Kirmān as far as the Indus, occupied by several mountain ranges, is poor in cultivated areas and has not much importance as a passage to the indus region. It consists of the coast region of Mekran and the parallel inner zone of Ḳāīūr, forming together the present Baluchestān.

The north-eastern part of the Iranian plateau consists of three main regions, of which Sīstān with al-Ra‘īkh khādji (Arachosia) is formed by the basin of the Hīlmand; these waters flow into the Sīstān lakes, which have considerably changed their form in the course of history. The principal mediaeval towns were Zaranj and Bust. The mountain ranges become higher towards the north of this region and run more north, north-east, north-west and south-east the border is the west-shed of the Indus valley.

To the north of Sīstān stretches the large region of Khurāsān. Its main features are a series of mountain ranges running east-west, north-west, north-east, north and south; the eastern border is the west-shed of the Indus valley.

To the north of Sīstān stretches the large region of Khūrāsān. Its main features are a series of mountain ranges running east-west, north-west, north-east, north and south; the eastern border is the west-shed of the Indus valley.
not quite complete watershed between Khurāṣān and Dūrjūn. Though certainly presenting a geographical unity, the large extent of Khurāṣān allows the division into smaller regions, such as Bādhīgī, al-Dūrjūn, Kūrghāštān and others. The present frontier between Persia and Afghanistan cuts from north to south right through Khurāṣān and Sistān. Finally the basin of the Indus and its tributaries forms a region of its own, although the part with Kābul to the south of the Hindī Kūh and Ghazna (Zābulistān) was often counted by the Islamic geographers to Khurāṣān. The more southern part of the Indus valley is separated from the Hilmānd system by the Sālimān range and the deserts of Waziristān and is, owing to climate, poor in cultivated areas.

All over the Iranian plateau a system of secular caravan roads links up the many cultivated centres. The chief connections with the surrounding countries were the passage of the Araxes towards the eastern Caucasian (al-Rām), the passes west of Urmia to Armenia, the pass-ways of Shahrizār and Hulwān to the Mesopotamian and al-Iraq, and the road from al-Baṣra to Ahwāz. The sea-ports on the Persian Gulf maintained regular intercourse with the coast towns of Arabia, India and even Eastern Africa. Towards Transoxania (Ma war ṣ al-Nahr) the chief passage went by Tirmidh on the Oxus, while the roads from Kābul and Ghazna to Mulkān were the chief connections between the Iranian plateau and the Islamic parts of India. The Caspian ports maintained a small traffic with the Volga mouth.

Historical survey. The relations between Arabia and Persia date from long before Islamic times. Arabs settled in southern Persia from the time of Shāhpūr I, and the Sāsānids were masters of southern Arabia up to the time of Muḥammād. Then began, under the caliph ʿUmar, the Arab conquest of Persia, which inaugurated the Islamic period in the history of that country. The political and psychological prelude to this conquest was the taking of the capital of the Sāsānid empire, al-Madaʾin, in 637, after the battle of al-Kādīsia. Although the exact dates of the different conquests and battles are not known, the early historical sources allow a reliable survey of the phases of the amazingly rapid progress of the Arabic invaders all over the Iranian plateau. For, with the exception of Makrān and Kābul, all regions had been reached, as far as Balkh, before the death of the caliph ʿOthmān (656). We may distinguish different chief expeditions that were directed primarily from Madīna, and secondarily from Kūfa and Basra by the governors of those two garrison towns. The first expedition, however, the conquest of the greater part of al-Dījūlī and south-eastern Arḍhārdīsān, was the immediate consequence of the expedition of al-Māʾrūn to the north of Syria by Abī Wāqīṣ. It was followed, probably in 638, by the battle of Dījīlī and the conquest of Hulwān, Kūrghāštān (Kūrghāštān) and, after reinforcement had been sent from Kūfa, by the famous battle of Nihāwand. These events caused the flight of king Vērdēgovd by the way of Isfahān, Isfahān, Kūrnān, Siddīqān, to Mār, where he was killed by the Marwānī Mūḥāyya (651). Immediately after Nihāwand came the capitulation of Arḍhārdīsān (about 641), together with raids into Dījīlī. The further conquest of Arḍhārdīsān, however, started from Māzand, taken in 641 by ʿOthāʾ b. Fāsḥaṭ, who, in the course of his ex-

pedition, took Shahrizār, Urmīya and several other places in Arḍhārdīsān. Nihāwand remained the base from which, under the direction of the first governors of Kūfa, were conquered al-Raʾy and the towns of Kūrnān (after 641), and about the same time Hāmadān, Kūrshīn and Zandān. In the following years several expeditions were necessary in this region against the Dūlamīts and other mountainers. From Kūfa started also the first invasion of Kūhīstān under the governor al-Muḥīrī b. ʿAṣība, but the real conquest of this region began in 638 under the famous governor of Baṣra Abī Mūsā al-Aṣḵārī. The subjugation of this very near neighbour did not take much time, the most serious resistance being given at Tūṭar (Ṣīhīṣhār). Kūhīstān remained Abī Mūsā’s base, from which he conquered the remaining towns of al-Dījūlī, namely al-Sāmān, al-Sharīq, Kūnām and Kūshān, and finally, in 644, by means of his lieutenant ʿAbd Allāh b. Buḥdīf, Ṣafāḥ. The latter was also the first to move in the direction of Kūhīstān by forcing the towns called al-Ṭabāṣān to capitulate. About the same time took place the first invasion of Fāris, not, however, from Kūhīstān, but from the opposite Arabian province of al-Bābkān, whose governor ʿOthmān b. Abī ʿAṣīb had an encounter with the marwūṣān on the island of Ahbarkān and subsequently took Tawwajdī, from where he began raids on the other towns of Fāris. His brother al-Haskam defeated the marwūṣān of Fāris near Rāhhar on the coast, in 640, in a great battle, which, according to al-Balkhī, was equal in importance to that of al-Kādīsia. Then Abī Mūsā was ordered to join forces with ʿOthmān b. al-ʿAṣ. Together they conquered between 644 and 647 52 number of towns: Maranjān, Shahrī, Shīrīn, Ṣafāḥ, Būghrān, Ṣafāḥ, Kūrghāštān, Dākhēbdījīl; Fāris; Abī Mūsā penetrated far into Kūrnān, Ṣafāḥ became here the principal Arab garrison. It was from here that, in the caliphate of ʿOthmān, started the great campaigns of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr, after his appointment as governor of Baṣra. In 649 he took the not yet conquered towns of Isfahān and Dījīl, and in 650 he set out for the conquest of Kūhīstān; the reason of this is said to have been an invitation by the marwūṣān of Tūṣ, addressed equally to his colleague of Kūfa, Saʾd b. al-ʿAṣ. But while Saʾd did not go beyond Baṭārān and Dūrjūn, where the mālid was made tributary, ʿAbd Allāh became the real conqueror of Kūhīstān. He had already dispatched his lieutenant Modjāḏī b. Maʾshī towards Kūrnān, in pursuit of Vērdēgovd; this first expedition having failed, Modjāḏī was sent a second time to Kūrnān in 650, where he conquered the principal towns: al-Sṭrādī, Būghrān and Dījīl. Battles were fought also in 650 and 651, the latter a similar minor expedition was sent by ʿAbd Allāh to Sīstān, under al-Raʾbī b. Ziyād, who crossed the desert from Fāhrād and conquered with considerable difficulty Zarānd, the capital of Sīstān, where he remained several years. His successor having been expelled from Zarānd, ʿAbd Allāh dispatched ʿAbd al-Raʾḥīm b. Sūmara, who reconquered the country and penetrated as far as Dāwār, Bust and Zābul. In 650 ʿAbd Allāh had in the meantime proceeded to al-Ṭabāṣān, already conquered, and sent from there al-Aṣḵārī b. Kaʾís to the conquest of Kūhīstān. He himself reached Nīshābīr, which surrendered after a siege. From several
towns were subdued by him and by his lieutenants, and with the *mawālī of Tūs a treaty was concluded. Marw capitulated without a fight. A secondary expedition to Herat under Awn b. Thālabī resulted in the capitulation of the ruler of that town, while finally eastern Khurāsān was subdued by al-ʿΑμrān b. Kaṣārī, who marched on the capital, which surrendered. Thus the region of al-Ḥujjājīnān and the town of Kalbī, continuing from here to the Kizhā, as far as Khaṭūnān. When ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr returned, he left Kaṣārī b. al-Haṭtham as the first governor of Khurāsān. This was the military situation at ’Othmān’s death. The conquests were by no means secure, least of all in Sīān and Khurāsān, but the placing of garrisons in Nihāwān, al-Ahwāz and Shīrāz enabled the Arabs to complete their conquests after the civil wars were over. The people and the authorities with whom the Arabs had to deal in Persia were very different. After the royal army had been destroyed at al-Kādīsiyya and Nihāwān, it was chiefly the marzākūn who opposed the Arab invaders with their local troops and concluded on their own account treaties (muḥāfāẓ), which guaranteed freedom of religion and the concession of private property on payment of ḥārāḍ. Where a town or a region had been taken by force, the Arabs became proprietors of the soil, as in the Median regions Māh al-Kifā and Māh al-Baṣra. Wholesale acceptance of Islam, as is reported of Karwān, was rare; the Zoroastrians continued the practice of their religion, notably in Fārs and Adhārābād, but from Fārs many of them took refuge in Sīān and Maktān, and about 700 took place the first emigration of Zoroastrians to Kathiawar in India. In the town of Dārābījī in it was the local herābī who treated with the Arabs. On the other hand, many Persians were taken as captives to Irāq and Arabia, where they became muḥāfāz, while also entire groups, such as many knights (sāwirā) of Yezdegard’s army, and different elements of the population of southern Persia (the Zolt, Sayyīdījā and others) joined forces with the Arabs. The mountainers, however, in Fārs and al-Dhībāl, and especially those of Dīlam and Daulām, long remained unconquered, living under petty local dynasties. In Khurāsān the Arabs had to deal with remnants of the Hepthalites (Hājīyatān), still further east with polytheists (muḥārīkūn), probably Buddhists and, in Khurāsān, often with Turkish auxiliaries. On the other hand, the conquests introduced a contingent of Arab Muslims in the Persian towns, where they generally began by establishing a mosque; they increased by colonisation in Umāiyad times and among them were many bearers of the traditions (hadīth) about the Prophet and other religious matters and in this way was prepared the gradual Islamisation of the population,favoured at the same time by economic conditions. The civil war, in which not a few Persians took part in Irāq, crippled for some time the Arab progress; the emissaries of ʿAlī’s governors in Kaṣārī and Bāṣra had great difficulty in maintaining themselves, and the whole of Khurāsān rebelled, in spite of the reported visit of the marzākūn of Marw to the fourth caliph, Kalbī was even for some time under Chinese control. It was only under the energetic governors of Irāq under the Umāiyads, Ziyād and al-Ḥajjājīd, that the conquest was taken up with renewed vigour. Under Mūṭawiya ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr had been again appointed governor of Bāṣra (662) and he sent again ʿAbd al-Ḥaymān b. Samʿān to Sīān, and then the Arabs reached Kabul, although he and his successors experienced greater difficulties in their dealings with the Kābul-Shāh and the different rulers of Zabulīstān who are called sūmil (according to Marquart, *Erinnerungen* p. 248). These difficulties continued throughout the Umāiyad period and became less only when the region was joined administratively to Khurāsān, and the Arab domination grew stronger in the latter region. Ibn ʿAmīr was also the first to begin the reconquest of Khurāsān by his lieutenant Kaṣārī b. Haṭṭam (capture of Herāt and Šāhīd; it was continued by Ziyād b. ʿAbd Sufīyān (from 666), under whom Marw was made a strong Arab garrison, and shortly afterwards 50,000 Arab colonists were established with their families in Khurāsān. al-Ḥajjājīd operated in Khurāsān through his able generals al-Muhallab b. Abī Sufīya, Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, and finally Kūstāb b. Mūsīlīm. One of the greatest difficulties was, in his time as many times afterwards, the clearing of the main road to Khurāsān by al-Ḥayrī, Kūtabī and Tabariyān, where many battles were fought with the mountainers. The transfer of a considerable Arab contingent to Khurāsān under Ziyād had been a consequence of tribal feuds that had started during Mūṭawiya’s reign. The new comers soon began to infect the Arab soldiery of the garrisons, while at the same time the political and religious parties born from the civil war began to gain adherents in Persia, first among the Arabs and soon among their Persian clients. Prominent were the Kūṣṭābī, who, under their leader Kaṣārī b. al-Fadlīya (killed ca. 697), founded a refuge in Kūtar at and made from there raids to the north and the west. And towards the end of the Umāiyad period, Ishāfān with parts of Fārs and Khurāsān were temporarily in the power of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥāfāz (744–746). The main object of the Umāiyad administration was the collection of the *ṣiyyāt* and the *ḥārāḍ* and, until the time of al-Ḥajjājīd, the books were kept by native scribes in Persian, after the cession of the Šāhīdāt. Under al-Ḥajjājīd the language and the script of the administration were changed to Arabic in Irāq, and we must assume that generally Arabic came into administrative use in the Persian provinces; nevertheless the first Arab governors, and among them Kaṣārī, had coins struck with Persian and Arabic legends. A considerable advance in the Islamisation of Persia was due to the financial policy of Umār b. ʿAbd al-ʿArīz and Ḥiḥān; after Umār’s edicts had induced many Persians to adopt Islam in order to get rid of the *ṣiyyāt*, the taxing of Muslims and non-Muslims alike by Ḥiḥān brought about an assimilation of the different elements of the population, from which there emerged at this time a reliable class of Islamic-Persian functionaries. Only the mountain people under their local chiefs remained unconverted. But probably the remote province of Khurāsān, though results were not rare, and notwithstanding the continuous tribal feuds of the Arabs, remained under firm government control, owing to the presence of the strong garrison at Marw, where the governor resided, and in a not less degree to the successes of the Muslims in Transoxiana under Kūtarat. This makes comprehensible why the anti-Umāiyad propaganda, directed by the *Aḥbāsids* in Syria, chose Khurāsān as the field of operation for their
emissaries. Making use of the animosity between the Arab tribes and the general dissatisfaction with the existing rule, this propaganda resulted finally in the revolt of 'Abd-Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karim in 747 and his victorious entry into Marw and soon afterwards into Naṣībūn. So it was to the Arab legions in Persia and their Persian helpers that the 'Abbāsīds owed their final victory in 750. Thus, of course, brought about a completely new orientation of Persia within the empire of the new dynasty, the more so as the 'Abbāsīds transferred their residence to 'Irāq, where the centre of the last national Persian dynasty was formerly situated. Persian attitude to life and Persian tradition became dominant in the new centre of Arab political power and soon of Islamic civilization in the newly founded Baghdad (762). A symptom of this Persian cultural influence is the translation into Arabic of products of Pehlevi literature by authors like Ibn al-Muqaffa. Further, powerful families of Persian origin, such as the Barakānids, and afterwards the Bānū Nāshīrī, such influence as vassals on the affairs of state. This was also the time when the racial sentiment of the Persians began to assert itself in the 'idālīya movement and when the manifestations of the Persian sīdīyīs aroused the anxiety of religious circles. The caliphs themselves showed more interest in their Persian provinces than the Umayyads had ever done; they were moreover compelled to do so, as events had shown what a powerful commander might be able to undertake against the central authority. In the south-western provinces — al-Djadhīd to Kufrāsān and Fāris — revolts of this kind were not to be feared, but farther away in the mountains the authority could only be maintained by repeated expeditions. So when the governor of Kufrāsān showed signs of disloyalty, the caliph al-Mansūr sent his son al-Mahdi with the general Khaṣṣān b. Kufrāsān to restore order and afterwards to subjugate a local dynasty in Tahbāristān. Then al-Mahdi took up his residence in al-Raiy until his accession. Hārūn al-Raṣīd undertook himself at the end of his life an expedition against Kufrāsān and Transoxania, during which he died at Tūs (809). His son al-Ma'mūn, who had accompanied him, remained in Kufrāsān, even after he had become caliph (813), until 817. During this time happened the episode of the infām 'Alī al-Riḍā [q. v.]. In the same early 'Abbāsīd period the attitude of the Persian population towards Islam had changed in so far as notably the revolt of 'Abd-Allāh had induced many Persians of the better class (the dādšāhs) to become Muslims, but at the same time the lower classes were liable to outbursts of religious fanaticism, in which Islamic and pre-Islamic views were intermingled. In Kufrāsān a number of "false prophets" made their appearance: Shahābīl the Mālikī (753), the Fatimī (768), the Barakānī (777-780). To the same kind of religious movements belonged the prolonged rebellion of the Khurramītes under Bābak (816-823) in Aḥbarīdān. The caliphs were justifying in repressing these movements with great severity, because they were generally accompanied by aspirations towards political independence. The revolt of the 'Alīd Yaḥyā b. 'Abd Allāh in Dālam in 703 showed likewise that it was already possible to operate in Persia with Islamic devices, and for this reason the caliph Harūn had to proceed with much circumspection in its repression.

Under al-Ma'mūn begins the political loosening of Khurāsān and neighbouring provinces from the 'Abbāsīd caliphate, not by the action of the ancient Persian nobles or princes, nor by the popular movements already described, nor by Khārijītī or 'Alīd propaganda, but by the action of Persian-Muḥam-mānian governors not of ancient noble lineage, but nevertheless inspired by national feelings, preparing in this way the Persian-Muḥam-mānian political and cultural renaissance. Tāhir b. al-Husayn, general of al-Ma'mūn, was appointed in 820 governor of Khurāsān. His descendants, the Tāhirīs, were nominally governors of the caliphs, but the latter had to leave to them an almost independent authority over Khurāsān with the regions to the east as far as the Indus and to the south far as al-Raiy. Those regions never came back under the caliphs' full authority, for the Tāhirīs lost their power and their territory in 873 in the struggle against the Saffārīs, a dynasty of still less noble descent, who in 867 had begun to make themselves masters of Sīstān under Yaḥyā b. al-Lāthī and his two brothers. Their territory comprised for some time Khurāsān with the regions of Kābul and al-Rukhshān — where the 'Abbāsīd power had never been well established — and even Kirmān and Fāris, but the position of the Saffārīs as leading power in Persia soon came to an end, when they were beaten in 879 in Khuṣṭān in their endeavour to attack the caliph in Baghādād. The cultural and religious position of the Saffārīs is not well known, but their exploits remained famous in Persia long after their extinction. During the same period the caliphs had to suffer the establishment of other more or less independent dynasties, such as the Dālāfīs in al-Karāuj in the south, the Nāṣirids in Basra (847-857), and the Rudānīs family in Aḥbarīdān. For more important is the rise of the Sūrism in Khurāsān and Transoxania. This dynasty originated in Khurāsān; they had been at first faithful servants of the Tāhirīs and occupied already a powerful position in Transoxania when the troubles in Khurāsān, after the fall of the Tāhirī power, enabled them to establish their power in Khurāsān in 892, under the nominal suzerainty of Baghādād. Under Naṣr b. al-Muqaddas (913-943) they governed also in Sīstān, Kirmān, Dārgānīs, al-Raiy and Tahbāristān. The immense cultural importance of this dynasty for Persia lies in the fact that a revived national but Islamized Persian spirit found an opportunity to develop itself in Khurāsān, as is revealed to us by the beginnings of the New Persian Islamic literature [cf. infra, iii.]. This development certainly goes back at least as far as the time of al-Ma'mūn. The Sūrism stayed in Transoxania and al-Kirmān governed by governors, so that it was not the neighbourhood of their brilliant court which favoured the Persian form of Islamic culture; this was due rather to the general prosperity which began to reign and which brought into existence a class of wealthy landowners who were able to patronize literary and scientific activity, for Arabic literature also began to flourish in Khurāsān (al-Raṣīlī and others). It is further noteworthy that the Persian renaissance did not take place in the traditional centres of Persis, Fāris and Aḥbarīdān, where about this time the ancient conditions had not much changed, but rather in a (culturally speaking) new country, where new forms could more easily come into existence.
sian national spirit took other, less refined forms, as the promoters were the never entirely subjected peoples of Dailam and Dzjân. Here the Zaidite 'Alid propaganda, begun under Hârîm al-Rashîd, had supplied popular opposition to the Caliphate with an Islamic badge. Several petty local dynasties were still in existence in Dailam at the beginning of the 10th century and from here started predatory expeditions, whose first aim was the town of al-Rayy. The brigand chiefs became generals, and some of them became rulers of countries with continually changing frontiers, owing to their warfare with each other and with the Ṣâmânids. The most stable of the dynasties thus formed were the Ziyârids (928–1042), who ruled for some time in al-Rayy, Iṣfâhân and Atâwâr, but were reduced in the end to the territories of Tabaristan and Dzjurdzân. In al-Dzjâbât, Fâris and Khûrân, they were soon replaced by the much more successful Bûyids, their former Dailamite confederates. The independent rise of the three brothers Allâ, Ḥasan and Ahmad, sons of Bûyâ, began about 933 and soon nearly the whole of western Persia had ceased to pay taxes and tribute to the Baghâd government, where, moreover, the caliphs were dominated by military commanders. Through the marriage of Ahmad b. Bûyâ, already master of Khûrân, to occupy Baghâd in 946 and to incorporate the seat of the caliphate in his possession. The caliphate was allowed to survive under the political power of this Persian Šâfîte dynasty. The other Bûyids brothers resided at al-Rayy and at Shârâr, and the most brilliant reign was that of Aḏûd al-Dawla, son of Allâ of Shârâr, who in his turn became master of Baghâd in 978 and reigned until 983, while his son Bahâ al-Dawla (980–1013) continued to reign in ʿIrân, Fâris and Kirmân. At the same time the north-western part of Persia had fallen, after the semi-independent reign of the governors of the ʿAṣâd family in Aḏharbâdjan (890–929), into the hands of Kurdish dynasties, such as the Musârids, the Shâdılısids, the Rawkûlids and others.

On account of these grave political disturbances western Iran was somewhat slower to accommodate the specifically Persian cultural development that had started in Khûrân, but towards the middle of the 10th century, when conditions became more settled, there clustered around the Bûyids courts and in other large centres a class of Persian-Islamic writers — such as Ḥamsa al-ʿĪsfâhânī (d. c. 970) — and scholars, among them such brilliant personalities as the Bûyids waṣâṣ Abû ʿl-ʿAdâl b. Ṣâdâl to Abâdâd. At the same time the different religious currents of the time filtered through into the classes of the continually increasing Islamic population, one centre preferring Šâfîte doctrines, another Muṭaṣṣilism, another traditionalism (aḥl al-ḥadîth), and so on (cf. the geographers al̲-ṣārīm). Karâma was, however, severely suppressed, when it appeared in Khûrân at the end of the 10th century, and though the Karâma propaganda was only brought in south-western Persia, its political successes were realised only on the opposite coast of al-Baḥrân. Šûšân likewise became widely spread in its different forms, developing peculiar types of Persian Šûšân as early as the 11th century. The life story of al-Hallâbî shows equally the fertility of south-western Persia for Šûšân propaganda. All these germes were destined to bear fruit in later centuries, but on the whole the political distribution of forces had already brought it about that western Persia, situated between Sunni Eastern Persia and Sunni ʿIrāq and Mesopotamia, tended towards the Shīʿa.

The 12th century witnessed the rise of the Turks in Persia. Turkish troops had already formed large contingents in the armies of the governors and princes who disputed with each other parts of Iranian soil, not excluding the mountainiers who shook horses alongside their local foot-soldiers. It is true that already in Šâmân time troops of Turkish tribes had been established south of the Dzjâbât in Ṣuṭṭârân, but the main role of the Turks in Persia had always been that of soldiers and military commanders in the service of local governors and princes. In the Šâmânid state several Turks had risen to high military and administrative functions, and, as the military power of the Šâmânids began to wane, these Turkish commanders aspired to political leadership, relying on their Turkish troops and using their natural capacity for military organisation. In this way the Turkish vassal of the Šâmânids, Sabuktâkin, founded his independence in the newly conquered region of Ḥamza and Kâbul, where until then local Hindu rulers had been able to maintain themselves; his power soon became a menace to the Šâmânids themselves, who, in Târmanisân, were continually losing ground to the Turkish Hâshân. Sabuktâkin had been a Šâmânid governor in Khûrân, and it was after his death (997) that his son Mâhmûd of Ḥamza (998–1030) took the opportunity of establishing an independent power in Khûrân, choosing Balkh for his capital at the outset. He extended his sway over Ṣâstân and as far as eastern Media, while his conquests in India and Târmanisân gave a strong backing to the consolidation of his power in ʿIrân. Mâhmûd had asked the caliph for a diploma for investiture and was noted as a champion of Sunnism. Under his reign the new cultural Persian-Islamic tradition of the Šâmânids was continued; his court was a centre of Persian court poets and whatever his personal relations with Firdawsi may have been, they show at any rate that his states offered congenial soil for the renaissance of Persian traditions. The name of al-Bîrûnî is sufficient to show also that the noblest and highest form of Islamic scholarship could flourish under his reign. And his immense popularity in later Persian Šûfi poetry has made this Turkish ruler a cultural Persian hero. The final finalisation of the Kâbul country was the work of the Ghazâwids. In western ʿIrân in the meantime, the later Bûyids were able to maintain themselves with less brilliancy; apart from the Ghazâwids they were seriously weakened in Fâris by the Shâhânsâh Kûrda in the first half of the 13th century. Yet conditions did not hinder the prosperity of Persian literature and science (Avicenna).

The rise of the Ghazâwids was only the prelude to the Turkish invasion under the house of Selçuk, by which Seldûk-i d. i. rule became established in Persia and beyond. This time the Turks, mostly called Ghuzz, had begun, since 1029, to migrate into eastern and northern Persia, in spite of the opposing measures of the Šâmânids and the Ghazâwids. Within seventeen years from his first appearance in Khûrân (1035), their leader Tâhirî Bek had overran the whole north of Persia, and made his entrance into Baghâd (1055).
At the same time the power of the remaining Ziyarids and of the different Buwayid dynasties was entirely crushed; the Iranian possessions of the Ghaznavid power were considerably reduced, and thus nearly the whole of Persia was united again under the Turkish dynasty of the Seljukids, whose members divided amongst them the different provinces: Khorasan, Sistan with Herat, Kirman, Fars and Adharbadjan. Toghril Bek fixed his residence at al-Raiy, he and his successors being called the Great Seljuk, in contrast to the minor Seljuk dynasties. The last Great Seljuk, Sandjar (1049-1157), though an able ruler, was real master only in Khorasan and had already to face new factors in Persia, which, after his death, brought about a political disintegration that could only be arrested by the Mongol conquest. The Turkish invasion, which brought nomadic Turks into nearly all parts of Persia, where they found conditions suited to their mode of life, and which in many regards may be compared with the Arab invasion, did not make of Persia a Turkish country, as was the case with Transoxiana and Asia Minor, with the exception only of Adharbadjan. The young Persian cultural renaissance had gathered enough vital force to assimilate the ruling Turkish elements, and this to such a degree that, until the xilth century, the Seljukids continued to spread Persian culture in Asia Minor. The nomadic Ghurids did not find the opportunity, as elsewhere, to assert themselves otherwise than as a very turbulent element, which in the xilth century became threatening even to the Seljukids themselves. The influence of their certainly not very orthodox Islamic religious views on the religious history of Persia has certainly not a little contributed to the spreading of Shi'ite ideas. The Seljukids themselves continued the tradition of the Sasanids and Ghaznavids by becoming champions of Sunnism. The minister Nizām al-Mulk is an outstanding figure among the many personalities of Persian desert who were the pillars of the political, religious and literary current of the time. Under his guidance worked al-Ghazālī, the scene of whose later activity was Nishapur in Khorasan. Persia had acquired at this time an importance as a seat of Islamic culture equal to that of 'Ira'q and other parts of the Islamic world. The theological colleges founded by Nizām al-Mulk (Baghdad and Nishapur) were the crowning work of the Sunni Islamic civilization, but involved at the same time a consolidation by which religious and cultural ideas were fixed and anchored for the centuries to come. The early Seljuk period shows also a continuation of the best of Muslim-madan scientific activity in Persia, for which we have to quote only 'Umarī Khayyān.

Western Persia, however, asserted her non-Sunnite tradition by the Isma'īli propagandas which resulted in the capture of the stronghold of Alamut near Karvin by Ḥasan-i Šāh Bāb in 1091. The sources of this propaganda were in the East (Nāṣir-i Khurazm and the West (Egypt) but its real political effects were contemporaneously, in ad-Djihāl, Fars and Khosistan and, to a less degree, in the east in Khustān, where about the same time a number of forces were acquired by the Isma'īlites. Ḥasan-i Šah Bāb and his successors became a political power in western Iran, especially in al-Djihāl, against which the Seljukids were more and more powerless, and which was crushed only by the Mongol invasion.

The Seljukids had established in their dominions a system of hereditary military fiefs (fithār) with the object of being able to dispose of an army commanded by reliable chiefs. The consequence of this system was the loosening of the central power which was supplanted in course of time by a number of independent military governors, who are known in history as ala'ibek. On Persia, the chief Ala'ibek dynasties were those of Adharbadjan (since 1146), of Luristan (since 1148), of Yad (since 1170), and the Ala'ibek dynasty of the Salgharids in Fars (since 1137), who annexed also Kirman after the extinction of the ruling Seljukids of Khorasan. In the southern parts of Fars and Kirman the Shēhānakra continued their irregular authority. In Khorasan the Seljukids were eclipsed after Sandjar's death by the Khwrizmshāhs, and simultaneously these rose into prominence the Ghorids dynasty, originating in the mountains of al-Ǧbor and al-Dīwār. It was the Ghurids who, by taking Ghazna in 1149, put an end to Ghaznavid rule in Persia; they likewise extended to Sistan and the country of Bost, and to the north, Bīlūmīyān and eastern Khorasan. Later on, they too lost the better part of their possessions to the Khwārizmshāhs. Sometimes the Ghurids were allied with the wandering Ghūz, and sometimes they fought the latter; on the whole the devastations brought by the Ghurids and their temporary allies mark the beginning of the cultural decline in north-eastern Iran.

This decline was hastened by the Mongol invasions. After the Khwārizmshāh Muḥammad had come into conflict with Čingiz Khān (1216), the Mongols first took possession of his lands in Transoxiana, of which their appearance in Khorasan was the political and military consequence. In the campaign of 1220-1221 the Mongol general Džebeand Subutai conquered Khorasan and the northern part of western Persia as far as Adharbadjan, driving the Khwārizmshāh Muḥammad to the island of Abshār in the Caspian, where he died, and forcing his son Dżai āl al-Dīn to cross the Indus. The great towns of Khorasan were devastated in a way that made it impossible for them to recover their ancient splendour; the population must have been considerably reduced by the wholesale massacres, and the works of art and literature were destroyed. The conquered cities were immediately placed under Mongol administration; where the population revolted, as in Hamadhān, there followed a pitiless massacre. The conquered territories were annexed to the part of the Mongol empire given to Čaghatay; Southern Persia was spared for the moment; in Kirman the Mongol emissary Burāq Hāshib founded in 1222 an almost independent state.

Soon afterwards Dżai āl al-Dīn reappeared from India to make his turbulent way to Adharbadjan and Armenia, without being able to drive out the Mongols. Then, in 1256, came the second invasion of Mongol armies under Hüilqī, brother of the reigning Khān Mangu. This expedition had been carefully prepared and was directed against the Isma'īli heretics in Persia and against the caliphate in Baghāshād, which was exterminated in 1258. Whatever the real political and religious motives for the expedition of Hüilqī, the friend of the Christians, may have been, its results were of immense consequence for eastern Islam in general.
Persia was entirely subdued and came to form the greater part of the dominions of the non-Islamic Mongol dynasty of the Ilkhanids, who resided most of the time in Ardabil (after 1306 in Sultanlya). By the end of the sixteenth century the smaller existing dynasties, such as the Saltanid atabeks of Fars and the Kutlug Khâna of Kirmân were also extinguished.

By the terrible devastations in Khorasan these regions ceased to be a hearth of national Persian Islamic culture and this role now was taken over by the west. At the same time these political events had loosened the ties with the western Islamic centres which at the time were wholly absorbed by the action against the Crusaders. Moreover by the extermination of the Timuri power and the uncertain attitude of the Ilkhanids towards Islam and its different aspects, Persian Islam passed in this period through a profound crisis, and many conflicting currents were at work. In this period lived in Ardabil the Shâhid Sa’îd al-Dîn (1252 – 1344), the ancestor of the Safavid dynasty. Still the Persian national character maintained itself and assimilated the many new foreign elements, mostly Turkish, so far as these were capable of advance to a higher cultural level. Great Persian poets (Sa’di) flourished, and the Ilkhanids showed an interest in the achievements of Islamic science (Naqsh al-Dîn Tûsî) and literature (Rashîd al-Dîn). During the Ilkhan period (1265 – 1337) Persia was considered by the European Christians as their ally against Egypt, now the chief champion of Islam in the west. But although the political opposition between the Ilkhan empires and western Islam became a living reality, any attempt to organize and propagate Christianity in Persia by the institution of bishoprics was fruitless. Persia was open, however, to closer contact with the European world than ever had been the case in Islamic times, not so much by the series of well-known travellers who passed through Persia on their way to the centre of the Mongolian Empire, as through the establishing of commercial settlements by the Italian republics in Ardabil (1345) for the overland commerce from their establishments on the Black Sea (Trebizond) through Armenia and Persia to Central Asia.

After the death of Abû Sa’d (1335) the dynasty of the Ilkhanids came to an end in the quarrels between the Djâljâr and Cûhân families. Abû Sa’d had already had great difficulty in maintaining the unity of his state, especially in his struggle against the influential amir Cûhân. Further the later Ilkhanids had already had to suffer the existence of semi-independent dynasties, such as the Kur dynasty at Herât, the only large town in Kûhrâ that had escaped Mongol devastation. Other powerful commanders, who had served the Ilkhanid, found during the troubles after Abû Sa’d’s death opportunity to aspire to political independence; the most successful were the Mânûshîrîdids in Fars and Kûhrâ, a dynasty of Arab extraction, who from about 1340 until their destruction by Timûr in 1392 held sway in southern Persia and for some time as far as Persian Itrâk (al-Djâhîl) and Adharbâjdân. Further Adharbâjdân was now in the power of the Khân of the Golden Horde and now in that of the Djâljâr dynasty of Baghdad, Eastern Persia was mainly divided between the Kur dynasty of Herât already mentioned and the Serbiddâr clan who had their centre in Sehewat.

In these chaotic times, when the authority of political power was waning, the more popular and, in a way, democratic elements in Persia, gained more opportunity of asserting themselves, as may be seen from this rather independent way in which the citizens of different towns behaved towards the quarrelling rulers. This self-assertion of democratic elements is also to be observed in Asia Minor, on the culturally more fertilized soil of western Iran, it bore the fruit of a brilliant literary development in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which at first sight may seem astonishing in such unfavourable political surroundings. This development was accompanied by an intensification of the religious currents that were at work among the population, where it was strongly influenced by the lower forms of Şûfism as propagated by the dervishes. In the case of the Serbiddâr in Kûhrâ the dervish activity had even political consequences and here also is a striking parallel with conditions in Asia Minor. Higher Şûfism was confined to the upper classes and expressed itself in literature, by which we are able to follow the different trends of thought. From the poems of Hâfiz we learn that the Sufi creed of the tâhir ‘ezâbiyya was already widely spread and that the tomb of “All al-Ridq” in Meshhed had become an object of national veneration.

At the end of the sixteenth century followed a fearful political reaction in the conquest of Persia by Timûr Lang, another foreign invasion which for the last time held up the development of a national state in Persia. Timûr, after conquering for himself an empire in Central Asia, founded on his descent from Cingis Khân a claim to the domination of Persia. In 1370 he had already conquered Balkh; in 1380 he subdued Khorasan, Statân and Mâzândarân, and in 1383 – 1384 he completed the conquest by taking Adharbâjdân, Persian Itrâk, and finally Fars by exterminating the dynasty of the Mânûshîrîdids (1399). The Serbiddâr had already been swept away and in 1389 disappeared the Kur dynasty at Herât. The most bloody event during this conquest was the sack of Ispahan in 1387. Timûr never resided for long in Persia, but considered its government to some of his sons, notably Shahrûkh, who became “king” in Kûhrâ and Statân as early as 1397. In Adharbâjdân reigned Mirâkshâh, not altogether to the satisfaction of his father. After Timûr’s death (1405) the political unity of the empire was on the whole preserved under Shahrûkh (d. 1447), who sought to repair much of the devastation wrought by his father’s campaigns. Shahrûkh still recognized nominally as his suzerain the emperor of China. After his death different descendants of Timûr, the Timûrids, disputed with each other parts of Persia, while after 1450 the dynasties of the Kara Köyûnlû emerged from the west to dominate large parts of Persia. The best known Timûrid in Persia was Sultan Husain Bâlûk, who ruled from his capital Herât over Kûhrâ, Statân and Djürûbân from 1468 to 1506.

Timûr’s reign in Persia meant also a Sunni reaction, but in western and middle Persia this reaction was not lasting. Among the many heterodox religious manifestations of this time is the appearance of the Hurûfî sect, one of whose adherents tried to murder Shahrûkh in Herât in 1436. This religious movement was suppressed by the government, but it had, like similar currents,
strong connections towards the west, through Adharbidjan into Asia Minor, where at this time the Sumi power of the Ottomans was re-establishing and strengthening itself to oppose the heterodox influence emanating from Persia. Meanwhile Persian cultural life continued to manifest itself in the important literature produced in western Persia, while also in the Caucasian countries and Mahammanen India Persian cultural and literary influence was reaching its climax. This was not the case in Khorasan; here, in the intellectual centre of Herat, developed at this time the eastern Turkish Caghatay literature, promoted by 'Ali Shir Naw' at Hussain Ba'kara's court at Herat. Alternatively, the Persian-Islamic tradition continued to influence in these regions, eastern Persia begins to be culturally separated from the west under influence of the Turkish and local elements; a development similar to that witnessed at the same time in Asia Minor and the regions of Arabic tongue in Mesopotamia and 'Iraq.

The events that preceded the rise of the Safavid dynasty have Adharbidjan as their chief scene of action. It was in Adharbidjan that 'Ala' al-Din, the Kha brightly dynasty began his career by taking Tabriz in 1406, and that his successors had the centre of their empire, which, under Djihanshah (1435–1467), extended over nearly all western Persia and in the east as far as Herat. And it was through Adharbidjan that Diri Hasen of the Ah Koyunlu penetrated Persia, after his victory over Djihanshah in 1467. Then he defeated the last Timurid Abl Sab' and became master of western Persia, inaugurating in the meantime the series of wars with the Ottoman Turks, that were to last for three centuries. The successors of Diri Hasen had already come into conflict with the Safavid leaders Shah'ib Habban and Sultan 'Ali, who about this time had acquired enormous influence in Adharbidjan and Asia Minor. The Safavid movement began indeed in a much more democratic way: than the preceding dynasties. Its chief adherents belonged to seven tribal groups of Turkish origin, amongst whom Shi'ite convictions had been spread by means of Shi'ite propaganda methods. This ever-increasing flock acquired at this time the celebrated nickname of Khil'i-Bash. Thus their political rising under Shah Isma'il was again a reaction against the official orthodoxy of the ruling classes, a reaction in which it was not difficult to enlist the Persian town population of western Iran, since olden times ready to accept non-official and unorthodox religious views, by which at the same time they showed their disdais for foreign rule. These different elements gave a Persian "national" character to the Safavid dynasty, although their leaders were Turks from unrecognized Adharbidjan. Shah Isma'il, on emerging from his hiding place in Djiitan, gained his first success in the Caucasus against the king of Shirwan, and this made him strong enough to turn his arms against the last rulers of the Ah Koyunlu, whom he defeated in the battle of Shahrud (1501). By 1510 he was master of western Persia and in addition of Armenia, Mesopotamia and 'Iraq (Baghdad taken in 1508) with the holy tombs of the Imams in Najaf and Karbala. He then turned to eastern Persia, where a new invasion from Transoxiana was threatening, after the death of Sultan Umayyad Ba'kara at Herat (1506), by the rise of the Uzbeks under Shahsultan Khan. The latter had already invaded Khorasan, and had not been defeated and killed in the battle of Marw (1510) by Shah Isma'il. Persia might have experienced a fourth wave of conquest from Central Asia. Then followed in 1514 the famous battle of Cadiirin; the defeat suffered here by Shah Isma'il from the army of Selim I showed where the political frontiers of the Safawis were henceforward to be; the wave of sympathy that had spread west from Adharbidjan far into Asia Minor was ruthlessly suppressed by the Ottomans. Shah Isma'il and Cadiirin showed that any political extension of Persia in this direction was impossible.

Thus the important events of Isma'il's career determined the field of action of the Safavids, which was to last until 1736. Religious and cultural traditions and geographical necessity gave this dynasty the character of a "national" dynasty, and the long period of its existence, together with the religious isolation of their empire, contributed not a little to the coming into existence of a real Persian "nation", that overcame the troublesome period of the xviii century and asserted itself ever more vigorously during the xixe century. The nature of the country, however, was not favourable to a rapid development in this direction. The many nomadic elements of Iran, Turkish and Arab origin kept much longer to their own traditions, and the disconnectedness of the various inhabited centres could not but weaken the authority of the government. Throughout Safavid rule, the kings had to reckon with the existence of half independent governors and tribal formations, from which came the powerful nobles and courtiers. In the time of Tahmasp I some Georgian nobles, relatives of the king, were in a dominant position, but on the whole it was the Kili-Bash clans who formed at times a dangerous power in the state, while nevertheless the kings were dependent on these elements for the defence of the country. It was only during the reign of 'Abbás I that something of a royal militia (the Shahnemeh) could be formed, while on the other hand the army was reinforced by European artillery. Therefore the civil and military administration of the country never acquired even such a regularity and a cohesion as is witnessed in the Ottoman Empire; the Safavids had to suffer for instance the permanent establishment of the Portuguese in Hormuz (1507–1622) and afterwards of the English, but this did not yet conflict with the state conceptions of that time. Governmental authority could only be maintained in the interior by the utmost severity, as was practised notably by 'Abbás I. For the same reason the frontiers of the Safavid empire in east and west were never very stable, although gradually a demarcation takes place. The eastern part of Khorasan and the regions to the south of it, long since culturally disconnected from western Persia, never returned to the Safawids. Balkh and Marw were under the almost unbroken domination of the Uzbek ("Abbás I only temporarily occupied Balkh in 1598), while Kâbûl and Kandahâr belonged from the beginning to the empire of the Great Mughuls of India, Kandahâr being only temporarily held by the Safawis. Only Herat was for most of the time under their control, but far in the sixth century Persia had not abandoned her claim to this town. All this makes clear why eastern Iran, after the extinction of the Usbecks and the Mughals, did not return to Shî'ite Persia, but came to form at last an independent state
under the Afghan rulers. Only western Khurasan, with the shrine of Meshhed, and Sistan remained an integral part of Safavid and consequently of modern Persia. In the west the Ottoman Turks and the Persans disputed with each other in a continual series of campaigns, interrupted by temporary peace. The large band of territory stretching from the Persian Gulf to Georgia. In the xvii century the Turks won and occupied Agharibidjan, Mesopotamia and Iraq. Under Abbas I most of the lost territory was recovered, but the capture of Baghdad by Murad IV in 1638 marked the end of Persian domination in the Tigris valley, while Agharibidjan and parts of Armenia and Georgia remained to Persia. In 1668 took place the first conflict with Russia by a descent of Cossacks upon Mazandaran.

Since the beginning of Ismail's career the Shi'ite creed had been forcibly imposed on the settled population and a regular persecution of all Sunnite theologians had begun. This persecution was accompanied by a repression of all Shi'ite manifestations, whereby the new state religion took at last the aspect of a fanatical and intolerant church, whose ministers, the Shi'ite divines, repressed all usages of free thought. Browses attributes to this development the sudden poverty of literary production in Safavid Persia. In these circumstances Persia became much isolated from the surrounding Islamic countries, but on the other hand the enemies of the Ottoman power in Europe looked to Persia as a valuable ally in their common efforts to crush that power. To this was due the forming of friendly diplomatic connections with European powers, such as Venice and Spain, who in addition, sought to profit by commercial relations. These relations, together with the political necessity of securing their colonial establishments in India and beyond, led other European states also to take up friendly relations with the Safavid court, namely the English, the Dutch and the French, after the Portuguese had been driven from the Persian Gulf. The European envoys, amongst whom the Raleigh brothers are most notable during Abbas I's reign, were well received, and established the first real contact between Persia and European civilisation. These relations also provoked the sending of some memorable Persian embassies to Europe. The political reasons that had brought the European sea powers to the Persian Gulf prevented Persia, however, from ever becoming a maritime power; even the endeavour of Abbas I to make of the newly founded Bender Aghbas a great maritime commercial town remained unrealised.

Most of the Safavid kings had very long reigns, for which the not uncommon practice of killing possible pretenders amongst the royal family was probably responsible. The most brilliant reign was that of Abbas I (1587—1629), who transferred his residence from Kazvin to Isfahan, which, by his buildings, became a splendid royal city. His successors profited by his work. After the middle of the xvii century Persia was passing through a peaceful period, owing mainly to the weakening of its neighbours. Conditions at this time are well known by a series of European travel accounts.

The same peaceful conditions had allowed, however, the establishment at Kandahir in 1709 of a Sunni rebellious movement, which was opposed in vain by the Safavid king Husain and was the beginning of the Afghan state. In 1722 the Afghan army of Mir Mahmid conquered Isfahan, after which the Afghan kings masters in Persia for about eight years. At last the Safavid successors of Husain were able to liberate the country through the help of their general Nader Shah. At that time he had already restored to Persia the cities in Agharibidjan and Georgia that had been taken by the Turks and likewise Raasht and Baku, occupied by Russia. After his coronation he set out on his invasion of India and the Afghan country, but his reign had brought so little stability that, after his murder in 1747, there followed a period of general lawlessness in Persia. The Afghans regained strength, but allowed Nader's blinded grandson Shihrukh to reign over Khurasan. The failure of Nader Shah to establish a lasting dynasty was also due to his endeavours to abolish the Shi'ite religious practices, but in this he met a determined opposition from the people and their spiritual leaders. After Nader's assassination there was hardly any question of restoring a Safavid to the throne. The real power devolved on Karim Khan Zand, who reigned mostly in Shiraz and who succeeded in uniting Persia during a benevolent reign; in his time the troubles on the 'Iraqi frontier led even to the conquest of Bagh. His death in 1779 occasioned a dispute for the throne among his descendants. Agha Muhammad Khan of the Kedjar tribe round Astarkh had profited from these troubles by bringing with much cunning and much cruelty the entire empire under his control. He was finally enthroned in Teheran in 1796 and was assassinated in 1797. With him began the Kedjar dynasty, which reigned until 1925.

At the beginning of Afghan rule Russia had occupied Derbend and Raasht, while Turkey had invaded the country as far as Hamadan; the Afghan ruler Ashraf, however, and after him Nadir Shah succeeded in recovering the occupied territories. A second Turkish attack in 1749 was equally thrown back by Nadir. During the second half of the century Russia and Turkey were too much occupied with each other to pay attention to Persia. The political development in the northeast had eliminated direct danger from the Uzbek states, but now the lawless Turcomans north of Khurasan had become by their raids a terror of the Persian population; Agha Muhammad Khan inflicted serious blows upon them. With the coming of the Kedjars, however, the international situation grew much more difficult, owing to Persia's becoming involved in world-wide political struggles.

Until 1814 the alliance of Persia was an object of dispute between England, whose position in India made Persian friendship a vital question, and the France of Napoleon, who schemed an invasion of India with the aid of the Russian army. In 1814 the French threat disappeared and England concluded a treaty with Persia. But the struggle with Russia for the possession of Georgia, which had begun already in 1812, soon led to military disasters and finally to the loss of all territory to the north of the Araxes by the peace treaty of Turkmanchay (1828). From this time on begins the rivalry between Russia and England, the latter country's policy being to prevent Persia, now politically under strong Russian influence, from gaining strength. Great Britain opposed for this reason any extension of Persian territory in
Afghanistan; it prevented the capture of Herat—a cherished Persian ideal—in 1838, and, when Herat was really taken in 1856, went even so far as to declare war on Persia and to land troops in the Persian Gulf; at the peace treaty of 1857 in Paris, Persia had to abandon her claims. In the meantime Russia's position grew ever stronger; a Russian naval base was founded in the bay of Astrakhan, and by the Russian conquest of Khiva and Bukhara, completed by the subjugation of the Tekke Turkomans in 1856, and the acquisition of the Murav oasis, the Russian Empire had attained an enormous military and political ascendancy over Persia, to which was added the Russian influence in northern Afghanistan and Turkish Armenia. Persia was not able to assert entirely its political freedom, but it gained for the first time well-defined frontiers; difficulties with Turkey in 1823 (massacre of Persians at Kertela) had led to the fixing of the Turkish-Persian frontier in 1823 (followed by a rectification in 1823), while the eastern frontiers with Afghanistàn and Balútistàn were defined by the Anglo-Persian boundary commission in 1873; these measures had been mainly necessitated by the establishing of a telegraph line through Persia to India. During the long reign of Náṣir al-Dín Sháh (1844-1894) international conditions remained stable, to which the on the whole untroubled domestic situation also contributed, but when, under his successor, conditions became less secure, owing to inner political and financial troubles, the intervention of the two great Powers became more threatening. It took the shape of the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1907, which practically divided Persia into a northern and a southern sphere of influence. During this 19th century indeed the Kádjar dynasty had been able to rule Persia in the traditional way, succeeding in checking the action of the troublesome tribes and their chiefs by profiting from their eternal discord. The influence of the higher Shi'ite religious leaders, over whose nomination the government had no authority whatever, and who resided for the greater part in the religious centres of Kerbelá and Najaf, was supreme among the population, although some divergent theological trends had developed, such as the Sháhtá's, since the beginning of the 9th century. This more spiritualized sect finally paved the way for the appearance of the Báb in 1844; the Báb movement for some years took the aspect of a religious-political rebellion, which the government had to suppress with bloody measures. Since then Bábism and, afterwards the movement of the Bábábí's, to which it gave rise, disappeared from the surface, but remained all the time a living factor in the national-religious life of the Persians. This contributed not a little to the awakening of a more independent and critical attitude among the more educated classes of the population, who generally found the higher divines at their side in their increasing criticism of government actions. The pan-Islamic propaganda of Djasim al-Dín al-Afghání also furnished elements to the awakening public opinion. Thus the bad inner conditions that had developed under Múṣaffár al-Dín Sháh and the consequences of the foreign loans contracted by that ruler brought about a popular action that led to the granting of a constitution and the opening of the first National Assembly (Majlis) in October 1906. The succeeding Shah's reactionary policy ended with his deposition in 1909, but the troubles connected with the accompanying revolutionary movement gave opportunity to the Russians to occupy Tabríz and Kázwín, while at the same time the Persian government was obliged to use foreigners in different branches of its administration (gendarmerie, finances, customs). During the world war Persia was officially neutral, but the German scheme of attacking Great Britain in India gave rise to an at first successful German Pagods in Southern Persia in 1915. On the other hand Russian troops were landed in Enzeli and these opposed the Turkish advance into Persia, which had begun in 1916 by the taking of Kirmanšáhí. In this same year began the British counter-action in Southern Persia by the formation of the South Persian Rifles. When by the Russian revolution the action of the Russian troops was crippled, British troops landed in the Gulf and succeeded in checking the Turkish advance in the western frontier region and in repressing, together with Russian troops, the local opposition of the Jangals in Gilân. Finally in 1918 the British had great difficulty in opposing a similar national rising in Sháhríraz, headed by the Kashkáí tribe.

Persia was evacuated after the war and became from the outset a member of the League of Nations. A treaty with Great Britain in 1919 re-established British influence, but the coup d'état of that same year suddenly changed Persia's internal and external policy. Sauyid Díyá'í al-Dín and Ríjá Khán assumed forcibly the leadership of the government. Ríjá Khán became minister of war and proved to be the man strong needed. His chief achievement was during the following years was the subjugation and disarmament of the turbulent tribes, and the forming of a reliable army of 40,000 men. In 1923 he became Prime Minister, Ahmad Sháh Kádjar left the country and was deposed in October 1925 by the Mardjís, whereby the Kádjar dynasty was brought to an end. At the end of the same year the scruples of many sections of the population against a new dynasty were dispelled and the dictator became king of Persia under the name Pahláví; he was crowned on April 25, 1926.

Persia's internal situation has been much improved by the action of the present king, while the exploitation of the oil wells in 2Arabistán has secured the government a profit that has not a little contributed to its financial liberty of action. The finances have been moreover controlled by an American adviser since 1923 and since 1928 by a German adviser. As to the currents of spiritual culture, the intellectual classes are abandoning the traditional religious views and this secular movement is favoured by the government, in connection therewith the influence of the divines is declining. On the other hand, the interest awakened towards the end of the 19th century for pre-lámpers Persian has given a new direction to national sentiment, expressing itself amongst others in literary occupation with ancient Iranian subjects and a great interest in excavations, the results of which are no longer allowed to leave the country.

The present ethnographical structure of Persia is quite different from what it was before the Arab conquest, owing to the repeated invasion of foreign elements during the thirteen centuries of its Islamic history. The combined existence of a sedentary and a nomadic or semi-nomadic population, however, is a feature proper to the geographical conditions of the country and has continued up to the present.
day. The general tendency of the nomadic elements to become settled, which can be observed all the time, was repeatedly counteracted by fresh invasions of nomads, chiefly from the north-east. At present the proportion of the nomads to the settled population is estimated to be 20/70. The development of urban settlement is a feature proper to Islamic times; it began with the expansion of the population outside the walls into the rasālā (cf. al-Hallajī, p. 324). From this, the name of the Persian town became alāf, which word had designated originally an entire region or country. The Arabs often placed their garrisons in less important places, which subsequently overshadowed the ancient centres. In the course of history many towns were devastated, but were generally rebuilt on or near the spot of the ancient ruins. Since the later Middle Ages great Islamic towns like Kāṣf, and the towns of Kirmān, have disappeared, to be replaced by formerly less significant places; among the latter are Tāberdān, Tabriz, and Mashhad, at present the largest towns of Persia. The townsmen, composed of craftsmen and merchants, have been in history the passive and suffering element, together with the rural population of the villages clustered together in the oases. This settled population was generally regarded with scorn by the tribesmen, who were the aristocrats, and from whom until modern times were recruited the ruling classes and the high officials. From the tribes have also been recruited the best soldiers in the armies.

At present the largest towns in Persia are Tāberdān (210,000 inh.), Tabriz (200,000), Isfahān (90,000), and Mashhad (70,000). The town population has been constituted in the course of centuries from the very different invading ethnic elements. They now constitute the most stable element in Persia and speak, with local dialectic variations, the New-Persian language, which runs more or less parallel with the written New Persian. Only in Adharbājja the Turkish is the language of the townfolk and the peasants.

The rural population of the villages around the towns has kept many particular local features of their own, and amongst them many remnants of other Iranian dialectical groups have been preserved, a fact which is already noted in ancient Islamic historical and geographical sources. In north-eastern Persia the different dialectical groups of these peasants are called Tāf, the so-called eastern Persia, they are often designated as Tāfīk.

Among the rural population, however, and in a less degree amongst the townsmen, there are many elements that are conscious of their allegiance to tribal formations, mostly so in regions where the population of the neighbourhood still possesses the tribal organisation. These settled members of the tribes are often called alāf-nikhatu, ilā-kehatu and alāf-nikhatu. As to the tribes themselves, called kočhā in Persia, they nearly always occupy a definite territory nowadays, on which many members of the tribe have become entirely settled, while the others are no more than semi-nomads who, in summer, go with their cattle to the higher mountain regions. Nomadism is not extinct, however, and anywhere in the Persian steppes the black tents of nomads may be seen occasionally.

The origin of the tribes is an extremely complicated problem. In almost every region they have resulted from a mixture of pre-Iranian, Iranian, Arabic and Turkish-Mongolian elements. In northern Persia the Turkish element is to no doubt the dominating, as judged by the language; here the redoubtable mountainers of the Fārs and the Dīl, who so long withstood Islamication and had still in the Middle Ages a language of their own, have mostly been Turkicized, in so far as they have not been assimilated by the Iranian settled population. In the mountain region stretching from Adharbājja to Fārs and Kirman, the Iranian element is largely prevalent, again as far as we can judge from the languages spoken there. The local traditions circulating among those tribes, and, about those tribes among the neighbouring populations, which often preserved the memory of extensive migrations that betrayed a partial Turkish or Arab origin. Some groups are even known as Turkish, although they speak Iranian dialects. Other tribes are still constantly of their Arab origin, although they no doubt have already been Turkicized for centuries; only a few tribes in Khūsistan and Khūrāsān have preserved the Arabic language. But those local traditions, which never go back more than two hundred years at most, often do not agree with what we may regard as established facts from historical sources. It is true, however, that even in recent historical times more or less important migrations of Iranian tribes have taken place. The movement of the Khūsān from the North-West to Kirmān and afterwards to modern Balāsānān had already begun in the early Middle Ages. In addition, reasons of military policy induced several rulers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to transplant some Kūr tribes to the North-East; best known is the settlement of Kūr tribes by Nādir Shah on the Khūrāsān frontier around Kūčān and in Māzandārān, where they have still preserved their own features and their language. The only possible description of the tribes in Persia has therefore to be based on their geographical distribution.

With the mediaeval Arab geographers all the tribes in al-Dīl, and Fārs, are included under the designation of kāf, i.e. Kūr, but the general term has hardly any ethnographic value. At the present day the name of kāf is generally restricted to the tribes inhabiting the environs of Kirmānghā and further to the north into western Adharbājjan. South of Kirmānghā the Fārs tribes, to the west of whom, in the mountains between Persia, Irāk, and Fārs, live the Bahātīyān. The northern mountains of Fārs are occupied by the Khūy, and the Māmās tribes. South of these, round Shīrāz, live the Kāshān, who still speak a Turkish dialect.

Arab, where in the Middle Ages the local kočhā language was not yet extinct, the Arab element of the settled population is strong; the Arab tribes here belong to the Ka'bah division and consist for the greater part of Arabs transferred here from Najd and Jaiba. The tribes on the Gulf fringes, in Persia Balāsānān, and in Shīhī, are Balāshī, who, since their immigration, have assimilated such considerable local elements as the Kūf, known from medieval sources. Further to the north there are Arabs in Khūsīn, notably around Kūčān. There is further a not unimportant part of the population, who claim descent from the Prophet, and consequently an Arab origin; these sitāyās abound especially in Māzandārān, where there were 'Abīd dynasties at an early period. In Persian Khūrāsān there are also Arabs,
a few Afghan elements and the already mentioned Kurds on the frontier. Finally there live all along the northern frontier of Khurasan Turkish tribes, some of whom have been there since the later Middle Ages, such as the Afghans and the Kazaks (round Astrakhan), while the more recent element is composed of Turkomans.

Other ethnic groups are the Armenians in Persian Armenia in Acharaishan, and the large Armenian colony in the suburb Djulfah of Isfahan transplanted there by 'Abbâs I. The Nestorian Christians in the east of the Urmiya Lake have nearly disappeared as a result of the war. In 'Aram Bastân there are still remnants of Mandaeans, and finally there are reported to be about 40,000 Jews in Persia, who for the greater part are probably descendants of the Jews who lived already in Persia in the beginning of the Islamic period and among whom notably the Jewish colony of al-Yahudiyah at Isfahan was well-known.

The great mass of the inhabitants of Persia, including in the first place the townspeople and the settled population, but also many members of the tribes of ancient Turkish origin, belong to the Ismâ'îlî (the Khâna 'Aashariya) and follow the waqfâbî called Dîfâ'. Their number is estimated at little less than 7 millions. About a million of them are the so-called Khâbârîyân, living in Hamadhân and al-Ahwâz and environs, who recognize only the authority of the traditions of the Prophet and the Ismâ'îlîs. Other Shi'ite sects are the Shâfi'îya (about 250,000) and the Nejâ'îya (about 100,000) in Gilân, of Jâ'îdîte origin. The Baha and the far more numerous Baha'is are represented in all towns, and reach together about the number of 700,000. The extreme Shi'ite called 'Ali Ihâni or 'Abî Haqq are found among the Kurds round Kirmânshâh, among the Lurs, and partly in Ma'zarshahr and Khurasân; their number amounts to 300,000. Half that number is given for the adherents of the Ismâ'îlî Harâtî sect, spread all over Persia. There are also some Vaskian Persian soil near Mâzâ. Sâmi (Shâfi'îte) Muhammadans are found only among the Kurds and the Arabs, the Turkomans and the Afghans, these latter being of Hanafite (about 85,000). Finally there are still remnants of the Zoroastrian creed at Yârd, Kirmân, Talesh, Baktr, and Kâshân.

The entire population of Persia is given as 12,000,000. This last figure is given on the authority of the last edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica; the other figures given are derived from the Annuaire du Monde Musulman, 3rd edition 1909.

Bibliography: In view of the general character of the above article it is sufficient to refer for all detailed bibliographical information to the historical, geographical and ethnographical articles dealing with Persia, and to the general bibliographical works on Persia: M. Schwab, Bibliographie de la Perse, Paris 1875; and A. T. Wilson, A Bibliography of Persia, Oxford 1930. (J. H. Kramers)

II. LANGUAGE AND DIALECTS

Introduction. The Persian language is one member, now the most widely extended member of a group of languages which are spoken over a region stretching from the River Euphrates in the East of the Hindu Kush, with branches in the Caspian and in the Mazarand Peninsula, 'Onata. It is convenient to group these languages, which in turn form one group within the Indo-European languages, under the name Iranice, a designation from Iran, the modern national name of the Persians, as it was also earlier, in Stâanian (aşyâ, irân), and Achaemenid times (aşyâ), and which is used also by the Ossetes (ir, irâ, iran). Formerly these Iranian dialects were more widely extended, to the north of the Caspian Sea, from Chorasmia (Khuvârzâm) to the west of the Black Sea (see M. Vasmer, Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnorte der Slaven, 1, Die Iraner in Sudrußland, 1923), and also to Sogdian colonies in Northern Mongolia (see O. Hansen, Zur sogdianischen Schrift auf dem dreiszügigen Denkmal von Karabalgaum, in J.S.F.O., xliv., 1930).

Earliest sources. 1. Sakâ. Three divisions of the Sakâ are referred to in the Achaemenid inscriptions: Sakâ hâmâvarâzû, Sakâ tigrizzasû, Sakâ nû yà ra'drâya (on the tomb inscriptions published in J.R.A.S., 1933, p. 374; Sakâ para'awasû). They are the Sakâ of Herodotos, and the Sacte of the Roman and Latin writers. At a later period they are attested in Sakstân (mod. Sistan), and in the Saka kings of India. Names of Sakâ are preserved in Greek and Latin authors, and the Middle Saka dialect is now largely known.

2. Chorasmian and Sogdian. Both these countries are named in the Avesta (varzâm, varzâ-) and the Old Persian inscriptions (âzimânavî, ùgäla), but the dialects are known only in later times.

3. Media. The Medes (Medai, Amadai) appear first 835 B.C. in the inscriptions of Shulmanaharîn III (see F. Hommel, Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orientes, 1926, p. 194). Names and some words are known in Greek (Herodotos quotes ùgäla 'bitch'), and there are loanwords in Old Persian (çispawanâ, cf. the dâvânî of the Elamite version).


5. The Avesta. To avoid too definite implications, it is usual to employ the designation 'language of the Avesta' (Pahl. 'ruv'ā, Syr. 'er, Pâzâr awâzâ, awâzî, Arab. asâbî, awâzî, asâbî, asâsî, bâtâlî) for the language preserved in the oldest Zoroastrian texts. The considerable extent of these texts makes them the most important witness to the Old Iranian stage of the dialects, although they have been preserved in a late orthography 1). In spite of continued discussion (see P. Tcheresov, in M.O., x. 255 sqq.; H. Reichelt, Iranisch, p. 29 in Geschichte der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft, ii., 1927; G. Morgenstierne, 1 For convenience the transcription of the G. P. is here followed, but a revised orthography, more conform to that of the Old Persian texts and the Greek and Akkadian transcriptions, would represent the Old Iranian form more satisfactorily (as e.g. ašya for ufige).
The Kāfīr dialects of Kat, Ashkhun, Frasun, Wālgari, are known only in a modern form from the sixteenth century, and adequately only this century (see Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, 1926, p. 39 sqq.; do., Report on a Linguistic Mission to North-West India, 1932, p. 40 sqq.; do., The Language of the Ashkhun Kāfīr, in N.T.S., ii. 192–289). The evidence of the Kāfīr dialects is important for the Indo-Iranian period, in particular: for the history of the sounds represented by the Kāfīr ū and ū, and for the corresponding to the Avestan a, Old Persian ā and Sanskrit ā, Old Persian a and Sanskrit j, thus Kati has dāst *tenli, dān *autumn, dāna, sw., v. t."*  

Periods of the Iranian dialects. The extant documents of various different characters, and in many scripts, are sufficient to allow the distinction of three periods: Old, Middle, and New Iranian. In the vast period of the Persian empire, the change to the Middle Iranian stage (marked by loss of large part of the old inflexion) is attested already in the later Achemenid inscriptions.

Old Iranian. The Old Iranian stage of development is known in the Old Persian inscriptions, the Avestan texts and the names of Medians and Sakas. The two dialects Old Persian and Avestan, in spite of the restricted number of texts, and hence the little known vocabulary, agree closely, but their shapes are clearly distinct. In phonology Old Iranian has *p̣ ḳ unchanged before and between vowels (bēh- to run, tāp̣ -to be hot, pār- to fly, bar- to make, abā- bad), but they are represented by spirants before consonants (baḥy- true, xaŋšaŋ- sleep, xaŋšo- spoken): before and between vowels is represented by ā (Old Persian ḫaš- with, šaš- the was), except that ā, ni replace older i, a as in also do i, u in Sanskrit, though unchanged in Kāfīr, thus Avestan mātif-sitting, dāv- had, Old Iranian verbal and nominal morphology is richly developed, with great facility of composition and derivation. Noun bases terminate in consonants, or in vowels and diphthongs: a i i a, a i i a, a i i a. Alternation of vowels (apophony, Ablaut) rests upon the older system attested also in the other Indo-European languages. The inflexion can be seen in an Avestan noun with base-ā (whereby falling all forms of one is the following are quoted: ahrā- lord, arpa- horse, aša- had, varsha- hand, vēr- party, varsta- malyan- man): singular, nom. ahrā, acc. ahrām, instr. ahrā, dat. ahrā, abl. ahrā, gen. ahrāhi, loc. ahrastā, apārā, voc. ahrā; dual, nom. acc. ahrā, dat. ahrāthā, gen. ahrāthā, loc. ahrastā. The verbal system is elaborately developed, but the extant texts do not provide all the forms. There are three voices: active, middle and passive; six moods: indicative, conjunctive, injunctive, optative, imperative, infinitive, with tenses present, preteterite (imperfect and aorist), perfect, pluperfect, future,
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with personal terminations in singular, dual and plural, and in addition participles present, aorist, future, and perfect. These cannot all be illustrated here. The following Avestan forms may be quoted: haravi ‘he bears’, jastiti ‘he worships’, conj. pres. haraš ‘he will bear’, opt. pres. jāstī ‘he shall be’, opt. perf. jāstamjav ‘I would have come’, imperative harav ‘be bear’, haravo ‘let him bear’, jāda ‘go’, haravi ‘make’. The infinitive has no single form, but is expressed by oblique cases of verbal nouns of action: avanōti ‘fall down’, avōdi ‘to choose’, apōagālti ‘remove’. There is no form for ‘we say’ (sāvata was spoken), jāstāti ‘was struck’, confined to the 3rd sing. The personal terminations differ in present, pres. and imperative. In the present are found: baravi, barakī, baravī, dual 3 baratī, plur. barakākī, sayatī, baravī; in the imperfect: baravī, jāstavī ‘then came’. haravī, dual 1 jāstavī ‘we two live’, 3 jāstavī ‘they two came’, plur. baravīna, jastāti, haravī. The present base was formed either with or without suffix, or by reduplication: astavī ‘he is’, dāti ‘he gives’, barawī ‘he becomes’, harawī ‘they remove’, āvāmā ‘I bless’, barawavī ‘makes’, ānātī ‘leaves’, ṣānātī ‘pours out’, jāstāvī ‘I pray for’, jāstavavī ‘heats’. The aorist was formed direct to the base (adāt ‘he created’) or with the suffix -vā ‘(dārāt ‘he held’), the perfect was either reduplicated (āvāmata ‘has spoken’) or not (vāda ‘has known’) with special terminations, the pluperfect was expressed by the use of preterite endings to the perfect base (vādat ‘had said’). The active present and future participle was formed by the -ēśa-suffix, and the passive preterite participle usually by the suffix -ā. Of these present bases and of these participle participles are preserved in New Persian. The comparison of adjectives could be expressed in two ways (suffixes yā-, tiu-and -tara-, vara-): yāhoe ‘good’, yauke-, yaukata-, aho-had, abhara, harvā, harvā ‘best’. These morphological genders (mas., fem., neut.) are expressed in nouns and adjectives. Of the many suffixes may be named the noun of agent -tār, noun of action in -ēti, abstract noun in -ētā. Compounds are of many forms: apārwa ‘horses and men’, vīrājān ‘slaying men’, dāhupata ‘lord of a country’, poṣavā-rāra ‘possessing many brothers’, ṣravavā ‘up to the knee’, dāhavatya ‘holding a chariot’. Of this whole elaborate Old Iranian system but small part has survived to the present day.

The Sogdian verbal system has present (durative present expressed by adding *šen, šun, and future by adding *kšen, *kšen*), imperfect (*šiyš* ‘thou hast heard’, *šiš-ter-rite* (*šiyš* ‘they bore’), durative participle with *šun (šawint *šawint* ‘they went’), conj. present (*šomol ‘I will do’), perfect (*šarz *šarz* ‘I have given’, *šarz-šarz* ‘I have come’), optative (*šarz* I. sing., imperative (*šarz, šarz*), infinitive (*šarz* ‘to pull’, *xoravat ‘to eat’), participles active present *šon, *šon, *šon, passive participle *šarz* (*šarz* ‘given’), adjectival form *šon* (*šon* ‘prepared’). The augment *š* is prominent, see H. Reichelt, Beiträge zur sogdianischen Grammatik, 1931. In Saka there is present (litte *he sees*), pres. intransitive (*hašsa* ‘he will know’), pres. conj. (*šnirat ‘he will be’, optative (*šnigrat *he would do*), imperative (*šon ‘go’), the participle is expressed by intransitive participle (*ša, *ša, *ša, *ša), plural *ša*, fem. *ša* ‘were’, compound tenses (*ša *he was seated’), participle (*ša, *ša, *ša, *ša), resemblance *ša, *ša, *ša, *ša, *ša*, ‘to be spoken’). The noun is fully inflected in Saka in three genders, and in Sogdian traces of nominal inflection are preserved (see P. Teledoscio, in Z.f.d., lv. 94 seqq.; E. Benveniste, Gram. sogd., ii. 77). Since the Indian Brahmi script is used in writing Saka, vocals as well as consonants are fully known.

Chorasmian is still little investigated. Apart from words quoted in Arabic writers, particularly the calendrical terms to be found in al-‘Ibtisim (Chronology, ed. Sachau, p. 47, 173, 192), there has been collected by Abest Zezi Valiab (Ethn. heemische Status in einem arabischen Fihz-Werke, in Islamica, ii. 1922). Here *šir* is ‘milk’, cf. Sogdian *šir* ‘milk’, *šir* ‘deep’, cf. Avestan *šir* ‘deep’; *šen* ‘nose’, cf. Sogdian *šen* ‘nose’. An exhaustive study is still awaited.

Middle Ossetic is known in names (see W. Miller, Ossietischer Etymol., iii. 39 seqq.; M. Vassmer, loc. cit.), such as *šarz* ‘woman’, *šarz* ‘man’, *šarz* ‘three’, *šarz* ‘four’, *šarz* ‘second’, *šarz* ‘leave’, *šarz* ‘make’, contrast with the South: *šon* ‘woman’, *šon* ‘man’, *šon* ‘three’, *šon* ‘four’, *šon* ‘second’, *šon* ‘leave’, *šon* ‘make’. Other dialect influence can be detected, e.g. in the change *šir* to *šon* (cf. New Persian *šon* ‘son’). Nominal inflection is absent from the Manichean texts. It is possible that the frequent final *š* of the Sasanian inscriptions represents the remains of the old ablative case *š*. The *šm ending in Old Persian *šmam* is gen. plur. appears as nom. plur. (*šmam* ‘the righteous’). The verbal system of the southern dialect agrees largely with that of early Persian of the Muslim texts (see Henning, Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanliteratur, in Z.f.d., i. 1933). The Old Persian present bases are represented by *šir* ‘leave’, *šir* ‘live’, *šir* ‘partes’, *šir* ‘strike’, *šir* ‘shine’, *šir* ‘final’, *šir* ‘know’, *šir* ‘make’, *šir* ‘gather’, *šir* ‘bring forth’. The trans. participle is expressed by the participle in *š* in passive sense. *šun* *šarz* *šon* *šmam* *šmam* *šon* *šmam* and you have clothe me, but the form *šon* *šmam* *šon* they have done (as in New Persian *šon* *šmam* *šon*) is found. A passive is expressed by *šun* *šon* *šmam* *šon* *šmam* is present. Beside the present indicative with the endings *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon* (and *šon*), *šon, *šon, *šon* (and *šon*), a full present conj. is attested with the endings *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon, *šon* and *šon*. An optative 3rd sing. in *šon* occurs. The infinitive is in *šon, the present participles in *šon, and (adjectival) *šon*. The vocabulary has many words lost to New Persian lexicography.

New Persian. The third period may be dated from the introduction of a New orthography by the writers in Arab. In the early Arabic books many New Persian words and names, Persian, Sogdian and Chorasmian, are recorded, stripped of the old historical spelling.

The Arabic alphabet was long insufficient to represent the Iranian sounds, while certain signs were superfluous (*š*). Hence some symbols had double employment: *š* (*š* or *š* in final position, the guttural (which was written, e.g. in Pahlavi *š* ‘house’, Turfan texts *š* ‘house’, and has moreover survived in some New Persian dialects, Kamn (*šmam* ‘fuel’, as in Turfan texts *šmam* ‘fuel’, Balfati W. Kamnag, F. Kamnag ‘raw’) was indicated by *š* or *š* and mediately by *š* or *š*.

The New Persian, which is closely connected to the colloquial language, developing widely from the literary norm, of the western cities, and the Tajik of the eastern Iranian region, Afghanistan, the Pamirs, Turkistan (see the references in W. Lentz, Farsi-Dialekten, i. 29 seqq.), is in strict accord with the language of the Old Persian inscriptions (Old Persian *šmam* ‘son’, *šmam* ‘know’, New Persian *šmam* ‘son’, *šmam* ‘know’, and the southern dialect of the Sasanian inscriptions and the Manichean texts, but from its earliest monuments after the introduction of Islam it appears as a dialect largely mixed with forms of other dialects. The mixture had been brought about already in Sasanian times. As successors of the Parthians whose dialect was of northern type the Sasanians took over part of the official vocabulary (e.g. *šmam* ‘country’, *šmam* ‘king’s son’ as proper name). Forms of both dialects occur in the Zoroastrian books and among the loanwords in Armenian. A few words entered from the eastern dialects (e.g. *šmam* ‘divine son’ as title of the Chinese emperors). Hence New Persian has two forms side by side: *šmam*, *šmam* ‘tribute’, *šmam*, *šmam* ‘wine’, *šmam*, *šmam* ‘earth’. In the vocabulary of New Persian, the Iranian verbs have been greatly reduced in number. Verbs which are found still
in use in other dialects have disappeared or survive only with preverbs or in nominal derivatives. Such is the case with *av-‘breathe*, sab-‘speak’ (in *savad*, *savata*), darb-‘see’, darz-‘stand’, sav-‘throw’, sav-‘front’, sav-‘toward’, *sina* ‘enclosure’), mar-‘move’, may-‘head’, and-‘head’, dan-‘bind’, build, rand-‘find’, hare-‘boil’, sard-‘throw’, shoot, gowd-‘dress’, down-‘throw’, goal-‘put upon’, hare-‘weep’, ar-‘grind’, gate-‘come upon’, and-‘make wet’, mug-‘pull out’, *kat* ‘fall’ (cf. khabah ‘old’). Two Old Persian *dive* ‘take away’ (in *niya-‘loss’), *vay* ‘to wind’. Formal nouns have also been lost: First dialect of Birijing *pah* ‘small cattle’, Ossetic *nargali* ‘bridge’. Baltoic *gwa* ‘horse’, *sax* ‘milk’, Pahlavi *dari* ‘known’. These and others are not represented upon us in New Persian. Arabic has continued enroached upon the vocabulary. The Iranian character of New Persian is also still recognised in its morphological (plur. of *nouns* *-an*, *-ah*; pronouns *mam*, *t*, *th*, *man*, *koh*, *lok*, *sia*, *to*; verbal forms, pres. tense *khan*, *khoon*, *kohon, kohand*, pret. *kard*, the verb substantive *saw, t, st, wau*).

New Iranian dialects have been preserved by their isolation, although, except Ossetic and Kumart, not by reason of their position, they are everywhere yielding to the prestige of New Persian. Recent research has brought knowledge of most of the existing Iranian dialects. Isolated places may, as in the Khūn-Tāfīn region, still conceal unknown dialects, elsewhere and especially in the Fārsiān is Fārāzin has been information largely increased. These dialects have so widely diverged from Old Iranian that the whole complex development cannot be indicated here. It must suffice to point out in the various groups certain developments in phonology and morphology.

**Phonology.** The developments of Old Iranian *b*, *d*, *g* (*vi, vi*, *gi, gi*, *vi*, *vi*) may be noted selected to illustrate the divergence.


19. Simnæti (in North Persia, east of Tihran): re willow, su wind, amuram I eat, dar’ door, mi yonan I know, vâ day, a dumurâmi I pour, janikâ woman, kismu’ wife, kâdár knife, wai bâdâmar I bore, par son, hari three.

20. Sangari (related to the dialect of Lâsjar): si willow, kânor I eat (Aor.), sâm’ knee, sa hundred, vâ day, kûnsu I say (Aor.), le woman, kelatén strike, ze four, le three, pa, par son.

21. Tâlâm (on the west of the Caspian Sea): su snow, kan’ sleep, hânâ hand’ sing, da door, as I, nea to know, darsen needle, hâm house, sâm white, vâ day, li to live, le woman, par’ bring, kâdár to do.

22. Gilakan (closely connected with Mazandarâni and the dialect of Goshgorkh): sùw snow, készr am eat, sam’ in-law, baror brother, suhmen I burn, pôt cooking, wan strike, kâdár I bore.

23. Gürkân of Kandia (dialects of Kandia, Pâw, Ausrâmân, Rîjkâ, Baklân, Talâhadegh are recorded): sámí rain, sâmí snow, vâr’ sleep, vâr heart, sâm in-law, mûbân he pours out, sâm window, li bowstring, le woman, par’ hard to make.

24. Kurdi (in several dialects: the following is from the Mûkri): bafr snow, sâm’ eat, tâlk eaten, dar door, sâm’ I know, sâm white, vâ day, dûse it is burnt, le woman, kâm done, hâm do I sent, li, li three.

25. Zâs dialects of Siwerek, Bâlaj, Câbâbâh, Râgh, Kot, Ceremuz and Fûl are recorded: sâm’ snow, sâm’ wind, sâm’ to eat, kâm done, sâm’ I know, kâm fire, sâm’ to flow, li day, pôt to cook, vâ, sâm’ to say, pôt strike.

26. Kumâtî (in the Masandarâni Peninsula, Ompa): vârun rain, gârîy hunger, sâm’ he ate, sâmñw sleep, dâmnsn winter, su anger, smayu earth, sâm white, ber happened, sâm’ needle, sâm window, sank woman, bûn strike, mûbán man, sâm food, dûs’ sickle, par son.

27. Tât (on the Aţpûl Peninsula): sâm snow, bêtà widow, sâm’ sister, dar door, dûmnâr in-law, dâmnsn to know, su mustan winter, sâmñw tongue, sâm’ woman, dûm to see, baror brother, pôt autumn, mûbân I siff, râ day, su woman, sâm’ sister to eat, sâmñw to do, par son.

28. Fârî (dialects of Sambhûn, Pârû, Mûsâmân, Bûrûnîn and Ismâidîn Isâmî): mûbân I see, bêtâ kûsân’ to wend, mûsân I slept, mûbân I do know, sâm’ knee, dûs’ give, mûsân I cook, sâm’ struck, kât I hard, bûn food, bûn eaten.

29. Lûtî, Bâkhtâsh: bôt snow, bôtë tent, sâmñw, dûm to eat, dâmnsn in-law, sâm’ tongue, sâm white, at’t smoke, bêtà, sâm’ willow, bôt to siff, rû day, sâmñw to strike, sâm woman, râa south.

30. New Persian: kât willow, kât wind, sâm’ mother-in-law, sâm’ self, dar door, dûm I know, dûm’ in-law, pos hunder, sâm’ white, pôtam I cook, dûm I siff, rû day, kât I made, mûd’ died, sâm three, par son.

The following general division may be especially noticed: 1. = is replaced by a gutteral in
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Bâlûc, Khûrî, Ommurî, Pârsî and partly also in New Persian; 2. the correspondence of Ossetic 4 (Iron dialect ë), 4, 4, Vaghânth ë, 4, 4, Shughrû and Vârsânâm ë, 4, 4, Mundîl ë, Pârsî ë, 4, Pâghô ë, 4, 4, in contrast to Ossetic and Pârsî ë, 4, 4, marks a distinction within the eastern group; 3. ë tends to be modified in the eastern dialects. Ossetic kax, gÎt ‘eat’, Ommurî gî, Pârsî gî, Mundîl gî, Pâghô gî, Vârsânâm gî, Shughrû gî, Vârsânâm gî, Râgh gî, Pârsî gî, Ossetic kax, gî ‘eat’, Vârgulâmî gî, contrasting with New Persian gî (gû).

Relationship of the Dialects. The larger divisions among the New Iranian dialects are results of old differences, originating in the earliest period. Two great groups, an Eastern and a Western, are distinguished by phonology, morphology and vocabulary (see G. Morgenstern, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, p. 31). The eastern group is itself divided by old differences into subordinate groups. Ossetic, isolated in the Caucasus, has developed a morphology which separates it sharply from the Vaghânth, with which however it shares, for example, the plural -t, Vaghânth -t. Vaghânth is in turn isolated as the only surviving Sogdian dialect. In the Pasîr Shughrû forms a group with Ossetic, Vârgulâmî, Rûshânî, Bartangî, Sarthoki, and the now extinct Wântit; similarly Iâshkhâmî and Sangléî. Mundîl in several dialects (see the classification by G. Morgenstern, Report on a Linguistic Mission to North-Western India, p. 70) has close relations with Vaghânth. Wântit stands alone, noticeably in its phonology (ì in la’ dog, ë in ën iron, ët in ën dead, ëc in ëc son). Ommurî and Pârsî, though now widely different, yet have common phonological traits, in particular -r, -e, -a, and the replacement of ì by ë. Pâghô is known in several dialects (G. Morgenstern, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, p. 11).

In the Western group subdivisions are similarly to be recognised. Zâs, Gûrûn, Kurdi, Khûrî, Balûc, Gilakan (with Tâlâm, the dialect of Goshgorkh, and Mazandarâni) form sharply distinct groups. The southern dialects, Lûtî, Fârî, Kumâtî, and the literary New Persian show clear descent from a dialect similar to, and probably identical with, the Old Persian. To these Tûtî belongs as the dialect of garrisons settled in the region of Darfûr.

In the central district lying between Tihran, Isfahân, Hamadân and Yazd, are found a number of dialects which have not yet all been fully investigated. They share a common vocabulary. The formation of the present affords a means of grouping them. The Sangléî, Lâsjarî and Shamârsdî agree in forming the present with the infix of a nasal -m, -m (possibly representing the Old Iranian -a participle, similar in Zâs): Sangléî hânsâm I strike, Lâsjarî hâm hâmâm I say, Shamârsdî hårâna the fall, Sangléî with present môtâmam I know. The dialects of Wônshûn (Wânshûn), Mahâlît and Khûnât agree in having it (à, ì, -ë) in the pres.: Wônshûn itêxârûn I break, Mahâlît ìxâmînà, Khûnât ìxâmûrân. Nûtanî, Farizandî and Yarân form one group: in the pres. Nûtanî kâran I do, Farizandî akurûn, Yarân akurûn. Sî (skêrûn), Melmei (sâmë he does), Kôhûdû (akûrûn), Keshê
Verb. The divergence from the Old Iranian system, already marked in Middle Persian, has developed further in New Persian. New verbal systems have been evolved. In spite of independent growth, however, a general resemblance is found, for example, between New Persian and Ossetic. In New Persian means are to hand to express active and passive, immediate, conjunctive, optative, imperative, infinitive, present (punctual and durative), imperfect, pretensive, perfect (punctual and durative), pluperfect, future, and conditional.

Infinitives. The infinitives show independent selection from Old Iranian verbal nouns. Old Persian -tanag reappears in New Persian -tan, Struadi -bardin -bear, Varnahmān -barn, Sangiāzar -bahktan, Ardistān -midan -die, Macri Kuri -kāla -draw, Gilaki -gāfīt -say, Tāti -dirān -see, and other western dialects, beside a second infinitive (representing the Old-Iranian verbal noun -tī, which serves in the passive in Avestan -far as infinitive): New Persian -gāft -speak, Gāz -khāt -he make, Mār -kuri -kūl -kill, Ardistān -dād -say, Zefr -bērēt -bear. Other verbal nouns are found: Ossetic -fārīs -ask, Gāz -khāzān, -kārē -dām (with related dialects), Vanderhēn -pūr -eat, -dākē -give, Gūznī (Aurangānī) -āmdēt -come, -kārē -make, Zātā -kālēt -make, Bełtjī -gayā -kill, Yaughnī -hārēt -do, Wakhti -sākāt -speak, Ossetic -sādā -laugh, Vanderhēt -kāst -make, Sangiāzar -kāst -go, -lāhāzānt -xvāt -eat, Yaughnī -hāēt -bear, Bełtjī -sād -know, Kārē -sāp -resell, Yaughnī -hāēt -make, Pahlōtī -kēl (here -sī represents the Old Iranian -shā). Present tense. In Old and Middle Iranian pres. ind., pres. conj. are clearly separated. Both modes of thought are expressed in New Persian. Conj. pres. inflection, distinct from ind. pres., is preserved in Yaughnī (kūnstī -he do), conj. kūnstī and Ossetic (hūnstī -does, conj. kūnstī). Other dialects have one form of present inflection, which therefore serves to express both present and sorist (with meanings of fut. and conj. pres.). In certain dialects, as in early New Persian -hāēt -I do, Bełtjī -xwēn -I eat, Yaughnī -xwēn -I see, Orōshori -xwānī -I do, Yaughnī -xwānī -we eat, -I see, Sangiāzar -xwān -I see, this form appears alone in both senses. But greater precision was attained by use of prefixes, suffixes, and periphrast forms marking the present. So in Kūhti -hērōn -I eat, -Kur Kuri -dā -kāhētī -I fall, Kūrumfēgī -dā (alāw -I fall), Abdī -hētī -I bring), Kūtārāīrī -dā (hī -I bring), Nūmī -mē -I bring), Orōshori -hētī -I bring), -xwēnī -I run), Lāri Rakhšīrī -ha (alāw -I do), Yaranī -ha (alāw -I hear), Farārīzī -ha (alāw -I hear), Sūsī -hā (duhār -he grinds), Gūznī Kūntārī -mē -I make), New Persian -hāmī, mi (alāsānī -I do), Yaughnī -mē -see (it looks), Yaughnī -hā -I hear), Xwēnī -mē -I see, Kūrīzī -mē -I do). Ossetic -hāmī (hī -I take), Ha kē (he makes). Periphrast forms are used in Pahlōtī -hēmānī -to come, be born, beside the durative pretensive amendēh -I was coming, and Bełtjī -hāmānī -I am doing), Zātā -kūrē -I am doing). Nūmī -hētī -I hear and Giłakī hūmnī have no prefix. The sorist (in meaning fut. and
Passive. In New Iranian the passive (which is of infrequent use in the colloquial language) shows but few traces of the Middle Iranian passive
(tu-ki): Gūrānī (Kandīlāt) Ḧārām 3rd sing. perf.
pass. 'has been made' mäšätān 'it burst': Zāsā ṭalčēmān 'I am killed'; Kurdi of Simnā has
akūzēm 'I am killed'. From Yarusti is quoted bahmarāt 'was broken'. The passive with unlaud in Kurdi Mūkri dādēr may represent the Old
Iranian passive in -ya-. Eastern Balūc employs-
je (as it seems borrowed from the identical
Sindhi passive): ḥalūjān 'I am killed'. But usually
in New Iranian dialects the passive is expressed
by the participle with auxiliary verb: 'was done'.
So in Balūc ḥalūjān 'I am killed'. New Persian has
used the verbs āmadām 'to come', galtān 'to turn',
tūdān 'to go, become' (this latter is now the usual
auxiliary); in other dialects has 'to become' is
frequent: Gīlakī hāmandeshe 'it was dug down',
Simnā ūvārād mābin 'I am asked', Mundži uses
the verbs ṣy- 'to come' (for the pres.) and
kēr- 'to go' (for the preterite) with the participle in
je. In Omrūcī the auxiliary is ḥārām 'to go', and
in Parāčī ḥārām 'to go', or parāč 'to go'. Early
kērām 'to go, become' in Waghūn. In Osotic
two forms are found, āmadām 'I am counted' and
maddas 'will be made known'.
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III. PERSIAN LITERATURE.

Definition. By Persian literature we understand all works written in modern Persian, in contrast to middle Persian (Pahlavi), or in other words the whole of Persian literature after the Arab conquest of the present day. It should be observed however that this literature can be regarded as a unity only up to a certain point. The vicissitudes of western Asiatic history brought it about that Persian became the literary language of a number of peoples whose vernaculars had no connection with Persian. Persian became the language of the upper classes of these peoples, just as French became in the xviiith century for various peoples in Europe. The result is that Persian literature in the wide sense includes not only the literature of Persia, but also the literature of Central Asia, and to some extent of Turkey, India and Afghanistan. Although down to the xviith—xviiith century these literatures were very slightly differentiated, in modern times the differences between them have become so strongly marked that their literatures can no longer be considered as a single whole. This circumstance makes a comprehensive survey of all the literature which may be called Persian an impossible task and forces the student to set more precise limits, which must also apply to this article. Hence therefore by Persian literature we mean only the literature of Persia, and such writers as belong to Central Asia, India or Afghanistan will be more or less disregarded.

The beginnings. It has so far been not possible to trace the initial stages of Persian literature exactly. There is, it is true, no lack of anecdotes relating to these first steps but they are so obviously unreliable that they are hardly worth consideration. It is of course natural that these early stages could only have been recorded by chance, as from the point of view of later ages they appeared of very little value.

Nevertheless the fragments that have survived make it possible to put forward certain hypotheses which are probably not too far from the actual truth. The early centuries after the Arab conquest saw a gradual decay of Pahlavi literature. At first sight it might appear that literary activity in Persia ceased completely. But this was not the case. If we turn to the Arabic literature of this period we find that a large number of Persian poets and scholars were writing in Arabic. The valuable anthology of al-Tha’liib (d. 1038), Yatmacat al-Dahr (pr. 1085), contains most interesting information which shows that already in the xiiith century Arabic had become the literary language of the upper classes in Khurásán and Transoxiana. This said, at the same time there were signs of activity in the opposite direction. The political situation of Persia, whose rulers were trying to cast off the Arab yoke, and the gradual exhaustion of the caliphate demanded not only political opposition to the Arabs but also the ending of the domination of the Arabic language in the field of literature. But the 150 years of the supremacy of Arabic did not pass without leaving a trace. Pahlavi had become a dead language; there was therefore only Persian to oppose to Arabic as a literary language. On the other hand, there prevailed, especially in poetry, Arabic forms (khusd, ghasl) and the Arabic quantitative metre ('arāf), which so firmly established thyme, probably foreign to Pahlavi, that a return to the poetical technique of the Sámaí period was impossible. Arabic poetry had however to submit to certain changes, such as the introduction of the very long syllable into prosody, which was not possible in Arabic at all and probably arose in the process of inserting Persian words into Arabic lines. How and when the first lines of verse entirely in Persian arose will hardly be possible to ascertain with certainty. Persian sources profess to consider the fragments that survive of a gā'fda by 'Abbas Marwazi as having been composed in Marw (809) in honour of
Ma'mun, son of Hārūn al-Raṣūlī, as the oldest poet in Persian. Unfortunately it is still somewhat difficult to express a definite opinion on the genuineness of these lines. The anthologies (sadākārā) and dictionaries (notably Asadī's valuable Lughāt-i Fārsi) contain isolated lines from poets like Abū Ḥafs Sūḥābī, Ḥanẓāla Bāḏγāšī, Māhīn Warrāz Harawī, Fīrūz Mašhīrī, Abū Salīk Gurgānī etc. of whom some may possibly be as early as the viiiith century. These fragments however are but miserable remnants, which give evidence of the existence of poetry but do not enable us to obtain a clear idea of Persian verse in its earliest period.

xii–xiiiith century. As early as the tenth century we find these early efforts attaining a very high degree of artistic perfection. The courts of the various princes around whom the poets gathered formed centres of literary activity. But as the poets were usually directly dependent on their patrons and had to some extent to adapt themselves to their taste, it is quite natural that almost every dynasty of Persia was surrounded by a group of poets who present a certain unity, especially from the point of view of style, so that the classification of Persian poets by dynasties, as has been usual in Persia from early times, has a certain amount of justification in literary history. In order to give some lucidity to our account of the rather complicated process of the literary evolution of Persian poetry, we shall retain this classification, at the same time subdividing our account according to the various kinds of poetry so that the links may not be broken. In the first section the following kinds of poetry are mainly concerned: a. lyrical court poetry, b. epic, c. mystic. Prose hardly comes into consideration at all in this section, as the older Persian literature scarcely ever uses prose for belles-lettres. Prose is for old Persia; the language of scholarship only. But it is to be noted that for the pre-Mongol period the language of scholarship is predominantly Arabic so that even in this field a higher degree of development of Persian prose is only slowly attained.

The Court Lyric. While as early as the time of the Tāhirids and Saffārīds we can recognize the first approaches to the formation of a characteristic court style, we do not see it in its full perfection till the time of the Sāmānids (875–999), whose capital was Bukhārā. Although here also the devastation wrought by time has left us only a few remains, it is still absolutely clear that at this time a flourishing literary activity in Bukhārā was in full swing. Round the Sāmānids court gathered a large number of distinguished poets, who on the one hand were engaged in singing the praises of the rulers in sonorous kāshā and on the other in bitter rivalries with one another for pre-eminence, a struggle carried on with poetical weapons also, i. e. satire (ṣadīr, ṣīfla). Of all these poets the greatest was the celebrated Rūdākī (q.v.) of Samarqand. His kāshā Mūdar-i mai is an unsurpassed masterpiece. Rūdākī seems to be the first creator of the type of the Persian poet which all others endeavoured to copy: poet, aristocrat, liberal, frivolous, amorous, wine-loving, chivalrous, devoted only to the joys of life, never touching its gloomier sides. In the field of didactic poetry also he won great fame by a version (which has unfortunately not come down to us) of the Katīla ma-Dinma. But he introduced another theme into Persian poetry, the lament for lost youth, which he expressed in moving language. His younger contemporary Kīsā-i (q.v.) (b. 953) of Marw dealt with the same theme. It may be assumed that these laments were not simply exercises in style but had a genuine foundation in the circumstances of the Persian poet. His duty was to adorn the court of his prince, to share his pleasures and to amuse him; a sour old greybeard was not suited for this and was no doubt, little appreciated in spite of former services. No less characteristic are the laments of the famous Shāhid of Balkh who is said to have been the first to collect a complete Dīwān. He wrote laments principally the injustice in the distribution of the world’s goods, which clearly points to his lack of success at court. The language of all these poets is clear and lucid; they are still very moderate in the use of poetic artifices and observe the limitations of poetry. Of second class (or perhaps by chance less known) names of this circle of poets the following may be mentioned: Maʿrīf Balbī (c. 954–961), Abū Shuʿīb Harawī, Abū Zarrāʾa Dūʾrānī, Abū Tāhir Khawwārī, Ḥiyābārī Bukhārāʾī, Amīr Aḥmadī, Bukhārāʾī, Kawsanī, Maʿrīf, Abū l-Fath Būstī (known also from his poems in Arabic) and Aḥmadī Marwānī.

After the fall of the Sāmānids a new literary centre arose in Gūzāna at the court of the celebrated Sulṭān Māhīn (q.v., 998–1030) and his successors. This school received its key-note from the famous poet ʿUmarī (q.v., d. 1050) of Balkh. His kāshā, which celebrate the sulṭān and his campaigns and endeavour to prove his claim to the throne of Persia by theological hair-splitting, are very fine examples of the more serious court poetry. Rūdākī’s frivolity would have been out of place at the court of the rigidly orthodox sulṭān. Two other poets who were mainly active at the court of his brother Amīr Nasrī recall in their jole de vivre more the poetry of the Sāmānī period. They are Minābīrī (q.v., d. 1050) of Damghānī, who has given us in several poems fine specimens of hibous humour and liked to make allusions to pre-Islamic legends, and Farrūkhī of Sāmānī (q.v., d. 1037–1038), whose Persian literary historians are fond of comparing with the master of the Arabic ʿAṣāfī d. Mūṭanābī (q.v.). The glowing colours of his descriptions of nature are really marvellous expressions of the imagination. As a theorist also he is known for his treatise Tāfdžumān al-Balāgā. No less important is ʿAṣāfī (q.v., d. between 1030–1041) of Ṭūs, who was the first to enrich the varieties of court poetry with the mawṣūla or dissertation (like the temne of Southern France). Two poets of this name are usually distinguished; the younger, author of the Garjār-

nāma, is said to be a son of the elder. But there are reasons for thinking such a distinction unnecessary and the existence of two ʿAṣāfī is doubtful. Under the successors of Sulṭān Māhīm, who were no longer able to hold together their father’s gigantic empire, poetry was still held in high honour. Of the poets who adorned their courts the master of the kāshā Abū l-Farsārī Kānī (d. about the beginning of the xivth century) and his pupil Masʿūd-i Saʿādī Salāmān (d. 1131) were specially prominent. The latter in particular, who spent a great part of his life in prison, created a new kind of poem, the Ḥabībīyya (prison kāshās), in which he lamented his cruell
endeavoured to check Anwari's influence with the work of Rāshid al-Dīn Waṣāṭī (q.v.; d. 1182-1183). This poet, who is also entitled to credit for his work as a theorist, is distinguished by unusually caustic language but as a poet he can scarcely be compared with Anwari, beside whom only the characteristic figure of Kāhānī (q.v., d. 1199), who sang the praises of the Shāhs of Ṣirān, remains unfaded. The difficulty of the language of this original poet is proverbial in the east but nevertheless he is recognised to this day as the greatest master of the καηδά. Shāhānī of Samarkand (d. 1173-1174) was also an occasional panegyrist of the Sāljiqs but he was known chiefly for his satires and parodies which are often obscene but very witty. Women also wrote poetry; for example we have a few lines by Sultān Sandjar's friend Muḥiṭ, which show great talent although they unfortunately contain unusually cynical expressions. Nāẓm-i ʿArūdi (q.v.) of Samarkand was a poet at the Ghurid court; he is chiefly notable for his Cabūr-Mahāla, one of the most important sources for the biographies of poets. The end of this period is marked by the two last great poets of καηδά, Zāhir al-Dīn Fārūkī (q.v., d. 1202), whose poems in spite of facility of technique show in comparison with Anwari a certain decline of the court style, and Kāḥāni-i Ṣamānī called Kahlīlīb-i Maḥāra or "Creator of Spiritual Ideas" (d. 1237). This last poet turned in his later years from the court style and preferred the contemplative life of a Ṣūfī ṣāhiq to success at court. His best work is already full of the spirit of Ṣūfī mysticism and in this field also he succeeded in creating real masterpieces.

8. Epic. The first essays in epic poetry, a genre which had been practically unknown to the Arabs and which, so to speak, represented the Iranian national element in Persian literature, were made by Persian poets even before the time of the Saljiqs, in the period of the first great Persian kings of their Arab masters. In this field therefore the Persians had no foreign models and were completely dependent on pre-Islamic tradition and to some extent on popular poetry. Unfortunately once more only fragments of the oldest works have come down to us, which do not permit us to gain anything like a clear idea of their character. In this field it was again the old master Rūdakī who created the first work of any size, namely the celebrated version of the Kāfīla nas-Dīmān of which only some 50 baits have come down to us. At the same court the talented young and vivacious poet Daḵīṭ (q.v.) undertook a larger work, namely a metrical version of the official Sāsānian book of kings, the Kāḥāni-nāma. His premature death prevented him from carrying out this grandiose scheme. All that he left was about 1,000 baits, which seem to have given the stimulus to the greatest achievement of Persian poetry, the Sāhā-nāma of the celebrated Abu ʿl-Kāsim Firdawsi (q.v.) of Tis (born c. 934, d. between 1020-1026). This gigantic work, which according to the poet himself contains 66,000 baits and combines the whole epic tradition of Persia into an artistically perfect whole, became the foundation for a long series of later poems or has been, as this genre is called, from an Arabic technical term. Firdawsi's second work, finished when he was well over seventy years of age, namely his Vāfīb-i Zāliṣhâ, is from the artistic point of view little
inferior to his masterpiece. The story of Joseph, which with later poets (Djamli) became a song of songs of mystic love, becomes in his hands a moving lament of the boy carried off to a strange land, which may well describe the feelings of the aged and homeless poet in Baghdad. Firdawsi's first successors followed his example closely and wrote regular epics, among which the already mentioned Garbeh-e-nama of Asadi and works like the Ruzai-nama, Sam-nama etc. may be particularly noted. But very soon the character of the epic changes and it gradually becomes a romance of chivalry. Thus for example the Wāniš ma-Adbr, now lost, of the already mentioned Unsurt, in spite of its many descriptions of fighting, is mainly concerned with the love-story of the hero and heroine. This transformation is still more evident in Fakhr al-Din Gurgānī's [see Ḩurrānī] celebrated Ḩis-i Rūmīn (written about 1048), the Persian counterpart of the European Tristan story, in which the hero, regarded from the point of view of the heroes of old Persia, is almost entirely devoid of knightly qualities. The courtly epic attains its zenith in the quintette (Khamsa) of the great Nīqūlī [q.v.] of Gangla (1141-1203). Some of his poems have really very little connection with the old epics and are, like La'īl-i Maqūfīn, predominantly lyrical and romantic in tone. After Nīqūlī the Persian court poets hardly ever attempted to treat of new subjects and remained within the bounds already laid down for them.

2. Mysticism. We have so far been mainly concerned with the court poetry, but the other current in Persian literature has its source in very different circles. Sufism [see TAṢAVVUFS] arising on Arab soil, entered Persia also and spread among the artisans and to some extent also among the merchants who populated the towns of Persia. In its quite early stages Sufism became connected with the sufawwada movement [q.v.] and the mystical note became more and more emphasised. So far as we can judge, the oldest Sufi lyrics arose from the demand for a poetry of their own which should brighten the public meetings of the Sufī bodies. Isolated lines, quatrains and Ḥijā'as of pronounced Sufi colouring arose as early as the tenth century, but the first more or less extensive collections belong to the first half of the xth century. While the famous Bābā Taḥīr ʿUṭūn (see Tūm; d. 1010) expresses pronounced Sufi views only in his prose works and in his quatrains follows the model of the popular poetry (even in language, for a number of them are written in dialect). Bābā Kāhī Shīrāzi (d. 1050) is already a mystic through and through in the full sense of the word. His Dīūān which has come down to us is, it is true, much corrupted, but the theories of the xth century are quite apparent from his verses which are interspersed with Ḥurā'n verses and Ḥadīths. Until quite recently it was generally thought that the earliest Sufi poet was the celebrated Shāhīb Abū Saʿīd of Malihana. But there is no longer any doubt that he only once in his life composed a quatrains on the spur of the moment. All the other poems ascribed to him are either forgeries, or possibly were really declared by him during his sermons without having been composed by him. The mystical lyric attains a higher degree of perfection in Anṣārī [q.v.] also called Pīr-i Anṣār or Pīr of Herāt (1000-1088), whose principal work is the celebrated Muntu, called prayers full of feeling in rhymed prose. The soil was now sufficiently prepared and Persian mysticism began to bear its finest flowers, which have given Persian poetry world-fame. But before we pass to these great masters we must briefly mention two names which has hitherto been the custom to mention in connection with Sufism. These are the famous scholars ʿOmar Khayyām (q.v.; d. 1103) and the preacher of Ismā'ilism Nāṣr-i Kāshvāq [q.v.]. To return to orthodox Sufism we must mention Ṣanāʿī [q.v.]; 1045/1046-1121), the poet of ʿazines. If his Dīūān, half secular, half mystical, reveals further development along the path laid by Anṣārī (q.v.), his didactic poems, among which we may mention the Ḥaḍrat al-Rūh, represent the first attempt to enliven the theories of Sufism by inserting parables of a popular character. This device, only sparingly used by Ṣanāʿī, is brilliantly exploited by his successor, the celebrated Farīd al-Dīn ʿAttār (see Āṭṭār: 1219-1230). In his poems the inserted tales attain full development and frequently display the greatest artistic perfection in their simplicity. The climax of this ascending series is formed by the incomparable and gigantic work of the great Djālāl al-Dīn Ṣūrī (q.v.; 1207-1273) also known as Mawāsī-i Rūm. His didactic poem, which bears the proud title of Mathnawī, i.e. "the poem par excellence" (perhaps with allusion to al-ʿKūnūn), is the finest thing that Oriental mysticism with its unlimited riches has produced. The famous Saʿdi (q.v.; 1184-1292) is also usually reckoned among the mystics, although really only a few of his works have a distinctly mystical tinge. Saʿdi is rather a teacher of practical wisdom; he endeavours to show his readers the way by which in his troubled period the all too heavy blows of fate could be softened.

3. Prose. We have already observed that classical Persian literature was accustomed to clothe belles-letters with a metrical garb, and preferred Arabic for learned works. The prose literature of this period is therefore not so rich as the poetry is. Along with the already mentioned work of Bānān many may also note the famous Abū ʿAli b. Sīnā (Avicenna; q.v.), who in addition to his works in Arabic wrote an encyclopaedia of philosophy in Persian, the Dīnāmī-nāma-yi ʿĀʿīn. The dialect of ʿTabari斯坦 was used at the end of the tenth century by Mārāhān b. Rustam [q.v.] for the Mursūn-nāma, a version of the ʿIklīl wa-Dimmā [q.v.]. Unfortunately this work is now lost and known only from Saʿdī Warrāwīn's Persian translation (written between 1210-1215). The Sīyāsāt-nāma of the Sailjīk waṭrī Nīṣām al-Mulk [q.v.; d. 1092] is an important book, besides containing valuable historical material, well reflects the political ideas of the period. This list of the most important works shows quite clearly that there is practically no belles-letters proper. The first work that we can put in this class is the Persian translation of the Kalīla wa-Dimmā finished in 1244 by Abū ʿl-Mawātī Nāṣr Allah [see NāṣR AL-AḤĀN]. But here again it must be pointed out that the book was not then regarded as light literature but as a kind of "mirror for princes", that is to say as a learned work. The aim of the Persian translation of the Farāhīh bād al-Ṣūda completed in 1155 by Husain al-Maʿāīyādī was similar, but with particular stress on the didactic element. The end of the sixth century
brings a series of romances of chivalry and versions of pre-Islamic material, the greater part of which is known only in later versions, often only in the form of popular romances. We may mention here the romance Kirdāb-i Samakī Ḥur by Sādžaštī Shīrāzī composed in 1180, the last of the great pre-Islamic romances, Amīr Ḥamza, the Bāghār-nāma and the romance of the Bedouin hero Ḥādīn Taqī. To conclude this section, we may mention that in this period we already find a certain development of historical writing, a series of works on poetics, and the first attempts at anthologies (taḏḵīra, among them ‘Awfī’s [q.v.] valuable Luḥāb al- marched. As this compressed survey of Persian literature is forced to confine itself to belles-lettres such works cannot be dealt with here.

From the Mongols to the sixteenth century. The early years of Mongol rule were a period of tribulation for Persia. Although later Mongol rulers took an interest in the restoration of the country the destruction done in the early invasions was so vast that the land could only recover slowly. In the general havoc it could hardly be expected that Persian literature would continue on its earlier lines. Yet it is this period that produces the great series of eminently important works that form the foundation of all research by European scholars. Without going into further details we must at least briefly mention the more important names. These are: Aṭā Allāh Ḥamza [see Ḥamza], Waṣṣīq [q.v.], the great Ḥādī al-Dīn [q.v.] Fadl Allāh and Hamd Allāh Mustawfī Ḥaḏī [see Ḥaḏī]. Poets on the other hand became rare and they seek comfort mainly in mysticism. Court poetry after the destruction of the brilliant court life survived mainly in outlying parts of the country which had suffered less in the general destruction. But this poetry could not for the most part rise above the level of the classical period and seeks to surpass its predecessors in dexterity of technique. Several poets who knew that they possessed a certain perfection of style left their native land and sought refuge with the rulers of India. For example Bādr al-Dīn, a fairly skilled master of the ḥaḏī, left Central Asia to become court poet of Muhammad b. Tughluq (1235—1351); there he was followed by Kānī of Tūṣ who however afterwards went to Asia Minor. An endeavour to give new life to the court language, which had become arid and formal, by the addition of Mongol and Turkish loan-words was made by Fūr al-Dīn [q.v.,], who described the earthquake at Nishāpūr in 1257—1268 in a successful ḥaḏī. Only the most gifted poets still retain traces of the ecstasies which filled the works of their predecessors. Of great importance is Fakhr al-Dīn Ṭrgā [q.v.] of Hamadān (d. 1289) who in his Lāfallūt, sung by Anṣārī’s Munūdī, produced a work sui generis; his ‘Uṣūl-i-nāma also contains much that is valuable. Less known but interesting is Ḥawd al-Dīn Kirmānī whose Mīsāb al-Arwisā in many ways recalls the Divan Compendia. ‘Aḥmedi [q.v.] of Maragha attained great renown. His Zan-i Dīnān, which is now very little read, was copied 400 times in a single year. For European scholarship the Gūrshān-i Rūz of Mḥmad Shabistānī (d. 1390) had considerable importance. This was the first work from which a clearer idea of the teachings of Ṣu’aṣīm was obtained. A further development of the mystical quest is found in Afdāl al-Dīn Kāshānī (also called Bāḥš Afdāl; d. 1307), who also can claim mention as the author of several treatises of a philosophical character. Among all these quite a special position is occupied by Nisārī Khūstānī (d. 1320), although from an earlier date, he is distinguished from the latter by sarcastic outbursts against orthodox Islam with such drastic effect that almost all authorities declared his writings heretical and hostile to religion. As a result manuscripts of his works are very scarce. Some of his longer poems (like Muqābir u-Aṣḥār) read like deliberate parodies of the aphorisms of Șa’dī and the court epic.

If Persian literature in the Mongol period had fallen into a kind of lethargic trance, under Timūr and his successors (1370-1405) it experienced a renaissance. The reason for this is probably that, with the decline of Mongol sovereignty, a large number of petty local dynasties arose who were all anxious to restore the ancient usages of court life and to adorn their courts with poets. This period therefore became a new flowering-time of Persian poetry and it may well be called the second classical period. Although the greater part of its poetry lacks the freshness and vigour of the pre-Mongol period, some of its poets succeeded in surpassing their predecessors. Of the masters of this period the following may be mentioned: Ibn Yāmīn (q.v., d. 1368), a time court poet to the Safavids in Sabzawār, a great artist in the ḥaḏī, which was very little cultivated before him and then mainly for its decorative beauty. ‘Aḥmad Kirmānī [see Kirmānī, d. 1381], author of a Khamā, which endeavours to discard the rather pedantic learning of Ni‘mī and is distinguished by grace and lightness of touch. His ghazals also show an endeavour to cast off Sa’dī’s moralising tendency and to melt into pure expressions of feeling. ‘Uḥdī [q.v.,] Zākīnī (d. 1371), one of the most original figures of Persian literature, whose occasionally rather bold parodies contain ruthless criticism and contempt for the Persian aristocracy. Sālānī [q.v.,] Sāwādī (d. 1376), celebrated for his difficult play on words, witticisms and technical skill, and lastly Līsān al-Qubl Khwāsī [q.v.,] Shīrāzī (d. 1386), the incomparable master of the ghazal, who was able to combine the greatest freshness and depth of feeling with the elegance demanded by the taste of the age and brought the ghazal to the height of its development, never again reached by any one after him. Two less talented parodists must be mentioned as characteristic representatives of the period: Aḥb Iṣḥāq Aṯ-īma, the poet of cooking, and Kārī Yāsādī (second half of the sixteenth century), the tailor poet. Their works show that the grandeur of the court poetry was already in decline and a new wave was about to break which revealed its weaknesses and made new demands on the subject of its art. Among the prose writers we may here mention Ḏīyā al-Dīn Nakhshabī [see Nakhshabī], whose book of the parrot (Ṭūfān-nāma, 1330), a version of the old and now lost Sīnādūf-nāma, had a great success and was utilized by several later writers. His short prose romance Gūrshī should also be mentioned.

Under Timūr’s successors the striving after artificiality increases still further. The poet’s object is not to be generally understood. On the contrary his aim is to write only for a few select connois-
The Kādjar and modern Persia. The Kādjar monarchy established at the end of the xviiith century brought with it a literary revival in Persia. While Fath 'Alī's court poets still followed the old traditions and produced little of value, a distinct change becomes apparent in the second half of the xixth century, the result of a closer contact with the European powers who were waging with one another for predominance in Persia. Fath 'Alī Shah's court poets, like Nāshīt (q.v.; d. 1828–1839) with his tender lyrics, Šahbāz (d. 1822–1823) with his Shahāna-nāme, an imitation of Firdawsi, which celebrates the wars of 'Abbās Mirzā with the Russians, or the "Dīvān of the xixth century", Wāżīl, all have much that is admirable to their credit; but nevertheless they are only epigones who lack originality completely. Quite a new note is struck in the works of the three great masters of this period: Kā'ān (d. 1853–1854), Shābān (q.v.; d. 1888) and Vāghmān (q.v.; d. 1860). Although Ka'ān studied both French and English and translated several books from these languages, his kāfīs are still, broadly speaking, repetitions of the long obsolete court style. But in the marāz of these bombastic exercises in style there are many wonder-
fully realistic scenes which would be quite impossible in the "golden age", Shahbâni, who suffered great injustice from the Khâdîjâ, strikes a gloomy and pessimistic note and bitterly laments the rottenness of the whole structure of the Khâdîjâ monarchy. Yaqûhî, perhaps the most interesting of all three poets, whose life was an unbroken chain of sorrows, attacked the Persian nobles in bitter satire and ended with even blacker pessimism and a complete denial of the possibility of a happy life. His effort to purify the Persian language of Arabic loanwords is of interest. A great influence on further development was exercised by the Dar-i-Furûn (1852), the first educational institute intended to further the study of western learning, the teachers in which were almost exclusively Europeans. The work of this institute required the translation of a series of western textbooks. This task however revealed that the rhymed prose of the classical period could not be used for such a purpose. The works of these first translators, who in addition to the textbooks also translated several novels, chiefly from the French, was of tremendous importance for the literary language of Persia and prepared to some extent the way for the literature of contemporary Persia. The Dar-i-Furûn was also of great significance for learning in Persia. Its first director Khâji Khâlî Khân (q.v.; d. 1871), who used the taqhalî Hîdâyât for his poetry, was one of the greatest literary historians of Persia. Among his pupils were the famous historians Şârî al-Dawla, later known as Hîdâyât al-Sâlih, and (d. 1896), whose works are still one of the most valuable sources for the history of modern Persia. The efforts of the Dar-i-Furûn also produced a widespread desire to help in making known the achievements of European science. Remarkable in this respect is the work of Mirâk ʿAbd al-Râhîm Nâdîjâr ʿZâdâ, who under the name of Tâlib published a series of popular works which dealt with the most varied subjects. Of these works the most important are the Khâji ʿAbbâd and Mâ'allîb al-Maŷsinâ. Of the greatest importance for Persian literature of the eighteenth century was the introduction of printing (first press in Tabriz in 1816-1817), which also made newspapers possible. But the first newspapers were intended only for court circles. It was not till 1831 that the first newspaper of any size appeared. The press made remarkable progress during the great struggle for the constitution (mahârûţa) especially after the opening of the Madjâna

This struggle hastened the literary revolution, which had been prepared for by the work of the writers of the eighteenth century. The political struggle made quite new demands on the participants. Literature was no longer to be the special property of the aristocracy but had to speak clearly and intelligibly to the masses. Satirical poetry, which was particularly cultivated during those years (1906-1909), therefore broke away from the old tradition; instead of the old literary language which was difficult to understand it uses the language of the street and of the bazaar, instead of the dry old classical forms it sets out to imitate the street ballads (taqāf). The vernacular also found its way into prose. "Ali Akbar Dîkhâdî (Dâkhâwî), the great master of the fezile, wrote his bitter and humorous pamphlets Čâram-i-pamârd, which heightened the revolutionary paper
technique he has a complete mastery, but as regards matter his poems with their glowing hatred of England and echoes of the World War are something quite new for Persia. The same may be said of the celebrated Malik al-Sha‘rā‘ Bahār, whose great kasidas in spite of their traditional style are almost entirely political in content. On the other hand, Abu ‘l-‘Asās ‘Alī ‘Askīs ‘Alī (born c. 1780–1860) has cast off the old tradition to a considerable extent. Of classical forms he prefers the ghazal, but has attained his greatest fame by personal satirical stanzas, some of which played a great part during the fighting in the Persian Revolution. The poems of Ṣa‘dār al-Misrī (d. 1926) are very famous; his main theme was the fight for the liberation of the Persian woman. Unfortunately his works are characterized by a repulsive cynicism which is quite irreconcilable with the loftiness of his ideals. Among the younger poets first place must be given to Ṣahīr Ṣādī (born 1887), whose tenderly nostalgic distinctly betray the influence of European poetry; Ṣādī has also distinguished himself as a literary historian. Nīrā is endeavouring to create new forms and his Majhas ("prison") he succeeded in impressively depicting the tragic lot of the Persian peasant. Mention must also be made of ‘Alī Ṣa‘dī, author of two short mahans which the European reader will feel to be too sentimental. The Sarghdāshī ‘Alī ‘Askīs is interesting; its author, Waḥīd Dāghī ‘Askīs, is editor of the Arman, the best Persian literary monthly. There are also women-writers and the rather naive verse of the poetess ‘Arman in which we may hope for success in this field also.

Revolutionary tendencies in Persian poetry are represented by Muḥammad Mīzrā ‘Askīs (killed in 1935), noted for his poem ‘Aqīl ‘A‘marār Dīkhān, and Ṣādī Lāḥūtī, now working in the USSR (d. 1887), who has with great skill been able to overcome the old traditions and to give his revolutionary poems artistic forms most effectively.

If the Persian poetry of recent years is still feeling its way only very tentatively, the prose can show remarkable achievements. The first years after the War gave the Persians their first historical novel ‘Isāh u-Sultānāt (printed 1919) by Shāh ‘Alī ‘Askīs, the best work in this, the Achaemenid Cyrus, the episode of ‘Umar and Muniya from Firdawsi’s Šāh-nāma was worked up into a long novel by Aḥmad Mīzrā ‘Askīs Ḥasan-Khān Bādī; the story of Manzāk was used by Sa‘dī ‘Askīs Kirmānī, who also wrote a novel from the life of ‘Abdāli (1927). The most interesting of all these historical novels is the Šamān u-Tughrā (in three parts; written in 1909) of Muhammad Bāq̄ī Mīzrā ‘Askīs Khurāsānī, who describes the condition of Fars under Mongol rule (XIIth century). Kamānī’s novel Lūshā (1931) is outspokenly nationalist. If the historical novels are intended to remind the Persian reader of the departed greatness of his country and arouse his national pride, the second group of modern novels is devoted to the criticism of present conditions. The difficult position of women in Persia is dealt with by Abbās Khālīfī in his Rūgbār-i ayāh (2nd ed. 1925). The same author has written a number of shorter novels and stories, among which we may mention Intīshāl, ‘Ālmān and ‘Alī-i Șah. The hard lot of the working classes and the criminal conduct of the Persian bureaucracy before the revolution of 1921 are described by Mustafā Mushīf Kāsīmī in his Tīhrān-i manāhīf (2nd ed. 1924). The same author has also published several shorter novels, ‘Alī Kāh Khu’dadā (1927). The novel Mas‘ūd ‘Alī ‘Askīs Dīnhānān (1925), which is the already mentioned ‘Alī’s, is fanciful and Utopian; the same author in 1934 published another Utopian novel, Rustām dar Kuri-i wāzānam, in which he endeavours to demonstrate the inadequacy of the old ideals of chivalry.

This compressed survey, which can only mention the more important works, shows that modern Persian prose has developed much more vigorously than poetry. If we consider the difficulties which the Persian moderns had to overcome, there can be no doubt that the next few years must produce an ever greater literary revival and that new Persia will soon produce works of art, which will be able to take their place beside the noble creations of the classical period in the literature of the world.

Bibliography: Only comprehensive surveys are given as this is not the place to give a complete list of monographs on individual authors.


(P. Berthele)

PERTEW PASHA, the name of two Ottoman statesmen.

I. PERTEW MURAD PASHA, Ottoman admiral and weftir, started his career on the staff of the imperial harem, became başıghü beşhi [q.v.], later Agha of the Janissaries and in 1562 (1555) he was advanced to the rank of weftir; in 1568 (1564) he was appointed third weftir, in 1582 (1574) second weftir and finally commander (cerdar) of the imperial fleet under the başşuğla beşhi Muferze-râde ‘Ali Pasha. He later fell into disgrace and died in Istanbul where he was buried in his own türbe in the cemetery of Eyüph.
PERTEW PASHA — PESHĀWAR


II. PERTEW MEHMED SA'D PASHA, OTTOMAN DIPLOMAT AND POET. He was of Tāriq descent and was born in the village of Dūndj near Čumîya. In his early youth he came to the capital Stambül and entered upon an official career. In Maharrâm 1240 (Sept. 1824) he became beşlî-kâf efendi, i.e. State referendary and in Şaban 1242 (March 1827), head of the imperial chancery (reîî-ṣulûkat). Two years later he lost his post as chancellor and went on a special mission to Egypt. On his return he became in 1246 (1830) assistant (kâya) to the grand vizier. In the 32nd Dhu l-Ka'da 1251 (March 12, 1836) he was appointed minister for civil affairs (mîhâkat-i 'abrî) and given the title of marshal (mâšûrî). In the spring of 1836 he was given the title of Pasha but was dismissed by the autumn. In the beginning of Sept. 1836 he was banished by Mahmûd II to Scutari in Albania. Pertew Pasha set out a few weeks after his banishment to his place of exile but did not reach it. He died in Adrianople three hours after a banquet which the governor there, Mustafâ Pasha, gave in his honour (according to Gíbb, H.O.P., iv. 333: Emin Pasha). No one doubted that his sudden death was due to poison and public opinion ascribed the crime to Mahommed himself. On his family see Sīgıllî-i Fâvâzî, ii. 88. His son-in-law, who shared his views, was the intriguing private secretary to Mahmûd II, Waṣṣaf Bey, a highly educated man but lacking in character and accountableness. He was accused of bribery, who lost his office about the same time as Pertew Pasha and was banished to Tokat in Anatolia; cf. G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türken, i., Leipzig 1866, p. 255 sq.; Pertew Pasha's successor was his political opponent, Kâfî Pasha, cf. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 337 sq. — As a statesman Pertew Pasha took up a pronounced anti-Russian attitude and was no less hostile to the Christians, whom he oppressed with long obsolete and forgotten laws. His feeling against the Christians increased with advancing years.

As a poet, Pertew Pasha composed a Divân, which was esteemed as a model of the poetical art of the period of Mahmûd II. There are two editions of it: Bâlâk 1253 (89, 91 pp.) and Stambül 1256 (89, 430 sq). On other works by Pertew Pasha see Brûssl Mehmêd Tâhir, Oftînînî Mâlikîfî, ii. 114 sq. — His valuable library, rich in manuscripts, is now in what was formerly the Selimiye monastery in Scutari.

Bibliography: G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türken, i., Leipzig 1866, pass. esp. p. 255 sq.; Gibb, H.O.P., iv. 322 sq. with references to Jousmim and J. v. Gaver, Turqueries, Paris 1843, for an account of the death of Pertew Pasha in Adrianople; Mehmêd Thūrēyâ, Sīgıllî-i 'othmānî, ii. 38; Şâhīn Bey Frâhîk, Kâmînî al-'Aᦂīm, p. 1494 sp.; Brûssl Mehmêd Tâhir, Oftînînî Mâlikîfî, ii. 114. — This Pertew Pasha is not to be confused with the statesman and poet Pertew Edhem Pasha who died on the 7th Dhu l-Ka'da 1289 (Jan. 6, 1873) as governor of Kayserî [q. v.], a number of whose poems have been published e. g. a-Shâhînum and Lâhsâhî, a.l. (= Stambül) u.d., and Iñâkat al-Akîr fi 'Uṣūl al-Akâr, Stambül 1304. On him cf. Mehmêd Tâhir, op. cit., ii. 114 sqq.

(Franz Babinger)

PESANTREN. [See Pasanteen.]

PESHĀWAR, a district, ṣubîl, and city in the North-West Frontier Province of British India. The district which lies between 71° 25′ and 72° 47′ E. and 33° 40′ and 34° 31′ N. has an area of 2,637 square miles and a population of 947,321 of whom 92 per cent are Muslims (19th Census Report). It is bounded on the east by the river Indus, which separates it from the Pindâr and Hazāra, and on the south by the Nikân hills which run off from the district of Kâhât. Elsewhere it is bounded by tribal territory. To the south lie the territories of the Pashtûn Khâl and Kâhât Pass Afritâ; westwards, the Khâleb Afritâs and Mûllâgors. Farther north, across the Kâhât river, the various Mohmand clans stretch to the Swât river. The northern boundary of the district marches with the territories of the U protestors, the Swât and Buner, the Khu’d Khâl, Gâduns and Umtâänâs. The district passes famous in frontier history connect it with the surrounding tribal tracts. In the north-east, the Mora, Shâkhut, and Mâlakund passes lead into Swât. The historic gateway of the Khâleb connects it with Afghanistan, while to the south, the Kâhât Pass runs through a strip of tribal territory, known as the Dâvâya peninsula, into the neighbouring district of Kâhât.

References to the district occur in early Sanskrit literature and in the writings of Strabo, Arrian, and Ptolomy. It once formed part of the ancient Buddhist kingdom of Gandhâra, for, from the Khâleb Pass to the Swât valley, the country is still studded with crumbling Buddhist stupas. Here, too, have been unearthed some of the most spectacular Buddhist sculptures in existence, while one of Asoka's rock edicts is to be found near the village of Shâhâbga in the Swât district. Both Fa-hien, in the opening years of the fifth century A.D., and Hiuen Tsang, in the seventh century A.D., found the inhabitants still professing Buddhism. It is also on record that Purushapura was the capital of Kanîgâka's dominions. Through centuries of almost unbroken silence we arrive at the era of Muslim conquest, when, between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, numerous Pashtûn tribes from Afghanistan spread over and conquered the country roughly corresponding to the modern North-West Frontier Province. (T. C. Plowden, Kâhîn-i Afghânî, chap. i.—v., Selections from the Tūrkeh-i Marâja.)

Towards the end of the fifteenth century, according to local tradition, two large branches of the Pashtûn tribes, the Khâhakī and the Ghûrīyâ Kâhî, migrated from their homes in the hilly country around Kâhût to the Dâtâlîbâd valley, and the slopes of the Swât Kâhût. The most important divisions of the Khâhakī were the Vûsânî, Gûgîyânî and Târkîhâ; the Ghûrīyâ Kâhût were divided into five tribes, the Mohmands, Khâhiks, Dîtâns, Camakandîn and Zârâns. The Swât district, advancing into the modern Peshâwar district, expelled the inhabitants, known as Dâtâns, and finally conquered the country north of the Kâhût river and west of Hori Murâda. By the opening years of the sixteenth century, the Ghûrîyâ Kâhût had also reached the Khâleb area. Eventually these powerful tribes dispossessed the original inhabitants, driving some to the Swât Kûhût and forcing the Dâtâns across the Indus. Later, the Ghûrîyâ Kâhût attempted to assault the Khâhakī
branch but were signaliy defeated by the Vissians.

Since the modern Peshawar district lay about halfway the route of invading armies from the direction of Central Asia, much of its history resembles that of the Panjnad. The Pathans of this part of the frontier proved a thorn in the side of the Muslim rulers of India, and, although nominally incorporated in the Mughal empire, they were never completely subjugated, even Akbar and Aurangzeb contending themselves with keeping open the road to Kābul. With the decline of Mughal power this area became a part of the Durrānī empire founded by Ahmad Shāh Ḍabdillāh. Disintegration set in under his weak successors and eventually in the early nineteenth century Peshawar was seized by the Sikhs of the Panjāb. Sikh rule was of the loosest type, and Peshawar groaned under the iron heel of the Indian General Avītalī. With the annexation of the Panjāb in 1849, the Peshawar valley came permanently under British control and remained an integral part of the Panjāb until the formation of the North-West Frontier Province in 1901. (A detailed examination of British administration and of the various expeditions against the frontier tribes will be found in “The Problem of the North-West Frontier” by C. Collin Davies.) In recent years this area has been the scene of the activities of ‘Abd al-Qāhir Khān, the founder of the “Red Shirt” movement, which, although ostensibly based on Gandhi’s creed of non-violence, has seriously disturbed the peace of the Peshawar valley.

Peshawar City, the capital of the North-West Frontier Province, has a population of 87,440 and is situated near the left bank of the Bārā river about 13 miles east of the Khāiber Pass. Its importance as a trading centre on the main route between India and Afghanistan has increased since the construction of the Khāiber railway in 1925. It has 16 gates which are closed every night and opened before sunrise. The richest part is the Andarshahr where the wealthier Hindus have taken up their abodes. In this quarter, conspicuous on account of its high minarets of white marble, stands the mosque of Khān Khānān, who was governor during the reign of Shāh Djiāhan. On the north-west the city is dominated by a fort known as the Dīlāb Hīshā. The Shāh Džāng with its spacious and shady grounds is a favourite resort of the inhabitants in the spring. The fame of the Khān Khānān or Storytellers Piazāz is known throughout the length and breadth of the frontier and beyond.

Two miles to the west of the city are the cantonments (population 34,426), the principal military station in the province. Some three miles to the west of the cantonments is the famous Islamia college, which, although essentially a Muslim college, opens its doors to students of all castes and creeds.

Bibliography: C. Collin Davies, The Problem of the North-West Frontier, 1932; do., British Relations with the Afghans of the Khāber and Trukh, in Army Quarterly, January 1932; M. Poucier, Notes sur la géographie ancienne du Gandhara, 1902; Frontier and Central Services Experiments from India, vol. 1, 1907; Supplement A, 1910; Imperial Gazetteer of India, s.v. Peshawar; H. R. James, Report on the Settlement of the Peshawar District, 1865; North-West Frontier Province Administration Reports (published annually); W. H. Paget and A. H. Mason, Record of Expeditions against the N. W. F. Tribes since the annexation of the Panjāb, 1885; Panjāb Administration Reports (published annually); Peshawar District Gazetteer, vol. A, 1933; T. C. Plowden, Kandahār Afgānān, 1875; H. Priestly, Hedāyat Afgānān, 1874. (C. Collin Davies)

Peshwa. [See Peshawa.

Peterwardein. [See Petrovaradin.

Petrovaradin (Hungarian Pétervárad, Turkish Vardım or Varadin), a famous fortress and town in Sirmia (Yugoslavia) on the main railway line Belgrade (Petrovaradin)—Novi Sad—Subotica—Budapest, lies on the right bank of the Danube opposite Novi Sad (Neusatz), chief town and headquarters of the Danube banate, with which it is connected by two bridges and since 1792 also administratively. There are two fortresses, an upper one which rises 150 feet above the Danube on rocks of serpentine surrounded on three sides by the river (forming the most northerly spur, 400 feet high, of the Fruska Gora) and a lower one which stands at the foot of the cliffs on the north. In the upper fortress there are no private houses but only military buildings, including the celebrated arsenal with many trophies from the Turkish wars, while the other fortress has a fine market, a main and two side streets. Numerous trenches have survived within the area of the two fortresses which have room for 10—12,000 men. The town proper lies half on the Danube and before its union with Novi Sad it had over 5,000 inhabitants (1921). There are many vineyards in the vicinity.

There was a settlement here even in Roman times called Cusium in which definite traces of the cult of Mitra have been found. According to one legend, the settlement received its later name Petriacum from Peter the Hermit, who assembled the armies for the First Crusade here. In any case the town was known as Petrīkon in the wars of the Byzantine emperors Manuel Comnenus (1143—1180) with Hungary. After belonging for a brief period to Byzantium, Petrovaradin returned to the kings of Hungary, and Bela IV in 1237 presented the town and the royal palace to the Cistercian abbey there of the B. M. V., Belaontia de monte Varadinipetri. This abbey survived throughout the middle ages until 1521 but from 1439 it and the town of Petrovaradin passed under the control of the ban of Mačva.

In Sulaiman I’s second campaign against Hungary, the first blow was dealt at Petrovaradin: the grand vizier and brother-in-law of the sultan, İbrahim Paşa (cf. Sīgīdīl ‘Alīī, 1: 95—94), stormed the town on the 15th and the fortress after a brave resistance on the 27th July. The Turks held Petrovaradin till 1687 when they began to withdraw gradually after the fall of Zrenjanin. Soon afterwards the town was occupied by the Austrians (finally in 1691) and after Slimieli ‘Alī Paşa had besieged it in vain for 23 days in 1694 (from Aug. 29) it was definitely ceded to them by the peace of Carlowitz 1699. But it is from the war of 1716—1718 that Petrovaradin is best known. The grand vizier Shâhâd ‘Alī Paşa (on him cf. ‘Abd al-Rahmān Sharaf, ii. 138 and Sīgīdīl ‘Alīī, 1: 528—529) with an army of 150,000 men encountered Prince Eugene of Savoy near the town and tried to begin
a regular siege. The Austrian general however foiled this attempt and instead fought a five hours pitched battle with his 64,000 men which ended in the defeat of the Turks (Aug. 5, 1716). This battle, in which 'Ali Pasha himself fell, with the fall of Temesvár and Belgrade (1717) brought about a decision in the war and led to the peace of Požarevac [q.v.] which established the Turkish frontier much farther south of Petrovaradin (indeed over the Save). A little later the empress Maria Theresa built the new fortress. In the Hungarian war of independence (1848–1849) Petrovaradin was for nine months in Hungarian hands until it surrendered to the Austrians in Sept. 6, 1849. On the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1918 the town passed to Yugoslavia.

Bibliography: (In addition to references in the article): Ewlyš Čelebi, Stjihbhatlumin, vii. (Stambul 1928), p. 145–147 (gives a very full account of the capture by the Turks; the other statements are rather vague as most of the figures are left unverified); Hammer, G.O.R., ii. 50; iii. 866 und iv. 145; Zinkelski, G.O.R., ii. 652 and v. 533–534; Sh. Şami, Ñâmûl al-Aâmûl, ii. 1489 (wrongly thinks that Petrovaradin remained Turkish down to the reign of Ahmad III [1703–1730]); 'Abd-al-Rahmân Sharaf, Târikh-i Devolet-i Eyañhâhi, i. 143; Meyers, Nieder-Süchern: Türken, etc., Leipzig–Vienna 1895, p. 331; J. Mockin, in Norðina skapðhlaði, iii. (Zagreb 1928), p. 336–337 (where some further literature is given); Almanah kráteñse靖 Ungarn, Zagreb 1931, p. 531; Glassk léttrskót drevlt o Novom Sadu, vol. vi. Heft 1–2, Sczmski, Karlovi 1923 (special number devoted to Novi Sad and Petrovaradin with important contributions and several old plans [from 1668] of the latter town). (FEHMTI BAJRAMIĆ)

PHARAO. [See FISÆN.] (Fisān.)

PIELE PASHA. Ottoman Grand Admiral according to St. Gerlach, Tage-Buch (Frankfurt a.M. 1674, p. 448), from Tolun in Hungary and is said to have been the son of a shoemaker probably of Croat origin. Almost all contemporary records mention his Croat blood (cf. the third series of the Relations degli ambasciatori Venezi al Senato, ed. E. Alberi, Florence 1844–1845, and exp. iii. 243: di nazione croata, vicino ai confini d’Ungheria; p. 357: di nazione croata; iii. 244: di nazione croata; p. 418: di nazione croata). Following the custom of the father his was later given the name of 'Abd-al-Rahmân and described as a Muslim (cf. F. Baldinger, in Litteraturdenkmäler aus Ungarn Türkenschrift, Berlin and Leipzig 1927, p. 35, note 1). Piele came in early youth as a page into the Serai in Stambul and left it as phragi bash [q.v.]. The year 961 (1554) saw him appointed Grand Admiral (kapudan pasha) [q.v.] with the rank of a beykhiyâ and four years later he was given the rank of a beykhiyâ (J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 406). He succeeded Sinân Pasha, brother of the grand viceroy Rustâm Pasha [q.v.], in the office which he had held from 955–961 (1548–1554). When after his capture of Djerba and other heroic achievements at sea he thought he might claim the rank of west with three horse-tails, Sultan Sulimân, thinking it too soon for this promotion and regarding it as endangering the prestige of the west (cf. Hıdır Khañ, Tâmis al-Kiyâr, first edition, vol. 36 and J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 406), married him to his grand-daughter Dhiewber Sultan, a daughter of Selim II. (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 392: summer of 1562). It was not till five years later that he received the three horse-tails as a west related by marriage (damûd) like Mehmedme Şokollu Pasha. In the meanwhile he had carried out several of his great exploits at sea and attained the reputation of one of the greatest of Ottoman admirals. Along with Torghud Reš, at the instigation of the French ambassador d’Aramon, he had harassed the coast around Naples, besieged and taken Reggio and carried off its inhabitants into slavery. In 982 (1555) he endeavoured in vain to besiege Elba and Piombino (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 418) and finally took the fortified harbour of Oran in Algeria with 45 galleys. In the following year with 60 warships he occupied the port of Bizerta (Bent-Zert) and a year later ravaged Majorca with 150 galleys and burned Sorrento near Naples. In 995 (1558) he lay inactive with his fleet, 90 in number, before Valona in Albania in order to watch the enemy fleets there which were preparing an enterprise against Djerba and Tripolis. July 31, 1560 saw his greatest exploit at sea, namely the capture of Djerba which had shortly before been taken by the Spaniards; this he did with 120 ships setting out from Modon. On Sept. 27, 1666, he held his triumphal entry into Stambul, to which he had sent in advance the news of his victory by a galley (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 421 sqq.). The Grand Admiral did not take the sea again till four years later when in Aug. 1564 he took the little rocky peninsula of Peñón de Vélez de la Gomera from the Spaniards and in order to prepare for the conquest of Malta, which the sultan’s favourite daughter Mihrâbah [see MİRÊM PASHA] was conducting with all her resources. This time however fortune no longer favoured him, for the siege of Malta in June—July 1565 failed against the heroic defence of the Christian defenders who performed miracles of bravery and inflicted heavy losses on the Ottomans. During the Hungarian campaign of Sulimân in the spring of 1566 Piele Pasha was placed in charge of the harbour and arsenal of Stambul (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 438), after previously undertaking a successful raid on Chios and the Apulian coast (ibid., iii. 506 sqq.) in which the island of Chios and its harbour passed into his hands (Easter Sunday 1566). Under Selim II, his father-in-law, he was disgraced and deprived of office of Grand Admiral; because, it was alleged, he had kept the greater part of the booty of Chios for himself (according to the report of the embassies of Albrecht de Wijis of May 1568 in J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iii. 782) and replaced by Mu’ezzîn-râde ‘Ali Pasha. He at once endeavoured to regain the imperial favour by new exploits at sea. In April 1570, he set sail with 75 galleys and 30 galleots, landed first of all on the island of Tine which he captured and next took part in the conquest of Cyprus. On January 20, 1578 — according to Ottoman sources on the 12th Dhu’l-Ka‘da 985 (Jan. 21, 1578) — he died in Stambul according to Stephan Gerlach (cf. his Tage-Buch, Frankfurt a.M. 1674, p. 448). His vast estates passed some time to the imperial treasury and some to his widow and children. His widow later married the third west Mehmed Pasha and his second son became Sandjak Bey of Klein (Clissa) above Splot (Spalato in Dalmatia) in 1584 (cf. the Italian record quoted by J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., iv. 104, note 1: La
PIASTRE. [See GHIJAS.]

PIE. [See PFL.]

PINANG or PILAU PINANG, an island on the western shore of the Malay Peninsula, lying in latitude 5° 24' N. and longitude 100° 21' E. The area is 276 km²; it is separated from the mainland by a channel from 3 to 16 km. broad. The town of Pinang is built on the northeastern promontory, 4 km. off the shore of the mainland. The official names, Prince of Wales' island and Georgetown, never became popular and exist only in official documents. — The island was acquired in 1786 for the East India Company against a yearly payment from the Sultan of Kedah by an agreement with Capt. Light, who founded the colony in the same year. He hoped the place would become an emporium of the eastern seas. It was practically uninhabited at the time and was made a penal settlement shortly afterwards. It remained the penal station of India till 1857. In 1805 it became a separate Presidency. When in 1826 Singapore and Malaca were incorporated with it, Pinang continued to be the seat of government; in 1837 Singapore was made the capital. In 1867 the Straits Settlements were created a Crown Colony; since that year Pinang has been under the administrative control of a resident responsible to the Government of the Straits. He is assisted by officers of the Malay Civil Service. Unofficial members of the legislative council of the colony, which holds its sittings in Singapore, are appointed with the sanction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to represent Pinang. — Pinang has an excellent harbour, which is important as a port of call; there is regular steamer-communication with the Dutch East Indies, Singapore, (British) India etc. The terminus of the Federated Malay States' railways is on the mainland opposite. Trade is adversely affected however by the proximity of Singapore, there are no port duties. — The island is now well opened up, the population has rapidly increased; it is largely Chinese and Tamil, though Malays are well represented, most of these originating from the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra; all of them are Muhammadans of the Shāfi‘ī rite. — Wellesley Province, a strip of land opposite on the mainland, forms part of the settlement of Pinang. It was acquired in 1800 from the Sultan of Kedah against a yearly sum paid for it and includes a district which was purchased in 1874 from the Sultan of Perak. The soil is well cultivated; there are large estates owned by Europeans and Chinese. Until recently a second strip of territory on the mainland and adjoining islands, known as the Dindings, formed part of the settlement; it was ceded by Perak and has now been restored to that state. — The population of the whole settlement, Dindings included, was 304,000 according to the census of 1921, that of the town 133,000; the number of Muhammadans is not known.


(K. A. KERN.)

PIR (F.), elder. In the Sufi system he is the murshid, the "spiritual director". He claims to be in the direct line of the interpreters of the esoteric teaching of the Prophet and hence has the authority to guide the aspirant (murid) on the path. But he must himself be worthy of imitation. "He should have a perfect knowledge, both theoretical and practical, of the three stages of the mystical life and be free of fleshly attributes". When a pir has proved — either by his own direct knowledge or by the spiritual power (wilāyāt) inherent in him — the fitness of a murid to associate with other Sufis, he lays his hand on the aspirant's head and invests him with the bāb. The murid need not necessarily invest his fortune with that pir who gave him instruction, who is called the fārār al-akhir. Pir also is the title given to the founders of dervish orders.


PIRĪ MEHMED PASHA, an Ottoman grand vizier, belonged to Amasia and was a descendant of the famous Djalal al-Din of Agramay and therefore traced his descent from Ali Bakr. He took up a legal career and became successively Khal of Sofia, Silifke and Galata, administrator of Mehemel li's kitchen for the poor (timarī) in Stamboul and at the beginning of the reign of Bayazid II attained the rank of a first defterdar (bāb defterdar). In the reign of Selim I he distinguished himself by his wise counsel in the Persian campaign (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 412, 437 1599); was sent in advance to Tahir to take possession of this town in the name of the sultan, and at the end of Sept. 1514 was appointed third vezir in place of Muṣṭafâ Pasha who had been dismissed (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 420). He temporarily held the office of a ḥārīma ṣafā in Stamboul and after the end of the Egyptian campaign was appointed grand vizier in place of Yūnus Pasha, who had been executed on the retreat from Egypt in 923 (1517). In this capacity he took part in the conquest of Baghdad in 1521. Soon after the occupation of Rhodes, Pirı Pasha fell from the sultan's favour as a result of the slanders of the envious Aymad Pasha who coveted his office, and was dismissed with a pension of 200,000 aspers on the 13th Sha'bān 929 (June 27, 1523). His successor was Ibrahim Pasha [q. v.], a Greek from Parga. Pirı Mehemel lived another ten years and died in 939 or 940 (1532-1533) at Silifki, where he was buried in the mosque founded by him. One of his sons, Mehemel Beg, had proceeded him in 932 as governor of Bursa. Pirı Mehemel Pasha created a number of charitable endowments, among them a mosque in Stamboul called after him (cf. Hüsi Hüseyn, Hafizat al-Dżiwan, i. 708), a medrese and a public-kitchen as well as what was known as a láb-khâne. — While his läqab was Pirı, he used Remzi as a nāmeh for his
poems, which are of moderate merit (cf. J. v. Hammer, "Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst," ii., 347 sqq., with the wrong year of death and also in p. 187 under Pirî without the identity of the two being recognized, also Lütghi, "Tudâhveri," p. 188 under Kemâl).

**Bibliography:** Mehmed Thauray, "Sügilt-i Şofâmül," iii. 43, more fully in "Othmanıâzade Mehmed İlyî Şofâmül," Istanbul 1271, p. 22 sqq., and the Ottoman chroniclers of the xvii. century. - Brunat Mehmed Tâhir, "Othmanıâzade Mehmed Tâhir," i. 111 sqq., deals with Pirî Mehmed Paşa as a literary man. According to p. 111 he wrote a small collection of poems ("Tüvâhvel") and an exposition of a part of the "Mehmed ve oflulü" entitled "Tûvâhvel". No further works are described as still in MSS. (Frank Baringer)

**PIRÎ MÜHYİ İ-L-DIN RETS**, OTTOMAN NAVIGATOR AND CARTOGRAPHER, was probably of Christian (Greek) origin and is described as nephew of the famous corsair Kemal Reis (on the latter see the Bonn dissertation by Hans-Albrecht von Bursak, "Kemal Reis," ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der türkischen Flotte, Bonn 1926, and especially J. H. Mommsen, "Zur Lebensgeschichte des Kemal Reis," in M.S.O.S., xxii., part ii., Berlin 1925, p. 29 r. and p. 424 sqq.), who was probably a renegade. His father is said to have been a certain Mardhût Mehmed, while he himself in the preface to his sailing-book calls himself the son of Hâdivet Hâcir, which is perhaps only to be taken as a name-chosen to rhyme with Pirî (cf. Sinâs h. Abd al-Mannâf or Dâdât h. Abd al-Wâdât and similar rhyming names of fathers of renegades usually formed with "âdât"). As Hâcir cannot be an "âdât" but at most a medhiyâ, the pure Turkish descend of Pirî is more than doubtful, if he was not called simply Hâcir Mehmed, i.e. bore a name for which there is evidence, for a longer period it is true, in the "Sügilt-i Şofâmül," ii. 259. The same source (p. 44) says that the corsair's full name was Pirî Mühyî "I-l-Din Ret." In any case it may be assumed that Pirî is to be taken as a "tâhir," while the real name ("âdât") was probably Mehmed - the combination Pirî Mehmed was quite customary in the xvi. century - i.e. an "âdât" to which Mühyî I-l-Din corresponded as "âdât" (cf. ib., xi. 1921, p. 20, note 3). Of the life of Pirî Reis, who made many voyages under his uncle Kemal Reis (d. 16. Shawwal 916 = Jan. 16, 1511) and later distinguished himself under Ebnal-Din Barbarossa, (q.v.; July, 1546) we only know that on these raids he had acquired an unrivalled knowledge of the lands of the Mediterranean. He afterwards held the office of Kapudan of Egypt and in this capacity sailed from Suez on voyages to the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea. In 945 (1547) he occupied 'Aden (cf. Die Osmanische Chronik des Rustem Pacha, ed. by Ludwig Förster [Turk. Bibl., xxii., Leipzig 1925], p. 174 sqq., with full commentary). In 952 (1551) he was on the coast of Arabia several of his 30 ships, took the port of Mekâz and carried off a number of his inhabitants as slaves. He then laid siege to Hormuz, but raised the siege and returned to Bâçara, having captured tribes to do so. It is said (according to Petroni, "All, Hâdivet Hâcir, Tûvâhvel-i Şofâmül," first edition, fol. 28 according to J. v. Hammer, G. O.K., ii. 415) that an enemy fleet was approaching and decided him to return hurriedly home with only 3 galleys but with all the treasure he had collected. He was wrecked on the island of Bahrân, but succeeded with two ships in reaching Suez, then Cairo. Köbab Paşa, the governor of Bâçara, had in the meanwhile reported to the Porte that the expedition had been a failure, which resulted in an order for the execution of Pirî Reis's being sent to Cairo. He was beheaded there, in 962 (1554-1555), it is said, but probably rather in 959 or 960 and his estate sent to Istanbul. After his death envoys are said to have arrived from Bâckos representing the plundered inhabitants to demand the return of the treasure he had carried off; they were naturally not successful. The post of Kapudan of Egypt was given to another noted corsair, Murad, the dismissed sanjakbey of Kastî (probably the same as survives in the proverb, according to H. F. v. Diez, "Deutschstädtischen von Aachen," part i., Berlin 1814, p. 55, as Murad häfizan).

Pirî Reis is generally known as the author of a sailing-book of the Aegean and Mediterranean known as Bâbîriye, in which he describes all the coasts he had voyaged along with an account of the currents, shallows, landing-places, bays, straits and harbours. Pirî Reis had already begun the work in the reign of Selim I (d. Sept. 1520) although he says in the preface that he did not begin it till 927 (end of 1520), in order to make a dedication to Selim the Magnificent be more impressive. He presented the completed atlas to the latter in 930 (1525). Paul Kahle has published a copy of this atlas with text and translation based on the known manuscripts, entitled Pirî Reis, Bâbîriye. Das türkische Segelhandbuch für das Mittelmeer von dem Jahre 1522 of which so far (middle of 1935) vol. i., text, part i. and vol. ii., part i. section 1-28, have been published, Leipzig and Berlin 1926. Separate sections have been previously published, e.g. H. F. v. Diez, op. cit.; E. Sachau, "Bibliothek der Nasciati di Michel Amari," ii., Palermo 1910, p. 1 sqq. R. Herrzog, "Ein türkisches Werk über das ägäische Meer aus dem Jahre 1520," in Mittellungen der Kaiserlichen Deutschen Archäologischen Institute, Akademie der Wissenschaften, xxvii., 1903, p. 417 sqq.; E. Obertammer, section Zypern, in: Die Insel Zypern, Munich 1903, p. 427-434. - Other sections in Carlier de Fignon, ed. E. Blchet (with pictures) and K. Förster, in M.S.O.S., part ii., xi. 1908, p. 234 sqq. Cf. thereon F. Taeschner in Z.D.M.G., lxviii. (1923), p. 42 with other references.

The so-called "Columbus map", found in October 1929 by Khalil Edhem Bey in the Sersa Library in Stamboul, according to his signature on it of the year 1513, seems also to go back to Pirî Reis; it is in Turkish in bright colours on parchment, 85 by 60 cm., and represents the western part of a map of the world. It comprises the Atlantic Ocean with America and the western strip of the Old World. The other parts of the world are lost. It has been supposed that this is the same map as Pirî, according to a statement in his Bâbîriye, presented to Sultan Selim in 1517 which would explain its preservation in the Imperial Library. On it cf. Paul Kahle, "Impronte Colombiane in una Carta Turcha del 1513," in La Cultura, year x., vol. 1, part 10, Milan 1931, d., "Una mappa di America fatta per il turch Pirî Reis, nel anno 1513," basandosi in una mappa de
PIR MURHY 'L-DIN REES — PISHWA

Callén y en maps portugueses, en Investigación y
Progresso, v. 12, Madrid 1931, p. 169 sqq. "C"
In the Illustrated London News, cxxxi., N. 4845
On Feb. 27, 1932, p. 307: A Columbus Contro
versy — and two Atlantic charts (with reproduction);
K. Kahie; the different Columbus-Karte No. 198
in einer dörflichen Weltkarte von 1513 (with
9 maps, 52 pp., Berlin and Leipzig 1932), also
Eugen Oberhumer, Eine dörfliche Karte zur
Entdeckung Amerika, in Ansicht der Akademie
Der Wissenschaften zu Wien, phil.-hist. Kl., 1931,
p. 99–112; d.o., Eine Karte des Columbus in
der dörflichen Weltkarte von 1513, in Mitteilungen der
Geographischen Ges. zu Wien, 1933, p. 115 sqq.
and lastly P. Kahie in Geographical Review, 1935,
p. 62–63.

Bibliography: Hádži Jalila, Džahanmán, Stambul 1145, p. 11; d.o., Tukušt al-Ḳibár fi
Estaf al-Bírýán, Stambul 1142, p. 28; d.o., Káší
er al-Zamán, ed. G. Finley, ii. 22 sqq. (No. 1689);
Mehmed Thureriy, Siúd-dží šeštámí, ii. 44; P.
Kahie, ed. cit., Introduction; Hans V. Milč, Píš
Rees und seine Kinder, in Beiträge zur
der Geschichte und Geographie etc., ed. by Hans V. Milč, Leipizg and Vienna 1929, p. 60–76.

(ERZ HAHNEN)

PISHWA, the title given to one of the
ministers of the Bahmanis of the
Deccan; the chief minister of Shāhidī,
the head of the Marāḥṭa confederacy.
(Persian “leader”; Pahl. pāšgbā; Arm. pāshpāy.)
For older forms see Häschenmann, Aramäische
Grammatik, l. 250.

Shāhidī, the founder of the Marāḥṭa political power in the Dakhan, was assisted by a council of ministers
known as the Asha Pradan, one of whom was
the Pīšwa or Mūghiya Pradan. The office of
Pīšwa was not hereditary and the nature of
Shāhidī’s autocratic rule can be gauged from the
fact that his ministers were not even permitted
to select their own subordinates or nāṣbā, all of
these being appointed by Shāhidī himself. Next
to Shāhidī the Pīšwa was the head of both the
civil and military administration, placing his seal
on all official letters and documents. During the
reign of Rājā Ram the power of the Pīšwa was
eclipsed by that of the Pand Pratānī. It is usual
to regard Bālādī Viswanāth (1741–20) as the
first Pīšwa because he was the real founder of
a line of rulers who gradually supplanted the
rājās of Satār as heads of the Marāḥṭa confederacy.
But there were really six pīšwās before his
time, namely, Sāmānī Nīlkanth Røcerkar,
Moro Trimbad Pīngl, Nīlkanth Moreshwar Pīngl,
Parrārām Trimbad Pratānī, Bahrī Moreshwar
Pīngl, and Bālādī Viswanāth Bātī (1714–1720), the founder of the dynasty of the pīšwās, was an able Cīpāw, and Konkanasth Brahman whom Shāhī
(1708–1749) appointed as chief minister. The
difficulties facing Shāhī, the political confusion in
Mahārāstra, and the weakness of the later
rājās of Satār were the chief factors underlying the
growth of the power of the pīšwās. The
imprisonment of the Pratānī Dādōba (Djagul-
vanīro) at the time of Shāhī’s death removed
another obstacle to their advancement and marks
the end of Dešghār Brahman political influence
in the Dakhan. Bālādī Viswanāth found the country
torn by civil war; he left it peaceful and prosperous.
By complicating the revenue accounts he increased

Brahman control over the state finances. During
his period of office the Mughal emperor, Muhammad
Shāhī, recognized the right of Shāhī to levy tax, a
contribution of one-fourth of the land revenue
throughout the Dakhan, and permitted him to
supplement this tax by an additional tenth of
the land revenue, called narsuzukhi. His son,
Rājā Rāo I (1720–1740), adopted a policy of
territorial aggrandizement. The year before his
death, a treaty, principally of a commercial nature,
was concluded with the Governor of Bombay
(Altcshion, vi., 1758). The third Pīšwa, Bālādī
Rājā Rāo (1740–1761), entrusted the government
to his cousin, Sadāghīv Rāo, the Bākū, and the
command of his armies to his brother, Raghunāth
Rāo, better known as Raghoba. His period of
office was marked by the rapid extension of
Marāḥṭa power, his armies ravaging the country
from the Carnatic to the Panjāb until their crushing
defeat at Pānpat [q.v.] in 1761. As a result of
an agreement in 1755 an Anglo-Marāḥṭa expedition
crushed the power of Anjara, a piratic chief whose
depredations were a constant menace to the shipping of the Konkan coast. At the end of this expedition a
peace treaty (Altcshion, vi., 1759) was made with the
Pīšwa which provided for the exclusion of
Dutch traders from Marāḥṭa territory. Dissensions
broke out after the death of the pīšwā which
seriously impaired the strength of the Marāḥṭas.
Power now passed to the Marāḥṭa generals, Siddhān
of Gwalior, Bhūsāl of Nāgāpur, Hālīrā of Indore,
and the Gaekwar of Baroda.

During the rule of Mādho Rāo (1764–1772)
Siddhān, in 1771, once more re-established Marāḥṭa
influence in northern India, and Shāhī ‘Alam, the
Mughal emperor, who had deserted the English,
became a puppet under Marāḥṭa control. Mādho
Rāo was succeeded by his brother, Nārāyān Rāo
(1772–1773), who was murdered at the instigation of
his uncle Raghoba. For a time the Marāḥṭa confederacy was divided into two hostile camps, the
supporters of Raghoba, who was a pretender
to the pīšwāship, and the Court Party under
Nīlkanth Phadnavis, who supported the claims
of Mādho Rāo Nārāyān (1774–1775), a posthumous
son of Nārāyān Rāo. The action of the Bombay
Government in supporting the claims of Raghoba
led to war between the English Company and the
Marāḥṭa which ended, thanks to the exertions of
Warren Hastings, with the Treaty of Sālihān
in 1782. This treaty which virtually recognized
the independence of Siddhān secured peace between
the English and the Marāḥṭas for twenty years.
Marāḥṭa history now becomes a struggle between
Nīlkanth Phadnavis (Bālādī Dādanīl), who
attempted to bolster up the power of the pīšwā,
and Māhāṇḍī Siddhān, who strove to control the
Pīšwa in order to use him as a cloak to cover
his aggressions.

The seventh and last pīšwā was Rājā Rāo II
(1796–1818). During the governor-generalship
of the Marquis Wellesley after the death of Nānā
Phadnavis, in 1800, there followed a struggle for
supremacy at Pāna between Hālīrā and Dāwālī
Rāo Siddhān, who had succeeded Māhāṇḍī Siddhān
in 1794. During this struggle the Pīšwa fled
to Bāsīn where they were thrown upon the protection
of the English. In 1802, by the Treaty of Bāsīn
(Altcshion, vi., 1803), Wellesley constituted
himself protector of the Pīšwa who agreed to
accept a “subsidiary” force and to permit the
English to mediate in his disputes with the other Indian princes. This naturally did not prove acceptable to the other members of the Marāṭhā confederacy. Unfortunately Bājjī Kāo came under the influence of an unprincipled favourite, Trimbakdāji, who was privy to the murder of the Gaekwār's emissary who had been invited to Pūna under a guarantee from the English of his personal safety. When Elphinstone, the Resident, reported that the Pishwā was secretly conspiring to form a Marāṭhā coalition against the English, the Pishwā was forced to come to terms and sign the Treaty of Pūna (1817), which completed the work of bassein. But Bājjī Kāo’s promises were written in water for, when Lord Hastings proceeded to crush the Marāṭhās, the Pishwā rose in revolt and plundered the British Residency. Eventually his forces were defeated and the pishāwīp was abolished. Bājjī Kāo, however, was granted a pension and allowed to reside at Bīthūr where he died in 1851. His adopted son, Nānā Sāhīb, disappeared in 1858.


PIST (V.), a kind of food composed of the liver of galleles or almonds etc. A daily portion of the size of a pistachio (pistā) is taken by the Persians and others who undertake long fasts, e.g. the forty-day fast and is sufficient to maintain life.

Bibliography: Vullers, Lexion Persico-Latinum, s. v. pīst, illa. (K. LELY)

PLATO. [See ÅKH PIN.]

PLEVEN (Pleven, Plevna, Turkish Pleven پیلوان), an important town in Northern Bulgaria, 350 feet above sea-level in a depression formed by the little river Teubenca (c 20), which flows not far from the town on the right into the Vid, the right bank tributary of the Danube. Surrounded by hills and at the intersection of the high roads to Vidin, Nikopol, Sofia and the passes of the Balkans, Pleven has long been a place of strategic importance; it is now also covered by one of the main railway lines (Sofia-Plevna-Summ-Varna). This busy town, the capital of a circle, where the chief business is in cattle and wine, and which has museums, which recall the Russo-Turkish War, is rising rapidly and in 1926 had 29,065 inhabitants.

Although in the vicinity of Plevna there are the remains of Roman settlements, the town really arose only under the Turks. We have however very little definite information about this period of the town’s history. Ewliyā Celebi’s statement that Plevna was built by the Wallachian ban Lădă (ł, Ł), has of course to be taken with caution; on the other hand, his assertion that “in the year 720 (1320) in the time of the Ghārī Khdāwāndīgūr it was taken by Mīkhāl Beg,” is not free from objections on chronological grounds. According to the same writer, Plevna after the conquest was an armed town and Mīkhāl Beg and at a later date was still within the sphere of influence of the noble family of the Mīkhāl-oghu [q.v.], who had several buildings erected there. According to Ewliyā Celebi and other Turkish sources (cf. vol. iii, p. 492a and Gavanī Shāhīng namūnā drūtā, xxii, 73 and 81), Plevna is the last resting-place of Mēmēd Beg, a son of Köse Mīkhāl, who died in 825 (1422), as well as of the celebrated ‘Alī Beg Mīkhāl-oghu, who is said to have died after 1507. According to Ewliyā Celebi, ‘Alī Beg was buried in the mosque founded by him. That Plevna was the capital of a district in the sandak of Nikopol we know not only from Ewliyā Celebi but also from Bājī Kā’s Khaifā (Rūmeil and Būna, transl. b. V. Hammer, Speno, xvii. 23). In the xvith century, when Ewliyā Celebi visited the town, it had 2,000 houses, a walled fortress, a college founded by the above-mentioned ‘Alī Beg, 7 schools, 6 tekke’s and 6 inns etc. — In the last days of Turkish rule, Plevna had, according to Sh. Sūm (Xwān al-šām, 1533-1533), 17,000 inhabitants and 18 mosques but, as many Muslims migrated after the Russo-Turkish war, the population sank to 14,000 and most of the mosques were described in 1889 as in ruins.

But it was not till the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878 that Plevna became world famous. When the Russians after crossing the Danube on July 19, 1877 appeared before Plevna, they met with the unexpected resistance of ‘Othmān Pasha, who had come up from Vidin. They attacked unsuccessfully on July 20 and 30 and suffered heavily. As Plevna was not fortified, ‘Othmān Pasha now had strong and extensive earthworks thrown up around it. On Sept. 11 and 12 the Russians with the help of the Romanians, whom they had summoned to their assistance, made a third attempt to take Plevna by storm and were again repulsed with great losses. After all these and further failures (on Sept. 18 and Oct. 19) the allies decided upon and began a regular siege of the town which was conducted by Totleben, the defender of Sebastopol, in person.

In spite of all ‘Othmān Pasha was not yet shut in on his west side and received munitions and supplies from there until Oct. 10. In the middle of November he was completely surrounded and on the morning of Dec. 10 he undertook a last desperate sortie in an attempt to break through the western lines of the besieging army of 120,000 men (including the Czar). This bold effort was accompanied by success for a few hours but in the meanwhile the heroic ‘Othmān Pasha (the “Lion of Plevna”) was himself wounded, and towards midday on the same day was finally forced to surrender with some 40,000 men. The Russians
had already forced their way into Plevna, the five months' siege of which had cost them and the
Russians over 40,000 men.

The fall of Plevna opened the way for the Russian soldiers to Adrianople and on to San Stefano,
where they dictated the peace which was then concluded.

Bibliography: (in addition to references in the text): Ewliya Celi, Seyahatnamesi, vi.
Istanbul 1838, p. 164–165; P. Kanitz, Donau-
Bulgarien und der Balkan, Leipzig 1882, ii.
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Meyers Rechensicher: Türkei etc., Leipzig–Vienna
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Internationale, 1933, p. 319).
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PLEVNA. [See PLEVEN.]

POLEI, transcribed by Arab writers as پلی, is the old name of a stronghold in the south of
Spain the site of which is the modern Aguilas de la Frontera, a little town with about
13,000 inhabitants, in the province of Cordova, on the shores of Cabra and of Lucena. The
identification of Polei with Aguilas was made by Dyos on the strength of information supplied
by a charter of 1328. The town which played a considerable part in the rising of the famous "hafšan
[k.v.] against the Umayyads emirs of Cordova is again mentioned in the xth century by the
geographer al-Idrisi. The ruins of a fortress
which dates from the Muslim period can still be seen there.

Bibliography: al-Idrisi, Description de
l'Espagne, ed. and trans. by Dyos and de Goeje,
text, p. 205; trans., p. 255; Hbn Haiyan, Muqadba,
MS. of the Bodleian, facsim.; Dyos, Historia des
Muslimam d'Espagne, new ed., Leyden 1932, ii.
62 sqq.; do., Kircheriès, i. 307.

(E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

POMAK, the name given to a Bulgarian
speaking Muslim in Bulgaria and Thrace.
This name which is usually given them by their
Christian fellow-countrymen, used also to be given
occasionally by Bulgarians to Muslims speaking
Serbian in western Macedonia. There however
the Serbian Muslims are usually called torbeši
(sing. torbec) by their Christian fellow-citizens, some
times also toruşlu, more rarely burci etc. How far
these Serbian Muslims are still called Pomaks by
some people depends mainly on the influence
of the Bulgarian school and literature and would
only be correctly applied when used of Muslims
who had actually migrated from Bulgaria, e.g. in
1828–1878 (cf. J. H. Vasiljević, Juna: Stara
Srbija, i. 187–188, 207 and 326). In the Khodopes
the Bulgarian Muslims are also called askriani
(ch = kh) or agorjani (Ishirkoff, ii. 15). In some
parts of Southern Serbia and Bulgaria the name
Grač (pl. Hlanč) is occasionally heard and it used
sometimes to be said (most recently by A. Urošević,
in Glasnik Skupštine munske drustva, vol. vi., 1929,
p. 319–320) that this name was only given to
Serbs converted to Islam; the truth seems to be
however that this name is limited to Turks in
the two countries (cf. H. Vasiljević, Musuljani,
xxviii., 1929, p. 616–614 and in Rečnik hrvatsko-
Srpskih i muguruških, djele, p. 449). No more correct
is the statement that pomeni is the name given
to Serbian Muslims in Southern Serbia; for this seems
to be a name applied to another one only to Albanians
who are closely related to one another (brothers and cousins, according to H. Vasiljević,
Musuljani, p. 34).

The origin and the etymology of these names in part more or less obscure and arbitrary.
The usual explanation that the name Pomak comes from the verb pomak "to help" and means helper
(pomakuloff) i.e. auxiliary troops of the Turks, was first given by F. Kanitz (Donau-
Bulgarien und der Balkan, vol. i., Leipzig 1882, p. 182) but was soon afterwards (1894) declared by Jireček
(see Bibli.) to be inadequate. Another equally improbable etymology is that which explains
Pomak by the Bulgarian word makedon "to torment,
force", and justifies this explanation by saying
that the conversion of the Bulgarians to Islam on a
considerable scale was carried out by force and
constraint (Ishirkoff, ii. 15). Quite recently Iv. Lekov
(see Bibli.) has explained the name Pomak from
posturnjak (lit. "one made a Turk");. Whether the
word torbeš in Turkish means "clab, cudgel", in
Ugur "Muslim" and in South Russia "pedlar"
(cf. Barthold, Oe. Asie, p. 82–83), is in any way
connected with Pomak, or has been influenced
by the Bulgarian posturnjak or confused with it
has still to be investigated.

The history of the conversion of the "Pomaks"
or "Torbeši" is very little known in detail. In
any case the adoption of Islam did not take place
everywhere at once but was gradual and at different
periods. A beginning was made immediately after
the battle of Marico (1371) and after the fall of
Trnovo (1393): many Serbs and Bulgars at this
time, especially as Jireček thinks, the nobles
and the Bogomils among these, adopted Islam. After
these first conversions under Bajram consider-
able numbers of converts were made according to
native tradition in the reign of Selim I (1512–
1520); for this purpose he is said to have sent
his "favourite Sinan Pasha" into the territory of
the Šar-mountain. The highlands of Čepino (in
the Rhodopes) were converted according to local
histories in the beginning of the xvth century,
according to Jireček (Fürstenkönig, p. 104) however,
ot till the middle, in the reign of Mehemed IV
(1623–1687); the grand vizier Mehemed Kopruli
is said to have taken a leading part in the work.

The conversion to Islam of the Dņube territory
(Laveč etc.) is put in this period. Towards the
end of this century (xvith) further conversions
took place among the Serbs in the Debar region.
In some districts Islam only gained a footing on
a large scale in the course of the xviith century
and sometimes not till the beginning of the xixth
(e.g. in Gora, south of Prizren).

Until recently one was very often inclined to
believe that these conversions to Islam were made
under compulsion, even by force of arms, but now
the view is beginning to prevail that the authorities
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never took any direct steps to proselytize their Christian subjects; conversion was on the contrary voluntary and for quite different reasons except in a few exceptional cases (cf. e.g. H. Vasiliev, Miusimani, esp. p. 53–61).

Towards the end of the sixteenth century when the process of conversion had ceased for decades everywhere, the great majority of the Slav Muslims (Bulgars and Serbs) were to be found in the Rhodopes and the mountains of eastern Macedonia and in groups of considerable size up and down Macedonia as far as the Albanian frontier, a wide area which stretched in the north from Plovdiv (Philippopolis) to Salonika in the south and in the east from the central course of the Arda over the Vardar and even beyond the Cni Drin, i.e. across the districts of Ohrid, Debar, Gostivar and Fierizen to the west. At that time only a small part of this territory which was interspersed with Christian areas belonged to the principality of Bulgaria; the greatest part was still Turkish and only after the Balkan War passed to Serbia or after the World War to Yugoslavia. — In addition to the main body of Muslim Bulgars in the Rhodopes mountains, there were at the same time also sporadic groups north of the Balkan range in the Danube territory, in the circles of Lovec, Pleven (Plevna) and Orshovo (Rahovo).

Since then however the frontiers of the "Pomaks" have receded considerably. During the siege of Plevna almost all the Bulgarian Muslims fled from the Danube districts to Macedonia; although they returned in 1880 they soon afterwards migrated into Turkey. After the union of eastern Rumania and Bulgaria in 1885 the Rhodopes "Pomaks" also began to emigrate. — The frontiers of the "Torbeli" likewise were not unaffected. The Balkan War and the World War brought about certain changes which resulted in the migration of some bodies of Serbian Muslims out of Southern Serbia.

As a result of various wars and the territorial changes that followed them, the statements regarding the number of Muslim Slavs in Bulgaria, Macedonia (or Southern Serbia) and Thrace as well as about their total number differ considerably and are often unreliable. For example Jireček (1886) estimated the total at about 500,000 including 100,000 in Lovec and Plevna (see Bibl.) At the beginning of the twentieth century Gavrilović (see Bibl.) estimated the total at only 400,000 and Inchirkoft at about the same (1917).

As regards the distribution of these Muslim Slavs according to countries the following statistics may be quoted. In what was to be the principality of Bulgaria Jireček estimated (1894) their number at most 28,000 souls and before the Balkan War there were within the old frontiers of Bulgaria (according to official statistics of 1910) 31,143 (0.49% of the population). In the lands acquired in the Balkan War in Southern Bulgaria there were however many more Pomaks, mainly in the regions of the rivers Arda, Mesta and Struma so that the official census of 1920 makes their number 58,399 (1.82% of the whole population). A somewhat higher figure is given by the Annuaire du Monde Musulman for 1929 (p. 395), namely 16,000 Pomaks in Bulgaria; proper statistics of 75,337 in Thrace, i.e. 91,337 in all. Finally the latest published statistics (1926 census) give 102,351 Bulgarian speaking Muslims in Bulgaria, i.e. 1.87% of the population, while the number of Muslims in Bulgaria without distinguishing their language was then 789,926 or 14.4% of the population. — Of these 102,351 Bulgarian speaking Muslims only 57,799 lived in the towns and the remaining 64,552 in the villages; the proportion of men to women was 1,000 in 1,005. Literate Pomaks in the whole of Bulgaria in 1926 numbered only 6,559 in 1926 (of whom 5,534 were men).

The number of Pomaks (in reality of Muslim Slavs) in Macedonia was according to S. Vuković (1894); see Bibl. 144,051 men (this figure is therefore doubled in Données statistiques sur l'ethnographie de la Macédoine, pub. by the Comité national de l'Union des organisations des émigrés macédoniens en Bulgarie, Sofia 1928, and ammends to 288,092 [with an error of minus ten souls]), according to G. Weigand (Die nationale Bestimmung der Balkanvölker, Leipzig 1898) 100,000 men, according to V. Kânov (1900; see Bibl.) 145,800 and according to V. Sis (Macedonien, Zürich 1918) 150,030 souls.

As regards the number of Serbian speaking Muslims in Southern Serbia, they were estimated by H. Vasiliev (Muslimi, ... p. 11 sqq.) whose calculations are however to some extent based on the situation before the Balkan War, at 100,000 souls; now (1935) the figure is put at 60,000 and the number of Serbo-Croat speaking Muslims in the whole of Yugoslavia at about 900,000 (exact figures cannot be given because the statistics according to religions have not been published).

For Thrace the figure of 75,337 Muslim Bulgars has already been given from the Annuaire; in Western Thrace there were according to the interzonal census (of March 1920) 11,739 (cf. La question de la Thracie, ed. by the Comité suprême des réfugiés de Thrace, Sofia 1927).

On these statistics the following observations may be made. The Bulgars (e.g. Kânov) usually include as "Pomaks" all the Macedonian Slavs of Muslim faith, i.e. including Serbs from Southern Serbia. On the other hand on account of their religion these Muslim Slavs are sometimes carelessly counted with the Turks. Moreover some statistics are not completely free from chauvinistic and political bias. The European estimates finally are based on approximations or are quite arbitrary.

In spite of the fact that the Pomaks and Torbes are occasionally included among the Turks and in spite of the fact that they sometimes call themselves Turks, they are nevertheless the purest stratum of the old Bulgarian or Serbian population as the case may be who have preserved their Slav type and Slav language (especially archaic words) very well, sometimes even better — as a result of their being cut off from the Christians and their isolation in outlying districts — than their Christian kinsmen, who have been constantly exposed to admixture from other ethnic elements. They have a certain feeling of aversion for the Turks whose language they do not understand. It is only in the towns that we find that in course of time some of these men have adopted the Turkish language. What bound them to the Ottomans was not language but principally a common religion with its prescriptions and customs (e.g. the veil of women) which along with Turkish rule naturally imposed upon them many Arabic and Turkish
words. In spite of this there survived among them many pre-Islamic customs and reminiscences of Christianity (observation of certain Christian festivals etc.).

That the Bulgarian Muslims in particular occasionally (esp. in 1876–1878) fought with the Turks against the Christian Bulgars may be ascribed to the fact that as a result of their low cultural level they made no clear distinction between nation and religion and that their Christian fellow-countrymen treated them as Turks and not as kinmen. These mistakes were repeated in the Balkan War when the victorious Bulgarian troops and the orthodox priests were led to so far as to convert the Pomaks in the Rhodopes and other districts to Christianity mainly by pressure and force of arms. But on the conclusion of peace they returned to Islam again. This is frankly admitted by the Bulgarian geographer Birkov (Ischirkoff) and the Bulgarian writer Iv. Karayov (in his Bulgarian periodical National Education, Kustendil 1931, according to Cemalpao [see Bibliography]).

Fifty or sixty years ago the songs and ballads of the "Pomaks" were the subject of much dispute. The Roumanian ex-cleric, Stefan Verkovic (1827–1903), an antique dealer in Serec, published under the title of Veda Slavena (i.e. the "Veda of the Slaves") (Bulg 1874, vol. i.) a collection of songs which were alleged to have been collected mainly among Pomaks and which celebrated "pre-christian and pre-historic" subjects (the immigration into the country, discovery of corn, of wine, of writing and legends of gods with Indian names, of Orpheus etc.). A. Chodzko, A. Doron (Chansons populaires bulgares indérites, Paris 1875; cf. also Recueil de littérature comparer, xiv., 1934, p. 155 xvi.) and L. Geindorfer (Poétique tradition Théocratique et laik, Prague 1878) also strongly supported belief in this "Veda": it was even assumed that the Pomaks were descended from the ancient Thracians, who had been influenced first by Slav culture and then by Islam.

But of ballads on such subjects neither the Mission nor the Christian Bulgars knew anything and Jireček, who investigated the question on the spot, repeatedly described this "Slav Veda" as the fabrication of some Bulgarian teachers (Führerthum, p. 107). We now know that Verkovic’s chief collaborator was the Macedonian writer Iv. Goljolov (cf. Pentscho Slawejkoff, Bulgarsche Volkhilder, Leipzig 1919, p. 15).

In view of the fact that the Muslims in question consist mainly of conservative dwellers in the mountains and villages — who are very industrious, honourable, and peaceful — they are for the most part illiterate and there could be no possibility of any literary activity amongst them. The only people among them who can write are the khodjas, who frequently use the Turkish language and Arabic alphabet when writing. They also frequently use the latter alphabet when writing their mother tongue. Of earlier generations of Bulgarian Muslims many distinguished themselves in the Turkish army or otherwise in the Turkish service. The modern generation who have been educated in the state schools have more national consciousness and are more progressive but are too few in number to make themselves felt in politics or otherwise.
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PONTIANAK, the name of a part of the Dutch territory "Wester-Afdeling" of Borneo, also of the Sultanate in the delta of the river Kapuas and of its capital. As a Dutch province Pontianak includes the districts of Pontianak, Kubu, Landak, Sanggau, Sekadau, Tajan and Millan. The administration is in the hands of an assistant-resident whose headquarters are in Pontianak where the Resident of the "Wester-Afdeling" also lives. The Dutch settlement is on the left bank of the Kapuas, where also is the Chinese commercial quarter. The Malay town lies opposite on the right bank. The sultanate of Pontianak with its capital of the same name is independent under the suzerainty of the Netherlands and is 4,545 sq. km. in area. In 1930 the population consisted of 100,000 Malays and Dayaks, 562 Europeans, 26,425 Chinese and 2,378 other Orientals. The term Malays includes all native Malaysians among them many descendants of Arabs, Javanese, Buginese, and Dayaks converted to Islam. The Dayaks
in the interior are still heathen. Roman Catholic missions are at work among the latter and the Chinese. This very mixed population is explained by the origin and development of Pontianak.

The town was founded in 1722 a.d. by the Sharif 'Abd al-Rahmân, a son of the Sharif Husein b. Ahmad al-Kadiri, an Arab who settled in Matan in 1735 and in 1771 died in Mampawa as viceroy revered for his piety. In 1742 'Abd al-Rahmân was born, the son of a Dayak concubine, and very early distinguished himself by his spirit of enterprise. He attempted to gain the ruling power, successively in Mampawa, Palembang and Banjarmasin, from which he had to retire with his band of pirates, although a certain Sultan had been his patron, after he had taken several European and native ships. By this time he had married a princess of Mampawa and Banjarmasin and possessed great wealth. On his return to Mampawa his father had just died. As he met with no successor here, he decided to found a town of his own with a number of other fortune-seekers. An uninhabited area at the mouth of the junction of the Landak with the Kapuas, notorious as a dangerous haunt of evil spirits seemed to him suitable. After the spirits had been driven away by huts of cannon fire he was the first to spring ashore, had the forest cut down and built rude dwellings there for himself and his followers.

The favourable position of the site and the protection which trade enjoyed there soon attracted Buginese, Mabys and Chinese merchants to it so that Pontianak developed rapidly and Sharif 'Abd al-Rahmân was able by his foresight and energy to hold his own against the neighbouring kingdoms of Matan, Sukadana, Mampawa and Sanggau.

He appointed chiefs over each of the different groups of people and regulated trade by reasonable tariffs. He was able to impress representatives of the East Indian Co. in Batavia to such an extent that they gave him the kingdoms of Pontianak and Sanggau as fiefs after the company had bought off the claims of Banten to Western Borneo. As early as 1772 the Buginese prince Kadja Ilyâdî had given him the title of sultan. After his death in 1808 his son sharif Kâsim succeeded him. He was the first to change the Arab ceremonial and court for more modern ways.

According to the treaty concluded with the Dutch Indies government in 1855, the sultan receives a fixed income from them while they administer justice and police of the country. The relationship to the Dutch Indies government has now been defined in a long agreement of 1912, which also settles the administration of justice and the taxes. From the local treasury, then constituted, the sultan receives 6,300 gulden a month; he also receives 50% of the excise on agriculture and mines.

In keeping with the nature of its origin Pontianak is predominantly Muslim in character and a relatively large number take part in the pilgrimage to Mecca. For these pilgrims who are known as Džagaj, the sultan when he performed the pilgrimage in the 80's founded several mehfil houses in the holy city.

The main support of the whole population is agriculture and along with it trade in the products of the jungle. The exports are copra, pepper, gambir, sago, rubber and roten, especially to Singapore and Java. Rice, clothing and other articles required by Europeans and the more prosperous Chinese and Arabs are imported. The import and export trade is mainly in the hands of the Chinese. They live together in the Chinese quarter in the European half of Pontianak on the left bank where also the other foreign Orientals have settled.

This is therefore the centre of trade and commerce in the valley of the Kapuas.

The Chinese traders maintain with their own steamers connections with the Chinese merchants farther up the river and also over seas with Singapore, both in competition with the Royal Pakefahrer Co.

In the swampy lands of Pontianak, intercourse with the outer world is almost exclusively by water. Only in recent years have motor-roads been laid over the higher ground from Pontianak to Mampawa and Sambas, to Sangei Kakap and from Mandor to Landak.

It may be particularly mentioned that Pontianak is a healthy place for the town is very often inundated and it is far from the sea that there is no malaria.


POONA. [See FUSU]

PORT SA'D, a Mediterranean seaport of Egypt at the entrance of the Suez Canal on its western bank, in 31° 18' 50" N., 33° 18' 42" E., 145 miles from Cairo by rail via Zagazig and Ismailiya, 36 and 125 miles from Damietta and Alexandria respectively along the coast. It was founded in 1859, as soon as the Suez Canal was decided, during the reign of Sa'id Pasha [i.e.], Viceroy of Egypt, and was named after him. Except for the strip of sand which, varying in width between 200 and 300 yards, separates Lake Manzala from the Mediterranean, the site of the present town was under the water. This site was selected by a party of engineers under Laroche and de Lesseps, not on account of being the nearest point across the isthmus to Suez, but because the depth of the water there corresponded most favourably to the requirements of the projected canal. As soon as work was started it was found that Canalet, five wooden houses were constructed above the water, supported on massive piles and equipped with a bakery and a water-distiller for the use of the pioneers. A year later, dredgers began to deepen the waters of the newly established harbour, and the mud thus raised was immediately utilized for more buildings which soon numbered 150 houses, 150 cottages, one hospital, one Catholic and one Orthodox Church, and one Mosque, besides the workshops, covering 30,000 square metres in all. This, however, did not suffice for the rapid growth of the population as the work on the Canal progressed towards Ismailiya. To meet this emergency and in the absence of stone quarters within reasonable reach of Port Sa'd, the manufacture of artificial stones capable of resisting the action of sea-water was begun by M essrs. Dussaud in 1865. Details of this process are given in 'Alt Paşa Mahbûrû's Ehtijat (x. 38—40). These stones weighed about 22 tons each and were used both for the construction of the two huge breakwaters of the outer harbour and for the construction of further building ground. In the same year, mail boats sailed up the Canal to Ismailiya while others brought imports to Port Sa'd. In 1868 the breakwaters were finished, and in 1869, the Canal was completed. As a result,
the town was thronged by consuls and representatives of many nations, and the population reached 10,000.

Like most Eastern foundations of this period, Port Sa'ïd was from the beginning markedly divided into Egyptian and European quarters. The first has grown up in the west and south-west around the mosque, officially inaugurated on Friday 14th Shaban 1300 (1883); and the second is situated near the Canal entrance and the beach towards the north and north-east. A regular water-supply now comes from the Nile by the Ismi'îyya Canal and the pipes leading to a large reservoir (château d'eau) capable of holding several days' supply. The great rapidity of the growth of Port Sa'ïd may be illustrated by the increase of its population, numbering 49,884 in 1907.

The town quickly rose to eminence as an emporium of Egyptian trade — second only to Alexandria in that country, and it also became one of the most important stations for sea-borne traffic between the East and the West. Its outer harbour, covering an area of 570 acres, its two moles or breakwaters built in such a way as to protect the Canal from the continuous outrush of sea-water and sand-drifts, and its docks numbering originally three on the western bank, all had to be extended. A large floating dock (250 ft. long, 85 ft. wide and 18 ft. deep, with a lifting capacity of 3,500 tons) was constructed; and, further, in the years 1903-1909, new docks were established on the eastern bank. To accommodate the workmen on these docks, the new town of Port Fu'nad, named after the present King of Egypt, has sprung up on the east side.

To safeguard the ships approaching the Canal by night, the Khedive Ismâ'il ordered four light-houses to be erected at the expense of the Egyptian Government at Rosetta, Burullûs, Burdji al-'Isha near Damietta, and Port Sa'ïd. The last is 174 ft. high and its beam is distinct from those of the other three and is visible at a distance of 20 miles. It lies at the base of the western mole which, at its sea-bound extremity, carries a colossal statue of Ferdinand de Lesseps by E. Fernier, unveiled in 1899.

Among the notable buildings of Port Sa'ïd are the offices of the Suez Canal Company. The town has a very cosmopolitan population and is noted for no special industry. Small dealers live on the sale of Oriental wares and curious to tourists on their passage to the East or to the West.

**Bibliography.** The chief contemporary source is 'Ali Pasha Mahârâk: al-Khitat al-Tunfisîyya, 2 vols., Cairo (Bâlâq) 1305-1306. See also 1. publications on the Suez Canal and its history; 2. the annual Tabûnî, Annuaire statistiques and the Trade Returns issued by the Egyptian Government and the Suez Canal Company; 3. guides to Egypt such as Bâdeker’s, Murray’s (ed. Mary Brodrick) and Cook’s (ed. Sir E. A. Wallis Budge). (A. S. ATIVA)

**POTIFAR.** [See KİRÎZ.]

**POZAREVAC** (pronounced 'Pâçarévâch', in the French orthography Pojarévarâ; Passarowitz is a corruption like the Turkish Pasarâcâ), a rising commercial town in Yugoslavia (in the Danube banate), headquarters of the district of the same name in the fertile plain between Morava and Mlava, only 10 miles from the Danube port of Dubrovica with 13,731 inhabitants (1930).

The town, the name of which is popularly connected with the Serbo-Croat word pohar ("fire") (M. B. Mîlîçevîch, Knjazina Srbija, Belgrad 1876, p. 172 and 1658), is first mentioned towards the end of the XVII century. It must however have been previously in existence and have become Turkish like the surrounding country in 1459. According to the Turkish treasury registers of Hungary of 1565 (A. Velic, Mûgâvarvâni vebh kincstâri defterleri, ii., Budapest 1890, p. 734), Pozarevac belonged to the Turkish sanjak of Semendire (Semendria, Smederevo), and in the middle of the XVIII century Hâddîî Khâlîfa describes it as the seat of a judge (básîlî). (cf. Spomenik, xviii., Belgrad 1894, col. 26). Towards the end of the century many Serbs migrated from Pozarevac and at the beginning of the XIX century it is sometimes mentioned as a village.

Pozarevac was however destined soon to become famous through the peace which ended the Austrian-Turkish war of 1716-1718. At the end of 1714 Turkey had already, declared war on Venice on the pretext that the peace of Carlowitz was not being observed and in 1715 occupied Morea and some of the Ionian Islands, Austria, which at first intervened to negotiate as an ally of Venice, on 1716 entered the war herself and her arms were led by Prince Eugene von Savoye through great victories, at Peterswarazie, Temesvár and Belgrad, so that England intervened to secure peace. After long preparations (cf. von Hammer, G. O. R. 2, iv. 159-164) the congress of Pozarevac was convoked. The negotiations at which plenipotentiaries of Turkey, Austria, Venice with England and Holland as mediators took part began on June 5, 1718 and the Treaty was signed on the 21st July.

Peace was concluded on a basis of the country actually held by the opponents at the time (nisi possestis); Austria retained the eastern part of Stiria, the banate with Temesvár, the whole of N. E. Serbia, with Belgrad, Pozarevac etc. and Little Wallachia; Venice also retained a few places she had taken on the Dalmatian and Albanian coasts, received certain commercial preferences and the island of Corfu (Turkish Korfu) and had to restore to Turkey the whole of the peninsula of the Morea and the south-eastern districts of the Herzegovina. By a commercial agreement which was also concluded in Pozarevac on July 27 Austria secured certain trading and other privileges in the Ottoman Empire.

Following the traditional formalities observed after the conclusion of a treaty of peace the first Turkish plenipotentiary Ibrahim Pasha went to Vienna with his retinue and Count Wirmont, the Austrian representative in the negotiations, to Constantinoile. A member of the Turkish embassy wrote in 1726 an interesting account which has been published by Fr. van Kralstiel in text and translation (Bericht über den Zug des Gross-Botschafters Ibrahim Pascha nach Wien im Jahre 1719, in S.B.A. Wien, vol. 158 [1908]), in T.O. E.M., vii. [1832 = 1916], 221-227, the Turkish text of this edition was reprinted by A. Reffig.

During the Austrian occupation (1718-1739) Pozarevac was the most important place in this territory. In the Serbion war of independence against Turkey it was besieged for a long period, and had finally to surrender to the Serbs (1804).

In 1815, the town again fell into Turkish hands but became Serbian again in 1815.
In the years of peace that followed (1815—1915) Požarevac developed. Prince Miloš in 1825 made it his second residence and had two konaks (palaces) built there. Shortly afterwards a Prussian officer visited the town and left interesting notes on the conditions there (Otto v. Pirch, Reise in Serbien im Spätherbst 1839, Berlin 1839, part i., p. 119—171). In the second half of the 18th century the population increased steadily but otherwise the town offered "little of interest" (F. Kanits, Serbien, Leipzig 1868, p. 13).

At the beginning of the 19th century Požarevac was one of the most important towns in Serbia. In the Great War it was occupied by the Germans in 1915 and by the Bulgarians (from Oct. 1916) but in the autumn of 1918 it was again occupied by the Serbs. Since then it has belonged to Yugoslavia.

Bibliography: (In addition to the references in the text) V. Bionchi [the Venetian plenipotentiary at the peace negotiations], Istoria relations della pace di Pozarevac, Padua 1719; ‘Abd-al-Rahman Sharaf, Ta‘rikh-e-Dawlet-i-Imamshāy, ii. (1312 = 1894), 140—147; G. Noradounghian, Recueil d’actes internationaux de l’empire ottoman, vol. i. (Paris 1897), p. 61—62 (N. 308 and 309), 208—216 (Latin text of the treaty of peace with Austria, and 216—220 (French résumé of it); Drag. M. Pavlovic, Poljskosrpski mir (1718—23); in Leipsic matice srpske, Novi Sad 1901, part 207, pp. 26—47, and part 208, pp. 45—80 (good historical study on the peace of Požarevac); V. Popovic, in Narodna enciklopedija, vol. iii. (Zagreb 1928), p. 428; Almanah kraljevine Jugoslavije, Zagreb 1930, i. 561; M. A. Jukanović, Požarevac, Požarevac 1934 (first attempt at a monograph on the town and its history).

(Fehim Bajraktarović)

**PRANG SABL, the name of the džihād [q.v.] in the East Indian archipelago; **prang (Indon.) = war.

The course of history has made it impossible for Muslims to fulfill their duties with respect to the džihād. The representatives of the law however still teach and the masses readily believe that arms should only be allowed to rest against the kōrfror so long as any sanctions must be despaired of. In a Mahammadan country under non-Muslim rule like the Netherlands Indies the teachers however prefer to be silent. At most they say that under the prevailing conditions there is no legal inducement to conduct the džihād in view of the superior forces and the comparative freedom enjoyed by believers. Or on the other hand, they expound particularly those texts which remove the more serious feuds between Muslim and kōrfror to the next world. — When political events, catastrophes, misfortunes of any kind result in disturbances, it is not at all uncommon for the Muslim population of the East Indian Archipelago to look at these things from a religious point of view. It may happen on such an occasion that the feeling of being bound to fight the unbeliever is thus awakened. If the leaders utter the war-cry "prang sabl", it finds a ready answer. It is true that according to the law, the signal for the džihād should be given by the imām. There is now no imām; but even in the time when the sultān of Turkey was still recognized as imām any misgivings were easily overcome if the imām remained inactive. Outside the boundaries of the territory in which the holy war is proclaimed, the silent sympathy of the believers is with the fighters. Any forcible conversion which takes place anywhere in the Archipelago is generally praised by Muslim chiefs and represented as a fulfillment of the more solid obligations of the džihād.

This practical teaching of the prang sabl was of particular importance in Atjeh in the last quarter of the 19th century. Circumstances were very much in its favor. The Atjehese were a self-satisfied people, convinced of their own superiority and also of a warlike disposition. Non-Muslims were everywhere hated or at least despised. At the same time those individuals who were in any way connected with divine worship were held in great honour. These qualities were however not in themselves sufficient to conduct a prang sabl with success against a disciplined attacking power. A military leader was necessary. There was indeed a sultān in Atjeh but he was a negligible factor as regards the situation in the country. The chiefs, the real rulers of the land, preferred to confine themselves to their own territory; they were not fitted for co-operation. Bands of armed men ravaged the country, doing the kōrfror as much damage as possible but they could raise no claim for general co-operation and assistance as they were not waging war in the way Allah had willed. The law lays down the sources from which the costs of the džihād can be met; pillage and plundering, as was the practice of these bands, could never be blessed by Allah. In addition the organisation of these bands was such that they never held together long. In these circumstances it was the 'ulāmā (also used as a singular) who took in hand the organisation of the war; among these the most prominent were the 'ulāmā of Tīro, from olden times a centre of study of sacred lore. They reproached the chiefs with their slothfulness and the people with preferring worldly advantages to heavenly rewards. Going up and down the country they preached the doctrine of the džihād and there was no one who could openly oppose them; indeed they represented the divine law, in order to be able to wage war a war-cloth was needed. The 'ulāmā claimed the share of the zadār set aside for Allah's purposes. The 'ulāmā of Tīro in particular needed it to train a strong force of duly converted recruits. The 'ulāmā were for a long time the soul of the war. It is however clear that the authority which they had gained over the secular rulers could only last so long as they were able to inspire the people to continue fighting. When the war was over, they returned to their old still very influential position as representatives of the holy law. — Variouws writings which together form a regular war literature, proved an effective means of inspiring their warriors with enthusiasm. They were an accompanying feature of the prang sabl. "Ulamā" wrote pamphlets and tracts in which attention was called to the duty of waging the holy war; emphasis was laid on the heavenly reward that awaited the zadār, and the kōrfror to be overcome were painted in the blackest colours. An elaborate poem, the Hijāza Prang sabl (1905), of which there were many versions, was specially intended to be declaimed in order to increase the courage and contempt for death of those who heard it.

Bibliography: C. Snauck Hurgonje, De Atjehers, Batavia 1895—1894, i. 183 sq.; B.
towards the temple, the nose straight or even aquiline, and often slightly rounded at the tip. There is little or no prognathism, the hair is ringlety and often straight... On his chin a man wears a scraggy tuft of beard. The eyes are almond-shaped and overhung by long black silky lashes. The beauty of countenance and graceful carriage of Fulan women are well known. In character the Fula is distrustful and shy, shrewd and artful. No African native can equal him for dissimulation and finesse*

This estimate coincides on the whole with that of the observers previously mentioned. Passage calls them "eine ritterliche Nation", in the sense that they despise both manual labour and trade, regarding war, the chase and the care of cattle as the only occupations worthy of a man. They have more dignity and force of character than the negro; at the same time, "trau ich dem Fula (sic) mehr überlegte Hinterlist als Er ist der grösseste Charakter, aber noch im gegebenen Moment der grösseste Schakke". Barth, also, says (ii. 505): "Die lebenswürdige Seele im Charakter der Fula ist ihre Einsicht und ihre Lebhaftigkeit, während sie andererseits einen ausserordentlichen natürlichen Hang zur Bosheit haben und bei weitem nicht so gutmütig sind wie die eigentlichen Swaruns."

Passage describes them as "fanatikal in religion", but, as the nomad Fulbe are still, at any rate to some extent, pagan (Meek, i. 200 and elsewhere), this must refer to the settled Fulbe, called by the Haussa Fulaman Gibi, who would seem to have been converted to Islam, like the other tribes of Nigeria, about the eleventh century (Meek, ii. 1—11). Those settled Fulbe are "by fire intermarriage and wholesale concubinage with the races whom they have conquered, fast being assimilated by the negro. Their noses are broadening, their lips are thickening, their hair is curling, their build is coarsening, and the prognathous mouth of the Negro type is beginning to appear. While they have profoundly modified the Negro type of those with whom they have settled, this modification must, in the absence of fresh infusions of Fulani blood, tend rapidly to disappear... they do not intermarry with the nomad pagan Fulani" (Meek, i. 25).

According to Labouret, nomad Fulbe are scattered over the country in small colonies "généralement installées à côté des villages sédentaires pour en garder les troupeaux". They supply the settled population with dairy products: Fulbe women selling milk and butter are a familiar sight to travellers.

The Fulbe reached the Upper Senegal region about 1300 A.D., when the Ghana empire was at the height of its power. About 1400, a section of the tribe, coming from Termes in the north-west, established themselves in Masina, under chiefs of the Djallo family. This kingdom was conquered by Askia Omar, the Songhai chief, in 1493. About the same time or not much later, a Pulo chief (arde) named Tengella revolted against Omar, but was killed in 1512. His son, Koli, set up an independent pagan kingdom in Badiar, on the Upper Gambia, and his descendants, known as the Demba dynasty, remained in power from 1550 to 1776.

The Fulbe entered Bornu during the xviith century and, as they had done elsewhere, gradually penetrated
the country in the guise of inoffensive herdsmen, until, watching their opportunity, "by a sudden coup, they made themselves its political masters" (Meek). Towards the end of the 18th century, Shehu Usman dan Fodio (born 1754) initiated a religious revival which ended in the conquest of Northern Nigeria. Usman established his capital at Sokoto (built by his son Belo in 1810) and before his death in 1817 was acknowledged as Sarkin Musulmi or spiritual head of the Muslims within his empire. He was succeeded by his son Belo, the "Sultan Belo" visited by Denham, Clapperton and Oude in 1821. He had his capital at Sokoto and later at Warno, while his uncle Abdallah ruled at Gando.

Meanwhile, in the west, a Pulo marabout, Seku Hamadu, had converted the Masina Fulbe to Islam about 1810, seized Djenné and even (1826) made himself master of Timbuktu; but the dominion founded by him was short-lived, his grandson being overthrown by al-Hajji 'Omar in 1862. Before this, in 1776, the Muslim Tekros, in Futa Toro, had revolted against the Fulbe Denizanke and established a "collective monarchy" (Delafosse) which lasted till the French annexation in 1881. "Omar at the head of another section of the Tekros, had conquered the local Fulbe and continued to give trouble to the French authorities till his death in 1864 (Delafosse).

The settled Fulbe do not differ greatly in customs from other Islāmized tribes, though even these appear to retain some traces of their pagan ancestry. Animal tabus, which may or may not be connected with totemism, are observed by some Muslim families (Meek, i. 174); apparently Hassa are meant, but it would seem as if the statement were intended to include at least one "Fanali Muslim sub-tribe". Moreover, when Muhammad al-Tunsi says (Meek, i. 99): "In Sudan it is related that they descend from a chameleon", this, so far from being a "fable invented for the purpose of contempt" may recall a real totemic belief.

A system of castes, otherwise unknown in Negro and Bantu Africa is common to the Fulbe, Wolof, Malinke, Marka and Bamana, with this difference that, with the Fulbe, the "castes" originated in tribal distinctions ("werden durch bestimmte Völker gebildet"; Frobenius, p. 156), and therefore are rigid, whereas, among the Mande, "werden die Kasten durch Sippen gebildet, die in ihrer Kastenzugehörigkeit schwanken". The castes of the Fulbe are:

- **Nobles**
  - Rimbe (plural of Dimu)
- **Serfs**
  - Rinaibe
- **Traders and Herdsmen**
  - Diwambe
- **Singers and Weavers**
  - Mabebe
- **Leather-workers**
  - Sakebe (elsewhere Gargassabe)
- **Wood-workers**
  - Labeibe (elsewhere Sekabe)
- **Smiths**
  - Wallebe (plural of Baili)

It is noteworthy that the Fulbe, unlike the other tribes mentioned, did not recognise a separate class of slaves. The serfs (called "Hörige" by Frobenius) were the descendants of the Rimbe by captive women. The wood-workers' and traders' castes are peculiar to the Fulbe; the rest are common to all the other tribes.

In contrast to the Galla, Somali and other pastoral Hamitic tribes, the Fulbe do not seem to have any special customs or ritual connected with milk. They keep two distinctive breeds of cattle, one or both of which are believed to have brought with them in their southward migration. Some particulars concerning their cattle are given by Meek (i. 115—118).

The Fulfulde language was long thought to be absolutely unique. If Barth found in it "Andeutungen eines Zusammenhanges dieses Stammes mit den Kaffern Südafrikas", he must have had in mind the system of nown-classes, which, in some respects, resembles that of the Bantu speech-family, though both more complete and more logical than the latter. F. Müller placed the language in a class by itself, forming one division of the "Nubu-Fulah group", for which he could discover no other affinities. A. W. Schleicher (1891) attempted to connect it with Somali, relying chiefly on verbal coincidences, entirely disregarding the system of noun-classes, and admitting that one important grammatical feature of Fulfulde is not to be found in Somali. In so far as he classed the language as Hamitic, he is partly in agreement with Meinhof who, somewhat later, came to the conclusion that it represents a pre-Hamitic stratum, from which were developed, on the one hand, the Hamitic languages as known to us to-day (Shwa, Suso, Gallu, etc.), on the other, the Bantu family.

In addition to the class-system already mentioned (in which the plural is formed by a change, not, as in Bantu, of prefix, but of suffix), Fulfulde exhibits a remarkable cross-division into a human and non-human; k large objects and small objects. Here, the plurals are formed by a change of initial consonant according to certain fixed rules summed up by Meinhof as the Law of Polarity. From this latter classification, Meinhof worked out a hypothesis as to the origin of grammatical gender, which has much to commend it. This is set forth in his *Sprachen der Hamiten* (1912). More recently, however, he has found reason to modify his view of Bantu origins, and considers it at least possible that the class-system is not a primitive feature in Fulfulde, but might have been taken over from some Bantu or "Semi-Bantu" language (Westernmann defines the term "Klassensprachen" for the latter and would-extend it to include others than those enumerated in H. H. Johnston's *Comparative Study*). It has also emerged that Fulfulde is less of an isolated phenomenon than had at first appeared. It has points of contact with Serer and other adjacent languages, and in particular, with the little-known Biífada of Portuguese Guinea, studied by G. A. Krause as long ago as 1865. Two important essays by A. Klingenberg in *Zeitschr. f. Eindeutsch-sprachen*, 1923—1924 and 1924—1925 are calculated to shed new light on a complicated problem. Fulfulde, like Hausa, possesses a written literature, for which the form of Arabic script, locally known as osen (Ar. 'adāman), has been used, probably, since the introduction of Islam. This script has peculiarities which cause it to differ markedly from that in use by the Swahili.

evidence also points to the fact that later, the Western Chulukyas, the Raštakštras, and the Deogirī Vīdravas ruled over this area. With the Khāldji and Taughilak [see Muḥammad Taughilak] invasions of the Dakhān it came under Muslim control. An interesting account of Pūna when it formed part of the Bahlānī kingdom has been recorded by the Russian traveller Anasāsīus Nikitiūn (1468—1474), who appears to have been the first foreign traveller whose impressions have been preserved for us since the visit of the Chinese pilgrim, Fa-hien, in the beginning of the fifth century A.D. (R. H. Major, India in the Fifteenth Century, Hakluyt Society). Pūna remained under Muslim rule until the growth of Marāhpā power in the latter half of A.wangchik’s reign. The district is therefore associated with the beginnings of Marāhpā history and closely connected with the career of Shīwāṇ. Under the Pīshāwā (q.v.) it became the centre of Marāhpā power until the British conquest in the early nineteenth century.

Pūna city, which is situated at the confluence of the Miṣāh and Mula rivers, has a total population of 250,187, of whom 28,925 are Muhāmadīs (Census Report, 1931). When but a village it was included in the gājir of Mālođi Bhōma, the grandfather of Shīwāṇ. Later, Shīwāṇ finding Pūna too exposed transferred his capital to Rāγgād where his coronation took place. Pūna was the scene of his daring attack upon Shīyāsīs Khān. With the growth of the power of the Pīshāwā Pūna once more became the capital and centre of the Marāhpā kingdom. The fortified palace of the Pīshāwā, known as the Shāhāwārī, was destroyed by fire in 1827. It was at Pūna in the year 1885 that the first meeting of the Indian National Congress took place.

Bibliography

Administration Reports of the Bombay Presidency (published annually).


Pūwa (Skr. pūwa), in the East Indian Archipelago the name for the month of Rāmdān and for fasting in this month or at other times. The Arabic names however are not unknown. Fasting is in Indonesia generally a favourite pious practice not only on the days prescribed or recommended by law but also as a means of attaining a desired end. The observation of the fast in Rāmdān is here as elsewhere

(P. Collin Davies)

Pūna, a city and district of British India in the Central Division of the Bombay Presidency. The district has an area of 5,332 square miles and a population of 1,169,791, of whom 54,997 are Muslims (Census Report, 1931). It was included in the powerful Khandāra kingdom of the Dakhān which came to an end about the middle of the third century A.D. The available
regarded as the most important of the pillars of Islam; here also we find the popular belief prevailing that it can atone for the sins of the whole year. Not all however continue the fast to the end of the month; if any one finds it difficult he satisfies his conscience by fasting on the first and last days of the month; nevertheless such people or even those who do not fast at all have the same elevated sentiment which fills all and which stamps Ramadān as the Muhammadan month like no other. Students, merchants, all whose business takes them away from home endeavour to spend this month at least in the family circle. In many districts the approach of puwass is remarkable for the increase of slaughtering in the last days of the preceding month. The meat is preserved for use; meals in puwass arc somewhat heavier than usual in order to strengthen for the strain of fasting. The markets are also more animated towards the end of the month; this is the time to make purchases in view of the approaching end of the fast. The beginning of the month is publicly notified; e. g. the drums which form part of the equipment of the houses of prayer are beaten in a special way. The beating of the drums is repeated throughout the whole month at particular times of day, especially after sunset and shortly after midnight in order to warn the faithful that the time for eating is nearly over so that they can prepare the morning meal (Ar. ṣa‘ūr). Finally at the end of the month when the period of abstinence is over, the drums are beaten with particular vigour. The ascertainment of the end and beginning of Ramadān usually leads to friction every year. Those who are free-thinkers in religious matters use the calendar and do not hesitate to announce the end of the fast in advance; all who demand that the law should be strictly followed and these include the modernists, stick to ṣawq̲e‘ evidence of the senses). The tarawīkh (Ar. tarawīkh) service is held in the public houses of prayer immediately after the ṣa‘ūr; it is also eagerly attended by people who on other occasions do not observe the legal obligations of religion. The lack of seriousness and the unifying conduct of many participants induces the devout to avoid this tarawīkh service and to observe it elsewhere with a small company of similarly minded people. It is worst in Atjeh; the tarawīkh service here is simply a caricature (Snouck Hurgronje). A special importance is usually attached to the last five odd nights of the month devoted to religious exercises in connection with the ṣa‘ūr al-Jadīd. They are not agreed as to which of these nights is most probably the correct one; the 21st and 23rd are preferred but the practice varies in different localities. Part of the ceremonial observation of these nights consists in having illuminations in front of the dwelling-houses. In Java special emphasis is laid on the eating of meals together. Every one, if he can at all do it, gives a religious feast every evening. Later they go round their friends; open house is generally kept and time spent in rejoicing until far into the night. Besides three private entertainments there are meals of an official nature. The people of the village come to the house of the village headman for a religious feast; every one brings his share. The higher officials, especially the administrative officials, give a feast to their subordinates. The most splendid observance of these five nights however is found in the palaces of the Javaese princes. According to ancient custom, these feasts took place in great splendour after sunset; the broad forecourts of the palaces give an excellent opportunity for them. These feasts known as ma‘luman, with which many legends are associated, follow one another in a hierarchical succession. First the prince has his on the 21st; next come the crown-prince, the princes of the blood, the governors and ministers; the dishes are intended for the host’s subordinates. In recent years these ma‘luman have become restricted so that only the first of them retains its official character. The ‘little’ feast is a day of rejoicing far surpassing the ‘great’ feast. After the ṣa‘ūr has been performed on the last day of Ramadān or even earlier and ablations have been taken with special care, in which the Javanese sometimes includes his cattle, a feast is prepared in the house in the evening after the breaking of the fast. The more devout make a modest meal precede this within the month of the fast to take farewell of the spirits of the deceased who wander about during Ramadān and now return to their abodes. The ceremonial ṣa‘ūr on the 1st Shawwal is little observed in Atjeh but is a great ceremony in other places; there is no ṣa‘ūr in the whole year which is better attended; many, who otherwise never enter a mosque never fail to be present on this occasion. In Java the regents, the highest native government officials accompanied by the whole of the staff of the regency, all in full dress go in the early morning, before sunrise from the regent’s house to the mosque in order to take part in the ṣa‘ūr there. After the end of the ṣa‘ūr they return in the same way. The regent then receives the homage of all. The same custom prevails in the southern Celebes; except that here the native princes take the place of the regents. On this day the young people let off fire-works. After the ceremonial ṣa‘ūr people set out in new clothes to visit relations and friends; congratulations are given on the successful conclusion of the fast and pardon is asked for any sins committed deliberately or involuntarily in the past year. It is a widespread custom to visit on this day the tomb of ancestors which have previously been cleaned, and then to spend some time scattering flowers and incense in pious devotion. In Java again we have the custom for the higher officials to treat their subordinates to what are called ‘mountains of food’ (dishes of all kinds arranged in artistic forms) In the native states, at the end of the fast, one of the three public holidays is observed, the essential feature of which is the public representation of the unity of the king- dom in the person of the prince. The three feasts are on the whole on the same lines. The prince appears in oriental splendour and shows himself in the outer court of the palace before the assembled people. Large supplies of food have already been prepared in the royal kitchens and are ceremonially piled up into mountains of food of exactly defined form and preparation. These ‘mountains’ which are so large that it takes several persons to carry one, are carried to the place of audience as soon as the prince has taken his seat and at his command taken on to the mosque. Here the food is distributed after the chief supervisor of the mosque has offered a prayer for prince and country. On account of the blessing associated with it it is lucky to get any of the food. The six days’ fast in Shawwal recommended by law is only observed
by a few very pious people; a minor festival is observed on the 8th of the month to mark its conclusion.


---

**QUETTA** (Pashtu: **Kwâta**), a **tâhîl** and town in the *Quetta-Pishin* district of British Balûcstân [q.v.]. The district, which contains the **tâhîl** of Quetta and Pishin and the administrative sub-division of Caman, has an area of 4,806 square miles and a population of 147,541, of whom 197,945 are Muslims. Nearly all these Muslims are Pashtu speaking Bahlû, only a very small minority speaking Brahui and Bahlû. The district, which is very mountainous, is bordered on the north-west by Afghan territory, on the north by the Zhob and Sibi districts, and on the south by the Balûn Pass district and the Sarawân division of Kalât.

The **tâhîl** of Quetta, which is held on lease from the Khân of Kalât, has an area of 548 square miles and a population of 76,649. The town of Quetta was destroyed by earthquake in 1935. In 1931 it had a population of 60,272, of whom 25,391 lived in the cantonment. The Territory of India, 1931, vol. iv., Baluchistan.

Until the middle of the eighteenth century, when Quetta finally came under Brahui control, the history of Quetta-Pishin is probably identical with that of Kandahâr [for early history see the art. Balûcstân and Kandahar]. Quetta was temporarily occupied by the British during the First Afghan War, 1839-1842 (see W. Hough, *A Narrative of the march and operations of the army of the Indus in the expedition into Afghanistan, 1840*). Its strategic importance was first recognized by General John Jacob who urged Lord Canning, in 1856, to garrison this important point of vantage. The proposal was rejected on the grounds that, surrounded by hostile tribes and cut off from its true base, the isolated position of the garrison would be extremely precarious. Ten years later, Sir Henry Green, the Political Superintendent of Upper Sind, seeking to improve the British scheme of frontier defence, proposed that Quetta should be garrisoned and connected by rail with Karâti. Unfortunately for those who desired an advance into Balûcstân the proposal had to face the united opposition of Lord Lawrence and his Council, all of whom were champions of non-intervention. Ten years passed. The exponents of "masterly inactivity" were no longer predominant in the Vicerey's council chamber; Khwâ [see Khwâ] had fallen before the Russians, who were drawing nearer and nearer to the gates of India; and, more dangerous still, the estrangement of Shâr 'Ali had brought the Amir of Afghanistan and the Government of India to the brink of war. It was therefore decided, in 1876, to occupy Quetta. The British right to despatch troops into Kalât territory had been recognized by the treaty of 1854 (Aitchison, xi. 212-213). Chiefly owing to the efforts of Major (afterwards Sir Robert) Sandeman, this treaty was renewed and supplemented on December 8, 1876, by the Treaty of Jacobabad (Pari. Papers, 1877, lxxxii., c. 1868, p. 314-316). In return for an increased subsidy the Khân granted permission for the location of troops in, and the construction of railways and telegraph lines through, Kalât territory. This was followed by the formation of the Balûcstân Agency, for on February 24, 1877, Sandeman was appointed Agent to the Governor-General with his headquarters at Quetta.

The strategic importance of Quetta is now almost universally recognized. Protected on the south-west by the lofty Chilun range and on the north-east by the Zarghan plateau, it dominates all the southern approaches to the Indus valley. The **tâhîl** of Quetta is held on lease from the Khân of Kalât, has an area of 548 square miles and a population of 76,649. The town of Quetta was destroyed by earthquake in 1935. In 1931 it had a population of 60,272, of whom 25,391 lived in the cantonment (Abstract of India, 1931, vol. iv., Baluchistan).

RÄ', tenth letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numeral value of 200. For its palaeographical evolution see the article ARABIA, plate 1. It belongs to the group of the liquidas and is frequently interchanged with ٧ and ٠. It regularly corresponds to the r of other Semitic languages. It is not guttural but lingual.


(A. J. Wensinck)

**RABĀB**, the generic name in Arabic for the violin, or any stringed instrument played with a bow (gama). The origin of the name has been variously explained: 1. from the Hebrew ṭābā (ἔνα and ṭābā being interchangeably); 2. from the Persian ṭabā (V āra ṭābā), which was played with the fingers or plectrum; and 3. from the Arabic ṭabā to collect, arrange, assemble together. The first derivation is scarcely feasible. The second has a rational basis, although the mere similarity in name must not be accepted without question. In spite of the oft repeated statement that the Arabs admitted that they borrowed the ṭabā from the Persians, together with the word ṭamānū for the bow, there is not the slightest evidence for it. No Arabic author (so far as the present writer knows) makes an admission of this kind, nor have the Arabs adopted the word ṭamānū for the bow, their own term being having been considered sufficient. It is true that we read in the Maghāth al-Ula'web (5th century) that “the ṭabā is well-known to the people of Persia and the Persians” (237), but this author was writing in a later Persian, and we know from al-Fārābī that the ṭabā was also well-known in Arabian lands. One argument against the alleged borrowing from Persia is that the ṭabā with the Persians has ever been a plucked and not a bowed instrument. Still, the Arabs may have borrowed the plucked instrument and adapted it to the bow. On the other hand, the Arabic root ṭabā as the parent of the word ṭabā has much in its favour. As the Arabic musical acousticians point out, plucked instruments such as the ṭabā (lute), ṭambūr (pandura), etc. gave short (muṣāfāt) sounds, but bowed instruments such as the ṭabā gave long or sustained (muṣāfīl) sounds. It was application of the bow which “collected, arranged, or assembled” the short notes into one sustained note, hence the term ṭabā being applied to the viol (see Farmer, Stud., t. 1, p. 2).

The ṭabā is mentioned as early as the Arabic prose of al-Dīnārī (d. 885) in his Majmū‘ al-Rawātī. Yet we cannot be sure whether this was the bowed ṭabā or the plucked ṭabā. At any rate, it already had a legendary history when it wrote. According to the Kāfkh al-Humām (15th–16th century) it is first found in the hands of a woman of Banū Ṭā’īr (fol. 263). Turkish tradition ascribed its “invention” to a certain Aḥmad Allāh Fārābī (Ewelya Celebi, Siykah-namâ, i/ii. 226, 234). An Andalusian legend places its invention within the Iberian peninsula (Delphin and Guin, Notes sur la poésie et la musique arabe, p. 59). One thing is certain even if we have iconographic evidence of the viol in the vineh (6th or 7th century (cf.  libro)), the earliest literary evidence of the use of the bow comes from Arabic sources, e. c. from al-Fārābī (d. 930), the Ibn al-Sābl (8th century), Ibn Sinā (d. 1037), and Ibn Za‘lī (d. 1048), as I have fully demonstrated elsewhere (Stud., t. 101–105).

Seven different forms of viols are known to Islamic peoples: 1. The Rectangular Viol, 2. the Circular Viol, 3. the Boot Shape Viol, 4. the Pear Shape Viol, 5. the Hemispherical Viol, 6. the Pandore Viol, and 7. the Open Chest Viol.

1. The Rectangular Viol. This consists of a wooden frame, more or less rectangular, over the face (muṣāfāt) and back (ṣabūr) of which is stretched a membrane (ṣīfīsa). The neck (muṣāfīs) is cylindrical and is of wood, whilst the foot (ritāf) is of iron. It has either one or two strings (muṣāfīs), generally of horsehair. Al-Khalīfī (d. 791) says that “the ancient Arabs sang their poems to its [the viol’s] voice [or sound]” (Farmer, Stud., t. 100). In the Kāfkh al-Humām (fol. 267) we read that it was used to accompany the pre-Islamic ṭabāb and the elegiac poem. Probably the pre-Islamic ṭabāb was of this rectangular form. Lane (Lesecon, p. 1005) held this latter view. Ibn al-Ṣabīr (d. 1435) [q. r.] describes this viol of the Bedouins as rectangular (muṣabīb) and with a membrane face and back and one string of horsehair (fol. 238). Niebuhr (t. 144) says that it was still called the muṣabīb in the 13th century. We certainly have a rectangular instrument shown in the frescoes of Qaṣr ‘Ansor (Musul, pi. xxxiv), but it is played with the fingers and not with a bow. Yet even in modern times the ṭabā of the desert was to be found played in this way as well as with a bow (Crichton, ii. 280; Burckhardt, Beduinen, p. 435; du, Travels, § 389; Burton, Personal Narrative, iii. 76). Niebuhr (Tab., xxvi, p) delineates a rectangular viol of two strings, although he says that he saw a violin of one string in Cairo. Villot (272–274; 913–918) distinguishes between the two instruments. In Egypt, he says, the ṭabā al-ṣālīr (poet’s viol) had one string, whilst the ṭabā al-muṣabīr (singer’s viol) had two strings (Lane, Med. Egypt., chap. xxviii, xx.). He describes them. These instruments never form part of a concert orchestra, being relegated to the folk. For other delineations of the instrument see Féret (Hist., ii. 145), Engel
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2. The Circular Viol. The modern instrument of this form consists of a circular wooden frame or pan, the face, and sometimes the back, being covered with a membrane. There is no foot. There is no special reference to this form in Arabic literature nor is there any definite iconographic evidence of it earlier than the 12th century when it is described and delineated by Niebuhr (i. 144; Tab. xxvi., C) who found it at Basra. It had but one string. It is still found among the folk of Palestine (Sachau, p. 30, 40, Tab. 3, 17) and the Maghrib (Chottin, p. 50) where it is still known as the rabab or ri"ob. For other delineations see Lavignac (p. 2790) and Chottin (pl. vi.).

3. The Boat Shape Viol. This form is confined to the Maghrib. It consists of a piece of wood hollowed out into the shape of a boat. The chest (qadr) is covered with skilled metal or wood pierced with ornamental rosettes (nuwârân), whilst the lower part is covered with a membrane. The head (ra'û) is at right angles to the body, and it is generally furnished with two strings. It seems to have been used by the Arabs and Moors of Spain since their invasion of the peninsula. It is praised by their 8th and 9th century writers Abd al-Rahman ibn Khaibar (see al-Shâlihi, fol. 15), and Ibn Hazm (see Muhammad b. Isâmiī, p. 473), and doubtless they refer to either this instrument or the Pear Shape Viol (see infra 4) since the Glossarium Latino-Arabicum (12th century) equates rabab with ilâra dicta a variacite. If we have no iconographic evidence of this viol from Arabic or Moorish sources, it certainly exists among the Spaniards, since the instruments in the Catálogo de Santa Maria (12th century) show definite oriental features; see Riaño (p. 129) and Ribera (pl. xi.). Ibn Khaibar (d. 1406) is the first to describe this viol, although not very clearly (Prot., xvii. 354). It is not until the time of 'Abd al-Rahman al-Fasi (ca. 1650) that we get any musical details of the instrument (J. R. A. S., 1931, p. 366). European travellers (Addison, Winthius, Höst, Shaw) mention the instrument as popular in the Maghrib, and to-day it is one of the principal instruments in concert music. Höst gives us one of the earliest delineations of the instrument from the Eastern sources (Tab. xxxii. 2). For a 12th century description see F. Salvador-Daniél (p. 80) and for a design see Christianovich (pl. i.). Several delineations of both instruments and players may be seen in al-Hafid (pl. 34, 39—52). Mahillon (i. 416—417), Félix (Hiss., ii. 146), Engel (Cat., pl. 143), Chouquet (p. 205), Sachau (Reallex., p. 317), etc. For the instrument of Northern India called the surangi see Lavignac (p. 350) and Félix (ii. 298).

4. The Pear Shape Viol. Probably, the earliest Arabic reference to this instrument is that made by Ibn Khurdâdhulluh (d. ca. 912) who, in an oration before Caliph al-Mutamid (d. 893), says that the Byzantines had a wooden instrument of five strings called the 'ara which was identical with the ra'ab of the Arabs (al-Mas'udi, Murâdi, viii. 91). We can probably identify the instrument in the famous Carrand Casket at Florence which dates from the 6th century (L'Arte, 1896, p. 44). From the Sinu-Moorish woodwork of the Palatine Chapel at Palermo (12th century) we see to better advantage what the Arabian instrument was like (B. Z., 1893, ii. 385). It was this form of the rabab probably, with which al-Fârâbî (d. 950) deals (see Land, Reallex., p. 130, 166). He gives full details of both the accordâvera and scales. We know little about this instrument in Arabic speaking lands after the 12th—13th century, until it is described by Niebuhr (i. 143; Tab. xxvi., D) in the 13th century, and even then it appears to have been favoured only by the Greek population. It had three strings. It may have been used in the Maghrib (Jackson, p. 159—160), but neither Villotvlo nor Lame know of it in Egypt. In Turkey, it appears to have been adopted from the Greeks, possibly in the 13th century, and with the 'ud and amûoã plays a prominent part in concert music to-day (Lavignac, p. 3015). Recently an attempt has been made to introduce this rabab turki or armûha, as it is now called, into Egypt (al-Hâfiz, p. 661, pl. 35). Designs of the instrument may be found in Engel (Cat., p. 210) and Crosby Brewer (Hist. flute, 24), where they represent specimens in collections at South Kensington (London) and New York.

5. The Hemispherical Viol. This is, perhaps, the best known form of the viol in the Islamic east. The body consists of a hemisphere of wood, cocoanut, or a gourd, over the aperture of which a membrane is stretched. The neck is of wood, generally cylindrical, and there is a foot of iron, although sometimes there is no foot. It is often known in Arabic as the khamûnja or more rarely as the shâhâb. The former is derived from the Persian khamûnja (dim. of khaman, "bow") whilst the latter is derived from the Persian and Turkish shâhâb, shâhâb, shâhâb, gâshâb, gâshâb, etc., which may have had their origin in the Sanscrit gauharaka, an instrument mentioned in the pre-Christian Nâtya-shâstra (cap. xxiii.). I believe that the words shâhâb and shâhâb mentioned in the Uighur al-Safa' (Bombay ed., i. 97) and al-Shâlihi (fol. 12) respectively, are copyist's errors for shâhâb and shâhâb. The work khamûnja is first mentioned in Arabic by Ibn al-Fahar (ca. 903) who says that it was used by both the Copts and the people of Sind (B. G. A.). Of course this need not mean that the instrument mentioned was a hemispherical viol, because, being a Persian by origin, the author may have used the word khamûnja in its Persian generic sense meaning a viol. That Egypt had an early liking for the khamûnja is borne out from various sources. Although in Egypt the hemispherical viol is nowadays called the rabab miyâf (Egyptian viol), in earlier days it was acknowledged that Egypt borrowed the instrument from Persia (Kutb al-Hamûs, fol. 106). The khamûnja was certainly popular at the courts of the Ayyubid al-Kâmil (d. 1238) and the Mamlûk Hâbars (d. 1277); see al-Makriti, i, 136; Lane-Poole, Hist. of Egypt, p. 249. In the Persian Kâne al-Tâbâh (13th century) the hemispherical viol is described and figured as the gâshâb, but in Ibn Ghâîth (d. 1435) where both the gâshâb and the khamûnja are described, the former is a larger type of the latter, having, in addition to its two ordinary strings, eight sympathetic strings (Kâne al-Tâbâh, fol. 261v; Ibn Ghâîth, fol. 78). In the 13th century the khamûnja is delineated by Russeî (i. 152—153, pl. iv.), and Niebuhr (i. 144, Tab. xxvi., E). Both Villotvlo (p. 900, pl. BB) and Lane (Mod. Egypt., chap. 19) give minute details.
of the construction and accoutumans. Mushkiya also describes the Syriac hamânda (hamânda) of his day (M. F. O. E., vi. 25, 81). For the modern Persian instrument see Advielle (14 and pl.) and Lavignac (p. 3704). Turkomanian instruments are given by Fitrat (p. 45) and Belaiiev (p. 54). For Malaysia see Kauden (p. 178); for India Lavignac (p. 349) and Féiss (ii. 295). For other designs see Farmer (Stud., i. 160-167), Conant (p. 205), Sacha (Realistik, p. 207).

6. The Pander.Virtual. This form is practically a tambûr, sitar, or the like, which is howled instead of being plucked by the fingers or a plectrum. The two best known examples from India are the errar and juilis. The former has a membrane on its face and has five strings played on with the bow together with a number of sympathetic strings. The latter is practically identical with the former but is adorned with the figure of a peacock (hence its name) at the bottom of the body of the instrument. See Lavignac (p. 351) and Mahillon (i. 131) for designs and details. With the Persians and Turkomans we see various kinds of pandores used with the bow. See Advielle (p. 14), Lavignac (p. 3074), Mironov (p. 27), Kinsky (p. 26).

7. The Open Chest Viol. This is unknown to the peoples of North Africa and the Near East, although it is popular in the Middle East. Unlike the preceding forms of the viol, the upper part of its face of the body or sound-chest is left open. The best known example of this is the sirkulâdd of India which has three strings. See Péjé (ii. 296), Lavignac (p. 351), Mahillon (i. 132) and Kinsky (p. 27), for both designs and details. In Turkomania a similar instrument known as the šapka is very popular. It has two strings. See Belaiiev (p. 52), Mironov (p. 25), Fitrat (p. 43).


(R. G. Farmer)

RABAB (s., pl. ar-râbîd), dis. a town, quarter, situated outside the central district of musîna [q.v.]. The term, which is very frequently found in the Arab historians of the middle ages in east as well as west, is the original of the Spanish word arrabâl which means the same. Rabab also means the immediate vicinity of a town. The rabab usually had a name of its own. This is how there have been preserved for the Cordova of the caliphate of the 9th century the names of twenty-one of the suburban districts. Rabab Shakûnda [q.v.] or al-Rabab (for short) was the southern quarter of Cordova, on the other side of the Guadalquivir where in 916 (914) the famous "rebellion of the suburb" broke out which was stifled by the emir al-Hakâm I [q.v.] and earned him the epithet of al-Raabâ. The name rabab was also given to the exiles who migrated at this time to the rest of al-Andalus, Morocco and to the east. In the castles (bihâr or qâbrâ) of Muslim Spain the name rabab was given to the civilian quarters below the strictly military quarters. Rabab was also the same name given in the towns of the west to the lepers' quarter and to that of the prostitutes.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

RABAH. Zoubair-Pasha, Egyptian governor of Bahri al-Ghazal in 1875, being recalled by Cairo left his son Sultânîn in charge. The latter thinking he was threatened by the hostility of Gordon, then Governor-General of the Sudan, joined Hâthîn, the deposed sultan of Dâr-Fûr, in order to rebel against Egypt. His chief lieutenant was a certain Rabah, son of a Negro who had been his father's nurse and was therefore his foster-brother. Gessi-Pasha and by Gordon inflicted a severe defeat on Sultânîn and Rabah took to flight with the remnants of his master's army and to retaliate his forces began a series of raids on the tribes of the northeast of Bahri al-Ghazal (1878). Then pushing westwards he entered the land of the Banda in 1879 and in 1883 fell back on the Dâr-Kûlit, installed a native chief named Sanilat there as sultan, attacked Bagirmi in 1892 and in 1893 seized its capital which then was Bugoman. In the same year he attacked Hâshâm, sultan of Bornu [q.v.], defeated and slew him (Dec. 1893). He then attacked Gobe or Tassàwa where Abû-Bakr, nephew and successor of Hâshâm, had taken refuge; checked by the army of the sultan of Sokoto he turned against the little states of the south of Lake Chad, took Gulfey from the Bâsîr, Kuri from the Mandara, Logone from the Koto, again invaded Bagirmi in 1898, burned Massênya, the old capital, pursued the king
Rabat, Ait Rihâb al-Fath, vulg. ar-Rihâb (ethnical Rihâb, vulg. Rihâf), a town in Morocco, situated on the south bank at the mouth of the Wadi Abî Râkâb (Wed Bu Regreg) opposite the town of Salé [cf. Salé]. Since the establishment of the French protectorate it has been the administrative capital of the Shari'îan empire, the usual residence of the sultan of Morocco, and the headquarters of the wakilûn [q.v.] and of the French authorities. The choice of Rabat as the administrative centre of Morocco has brought this town considerable development in place of the somnolence in which it was sunk a quarter of a century ago.

The foundation of Rihâb al-Fath was the work of the Almohads [q.v.]. The site of the "Two Banks" (al-'Istâwan) of the estuary of the Bu Regreg had previously been the scene of Roman and pre-Roman settlements; the Punic, later Roman, town Salé was built on the left bank of the river higher up at the site of the royal Merinid necropolis of Chella (Challa; q.v.). The Muslim town of Salé on the right bank had, from the beginning of the tenth century to protect it against the incursions of the Berghawâta [q.v.] heretics at the time when it was the capital of a little Ifrîdîn kingdom, fortified on the other side of the river by Rihâb [q.v.], which was permanently occupied by devout volunteers who in this way desired to carry out their vow of hijâd [q.v.]; the geographer Ibn Hawâ'ik is authority for its existence at this date [cf. R. G. A., i. 56]. But we know very little of the part played by this Rihâb in the course of the sanguinary wars that were fought between the Berghawâta and the Almoravids. It is not even possible to point out its exact situation. It was perhaps the same fortified spot that is mentioned in the middle of the xiith century under the name of Kalîn Bani Targhî by the geographer al-Fârî'i.

The final and complete subjugation of the Berghawâta meant that a different part was to be played by the Rihâb on the estuary of Bu Regreg in 545 (1150), the founder of the dynasty of the Mu'minnîn, Abî al-Mu'min, chose the fort and its vicinity as the place of mobilisation for the troops intended to carry the holy war into Spain. A permanent camp was established there and he provided for a supply of fresh water by bringing a conduit from a neighbouring source, 'Ain Ghabila. The permanent establishments, — mosque, royal residence — formed a little town which received the name of al-Mâhdîya. On several occasions very large bodies of men were concentrated around the Rihâb, and it was there that Abî al-Mu'min died on the eve of his departure for Spain in 558 (1163).

The development of the camp went on under Abî al-Mu'min's successor, Abî Ya'ubî Yûnus (558—580 = 1163—1184), but it was the following prince of the Mu'minnîn dynasty, Abî Yûnus Ya'qûb al-Manṣûr, who at the beginning of his reign gave the orders and opened the credits necessary for its completion. In memory of the victory won in 1195 by the Almohads over Almogarâr VIII. of Castile at Alarcos [q.v.], it was given the name of Rihâb al-Fath. The camp was surrounded by a wall of earth flanked with square towers enclosing with the sea and the river an area of 450 hectares. The wall is still standing for the most part and is nearly four miles in length; two monumental gates, one now known as Bûb al-Ruwûh (Bûb er-Ruûh), the other which gives access to the kasbûn (Kasbah of the Oudaya), date from this period. It was also Ya'qûb al-Manṣûr who ordered the building inside Rihâb al-Fath of a colossal mosque which was never finished; rectangular in plan it measured 610 feet long by 470 feet broad; the only mosque in the Muslim world of greater area was that of Sâmrâr [q.v.]. It was entered by 16 doors and in addition to three courts had a hall of prayer, supported by over 200 columns. In spite of recent excavations more or less successfully conducted this mosque still remains very much a puzzle from the architectural point of view. But the minaret, which also remained unfinished and was never given its upper lantern still preserves the traveller by its unusual dimensions. It is now called the Tower of Hassan (Fort Hassan), built entirely of stones of uniform shape it is 160 feet high on a square base 55 feet square. Its walls are eight feet thick. The upper platform is reached by a ramp two yards broad with a gentle slope. This tower in its proportions, its arrangement and decoration is closely related to two Almohad minarets of the same period: that of the mosque of the Kutanbîyûn at Marrakesh [q.v.] and that of the great mosque of Seville [q.v.], the Giralda.

Ya'qûb al-Manṣûr's great foundation never received the population which its area might have held and the town opposite, Sale, retained under the last Almohads and in the xiith and xivth centuries all its political and commercial importance. Rabat and Sale in 1248 passed under the rule of the Marinids and it seems that Rabat in those days was simply a military station of no great importance, sharing the fortunes of its neighbour which had gradually become a considerable port having busy commercial relations with the principal trading centres of the Mediterranean. But a chance circumstance was suddenly to give the town of the "Two Banks" a new aspect. The expulsion of the last Mori cors [q.v.] decided upon in 1610 by Philip III brought to Rabat and Sale an important colony of Andalusian fugitives who increased to a marked degree the number of their compatriots in these towns who had previously left Spain of their own free-will after the reconquest. While the population of the other Moroccan cities, Fès and Tetouan principally, in which the exiles took refuge, very quickly absorbed the new arrivals whom they had welcomed without distrust, the people of Rabat and Sale could not see without misgivings this colony from Spain settle beside them, for they lived apart, never mingled with the older inhabitants and devoted themselves to piracy and soon completely dominated the two towns and their hinterland. Rabat, known in Europe as "New Sale" in contrast to Sale ("Old Sale"), soon became the centre of a regular little maritime republic
in the hands of the Spanish Moors who had either left of their own accord before 1610, the so-called "Havuz-ehas"; or had been expelled in 1610, the so-called "Moriscoes"; the former however being in the majority. This republic, on the origin and life of which the documents from European archives published by M. de Castries and P. de Cenat have been of recent years thrown new light, hardly recognised the susurrancy of the shari'ah who ruled over the rest of Morocco. While boasting of their jiḥād against the Christians, the Andalusians of the "Two Banks" really found their activity at sea a considerable source of revenue. They had retained the use of the Spanish language and the mode of life they had been used to in Spain. They thus raised Rabat from its decadence. Their descendants still form the essential part of the Muslim population of the town and they have Spanish patronymics like Barcajó (Vargas), Palminico, Moreno, Lópeza, Pérez, Clitoquito, Díaz (Díaz Dénia), Ronda (Span. Ronda), Mulín (Molino) etc.

The spirit of independence and the wealth of the Spanish Moors in Rabat soon made the town a most desirable object in the eyes of the sultans of Morocco. Nevertheless the little republic with periods of more or less unreal independence, was able to survive until the accession of the 'Alid sālān Saiyid Mūhammad b. Abīd Allāh in 1757. This prince now endeavoured to organise for his own behalf the piracy hitherto practised by the sailors of the republic of the "Two Banks". He even ordered several ships of the line to be built. But the official character thus given to the pirates of Sale was soon resorted to the bombardment of Sale and Larache [q. v.] by a French fleet in 1765. The successors of Mūhammad b. Abīd Allāh had very soon to renounce any attempt to wage the "holy war" by sea. The result was a long period of decline for Sale which lasted for not only in the gradual diminution of its trade but also in a very marked hatred of each town for the other. At the beginning of the 19th century, Rabat like Sale had completely lost its old importance. They were both occupied by French troops on July 19, 1911.

Rabat is one of the towns of Morocco, the population of which is both kasārīyā, i.e. essentially town-dwelling, and mahārīyā, i.e. residence by the sultan of the Shi'it empire. The non-European population has increased in a marked degree since the establishment of the protectorate and its choice as permanent capital of the sultan. The number of inhabitants at the census of 1931 was 27,986 Muslims and 4,618 Jews (20,452 and 3,567 in 1926; Sale which is a separate municipality had in 1931 21,145 Muslims and 2,387 Jews). They live almost entirely in the mada'in, which is in the shape of a trapezoid, and its annexes furmed by the Jewish melikţ [q. v.], and the kāsār of the ūdāya, a separate walled area with its own mosque, originally inhabited by contingents of the gāh tribe [q. v.]; Ar. gāh] of this same (Kasta of the ûdâya). The chief mosques of Rabat are the foundations of 'Alid sālān, Mawṣūl al-Qādī [q. v.], and Mawṣūl al-Sulāmī (Moulay Sulaimān; the mosque near the imperial palace, the Dāmīl al-Sulām, was built in the second half of the 18th century, besides the monumental gates there are several other entrances in the Almoahad sequence; the Khusūl al-'Uth (Rabi al-Aqsa) admits from the madda'in to the cemetery and the cliffs which rise up from the ocean; the gate called Zābir (Bāb Zābir) is in the immediate vicinity of the Mamlīd royal cemetery of Charia (Shiraz).

The French town of Rabat built outside the mada'in is developing rapidly; the palace of the Resident-General, the public offices, fine esplanades, villas surrounded by gardens give the new town a particularly attractive appearance. French Rabat at the present day is a masterpiece, famed throughout the world, of successful town planning and architecture. It is connected by railway to Casablanca and Marrakesh in the south, Tangier in the north, Fez and Algiers in the east. Since October 1935 it has been the final resting-place of Marshal P. Lamartine to whom it owes its position as capital and its reconstruction.


RABB (Ar.), lord, God, master of a slave. Pre-Islamic Arabia probably applied this term to its gods or to some of them. In this sense the word corresponds to the terms like 'Alāl, Adon in the Semitic languages of the north where rabb means "much, great". In one of the oldest steles (civ. 3) Allāh is called the "lord of the temple". Similarly al-Lāt bore the epithet al-Rabba, especially at Tā'if where she was worshipped in the image of a stone or of a rock. In the Qurʾān rabb (especially with the possessive suffix) is one of the usual names of God. This explains why in Islam the slave is forbidden to address his master as rabb, which he must replace by sayyid (Muslim, al-Amīn min al-Adab, trad. 14, 15, etc.). The abstract raṣūlīyya is not found in either Qurʾān or Hadith; it is in common use in mystical theology.

Bibliography: The Arabic dictionaries; Fitṭīql, Cordottius Cordani.
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RABIʾ (A.), the name of the third and fourth months of the Muslim calendar. The name is an Aryan loanword and in the Syriac translation of the Bible corresponds to the Hebrew maḥšāḥ (late rain). Thus the fact that the two months following Rabīʿ II are called Ejjāḏāh (month of frost) suggests to Wellhausen that these four months originally fell in winter and that the old Arab year began with the winter half-year [see AL-MUḤARRAM]. Rabīʿ means originally the month in which the earth is covered with green; this later led to the name Rabīʿ being given to spring. Al-Shirazi expressly describes autumn (ḥarrīf) as the season indicated by Rabīʿ. As a result of the Qurʾānic prohibition of intercalation [see ṢĀʿAʾ], since the beginning of the Muslim era the two months no longer fall at a regular season.


AL-RABIʾ B. YUNUS B. ʿABD AL-LLĀH B. ʿABD FAWKA (so-called from his entering Medina with a scene on his back), emancipated slave of al-Ḥārīrī al-Haffār (grave-digger), emancipated slave of ʿOqlhumān b. ʿAffān. He was really a bastard of obscure origin, a fact which was often brought up against him by his enemies later in his career. Born in slavery at Medina about 112 (730), he was bought by Ziyād b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Khāʾī, who presented him to his master Abu l-ʿAbbās al-Saffāy, the first Ṭāhānī Caliph. All his life, he served, with varying fortunes, three more ʿAbbasid Caliphs: al-Manṣūr, al-Mahdī and al-Hādī.

He reached the zenith of his power under al-Manṣūr. (136–158) who, finding him a capable and useful courtier, appointed him ḥāṭef and afterwards made him his confidant in succession to Abu al-ʿAbbās al-Mawṣūlī. His son al-Fajjāl b. al-Rābīʾ, who was destined to play a prominent part in the forthcoming intrigues against the house of ʿAbbās, took his father's duties as ḥāṭef. After the foundation of Baghdad, the new capital was divided into four quarters, one of which was given in gift by al-Manṣūr to al-Rābīʾ and was thus named after him (ḥāṭef at-Rābīʿ).

During the reign of al-Mahdī (158–169), his influence seems to have dwindled for some time. “Abū Allāh b. Abuʾbaid Allāh (known as Abu ʿOthā ṭā a became wazir, hence al-Rābīʾ participated in an intrigue which led to the downfall of his rival by exposing his son as a heretic (ṣīḥa) in 165 (779–780). Even then al-Rābīʾ only retained his old office as ḥāṭef and never became Mahdī’s wazir. It was “Abdu’llah Abu ʿAbd Allāh b. Diwūr who was appointed the disgraced minister. On al-Ḥādī’s accession (169 = 785), however, al-Rābīʾ was once more promoted to that dignity, but only for a period, after which he was entrusted with a secretarialship for the Caliph’s aṭṬawīr (aṭṬawīr al-muṣawma). He remained in this capacity until his death after a short illness lasting eight days. His sudden and gave rise to the suggestion that he was poisoned by al-Hādī, but this is discredited by the most authentic sources. The exact date of his death is uncertain. While al-Jalāḥyštī and al-Ṭabari place it in 169, al-Khalili al-Baghdadi and Ibn Khallikān assert that he died at the beginning of 170 (786).

Details about his administration are scanty, but it is certain that he was an able, industrious, temperate and tactful man of affairs. Even al-Mahdī, who was never lavish in showering favours on al-Rābīʾ, once described him as the model of a good administrator (Yaʿqūb, ii. 486). The literary sources, however, do not single him out as a patron of letters, a quality which both his ʿAbbāsid masters and his Barmakid successors possessed with distinction.


RĀBĪʿA AL-ʿAADAWĪYA, a famous mystic and saint of Baṣra, a freedwoman of the Al ʿAṯī, a tribe of Kāʾa b. ʿAbd, known also as al-Kāʾa, born 95 (719–724) or 99, died and was buried at Baṣra in 185 (804). A few verses of hers are recorded: she is mentioned, and her teaching quoted, by most of the Sufi writers and the biographers of the saints.

Born into a poor home, she was stolen as a child and sold into slavery, but her sanctity secured her freedom, and she retired to a life of seclusion and celibacy, at first in the desert and then in Baṣra, where she gathered round her many disciples and associates, who came to seek her counsel or prayers or to listen to her teaching. These included Mālik b. Dīmar, the ascetic Rabhī al-ʿAṯī, the traditionist Sufyān al-Thawrī and the Sufi Shākiṣ al-Balqīṣī. Her life was one of extreme asceticism and otherworldliness. Asked why she did not ask help from her friends, she said, "I should be ashamed to ask for this world's goods from Him to Whom it belongs, and how should I seek them when He does not belong?" To another friend she said, "We must not forget the poor because of their poverty or remember the rich because of their riches? Since He knows my state, what have I to remind Him of? What He wills, we should also will." Miracles were attributed to her as to other Muslim saints.

Food was supplied by miraculous means for her guests, and to save her from starvation, a camel which died when she was on pilgrimage, was restored to life for her use; the lack of a lamp was made good by the light which shone round about the saint. It was related that when she was dying, she bade her friends depart and leave the way free for the messengers of God Most
High. As they went out, they heard her making her confession of faith, and a voice which responded, "O soul at rest, return to thy Lord, satisfied with Him, giving satisfaction to Him. So enter among My servants into My Paradise" (Sūra lxxix. 27-30). After her death Rābi'a was seen in a dream and asked how she had escaped from Munkar and Nakir, the angels of death, when they asked her, "Who is your Lord?" and she replied, "I said, return and tell your Lord, 'Notwithstanding the thousands and thousands of Thy creatures, Thou hast not forgotten the weak old woman, I who had only Thee in all the world, have never forgotten Thee, that Thou shouldst ask, Who is thy Lord?'"

Among the prayers recorded of Rābi'a is one she was accustomed to pray at midnight upon her roof: "O Lord, the stars are shining and the eyes of many are open and kings have shut their doors and every lover is alone with his beloved, and here am I alone with Thee." Again she prayed, "O my Lord, if I worship Thee from fear of Hell, burn me therein, and if I worship Thee in hope of Paradise, exclude me thence, but if I worship Thee for Thine own sake, then withhold not from me Thine Eternal Beauty." Of Repentance, the beginning of the Sūfi Path, she said, "How can anyone repent unless his Lord gives him repentance and accepts him? If He turns towards you, you will turn towards Him." She held that Gratitude was the vision of the Giver, not the gifted, and one spring day, when urged to come out to behold the works of God, she rejoined, "Come rather inside to behold their Maker. Contemplation of the Maker has turned me aside from contemplating what He has made." Asked what she thought of Paradise, Rābi'a replied, "First the Neighbour, then the house" (al-qawm thumma 'l-dar) and Ghaṣṣū, commenting on this, says she implied that no one who does not know God in this world will see him in the next, and he who does not find the joy of gnosis here will not find the joy of the Vision there, nor can anyone appeal to God in that world if he has not sought His friendship in this. None may reap who has not sown (Iyāz, iv. 269). The otherworldliness of her teaching is shewn in her declaration that she had come from that world and to that world she was going, and she ate the bread of this world in sorrow, while doing the work of that world. One who heard her said derisively, "One so persuasive in speech is worthy to keep a resting-place" and Rābi'a responded, "I myself am keeping a resting-place, whatsoever is within, I do not allow it to go out and whatever is without, I do not allow to come in. I do not concern myself with those who pass in and out, for I am contemplating my own heart, not mere sky." Asked how she had attained to the rank of the saints, Rābi'a replied, "By abandoning what did not concern me and seeking fellowship with Him Who is eternal".

She was famed for her teaching on mystic love (wasi' al-rab) and the fellowship with God (umma) which is the preoccupation of His lover. Every true lover, she said, seeks intimacy with the beloved, and she recited the lines:

*I have made Thee the Companion of my heart, and my body is friendly towards its guests. But the Beloved of my heart is the guest of my soul*. (Iyāz, iv. 358, margin)

She demonstrated the need for disinterested love and service by taking fire in one hand and water in the other and saying, when asked the meaning of her action, "I am going to light fire in Paradise and to pour water on to Hell, so that both wells may be taken away from those who journey towards God, and whose purpose may be sure and they may look towards their Lord without any object of hope or motive of fear. What if the hope of Paradise and the fear of Hell did not exist? Not one would worship his Lord or obey Him" (Alfākī, Ma'mūṣ al-Aṣfīn, India Office, N. 3170, fol. 114v). Questioned about her love for the Prophet she said, "I love him, but love of the Creator has turned me aside from love of His creatures", and again, "My love to God has so possessed me that no place remains for loving anyone save Him". Of her own service to God and its motive-force she said, "I have not served God from fear of Hell, for I should be but a wretched hireling if I did it from fear; nor from love of Paradise, for I should be a bad servant, if I served for the sake of what was given me, but I have served Him only for the love of Him and desire of Him". Her verses on the two types of love, that which seeks its own end and that which seeks only God and His glory, are famous and much quoted:

"In two ways have I loved Thee, señorally, And with a love that worthy is of Thee. In selfish love my joy in Thee I find, While to all else, and others, I am blind. But in that love which seeks Thee worthily, The veil is raised that I may look on Thee. Yet is the praise in that or this not mine, In this in that and the praise is wholly Thine."

Ghaṣṣū again comments, "She meant, by the selfish love, the love of God for His favour and grace bestowed and for temporary happiness, and by the love worthy of Him, the love of His Beauty which was revealed to her, and this is the highest of the two loves and the finer of them" (Iyāz, iv. 267). Like all mystics, Rābi'a looked for union with the Divine (wasi' al-rab) and in certain of her verses she says, "My hope is for union with Thee, for that is the goal of my desire", and again she said, "I have ceased to exist and have passed out of self. I have become one with God and am altogether His".

Rābi'a, therefore, differs from those of the early Sufis who were simply ascetics and quietists, in that she was a true mystic, inspired by an ardent love, and conscious of having entered into the unitive life with God. She was one of the first of the Sufis to teach the doctrine of Pure Love, the disinterested love of God for His own sake alone, and one of the first also to combine with her teaching on love the doctrine of Ghiyāf, the unveiling, to the lover, of the Beatitude Vision.
Mua. Add. 23,369, fol. 50 sqq.: al-Shārāni, al-Tahāfi al-ḥimā, Cairo 1299, p. 36; Idrīsī, Nasāḥat al-ই, in. Nuzzān-Leen, to. 716, sqq. —
Chief references to teaching: al-Qaṣī, Ḥuṣn, Cairo 1725, iv. 267, 269, 291, 308; al-Kāḥāfī, Kitāb al-Tawārīf, ed. Abtībar, Cairo 1364, p. 78, 121; al-Khājār, Ḥuṣn, Bilād 1367, p. 80, 173, 192; al-Makki, Kitāb al-Qaṣī, Cairo 1316, l. 105, 156 sqq., ii. 40, 57 sqq. —
For a detailed account of life and teaching, with full references, cf. Margaret Smith, Rabīb, the Mystic and her Fellow-Saints in ‘Iṣbān, Cambridge 1928. (MARGARET SMITH)

RABI‘ AL-DAWLA ABU MANṣūR ABU SHUQI MU‘AMMAD B. ‘ALI SHUQI —
When the vizier Abu Shuqī Mu‘ammad al-
Dawla Mu‘ammad b. Isḥāq [see the article ‘INASHTA, 3] Rabīb al-Dawla was appointed vizier of the caliph al-Muṣtaṣir [q. v.]. In Dhu l-Hadījā 511 (1118) the fourteen year old Mu‘ammad b. Mu‘ammad succeeded his father at Sallāhja, when, and when he was looking around for an able vizier, he was recommended to come from some one who had had the necessary training in the service of the caliph (min tarbiyat ‘al-ḥalīf), because there was no suitable man in the train of the young sultan. The choice therefore fell upon Rabīb al-Dawla who was at once summoned from Baghda to Isfahān and, as we know from al-
Bundari, proved himself in every way fit for his difficult task. But his tenures of office was of short duration: he died in Rabī‘ I 513 (June—July 1119); according to another statement he died as early as 512 (1118–1119).


RABI‘A or RABI‘A also RABI‘A (A.), suckling; as a technical term, the suckling which produces the impediment to marriage of foster-kinsman. It is to be supposed that the idea of foster-kinsman was already prevalent among the ancient Arabs (cf. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, 2, p. 176, 196, note 1); this is evident from, among other things, the way in which the prescription of the Qur’an regarding this is interpreted in Tradition. In Sūra iv. 23, among the female relatives with whom marriage is forbidden are the foster-mother and the foster-sister. This must correspond exactly to the old Arab usage, which regarded blood-relationship also only in these two degrees as an impediment to marriage (cf. Robertson Smith, loc. cit.). But as the Qur’an in the passage quoted extends the circle of prohibited relationships beyond that of blood-relationship, foster-kinsman was treated accordingly contrary to the unambiguous language of the passage. To justify this, it is frequently thrown down in traditions, in keeping with the principle of the old Arab attitude, that foster-kinsman is an impediment in the same degrees as blood-relationship. The isolated case, which is decisive for the principle, that the prohibition of marriage with the daughter of a foster-brother, is brought into close personal relationship with the Prophet. Through the prohibition of marriage laid down in Tradition between the foster-children of two wives of the same man, relationship by marriage becomes included in foster-relationship, and in the tradition which expounds the verse of the Qur’an quoted, foster-kinsman is given among the impediments to marriage on the ground of relationships in law. As a justification for this prohibition it is stated that the semen genital (which the milk has produced) is the same; against the view that blood-relationship is not to be combined with foster-kinsman, so that the brother of the husband of the foster-mother is not to be regarded as a foster-relation, there is a polemic in a tradition (Kanz al-
Umālī, iii., No. 391). The question of the amount of suckling necessary to produce foster-relationship is a very old point of dispute; some traditions do not consider isolated suckings by the suckling or one or two acts of suckling as sufficient, others demand not less than seven acts of suckling, others again say that the child must be fed entirely; on the other side, one group of traditions says the prohibition of marriage is the same whatever the amount of suckling that has been given. There is even said to have been a case in the Qur‘ān which in the older, later abrogated, version demanded ten feedings and in the later version five. The case which was obviously only intended to support this view is not trustworthy (cf. Noldeke-Schwarz, Geschichte der Querant, t. II. 556 sqq.; Kanz al-
Umālī, No. 3, 953 sqq.). That the practice of suckling adults in order to establish an artificial foster-relationship existed is certain; it is recognised by several traditions and by others directly or indirectly denied (by the legal maxim: al-‘adqā‘a min al-madā‘a, “suckling demands hunger”), the chief case for the validity of such an act of suckling is described as a privilege granted by the Prophet personally (Kanz al-
Umālī, No. 3, 919) and even the suckling of children to establish an impediment to marriage is in an isolated case described as illegal (ibid., No. 3, 955). To prove foster-kinship many traditions are constant with the testimony of the foster-mother or with even without oath or with the testimony of a woman simply or with that of a man and of one woman; in refutation of this anomaly, obviously at one time permitted, another group of traditions dem ands the normal testimony of two men or of one man and two women. These points of difference found in tradition are continued in the differences of opinion among the old jurists. The views of the principal authorities are given in al-Shawkānī, Nafī al-
Awārī, Cairo 1345, viii. 113 sqq.
The most important new point in dispute, discussed in this later period but scarcely touched upon in the traditions, is the period within which foster-kinship can be established by a child; sometimes it is said to be the period till weaning, sometimes the whole of childhood without an exact limitation, sometimes the fixed period of two years, or 1½ or 3 or 7 years; for the period of two years the authority of the Qur’an is quoted, Sūra ii. 233 (“Mothers shall suckle their children two full years if they wish to carry through the suckling to its end”) (on the details cf. al-Shawkānī, op. cit., p. 120). The four regular Sunni law-schools are agreed that foster-relationship exists between a man and all his descendants on the one side and his nurse, all her foster- and blood-relatives, her husband and all his foster- and blood-relations on
of Râdhâpur, the capital of the state, has a total population of 11,235, of whom 3,694 are Muhammadans (1931 Census Report).

Bibliography: see bibliography.

(ROBERT DAVIES)

AL-RÂDĪ BI 'ILLĀH, ABU 'L-'ABBâS ÂHMâD (MUHAMMAD) b. MUQADÂS, THE TWENTIETH 'ABBâSîD caliph. He was born in Rabî' I 297 (Dec. 909); his mother was a slave named Zâlîm. He was proposed for the caliphate immediately after the assassination of his father al-Muqaddâs [q.v.], but the choice fell upon al-Kâbir [q.v.]. The latter had him thrown into prison; after the fall of al-Kâbir, he was released and put upon the throne (Djumâdâ I 1 342 = April 934). As his adviser in this difficult period al-Râdî chose al-Muqaddâs's vizier, 'Ali b. 'Ishâq [see the art. ÂHMâD al-MUQADÂS, 2] who however asked to be excused on account of his great age, whereupon Ibn Muqaddâs [q.v.] was given the office. The most influential official however continued to be Muhammad b. Vâqît [q.v.] and only after his fall in Djumâdâ I 343 (April 935) did Ibn Muqaddâs gain control of the administration, while the caliph Muqadâs fell completely into the background. But Ibn Muqaddâs's rule did not last long; in Djumâdâ I 344 (April 936) he was seized by al-Muazzâm b. Vâqît, brother of the above-mentioned Muhammad, and the impotent caliph had to dismiss him and in the same year summon the governor of Wâsit and Bayra, Muhammad b. Râ'îk [q.v.], to Bagdad and entrust him with complete authority as amir al-unârâ [q.v.]. This meant a complete breach with the past; the caliph was only allowed to retain the capital and its immediate vicinity and to abandon all influence on the business of government, while Ibn Râ'îk in combination with his secretary decided all the more important questions. Ibn Râ'îk held power for nearly two years; his name was actually mentioned in the khawâfa for the reinauguration dynasty along with that of the caliph; in Dhû l-Ka'dâs 326 (Sept. 936) however, he was replaced by Bedkâm [q.v.].

To the financial difficulties the caliph Muqadâs had to add the constant quarrels of the viziers and emirs there was now added war with foreign foes. In 343 (935) al-Râdî endeavoured to remove from office the governor of al-Mawâsir, Nâjîr al-Dawla [q.v.], but failed, and a few years later Bedkâm, accompanied by the caliph, attacked the Hamâdânâs in order to force them to pay tributes levied upon them; but had to make peace because the futile Ibn Râ'îk suddenly appeared in Bagdad. The war with the Byzantines was also continued; the Hamâdânâs however in this war came forward as defenders of Islam. In Egypt Muhammad b. Taqâdâm founded the dynasty of the Khâshâïds [q.v.], and at the same time Bedkâm had to fight with the Biyâids who were advancing on several sides and a few years later victoriously entered Bagdad.

In the capital itself al-Râdî had to take measures against the fanatics, the panûbâns (392 915), who had many followers among the common people and committed all kinds of excesses. They entered private houses, destroyed musical instruments, ill-treated women singers, poured away wine that they found, interfered in business, annoyed passers-by in the streets, beat Shî'is and generally behaved as arbitrarily as if they represented a kind of tribunal of the Inquisition.

Al-Râdî died in the middle of Rabî' I 329 (Dec. 940) of dropsy. The Arab historians praise his
pity, justice, clemency and generosity as well as his interest in literature and it is said of him, for example (Ibn al-Tikżski, al-Tabari, p. 380): "He was the last caliph, by whom a collection of poems exists, the last who retained his independence as a ruler, the last to preach a sermon from the pulpit on Fridays, the last to mix freely with his friends and to welcome men of learning, and the last who followed the principles of the earlier caliphs as regards rank, tokens of favour, servants and chamberlains". This characterisation may well be correct in its main lines but al-Radi was not independent; he was on the contrary a ready tool in the hands of his sitters and emirs.


RADIF. [See Redif.]

RADIJA. [See Redjia.]

RADJIB (A.), the name of the seventh month in the Muslim calendar. In the Dīkhiyta it introduced the summer half year until, as a result of the abolition of the intercalated months, the months ceased to fall regularly at the same season of the year [see al-Muḥākarram and Nāṣī]. The month was a sacred one; in it the 'umra [q.v.], the essentially Meccan part of the pre-Muḥammadan ceremonies of pilgrimage, took place. The peace of Allāh therefore prevailed in it; the forbidden war which was fought in Rājdāḥ between Kurāsh and Harāmūn and in which the young Muḥammad took part is called Ḥajjāb (perfidy) [q.v.].

In the Qur'ān, as recorded in the article al-Muḥākarram, only "the" holy month is mentioned and not the four which have become traditional from the sole reference ix. 36. If the reference in Surā v. 2 is to the 'umra we can therefore understand why the commentators in part identify the holy month mentioned in this verse with Rājdāḥ.

In Islam the month attained great importance through the memory of the Prophet's night journey to heaven which in later times was put on the 27th of the month (on the original dates see mī'raj). This night is therefore called Liqā' al-Mi'raj and is celebrated with readings of the legends of the ascension.

Bibliography: Welhausen, Keits arab. Hidlatinum, v. 77 sq.; al-Bīrūnī, Ahār, ed. Sachau, p. 50 sqq.; Juybūn, Handbuch der islamischen Gesch. 1916, p. 131 sq.; the works mentioned in the books and articles quoted. (M. Plessner)
and return in procession to Mecca (Ifadja). This last rite prepares the sexual deconsecration; the three others together abolish the prohibitions of the hadfi but the legists are not agreed on the order in which they have to be accomplished. The hadith say that the Prophet replied to the pilgrims who were worried, not having followed the order in which he had himself followed them: Ia Harunija: "no harm (in that)" (Bukhari, Hadīṣ, b. 125, 130 etc.). It is explained that the Prophet on this day of rejoicing did not wish to hurt the feelings of the believers. We may imagine that these 'Arab did not follow the customs of the Ka'bah and that Muhammad had neither the time nor the inclination to impose his own choice between the varying customs.

Muhammad began with the lapidation at al'Akabah. After the hadfi, the sacrifice and the ifadja, he returned to spend the night in Minā. Then on the 11th, 12th and 13th, he cast 7 stones at the three qamarūt ending with that of al-`Aqaba. The pilgrims imitating him ought therefore to throw 7 + (7 × 3) = 207 stones. But in general they take advantage of the liberty (ru'bah) given them by the hadith to leave Minā finally on the 12th and therefore only to throw 7 + (7 × 3) = 49 stones. It is probable that there was no ancient usage; the presence of the bodies of the sacrificial victims made Minā a horrible place. It is difficult to see how Wavell (Pilgrims, p. 202) threw 63 stones, i.e. (7 × 3) 3; this is however the number of victims which, according to tradition, Muhammad sacrificed with his own hand, one for each year of his life.

The stoning of al-'Aqaba is done on the 10th by the pilgrims in ifadja; those of the three days following by the deconsecrated pilgrims. The whole business is not a fundamental element of the pilgrimage (ru'bah).

Little stones are thrown, larger than a lentil, but less than a nut, what the old Arabs called baṣa (`-ḥadīf) which were thrown either with the fingers or with a little lever of wood forming a kind of sling (miṣk-hadda: Tirmidhi, iv. 123). A hadith forbids this dangerous game, which might knock out an eye but is not strong enough to kill an enemy: it must therefore have had something magical or pagan in its character. The stones have to be collected of the proper size and not broken from a rock. Gold, silver, precious stones etc. are condemned; but some texts allow, in addition to date-stones, a piece of camel-dung or a dead sparrow which we find are the means used by the women of the Djiłliya at the end of their period of isolation to remove the impurity of their widowhood and prepare a new personality. — It is recommended that the 7 stones for the lapidation of al-`Aqaba should be gathered at the maghar al-`baraw at Mundalifa, outside of Minā. As a rule the 63 others are gathered in the valley of Minā, but outside of the mosque and far from the qamarūt to avoid their having already been used (Ibn Taimiya, p. 347). Besides it is thought that stones accepted by Allah are carried away by angels. — Stones collected but not used should be buried; they have sometimes a sacred character which makes them dangerous.

The model pilgrimage of the Prophet fixed the time of the qamarūt al-`Aqaba for the day of the 10th. It shows him beginning the ḫadija of Mundalifa after the prayer at dawn (fātir) and casting the stones after sunrise. But by survival of an ancient custom more than for reasons of convenience other times are allowed by law. Al-Šāhī, against the three other imāms, permits the Akabah ceremony before sunrise (Rīfāt, i. 115); in general, the time is extended to the whole morning (fahmah), till afternoon (sunūf), till sunset, till night, till the morning of the day following: these infractions of the normal routine are stoned for by a sacrifice or alms, varying with the different schools. — The qamarūt of the three days of the tabassh take place in the sunūf; here again there are various traditions (Bukhari, Hadīṣ, b. 14). — In fixing the time of the lapidations that law has been endeavoured to avoid any Muslim rite, e.g. prayer, coinciding with one of the three positions of the sun by day, rising, noon, setting. A. J. Wensinck has shown (E.J., ii. 200) the probability of the solar character of the pagan ḥanif. —

Muhammad made his lapidation at al-`Aqaba from the bottom of the valley, mounted on his camel, turned towards the qamarūt, with the Ka'bah on his left and Minā on his right, standing at a distance of five cubits (eight feet). But there are other possible positions. — Rīfāt (i. 328) gives the qamarūt the following dimensions: 10 feet high and 6 feet broad on a rock 5 feet high (see the photographs, ibid.). It is said to have been removed at the beginning of Islām and replaced in 240 (854-855) (Azaφa, p. 212). — Muhammad made the lapidations of the other two qamarūt on foot, turning towards the ḥabb. In brief, the stones are cast in the attitude one happens to be in. The obliquity facing the Great Devil is explained to the nature of the ground, but it would also be in keeping with the idea of a curse cast in the face of a fallen deity. The position which makes the pilgrim turn towards the Ka'bah is due to the Muslim legend of the tempter Satan and to the rule of the tabāhir which will be explained below.

According to the ṣawma, the stones are placed on the thumb and bent forefinger and thrown, one by one, as in the game of marbles. However the possibility of the stones having been thrown together in a handful has been foreseen, and it was decided that this should only count as one stone and that the omission could be made good.

— The stone should not be thrown violently nor should one call "look out! look out!" (Tirmidhi, iv. 136), a pagan custom which the modern Beduins still retained quite recently (Rīfāt, i. 89). It seems that Muhammad put some strength into it for he raised his hand "to the level of his right eyebrow" (Tirmidhi, iv. 135) and showed his armpit (Bukhari, Hadīṣ, b. 141).

In Islām the casting of each stone is accompanied by pious formulas. It is generally agreed that the tabāhir is no longer pronounced at 'Arafa or at least before the lapidation of al-`Aqaba (Bukhari, Hadīṣ, b. 101); some writers however approve of it after al-`Aqaba. The takhli and tabsh are permitted, but it is the tabāhir which is recommended (Ibn Taimiya, p. 382); Bukhari, Hadīṣ, b. 138 and 143). The spiritual evolution of the rites even seen in this the essential feature of the rite, the throwing of the stone and the figure formed by throwing it by the thumb and forefinger forming an akh which represents 70, being no more than a symbolical and mnemonic gestures. The throwing of the stones was only instituted to cause the name of God to be repeated" (Tirmidhi, iv. 139).
To Ghasitil (Jhya', i. 192) it is an act of submission to God and of resistance to Satan who seeks to turn man away from the mystique of the kadjil but the rite is without rational explanation. The ghandi is a ghati i.e. 'the abode of the dead' (C. Goldsifer, Nichiyog, p. 252). — The devout man adds a prayer (dus) which is a ritual. The usual prayer is: Alhumdulilah jahadjiljil matbatun wuqatun mugh farun mawta wuqatun mughfarun "Lord, make this pilgrimage for me, pardon our sins and recompense our efforts!". There is, as matter of fact, a sudden halt, a waqf, before the two higher i.ganit, that at the second being especially long; the duration is calculated by the recitation of the Sura of the Cow (II), or of Joseph (XII), or the family of Imran (III) by the alternating indication in the hadith (Bukhari, Hadidji, b. 135, 136 and 137). This would take place of the ancient ceremony of imprecation.

The rules for the performance of these diverse ceremonies, especially as regards the number of stones thrown and the time when they are thrown ('Umda, iv. 767 sqq.; Riskit, i. 113), are punished by aoniments the exact nature of which the legists delight to vary from a victim to the giving of a mu'ad of food in alms.

The Muslim teachers have sought to explain the lapidations of Minni. Some exegists (e.g. Tabari, Tafsir, xxx. 167) have seen quite clearly that they represent ancient rites and have compared the rantsy of the tomb of Abu Ridjil. Others are known, for example at the well of Dhu l-Hulaifa (Lambman, Brillet, p. 94). The works quoted (E. L.) show the spread of this rite and the cases in which we are certain that it is a question of the driving away or the expulsion of evil; they might be further added to. Stones used to be thrown behind an individual whom one wished to return (Hamaghalia, Madinat, ed. Bairut, p. 23). At Alexandria, tired people used to go and lie down on the stones in order to throw the stones behind them on a pile "like that of Minni", it is possible that lapidations at one time followed the sacrifices which perhaps took place at 'Arafa and Muzdalifa.

Radjput, inhabitants of India, who claim to be the modern representatives of the Kshatriyas of ancient tradition. (From the Sanskrit radjaputra, a king's son). For the connection between Radjapsya and Kshatriya see Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, i., s. v. Kshatriya. The term Radjput has no racial significance. It simply denotes a tribe, clan, or warlike class, the members of which claim aristocratic rank, a claim generally reinforced by Brahman recognition.

The origin of the Radjputs is a problem which lies with difficulties. The theory which at present holds the field is that proposed by Bhanderkar, Smith and Crooke. According to this theory the Radjputs can be divided into two main classes, the foreign and the indigenous. The foreign clans, such as the Chahans, Cakukvas, and Gardjars, are the descendants of invaders of the Vth and VIth centuries of the Christian era. The indigenous Radjputs include the Radjhratkias of the Deccan, the Khaks of Radjputana proper, and the Candilas and Bundilas of Bundelkhand.

The theory that certain Radjput clans are of foreign extraction is chiefly based on Radjput legends and folklore according to which there are three branches of Radjputs: the Stradihans, or Solar race; the Candrahas, or Lunar race; and the Agni Kula, or Fire-group. The legend relates how the Agni Kula Radjputs, that is, the Chahans, Cakukvas, Gardjaras, Prathihars, and the Pramara, originated in a fire-pit around Mount Abu in southern Radjputana. From this it has been concluded that the four clans in this group are related and that the fire-pit represents a rite of purification by which the tint of foreign extraction was removed. Since these writers believed the Parhiars to be invaders of Gilja stock, it was concluded that the other three Agni Kula clans were also invaders.

According to Smith the Gardjaras were invaders who founded a kingdom around Mount Abu. In the time of the rulers of this kingdom who were known as Gardjaras-Prathihars conquered Kanaowj and became the paramount power in northern India about 800 A.D. Smith contends that the Prathihars were a clan of the Gardjara tribe. This seems to be the chief evidence produced by these writers for the foreign extraction of certain Radjput clans.

It seems wrong to base this theory of foreign descent principally upon the Agni Kula legend, for Waidya and other writers have proved this to be a myth. The first heard of in the Pratihara-raj-ras of the poet Cand who could not have composed this work before the Xth century A.D. Recent research has brought to light the fact that the inscriptions of the Prathihars and Chahans before the Xth century represent them as Solar Radjputs, while the Cakukvas are represented as of the Lunar race. The Agni Kula legend does not therefore deserve the prominence given to it by Smith and other writers. Even the contention that the Prathihars were a branch of the Gardjara tribe has met with much hostile criticism.

According to the orthodox Hindu view the Radjputs are the direct descendants of the Kshatriyas of the Vedic polity, but this claim is based on fictitious genealogies. The Kshatriyas of ancient India disappear from history and this can probably be explained by invasions from Central Asia which shattered the ancient Hindu polity. It is accepted that these invading hordes, such as the Yashch-i and Hinans, became rapidly Hinduized, and that
their leaders assumed Kshatriya rank and were recognized as such. Out of this chaos arose a new Hindu polity with new rulers, and the families of invaders which became supreme were recognized as Kshatriyas or Rādjputs. In later times many chiefs of the so-called aboriginal tribes also assumed the title of Rādjput.

It is therefore safe to assert that the Rādjputs are a very heterogeneous body and probably contain some survivors of the older Kshatriyas. A mass of legend arose assigning to the various septs a descent from the sun and the moon, or from the heroes of the epic poems. These are the legendary pedigrees recorded in great detail by Tod. The main argument which can be brought forward in support of the foreign descent of certain Rādjput clans is the incorporation of foreigners into the fold of Hinduism to which the whole history of India bears testimony. Even though the Agni Nāla legend be discredited it is still possible to argue that the Rāждputs are not a race. Anthropologically they are definitely of mixed origin. That some Rāждputs were of foreign origin can be proved by the acceptance of the Hīṇas in the recognized list of Rāждput tribes.

Whatever may be the origin of the Rāждputs we know that disorder and political disintegration followed the death of Harīṇa, and that until the Muslim invasions of northern India the chief characteristic of this period was the growth and development of the Rāждput clans. Except for about two hundred years, when the Gudjāra-Pratihāras were the paramount power in Hindūtāna, there was constant interference warfare between the various Rāждput kingdoms. This weakness considerably facilitated the Muslim conquest. It was not however until the days of Muhammad of Ghōr that the Rāждput dynasties in the plains were finally overthrown [see above, iii. 742²]. Driven from Dīhlī and Kanawīd they retreated into modern Rāждputāna where they eventually built up a strong position and were able to resist the Muslim invaders, for it cannot be said that the Sultans of Dīhlī ever really subdued the Rāждputs of Rāждputāna. Nevertheless, throughout this period there was constant warfare, fortresses and strongholds frequently changing hands. The Rāждputs nearest to Dīhlī were naturally the weakest because the eastern frontier of Rāждputāna was exposed to attack. The Sultans of Dīhlī appear to have realized the value of communications with the western coast and we find that the route between Dīhlī and Gudjārasth via Aḍāmūr was usually open to imperial armies. The chief menace to the Rāждputs was not from Dīhlī but from the independent Muslim kingdoms of Gudjārasth [q.v.] and Mālwā [q.v.]. The outstanding feature of the period from the end of the so-called Siāyid rule to the final invasion of Bābur was the growth of Rāждput power in northern India under Rāṅga Sangas of Mewār. Taking advantage of the weakness of the Lodis under Isāḥīm [q.v.] and of the war between Gudjārasth and Mālwā he had extended his sway over the greater part of modern Rāждputāna. The battle of Khaṇḍāna in 1527, when Bābur shattered his power, marks a turning-point in the history of Muslim rule in India, for the Rāждputs never again attempted to regain their lost dominions on the plains and contented themselves with remaining on the defensive. After Khaṇḍāna the place of the Sesodias in Rāждput politics was taken by the Rāṭhors, the growth of whose power under Malīdī of Mārwār was facilitated by the struggle between Humāyūn [q.v.] and Shāh Shihā. Akbār’s Rāждput policy was based on conquest and consolidation. The fall of Cītur and Rāntambhūr made him master of the greater part of Rāждputāna, with the exception of Mewār which was not completely subdued until the reign of Dīshāṅghī [q.v.]. The reversal of Akbār’s conciliatory policy produced the great Hindu reaction of Awaṅgāzēb’s reign, when, faced at the same time with the Rāждputs of the north and the Marāṭhās of the Deccan, Awaṅgāzēb [q.v.] was unable to concentrate on either campaign. But internal dissensions once more prevented the Rāждputs from taking advantage of the decline of Mughal power, and, in the second half of the eighteenth century, they proved no match for the Marāṭhās who easily overran their country. It was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century when the British were at war with the Marāṭhās that they entered into political relations with the Rāждput states. Before the end of the year 1818 the group of states which now comprise Rāждputāna had been taken under British protection.

To-day India contains 16,743,991 Rāждputs distributed throughout the country as follows: United Provinces, 3,756,936; Pandiāb, 2,351,650; Bihār and Orissa, 1,412,440; Rāждputāna, 660,516; Central Provinces and Bārāwar, 506,087; Gwalīn, 393,076; Central India, 388,942; Bombay, 352,016; Dījjam and Kāṣhumī, 356,020; Western India States, 227,153; Bengal, 156,978; Baroda, 94,893; and Haidārābād 88,434 [1931 Census Report]. It will be noted that in Rāждputāna only 669,516 Rāждputs are to be found out of a total population of 11,225,712. The states of Rāждputāna are ruled by Rāждputas, with the exception of Tonk which is Muslim, and Bhatāpur and Dholpur which are Bīsth. The chief Rāждput clans in Rāждputāna are the Rāṭhors, Kachhāwa, Chāhūnī, Dāledon, Sesodia, Powar, Parhār, Tonwar and Dījālī. Rāждasthāni is the mother tongue of 77 per cent. of the inhabitants of this area. It is interesting to note that in some parts of India Rāждputs have embraced Islām, as for example the Māṅbās, Kāṭís, and Salāhīs of the Pāṇḍūjī.

RAF. [See Rafa.]

RAF AL-DIN, Mawlāna Shāh Muḥammad, b. Shāh Wali Allāh b. 'Abd al-Rāṣīm al-Ḥaram (after the Caliph Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb), was born in 1176 (1750) in Dihli, in a family which enjoyed the highest reputation in Muslim India for learning and piety, from the xviiith century onwards, and produced a number of eminent scholars up to the "Mutiny" (see Siddīq Ḥasan Khān, Ḥāfiz al-Nabūtā, Čawmān 1288, p. 296 sq.; J. A. S. B., xiiii. 310). He studied hadīth with his father, who was the most celebrated traditionalist in his time, in India.

After the death of his father in 1176, he was brought up by his elder brother Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz (1159-1233 = 1746-1823) with whom he completed his studies in the usual sciences, being especially interested in hadīth, kalām and uṣūl. When about twenty, he entered upon his career as muftī and muhaddis, and later succeeded in these capacities his brother and teacher, who, in his old age, had lost his eye-sight, and had indifferent health. He died on the 6th Shawwāl 1253 (Aug. 9, 1838), at the age of 70 (lunar years), of cholera in his cells in the family grave-yard outside the city of Dihli.

He wrote about 20 works, mostly in Arabic and Persian, and a few in Urdu. He is praised for the subtlety of his ideas and the conciseness of his style. Among his works are:

In Urdu: 1. a translation of the Kur'ān, interlinear to the Arabic text, which it follows closely and faithfully. He and his brother 'Abd al-Kaḍīr [q. v.] were the pioneers in this field, though their work was considerably facilitated by their father, Shāh Wali Allāh's Persian translation of the Kur'ān (entitled Fath al-Raḥmān fi Tārīqat al-Kur'ān). The first edition of Shāh Raf al-Din's translation appeared in Calcutta in 1254 (1838-1839) and again in 1266 (1848-1850). For some of its numerous editions (from 1866 onwards) see Blumhardt, Cat. of the Hindustani Printed Books of the Libr. of the British Museum, London 1889, p. 290 sq., and the Supplement to the same, London 1909, p. 403.

In Arabic: 2. Ṭaḥthil al-Šīrāzī or Ṭaḥthil al-Ṣīnān al-Allāhm, dealing with a logic, b. taḥthil, i.e. principles of dialectics, teaching, learning, authorship and self-study; c. Malākhīn min al-ʿUghtār al-ʿArabiyya (some metaphysical discussions) and d. Ṭaṭḥil al-ʿArūs (i.e. an inquiry into the causes and the criteria: for judging conflicting opinions in religious matters). A portion of the work has been quoted in the Afzād al-Ulūm, p. 127-135 and 235-270; 3. Mahādīnat al-Šīrāzī; see Afzād al-Ulūm, p. 124: 4. Ṣīrāt al-Muḥabb, a discourse on the all-pervading nature of love; see Afzād al-Ulūm, p. 254: 5. Ṣīrāt Ṣūfī al-Nuṣr, a commentary on Sunn xxiv. 35: 6. Ṣīrāt al-ʿArūs wa l-ʿAḥādy; see Afzād, p. 915; 7. Danq al-ʾUṣūl, dealing with some abstruse problems of the ʿilm al-khābā; 8. a gloss on Mīr Ẓāhir al-Harāmī on Kūth al-Din al-Rāṣīs Ṣīrāt al-Tawḥīd wa l-ʿUṯūrīs (see Brockelmann, ii. 209); 9. ʿIṣāb al-Burāhn al-bismiyya "alā Ṣūr al-Ḥukmām". Nrs. 4-9 are unpublished.

In Persian: 10. ʿAḥādīs Nāmah (Lahore 1339; Haidarabad, undated ed.), on the last judgment, also called ʿAḥādīs Nāmah (see Browne's Supplementary Handlist, p. 189). For the two poetical versions, in Urdu, of this popular work, viz., Aḥādīs Muḥammad (chronogrammatic name, which gives 1250 as the date of composition), and Aḥādīs Muḥammad, see Spranger, Oudh Catalogue, p. 524, 4. Blumhardt, Cat. of the Hind. Printed Books, p. 335. A prose version, ʿAḥādīs Nāmah wā Dāʾl al-ʿArūs, is attributed to Blumhardt, loc. cit.; 11. ʿAlawī, Dihli 1322; 12. Majmūʿat al-Sīrāt, Dihli 1314, small treatises on religious and mystical topics; 15. Sharḥ al-Saḥāb bi-Sharḥ ʿAḥādīs al-Muḥfiz wa l-ʿArūs, an exegiustic work, covering ff. 2002 of a small size, in a MS. copy in the Dār al-ʿUlūm, Deoband, which institution also possesses the MS. of his 14. Lāfīf al-Ḥaqqat, a mystical work (ff. 32).

Bibliography: Besides the references given above, Mafṣūrat Shāh 'Abd al-Azīz Muḥaddith Dīkanā (composed 1233), Meerut 1314, p. 79, 83 sq.; Moḥammad b. Yāhiya (commonly known as Moḥammad b. Tirmiżī), ʿArbaʿiʿ al-Qanāt wa ʿAḥādīs al-Muḥfiz, ʿAbd al-Qanāt (litigous, on the margin of the Ṭabīʿ al-ʿĀra با  currentPage 256 Al-Rāṣīs ʿArūs al-Muḥaddith, and composed in Medina in 1280 (1863)), Deoband 1349, p. 75; Siddīq Ḥasan Khān, Afzād al-Ulūm, Bhopal 1295, p. 124, 914 sq., and other places mentioned in this article: Kārim al-Din, Farḥād al-Dārā, Dihli 1284, p. 125; ʿAbd al-Azīz al-Siddīq Khān, Dihli 1370, p. 156; ʿAbd al-Muḥammad Dīkanā, Hadīḳ al-Maḥāṣiyā, Lucknow 1891, p. 469; Shāhīn, Alī, Tashkhabār (litigous, to Hill), Lucknow 1914, p. 66 (and p. 4, 24, 51, 65, 232, 276 for notices etc. of the Shāh's sons and pupils); ʿAbd al-Din Muḥammad, ʿAbd al-Qanāt Dīkanā, Agra 1918, ii. 588 sq.; Gérard de Tassy, Histoire de la littérature Hindoue et Hindustanien, 2nd ed., Paris 1870, ii. 548 sq.; Saksena, History of Urdu Literature, Allahabad 1927, p. 233; Muṣāfir (an Urdu monthly published from Agra, India) for Nov. 1928, p. 344 sqq.; The Oriental College Magazine, Lahore (an Urdu quarterly) for Nov. 1925, p. 42-49 (life, including a biog. notice from the unpublished Nasihat al-Ḳaṣāmī by Maj. 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Lucknow, and a list of works). (Muḥammad Shāṭī)

AL-RĀḠĪB AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ, Abū l-Kaḍīr al-Ḥusain b. Muḥammad b. al-Maṭāwūṣ (according to others: al-Falāḥ, al-Suyūṭī, etc., wrongly: al-Muḥaddith b. Muḥammad), a Persian and Arabic writer, of the details of whose life nothing is known beyond that he died at the beginning of the xivth (xvith) century, perhaps in 502 (1598). Some regarded him as a Muʿtaṣib but Fakhr al-Din al-Rāṣīs in his Asaṣ al-Ṭabīʿīs established his orthodoxy. His work was concerned with Kurʾānic exegesis and edifying literature. His studies on the Kurʾān from which al-Baḥṣtī is said to have taken a great deal were opened with a Niṣābat munabbahāta ʿAbd al-Qanāt al-Kurʾānī now lost, perhaps identical with the Muḥaddīdat al-Taḥṣīr, pr. at Cairo 1299 at the end of ʿAbd al-Dżubbar's Tāmāṣī al-Kurʾānī amīr l-Muṣṭafī. He next compiled an excellent dictionary of the Kurʾān arranged alphabetically according to the initial letters entitled Rūżt Maṣāgāt al-ʿAḥādīs al-Kurʾānī, which in addition to the MSS. mentioned in G. A. L., i. 289, survives in many others in Stambul (see e.g. M. O., vii. 106, 127) and in Bankipore (Cat. xviii. 1484) and under the title Muṣāfāt al-Sīrāt al-Kurʾānī is printed on the margin of Ibn al-Athīr's Nihāya, Cairo 1322 and edited by Muḥammad
RAGUSA (Raguse), a town in Dalmatia, formerly a free state (now Dubrovnik), on the south side of a peninsula which runs out into the Adriatic, picturesquely situated (50 feet) at the foot and on the slopes of Mount Sisari with about 14,500 inhabitants, mainly Croats, was founded in the viith century by Romance fugitives from Epidauros which had been destroyed by the Slavs, later belonged to Byzantine Dalmatia which had been settled by a Romance population. At the end of the tenth century the town, which had become strong and rich through its prosperous maritime trade, was paying homage to the Venetians under whose suzerainty it remained after various interludes continuously from 1204 to 1358. In this year Ragusa passed to Hungary and soon attained such power through its flourishing trade that it formed a free state with an aristocratic form of government. Authority was in the hands of the nobles (Grand Council) who chose the Senet (45 members). The latter chose the Little Council (10, later 7 members) which chose every month a Rector (rector) as head of the state. Al-Idrisi [q. v.] mentions Ragusa in his Kitab al- 
Ragusa as رومة (other readings: روما) and is evidently quoting Frankish sources (cf. thereon Wilh. Tomashcz, Zur Kunde der Himmelskunde I: Die Handelswege im XII. Jahrh., nach den Erkundungen des Arabers Idrisi, Vienna 1887 = S. B. Ak. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., vol. exilii, fasc. i). In the Ottoman period the Slav name Dubrovnik is found exclusively, in place of Ragusa.

Ragusa's relations with Islam, at first completely hostile, go back to a remote date. When the Arabs in the ninth century conquered Sicily and established themselves on the mainland in Bari (Apulia) they besieged Ragusa on one occasion which defended itself bravely and was relieved by the navy of the emperor Basil I (867-886). Under the emperor Romanus III (1028-1034) the Ragusans distinguished themselves in the seafights between Byzantines and Arabs. It was not till a later date that relations became more peaceful when Ragusa commenced, which extended to Egypt and Syria, to Tunis and as far as the Black Sea, began to flourish. As early as the 13th century, corn was exported to Ragusa from the harbours of Anatolia and the relations to the petty states (farsı-fı mülür) in Anatolia were well established. The first documented relations between Ragusa and the Ottoman empire belong to the period of Bayazid I. Yildirim (1380-1402; q. v.) as the relations of the free state to Ortkan [q. v.] and Murad I [q. v.] mentioned in later Ragusan histories will not bear serious investigation. It is however certain that at quite an early date it became necessary for the Ragusans to remain on good terms with the Ottomans, who were advancing westward, for the sake of their trade. They were able to deal with tact and skill with their new neighbours, Ragusan trade in Turkey developed considerably as being present among the many frontiers and customs offices of the numerous petty rulers of the Balkans, who had been disemboweled by the Turks, disappeared and the Turkish duties were uniform and low. Articles manufactured in Ragusa itself, like cloth, metal, soap, glass, wax etc. or goods imported from Italy for the Balkan peninsula were taken into the interior on safe roads. There was a caravan trade which went from Ragusa via Trebinje, Tien...
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tiste, Foča, Goražde, Plevlje, Prijeponje, Trgovitse, Novibazar [q.v.], Niš, Sofia, Philippopolis to Adrianople and later to Stambul (cf. C. J. Jirecek, Die Handelsstrassen und Bürgerwe von Serbien und Bosnien während des Mittelalters, Fray 1879, p. 74 sqq.: Von Ragusa nach Niš). In the interior of the Peninsula there were the factories of the Ragusans like Rudnik, Priaren, Novo Brezo, Priština, Zvornik, Novibazar, Skopje, Sofia with many other settlements extending as far as the mouths of the Danube. On May 12, 1392 the Little Council of Ragusa gave the nobleman Teodoros Gislia in Novo Brezo orders to travel to the Turkish sultan and to make representations about the capture of some Ragusan merchants. There is a Turkish safe-conduct (littera securitatis) of June 20, 1396 prepared for Ragusan merchants. In 1397 Sultan Bajazid I allowed the Ragusans to trade unhindered in the Ottoman empire, and a few years later (1399), the first Ottoman embassy led by Kefalija Feriz (Fritza-Beriz) arrived in Ragusa from the citadel of Zvečan (in Kossovo) (cf. F. v. Kraelits-Greifenhorst, cts. cit., p. 7). The first embassy from Ragusa to the Sublime Porte was however not sent until 1430. It was received by the sultan in his court at Adrianople and received from him the first extant charter of trading privileges, dated Adrianople, Dec. 6, 1430 (cf. Ciro Truhelka, Turkolobijski spomenici dobrovski arhiva, in Glavnik srpskog natjecanja u Barini i Herzegovini, Sarajevo, vol. xxii. [1911], No. 2). To protect her widespread trade on the Balkan Peninsula Ragusa, after the first temporary conquest of Serbia by the Ottomans, founded herself to force the Porte an annual present of 1,000 ducats in silver plate (argentum) but when Georg Brankovic restored the independence of Serbia in 1444 this promise was promptly withdrawn, on the final subjection of Serbia by the Turks in 1459, this tribute (kharidi) became a regular institution. From 1459 it was 1,500 ducats and gradually increased to 15,000 ducats. From 1481 it was 12,500 ducats and was annually brought to the Porte by special oratores tributi with very detailed instructions (cf. the text of one of these commissiones for the Paladino Marino de Gondola and Pietro di Lucarelli of 1458 and of a later one for the ambasciador del tributo Giov. Mari de Resti of 1572 in Lajo knj. Vojnovic, Dubrovnik i romanice carstva. Prva knjiga: Od prvog ugovora s portom do unutnjica Herzegovine, Belgrad 1898, p. 118—155 and p. 256—266); cf. C. J. Jirecek, Die Bedeutung von Ragusa etc., note 49. A number of the earliest documents relating to these missions have been published by F. Kraelits-Greifenhorst, in his Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache aus der zweiten Hälfte des XV. Jahrhunderts (= S. E. Ab. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., vol. 197, Vienna 1923); they come without exception from the archives of Ragusa, part of the Turkish portion of which is still present in Belgrade.

On their journey the envoys had to give kinds of presents, for example to the Sandjak bey of the Herzegovina in Sarajevo [q.v.] and the Beglerbeg of Rumelia whose headquarters were in Sofia. The readiness with which the Ragusans adapted themselves to the requirements of dealings with the infidel Turks did not at first find approval at the Holy See. Paul II in 1468 gave the Ragusans permission to trade with the heathen Ottomans (cf. W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, ii., Leipzig 1885, p. 347 sq, with further references to Ragusan trade with the Ottomans). The lands of the free state of Ragusa which stretched from the mouth of the Narenta to the Gulf of Cattaro (Kotor), thanks to the skillful policy of its leaders, thus remained intact till its end in 1808. Only occasionally the Ragusans had to suffer from the covetousness of Ottoman rulers, e.g. about 1667 when Khan Mustafa [q. v.] demanded from the Ragusan envoys 150,000 talers "blood money" for the Dutch ambassador G. Crook who perished in the great earthquake in Ragusa (April 6, 1667) (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 203 sq), or when ten years later the same grand vizier endeavored to extort the same sum and threw the ambassadors of the free state into prison (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 346 sq). When Ragusa had fallen several years behind with the tribute, it had to in 1695 to pay a considerable sum in compensation (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 616). In 1722 a similar case occurred (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., viii. 512 sq) when the tribute was three years in arrears. It is to be noted that Ragusa cunningly used every opportunity to avoid its oppressive obligations (cf. the significant saying in the Levant quoted by van Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 29. Non siano Christiani, non siano Ebrei, ma siano Ragusi), until the peace of Karlowitz (1699) made it possible for the Ottomans to collect the tribute again (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 29). From 1703 it was paid every three years and in 1804 delivered for the last time in Stambul by the envoys Paul Goeze and Blasius Menze.

In the Turkish wars of 1683—1699 and 1714—1718 the Venetians occupied the hinterland of Ragusa and Trebinje but at the peace of Karlowitz and Passarowitz the Ragusans, protected by Austria and the Porte, negotiated so skillfully that Turkey was not only left the land as far as the Ragusan frontier but also two strips of territory on the coast (Klek and Sutorina) so as not to become direct neighbours of Venice. This was the last great coup of Ragusan policy.

With the decline in Ragusan trade, which came about for the same reasons as the general decline of Italian trade in the Levant, the political decline of the republic set in. In 1808, Napoleon sent General Marmont, afterwards Duc de Raguse, to dissolve the Senate and a year later made Ragusa a province of Illyria. In 1815 the town passed to Austria and since 1918 it has belonged to Jugoslavia.

The Ottoman traveler Ewlija Celebi [q. v.] in his Sürküste (vi. 443 sqq., esp. p. 445—453) gives a full description of Dobro Vinozk which he contrasts with Brunokulj Vinozk, i.e. Venice (cf. on these terms F. Babinger, Aus Südtürkischen Türkenschriften, Berlin 1927, p. 38 note and H. v. Milk, Beiträge zur Kartographie Albaniens, in Geographische Zeitschrift, vol. 3, Leipzig 1922); they come without exception from the archives of Ragusa, part of the Turkish portion of which is still present in Belgrade.

Statistics regarding the population of Ragusa in the older period are not available. The town had 800 houses. The whole district had 50,000 inhabitants. With the prosperity and long period of peace, a literary life began; poetry — Latin
and Slav — was definitely cultivated from the end of the 18th century. Latin was used in the offices for over 1,000 years, in recording the proceedings of the Senate till 1808. Within its walls Ragusa frequently sheltered illustrious fugitives from Turkish persecution (e.g. Skanderbeg).


Ragusa had busy commercial relations with other Muslim states besides Turkey. In 1510 for example, Ragusa received from Kânsîl ad-Dîhirî [q.v.], the Gran Colle of trade, the privilege of a safe conducts protection and freedom (cf. Giacomo Lucchieri, *Copia nelle istanzioni dell'Assisi di Ragusa, Venice 1605*, p. 136 and thereon Fr. M. Appendini, *Nelitalia nelle istorico critiche antichità, storia e letteratura de' Ragusini*, Ragusa 1802, i. 213 with erroneous conclusions). The relations were, it is true, not always of a peaceful nature as the "state of war" in 1194 (1780) between Ragusa and Morocco showed (cf. thereon F. Bähringer, *Ein marokkanisches Staatsaktchen an den Freiherrn de Ragusa vom Jahre 1780*, in *M.S.O.S., 31*, Berlin 1927, part ii, p. 101 sqq. and ibid., XXXI, p. 98 sq.). The archives of Dubrovnik contain further unpublished Moroccan documents of the end of the 18th century, e.g. a government document of the 9th Rabi II, 1119 (April 4, 1781).

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works mentioned in the text cf. also the older travellers in so far as they describe the road through the Balkan Peninsula (Slavonia), especially Jean Chenu, *Les Voyages de Monseign A Râvan* (1547), Paris 1557, ed. by J. de Sclier: *Sieur D'Ex Hayes de Courmemin*, *Voyages du Lombarde et fait par le commandement du roy en l'année 1622 par le Sieur D.C.*; Paris 1632; and French translation *Voyage de Dubroton, de Grèce et du Levant*, Amsterdam 1669, 2 vols. — A scholarly account, particularly one based on the documents, of the relations of Ragusa with the Ottoman Empire is still lacking as is a full commercial history of the republic. — The principal work on the history of Ragusa is the *Geschichte des Freiherren von Ragusa, Vienna 1807*, by Johann Christ. v. Engel (1770—1814). On other relations between Ragusa and the lands of Islam see Vladimir Malinovski, *Studien über die Islamischen Spiele, Die X. bis zur XIV. Jahrhundert*, transl. into German and publ. by Camilla Lucerna, Zagreb-Leipzig 1928, 55 sqq. A work which however does not on every point stand the test of strict examination. — On the coinsage of Ragusa see Milan v. Rešetar, *Dubrovacka numismatike, 2 parts, 1924—1926*. — Of the Ragusan historians of the older period in addition to S. Razi, *La storia di Ragusa, Venice 1585 and Jun. Resti, *Chronica Ragusina (in the Monumenta Slav. Merid., vol. xxx., Agram 1893), Giacomo di Pietro Lucarei [= Jakov Lucarović (1551—1615)] most deserves mention, but a thorough study of the probably unreliable sources of his *Copia ristretto degli annali di Ragusa (Venice 1605, 3*, 176 p., 4° and Ragusa 1700, 331 p., 8°) is still a desideratum (cf. for the present Vl. Malinovski, *Studii dubrovacka historika Jakovu Lukaroviću, in Narodna Starina*, Zagreb 1924, No. 8, p. 121—153. — An excellent and exhaustive bibliography on Ragusa is given in: the introduction to the work of Ivan Dujčev, *Avvisi di Ragusa, Documenti sull’Impero turco nel secolo XVII e nella guerra di Cambria*, Rome 1935, which is also of great importance for the history of relations between Ragusa and Turkey. — There is no collection or edition of the surviving reports of Ragusan envoys on their journeys to the Porte on the lines of the long available Venetian relations. The only possible exception is the *Relazione della visita della religione musulmana in parte dell’Europa sottoposta al dominio del Turco di Matthias Gumulic* (Gondola) who was in Turkey for 28 months until July 1674 written in Rome in 1675, ed. by Banduri, *Imperium Orientali, Paris 1711*, vol. ii.: *Ambassadore in Constantin. Persiphragen. de administratione imperii*, p. 99—106 (cf. thereon in *Periodotikos Spisanie* di Balar, i. 65, who did not know this edition and published extracts from another manuscript). Nor is there a list of these: *envoyes available (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. E., ix. 318) among whom we find representatives of almost all the noble families of Ragusa, like the Bona, Caipha, Gozze, Gondola, Menze, Pozza, Resti etc. Ragusa being a tributary country the Porte never sent ambassadors to it but only commissioners (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. E., ix. 331). So that we have no Turkish reports at all.

(Franz Babinger)

**AL-RAHBA, RAHAT MALLI R. TAWF 132 OF RAHAT AL-SHAM, A TOWN ON THE RIGHT BANK OF THE EUFRAITES, THE MODERN AL-MILHÁL.**

Hardly anything definite is known about the history of the town before the Mamluk era. In the middle ages it was usually identified as the Rihbih-n-Nâhir of the Bible (Gen. XXXVI. 37) i.e. Rihbâhit on the river (Euphrates) especially in the Talmud and by the Syriac authors (e.g. Mich. Syr. cf. index, p. 63): Barhebræus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 273 and passim), who usually call it Reheb, Rahbat (M. Hattmann, in Z.D.P.W., xxiii, p. 42, note 3). A Must (The Middle Euphrates, New York 1927, p. 340) takes it to be the Thapsakos of Ptolemy, which he — certainly wrongly — wants to distinguish from the well-known town of the name at the bend of the Euphrates (ibid., p. 315—326) instead of seeing only an erroneous location by the Alexandrine geographers (cf. the article Thapsakos in Pauly-Wissowa, K.E., v, A. col. 1272—1280). The name al-Rahba is explained by Yakút (Mu'sjam, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 764 following the grammarian Najjar b. Shumail) at the flat part of a wash, where the Tigris collects (Escalera, Archäologie, Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, Heft 32; cf. A. Socin, in: Z. D. P. W., xxii. 45).

According to Arabic accounts it was at one time called Furdat Nu'um (al-Tahari, ed. de Goeje, i. 917) or simply al-Furd (Ibn Miskawsh, Tabikhir, 1100)
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ed. Caetani, p. 87) in the vicinity was a monastery, Dair Nu‘m (Yākūt, ii. 704; iv. 297).

According to al-Ra’ilīt (ed. de Goeje, p. 180), there was no evidence that al-Rahba below Karbisiya was an old town; on the contrary it was only founded by Mālik b. Tawāk b. Ātālah al-Taghlib (cf. Abu l-Maḥmūd, ed. Popper, ii. 34) in the caliphate of al-Ma’mūn (813–833) (a legendary embellishment of the story of its foundation by ‘Umar al-Bishāmī in Yākūt, ii. 764). The new foundation was in the form of a long rectangular head cloth (palasūn). After the death of its founder (Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, v. 188) in 860 (873–874) he was succeeded as ruler of the town by his son Ahmad who however was driven out of it in 883 by Ibn Abi l-Sālih, lord of al-Anāb, Ţarīk al-Furāt and Raḥbat Tawāk (al-Tubah, iii. 2030).

The Karmaṣṭān Abū Tāhir took the town on March 3, 928 and killed many of its inhabitants (Ibn Khurāṣwāl, Talqārīt, ed. Amedroz, i. 182 sq.; al-Maqrīzī, viii. 364 sq., in G. ed. Ibn al-Athir, iii. 132); ʿArīb, ed. de Goeje, c. 134). In the following decades the town suffered much from civil wars until Abī, who had been sent from Baghdad by Baḍjikm, in 350 (941–942) took possession of the town and the whole province of Ţarīk al-Furāt and a part of al-Khārij (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 266 sq., 295). In the reign of the Ḥamānīd Nāṣir al-Dawla the Taghlibi Dājmān rebelled in al-Rahba, and the town suffered very much; he was finally driven out and was drowned in the Euphrates (cf. c. iv., p. 357 sq.). After the death of Nāṣir al-Dawla (358 = 966) his sons Ḥamdūn, Abu l-Barakāt and Abū Tawāk disputed for the possession of the town which finally fell to the last-named, who had its walls rebuilt (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 437 sq.). He lost it again in 368 (978–979); it then passed to the Būyid ʿAbd al-Dawla (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 511 sq.). Ḥaḥāl al-Dawla in 381 (991–992) at the wish of the inhabitants appointed a governor to al-Rahba (Ibn al-Athir, iv. 64). Six months later possession passed to Abū ʿĀli b. Thāmil al-Khāṣfārī who was killed by the ʿUkaidī Isā b. Khālid in 399 (1008–1009). The latter in turn was defeated by an army sent by Abī al-Ḥakīm from Egypt and slain. The ʿUkaidī Baḍr b. Mākāliwād was, it is true, able to drive back the Egyptian army but ʿArnūn of Damascus soon afterwards brought al-Rahba and al-Rahba into Egyptian power.

A citizen of the town, Ibn Maḥnān, next made himself its independent master and also took ʿAnā, an enterprise in which the Ḥaḥālī ʿAbd b. Mirjān of al-Hilla at first supported him but later killed him in order to make himself master of al-Rahba (Ibn al-Athir, ix. 148; Ibn Ḥaldūn, Ṭabar, ed. Būlāq, iv. 271). Between 447 (1055) and 450 (1058) Anšān al-Basāṣīt (q.v.) fled to al-Rahba in order to join up with the Egyptian caliph al-Mustanṣir from there (Yākūt, i. 608). ʿAbdī’s son, Thāmil, later lord of Ḥaḥāl, followed him in possession of the town (Ibn al-Athir, ix. 163). In the spring of 1060 his brother ʿAbdī (Ibn al-Athir, x. 8) captured it. He was driven from Ḥaḥāl in 1065 by his nephew Maḥmūd, but remained lord of al-Rahba, A’sā, Ṣambābī and Būlāq (Kamāl al-Dīn, Ḥikāya Maqādisi, transl. J. J. Müller, p. 59). To the district of al-Rahba at this time (1063) there also belonged al-Khāṣṭa, Karbisiya and Dūwāra (Ibn al-Kalānīst, ed. Amedroz, p. 116). Malikṣabṭ in 479 (1086–1087) granted al-Rahba with the country round it Ḥarrān, Sarārī, al-Rahba and al-Khāṣṭa to Muhammad b. Shams al-Dawla (Ibn al-Athir, x. 105). In 480 (1090) Karbisiya of al-Hilla seized and plundered the town (Ibn al-Athir, x. 177). After his death it passed (1103–1105) to ʿAlaʾ b. ʿAlāʾ, a former general of Alp Arslān, then to the Turk ʿAlāʾ. It was taken from him by the sultan of Damascus who sent the Shabinīd Muṣḥin b. al-Sabbāk to govern it (Ibn al-Athir, x. 249). On May 19, 1107 Dūwār, the general of Imād al-Dīn Zaghlī, took the town through treachery (Ibn al-Athir, x. 297; Ibn al-Kalānīst, ed. Amedroz, p. 156 sq.; Michael Syrūs, transl. Chabot, iii. 193; iv. 529; Barbehaeus, Chron. syl., ed. Bedjan, p. 273; Iṣṣ al-Dīn Maṣʿūdī b. Ḥabšī took it in 1127 shortly before his death (Ibn al-Athir, x. 360 sq.; Mich. Syr., iii. 228 = iv. 610; Barbehr, Chron. syl., p. 287). His successors killed one another fighting for the succession and al-Rahba then passed to Iṣṣ al-Dīn’s young brother for whom Dūwār governed it as vassal of ʿAlāʾ (Ibn al-Athir, x. 453 sq.; Ḥabšī al-Dīn, son of ʿAlāʾ, in 544 (1149–1150) occupied the town (Ibn al-Athir, xi. 93). On Aug. 12, 1157, al-Rahba with Hamān, Salamiya and other towns were destroyed by an earthquake (Ibn al-Kalānīst, ed. Amedroz, p. 244; Mich. Syr., iii. 316; Barbehr, Chron. syl., p. 325 sq.). The Ḥaḥālī tribe who in 1161 had plundered the district of al-Hilla and al-Kūfā returned to Raḥbat al-Saʿūm followed by the government troops where they were reinforced by other nomads and scattered the enemy (Ibn al-Athir, xi. 182 sq.). Nūr al-Dīn granted the Kurd ʿAbd al-Dīn Shirkh b. Ḥamdūn. Shirkh built al-Rahba al-Dīdīa with a citadel about a tawāk (3 miles) from the Euphrates because of the town of Rahba Malik b. Tawāk was now in ruins (Abu l-Tawāk, Taḥṣīn al-Bulūk, ed. Reinsch, p. 281; Ḥaḥālī Khālid, Liḥām-nawām, Stambul, p. 444). The new town of al-Rahba became an important caravan station between Syria and the Iraq, as we learn from Ibn Baṭṭūtā among others (Ṭṣafī, ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iv. 315) who travelled from there via al-Sukhna to Tadmur.

The town remained for a century in Shirkh’s family until in 1264 Balbars installed an Egyptian governor there (Ibn al-Athir, xi. 341; xii. 189; Abu l-Tawāk, Anmales Musulmān, ed. Reinsch-Adele, iv. 142; v. 16). Sonkor al-Ashkar of Damascus who rebelled against Kalānāt in 678 (1279) fled after a defeat to al-Rahba to the emir ʿIsā and from there appealed to Abaqa for protection (Barbehr, Chron. syl., p. 543).

The Mongols under Khārbānā besieged al-Rahba in 712 (1312–1313) on their way to Syria. On his return Khārbānā left his siege-artillery behind; therewith it was taken by the defenders of the town into the citadel (Abu l-Tawāk, v. 268 sq.; al-Hassan b. Ḥalb b. ʿUmar, Durraṯ al-Aṣlāh fi Dūwār al-Aṣlāh, in H. E. Weijers, in Orientalis, Bluëmbul, ii., Amsterdam 1846, p. 319). Its governor at the time, Ibn al-Arkashti, died in 715 (1315–1316) in Damascus (Abu l-Tawāk, v. 300). Muhannya and his family, the ʿIsā, were driven from the district of Salamiya in the spring of 1320 and pursued by the Syrian troops as far as
Rahba and ‘Ana (Abu ‘l-Fidā‘, v. 340 sq.); the town was perhaps destroyed on this occasion.

In 1331 the Euphrates inundated the country round al-Rahba (Ibn al-Athir, Vienna MS. in Musul. The Middle Euphrates, p. 3, note 3).

According to the Muslim geographers, al-Rahba lay on the Euphrates (Kadāma, in B. G. A., vi. 233; al-Makdisi, in B. G. A., iii. 138; al-Iṣākāri, transl. Jaubert, ii. 137 sq.; al-Dimīqāsh, ed. Meuren, p. 93; Abu ‘l-Fidā‘, ed. Reinard, p. 51) and also on the canal Sa‘d colored from it at Fām Sa‘d on the right bank, which rejoined the Euphrates below the town, the gardens of which it watered, and above al-Dilāyā also called Dalliyat Mālik b. Tawāk (Suhra, ed. v. Mālik, in Bibl. arab. Heiter, u. Geogr., v. Leipzig 1930, p. 125; Yāhūn, iv. 840; Abu ‘l-Fidā‘, Ta‘līqān, p. 281). The town lay 3 farsāhs from Karkisya (al-Azīzī, in Abu ‘l-Fidā‘, ed. Reinard, p. 281) and, according to al-Makdisi (B. G. A., iii. 149), a day's journey each from this town, al-Dilāyā and Birā (the latter statement is quite inaccurate; cf. Musul, op. cit., p. 55 sq.), Musul (ibid., p. 250) wrongly takes al-Dilāyā, but al-Jāmī states that it is impossible as 8–10 miles above it the Euphrates flows close to the foot of Djaabal Abu ‘l-Kāsim, so that the Sa‘d canal must have flowed north of it back into the Euphrates (cf. the Karte von Mesopotamien of the Prussian Survey, Feb. 1918, i. 400,000, sheet 35). An: Cenom., Feuilles de Douro-Europes, Paris 1926, Atlas, pl. i: Cours de l'Euphrate entre Cirencester et Douro-Europes, on the scale and the maps in Sarre-Hersfeld, Arch. Reis, The town of al-Rahba was a Jacobite bishopric (a list of the bishops in Mich. Syr., iii. 502), but for a time at least — also a Nestorian bishopric is shown from a life of the Katholikos Elyáš I. (In this case Bauckert, Geschichte der syr. Literatur, p. 286 sq.) who shortly before his death on May 6, 1049 appointed a bishop to this town (Assemény, in B. O., iii. 263).

In the statements of the Arab geographers, it is mentioned that the old Rahbat Mālik b. Tawāk lay on the bank of the Euphrates (al-Iṣākāri, in B. G. A., i. 15, 17; Ibn Hawāqal, B. G. A., ii. 15, 17; al-Makdisi, B. G. A., iii. 138; Yāhūn, Medīqm, iii. 860; Ibn Khairāldāh, B. G. A., vi. 233) i.e. presumably corresponded to the modern al-Miyādīn (plur. al-muddāin) (G. Hoffmann, Auslegung aus syr. Akten pers. Mārtwyre, p. 165; E. Hersfeld, Arch. Reis, ii. 382, note 14; A. Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 3, 253, 340) while the new al-Rahba, as we saw, was built a farsāh from it, where in the S. W. of al-Miyādīn there still are the ruins of the citadel al-Rahba or Rahba. According to Abu ‘l-Fidā‘ (ed. Reinard, p. 281), towers were still standing among the ruins of the old Euphrates. Opposite al-Rahba on the left bank of the Euphrates stood a fortress, taken by Marwān II. (744–750) in the fighting with Hājjām (Mahbūb of Manbij), Kitāb al-Umār, ed. Vasiliev, in Patr. Orient, vol. viii. 517 sqq.) in this fortress Musul (op. cit., p. 338 sqq.) has recognized al-Zalī‘a (al-Dilāyā, ed. De Goeje, p. 180; Tabāth, ii. 1467 sqq.; Ibn Khairāldāh, p. 74) and the ancient Zāqā which is still called al-Murswāyna after this caliph, but really is not opposite al-Miyādīn, but fourteen miles farther down.

Ibn Hawāqal (B. G. A., ii. 155) praises the fertility of the well-watered region of Rahba, where the orchards on the east bank of Euphrates also produced date-palms; their quinces were also famous (al-Makdisi, in B. G. A., ii. 145). The Karte von Mesopotamien (1 : 400,000) marks at "Majdīk" "the first (most northerly) palm". Dates really only ripen in specially favourable weather in the region of Albu Kamāl (Musul, op. cit., p. 342). According to al-Iṣākāri (B. G. A., i. 77), Rahbat Mālik b. Tawāk was larger than Karkisya; al-Makdisi (B. G. A., ii. 142) calls it the centre of the Euphrates district "(anāl al-Furā‘ or nā‘īhyat al-Furā‘) as in the early Muhammadan period the fertile plain from Dair al-Zawr to Albu Kamāl with the towns of al-Rahba, Dilāyā, ‘Ana and Alhadīja was called (Hersfeld, op. cit., ii. 382). According to him the town was built in a semi-circle on the edge of the desert and defended by a strong fortress.

Yāhūn visited the town, which according to him was eight days' journey from Damascus, five from Halab, one farsāh from Baghdād and a little over 20 farsāhs from al-Rahba. In al-Dimīqāsh (ed. Meuren, p. 202) it is called Rahbat al-Fursātiya. In the time of Khalil al-Zahir (Zahha, ed. Ravaise, p. 305) it belonged to Halab. According to al-Umarī, Syria, to be more exact, its eastern marches with the casually Romans reached as far as al-Rahba until he mentions there a "cavalry, and a governorship, and there are Bahri's, cavalry, scouts and mercenaries stationed there" (al-Umarī, transl. R. Hartmann, in Z.D.M.G., lxx, 23, 30). Ibn Bāṣīrfa (op. cit.) calls the town "the end of al-Irāk and the beginning of al-Sha‘am". Hājjāj Khalīfa seckons from ‘Ana al-Rahba three days' journey and from there to al-Dair one day's journey (Djāhānum-nām, Stambul 1445, p. 483; cf. thereon Musul, op. cit., p. 257).

The Venetian jeweller Gaspar Balbi who passed the town on Feb. 6, 1588 on the Euphrates says (Viaggi dell' Indie orientali, Venice 1590, without pagination): "nominavano castello Rahabi oppresso il qual castello si vede una città rivenata, ma in alcuni lati di essa habita da alcune poche persone di nome di Rahabiliatica (on the form Rahbāth, cf. M. Hartmann, in Z.D.P.V., xxii. 44, on N. 590). Pietro della Valle (Viaggi, Venice 1544, i. 571) saw the town of "Rachba" at some distance from the Euphrates and heard that there were some old buildings there. Tavernier (Les six voyages, i. Paris 1676, p. 285) mentions a place called "Mached-rabā", i.e. Maybad al-Rahba (six miles S. W. of al-Rahba).

In modern times al-Miyādīn and the ruins of al-Rahba (the usual formation) have been repeatedly visited (see Bibl.). The plan of the castle forms a triangle with flattened angles; pictures of the castle will be found in Musul, The Middle Euphrates, p. 7, fig. 2 or Sarre-Hersfeld, Arch. Reis, ii. pl. lxxix. sq.)

RAHBĀNĪYA (A.), monasticism. The term is derived from rāhib [q. v.]; it occurs in the Kurān once only, in a passage (sūra lxvi. 37) that has given rise to divergent interpretations: *And we put in the hearts of those who followed Jesus, compassion and mercy, and the monastic state, they instituted the name (we did not prescribe it to them) only out of a desire to please God. Yet they observed not the same as it ought truly to have been observed. And we gave unto such of them as believed, their reward; but many of them were wicked doers. According to some of the exegists the verb "we put" has two objects only, viz. compassion and mercy, whereas the words "and the monastic state" are the object of "they instituted". Accordingly the monastic state appears here as a purely human institution, which moreover has been degraded by evil doers.

According to others, however, the object of the words "and we put" is: compassion, mercy and the monastic state. According to this exegesis monasticism is called a divine institution. Professor Massinon has pointed out that this exegesis is the older one; the younger exegist expresses a feeling hostile to monasticism, which coined the tradition "No rāhibāniya in Islam."

This tradition does not occur in the canonical collections. Yet, it is being prepared there. When the wife of ʿOthmān b. Maʿṣūf [q. v.] complained of being neglected by her husband, Muḥammad took her part, saying: "Monasticism (ḥabaniya) was not prescribed to us (ʿAbd b. Ḥanbal, vi. 226; Dārānī, Wāḥab, ibid. 3). The following tradition is less exclusive: Do not trouble yourselves and God will not trouble you. Some have troubled themselves and God has troubled them. Their successors are in the hermitages and monasteries, an institution we have not prescribed to them" (ʿAbd Dāwūd, Adab, bāb 44).

Islam, thus rejecting monasticism, has replaced it by the holy war: "Every prophet has some kind of rāhibāniya; the rāhibāniya of this community is the holy war" (a tradition ascribed to Muḥammad in ʿAbd b. Ḥanbal, iii. 266; to Abū Saʿīd ʿAlī b. Kaʿb, iii. 82). Cf. also yāḥya, zum.

Bibliography: L. Massinon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, p. 123 sqq.; the commentaries of the Kurān on sūra lixiv. 27; Ibn Saʿd, Taḥāfūt, ed. Sachau, iii, 257; Harrit, Maʿālim, ed. de Saucy, p. 617-619; Zamakhshari, al-Falāʾī, Haldarābād 1324, i. 269; Ibn al-ʿAṣir, Ṣafā, s. v.; Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Muḥammad, i. 389; Goldscheider, Muḥammadanische Studien, ii. 396; do., in R. H. K., xviii. 193-194; xxxvii. 314. (A. J. Wenck)

RĀḤĪL (A.), plural, rāḥibīn, rāḥibūn, rāḥibīn, a monk. The figure of the monk is known to pre-Islamic poetry and to the Kurān and Tradition. The pre-Islamic poets refer to the monk in his cell the light of which the traveller by night sees in the distance and which gives him the idea of shelter.

In the Kurān the monk and the ẓāhir, sometimes also the ʾaḍhār, are the religious leaders of the Christians. In one place it is said that rāhibs and monks live at the expense of other men (sūra lixv. 34) and that the Christians have taken as their masters instead of God their ʾaḍhār and their monks as well as al-Maṣūhī b. Maryam (sūra lixv. 31). In another passage the Christians are praised for their friendship to their fellow-believers which is explained from the fact that there are priests and monks among them (sūra v. 87). In Ḥaḍīth the rāhib is frequently encountered in stories of the nature of the ḫiṣāṣ al-anṭūyā (cf. Buhārī, Anṣūb, bāb 54; Muslim, Zuhār, Tr. 73: Taḥāfūt, Tr. 46, 47; Tirmidhī, Tafṣīr, Sūra 85, Tr. 2; Manṣūhī, Tr. 3; Naṣīr, Maṣāḥif, Tr. 11; Ibn Māḍja, Fīlah, Tr. 20, 23; Dārānī, Fadwal al-Kurān, Tr. 16; Abū Ḥanbal, i. 461; ii. 434; iii. 337, 347; v. 4; vi. 17 sqq.).

From the fact that in the Muḥammadan literature of the early centuries A. H. the epithet rāhib was given to various pious individuals it is evident that there was nothing odious about it. Cf. however the article RAHBĀNĪYA.

Bibliography: cf. that of RAHBĀNĪYA. (A. J. Wenck)

RĀḤĪL, in the Bible Rachel, wife of Jacob, mother of Joseph and Benjamin, is not mentioned in the Kurān. There is however a reference to her in Sūra iv. 27: "Ye may not have two sisters to wife at the same time; if it has been done formerly God now exercises pardon and mercy". This is said to allude to Jacob's marriage with Liyā and Rāḥīl; before Moses revealed the Tora, such a marriage was valid. Ṣaḥīḥ gives this explanation in the Ammān, l. 356, 359 sq. Ibn al-Qāhir, p. 90, adopts it. But already in Tafsīr, iv. 210, Ṣaḥīḥ explains the verse correctly: Muḥammad forbids for the future marriage with two sisters but he does not dissolve such marriages concluded before the prohibition. — Islamic tradition generally adopts the view that Yaʿṣūb only married Rāḥīl after Liyā's death. So already in Ṣaḥīḥ, i. 355, Zamakhshari, Bābdīwād, Ibn al-Qāhir, etc. Al-Kisāʾ even thinks that Yaʿṣūb only married Rāḥīl after the death of Liyā and of his two concubines. Here again Muslim legend differs from the Bible, in making him not marry Rāḥīl until after 14 years of service; in the Bible, Jacob serves seven years, marries Leah and after the wedding week Rachel
and serves another seven years. — Ya'qūb's wooing and Laban's trick by which he substitutes Liyā for Rāhīl as "neither lamp nor candle-light" illuminate the bridal chamber, is embellished in Muslim legend.

Rāhīl is also of importance in the story of Ya'qūb. Ya'qūb inherits his beauty from Rāhīl; they had half of all the beauty in the world, according to others two-thirds, or even according to the old Haggadic scheme (Kiddushin, 49b), nine tenths (Thalābi, p. 69). — When Ya'qūb left Lībān, he had no funds for the journey; at Kārūn his suggestion is accepted. Ya'qūb steals Laban's goods. — As Ya'qūb sold by his brothers, passes the tomb of Rāhīl he throws himself from his camel on the grave and laments: "O mother, look on thy child, I have been deprived of my coat, thrown into a pit, stoned and sold as a slave". Then he hears a voice: "Trust in God". The old Haggada does not know this touching scene. But it has found its way into the late medieval book of stories Sefer Hayayyōr (ed. Goldschmidt, p. 150). The Jewish-Persian poet Shāhīn (sixth century) adopts this motif from Firdawsi's Yāsuf u-Zulālīḥī in his book of Genesis.


RAHĪM. [See Allāh, i. 308, 304.]

AL-RAHĪM. [See Kibrawī Fīrūz.]

RAHMĀ, compassion [See Allāh, i. 503, 306.]

RAHMĀNIYA, Algerian Order (jārīya) called after Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Ghūṭātī al-Dījrūjī al-Azhārī Būl Kābir, who died 1228 (1793-1794). It is a branch of the Khalwātī and is said to have at one time been called Dākīya after Muṣṭafā al-Ḥakīmi al-Ṣāhī. At Nīja, in Tunisia, and some other places it is called Arīṣīya after Muṣṭafā b. Muḥammad b. Arīṣ. Life of the Founder. His family belonged to the tribe Aṣīl Smāl, part of the confederation Gaḍhātul in the Kādīyā Dījrūj; having studied at his home, and then in Algiers, he made the pilgrimage in 1152 (1739-1740), and on his return spent some time as a student at al-Azhār in Cairo, where Muḥammad b. Šallīm al-Ḥamāwī (d. 1181: Sīk al-Durrār, iv. 50) initiated him into the Khalwātī Order, and ordered him to propagate it in India and the Sudan; after an absence of thirty years he returned to Algeria, and commenced preaching in his native village, where he founded a monastery; it seems to be because he has introduced some modifications into Khalwātī practice, and in his Seven Visions of the Prophet Muhammad made some important claims for his person and his system; immunity from bell-fire was to be secured by affiliation to his order, love for himself or it, a visit to himself, stopping before his tomb, hearing his dhikr recited. His success in winning adherents provoked the envy of the local meḥrikān, in con-

sequence of which he migrated to Hamma in the neighbourhood of Algiers. Here too his activities met with opposition from the religious leaders, who summoned him to appear before a muṣāfīr under the presidency of the Mālikī Muḥammad al-Azīz b. Anīn; through the influence of the Turkish authorities, who were impressed by the following which he had acquired, he was acquitted of the charge of unorthodoxy, but he thought it prudent to return to his native village, where shortly afterwards he died, leaving as his successor Allāh b. 'Iṣā al-Maghribī. His corpse is said to have been stolen by the Turks and buried with great pomp at Hamma with a ṣāḥib and a mosque over it. The Aṣīl Smāl however maintained that it had not left its original grave, whence it was supposed to have been miraculously duplicated, and the title Aṣīl Kābīr, "owner of two graves", was given him.

History and propagation of the Order. Allāh b. 'Iṣā al-Maghribī was undisputed head from 1208 (1793-1794) to 1251 (1836-1837); his successor died shortly after, and from the following year, though the Order continued to win adherents, it divided into independent branches. This was owing to the objectors raised by the Aṣīl Smāl to the succession of al-Hājjī Bāshīr, another Maghribi; in spite of the support of Allāh b. Kāṭīr (the famous enemy of the French) he had to quit his post, which he held for a time by the widow of Allāh b. 'Iṣā, who, however, owing to the dwindling of the revenues of the sāwīya had ultimately to summon Bāshīr back. Meanwhile the founders of other sāwīyas were assuming independence. After the death of Bāshīr in 1259 (1845-1844) her son-in-law al-Hājjī Ammār succeeded to the headship. Finding his influence waning owing to his failure to participate in the attack on the French organized by Bā Bhāgīr, he in August 1856 called his followers to arms and obtained some initial successes; he was however compelled to surrender in the following year, and his wife (or mother-in-law) at the head of a hundred ṣāḥibūn shortly after, Bāshīr retired to Tunis, where he endeavoured to continue the exercise of his functions, but he was not generally recognized as head of the order, and his place among the Aṣīl Smāl was taken by Muhammad Amālī b. al-Hājjīdād b. Sādīk, who at the age of 80 on August 8, 1871 proclaimed ḥijāb against the French, who had recently been defeated in the Franco-Prussian War. The insurrection met with little success, though it spread far, and on July 13 Ibn al-Hājjīdād surrendered to General Sausser, who sent him to Bougie. The original sāwīya was closed as a precautionary measure.

His son 'Arīṣ, who had been transported to New Caledonia, succeeded in escaping to Djeddā, whence he endeavoured to govern the community; but various muḥāfāzahs who had been appointed by his father, as well as other founders of sāwīyas, asserted their independence. Lists are given by Deponi and Coppolani of these persons and their spheres of influence, which extend into Tunisia and the Sahara. In their work the numbers of the adherents to the Order are reckoned at 15,614 (1897). Kinn notices that the Rahmāniya of Tolga regularly maintained good relations with the French authorities.

Practices of the Order. The training of the waḥīf consists in teaching him a series of seven
character of the security is in general allowed; but exceptional cases are recognized in which the debt is extinguished by the disappearance of the security i.e. the risk passes to the taker of the pledge. While the ownership of the pledge remains with the debtor, he has no power of disposal over it and possession passes to the creditor; the latter has the right to sell it to satisfy his claim if the debt becomes overdue or is not paid. Mortgage is unknown as well as a graded series of rights to the same object of pledge. To be distinguished from the pledge is the detention (habib) of a thing to enforce fulfilment of a legal claim, which represents a concrete right afforded by the law in individual cases so that it has contacts with the legal right to pledge.


RAIS AL-KUTTAB, RAIS EFKNID. [See RAIS.]

RAIY, the ancient Ragha, a town in Media. Its ruins may be seen about 5 miles S.E. of Teheran [q.v.] to the south of a spur projecting from Elburz into the plain. The village and sanctuary of Shah 'Abd al-'Azim lie immediately south of the ruins. The geographical importance of the town lies in the fact that it was situated on the fertile zone which lies between the mountains and the desert, by which from time immemorial communication has taken place between the west and east of Iran. Several roads from Marandarân [q.v.] converge on Raiy on the north side.

In the Avesta, Vidwatait, i. 15, Ragha is mentioned as the twelfth sacred place created by Ahura-Mazda. Yasna, xix. 18, calls it zaharatai Ragha sarabtirî "Zoroastrian Ragha possessing four degrees of hierarchy" because of Ragha the representative of the prerogatives going back to Zoroaster (Zarathustra) held also the powers of a prince (raiiz dakhmany) while elsewhere these two dignitaries with the three categories of chief subordinates, formed five degrees of hierarchy. The Middle Persian commentary deduces from this that Zoroaster must have belonged to Ragha. The town is also called raiiznam (Vidwatait, i. 15) which Bartholomae interprets as possessing "three districts" (drei Gaue besitzend) although the explanation of the Middle Persian commentary is: "possessing three estates (social classes) for the priests, warriors and cultivators there were good" (cf. Bartholomae, Altiran. Wörterbuch, col. 579, 811, 1497; cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 122). The later commentaries put Raiy in Atropatene in conformity with the late tendency to localize events in sacred history in this province.

In the Old Persian inscriptions (Bh. 2, 10-18) Raga appears as the province of Media in which in the autumn of 324 B.C. the false king of Media Prawartiagh sought refuge in vain; from Raga also Darius sent reinforcements to his father Whigatasp when the latter was putting down the rebellion in Parthis (Bh. 3, 1-10).

Rai is also mentioned in the epigraphy. Tobit sent his son Tobias from Ninivah to recover the silver deposited in Rages with Gabael, brother of...
Gabrias (Tobit, l. 14). The book of Judith (i. 15) puts near Ragas (if it only were Ragha!) the plain in which Nebuchadnezzar defeated the king of Media, Archaxad (Phraortes!).

In the summer of 330 B.C., Alexander the Great following Darius III took 11 days to go from Eschatane to Rhagae (Arrian, 3, 20, 2). Dio-
doros relates that Antigonus passed near Rhagae after his victory over his rival Eumenes (310 B.C.). According to Strabo, x. 9, and xi. 15, Seleucus Nicator (312-286) rebuilt Rhagae under the name of Europos (in memory of his native town in Macedonia) and that near Europos the towns of Laodicea, Apeamna and Heraclea were peopled with Macedonians. After the coming of the Parthians the town was renamed Araxa. It is however possible that all these towns although situated in the same locality occupied slightly different sites for they are mentioned side by side in the authorities.

Rawlinson (7 G.S. x. 119) would put Europos at Wadi Min at [q.v.]. Athenaenaeus in Deipnosophistae, says that the Parthian kings spent the spring at Rhagae (in Eregz) and the winter at Babylon (see the details in A. V. W. Jackson, and Weis-
bach). The Greek popular etymology which explains the name Rhaga as alluding to earthquakes seems to reflect the frequency of this phenomenon in this region so close to Damazand.

In the Sasanian period Yazdagird III in 641 issued from Rayi his last appeal to the nation before fleeing to Khurzaan. The sanctuary of Bibi Shahr-Bains situated on the south face of the already mentioned spur and accessible only to women is mentioned with the association of the daughter of Yazdagird who, according to tradition, became the wife of Husain b. 'Ali. In the years 486, 499, 553 A.D. Rayi is mentioned as the see of bishops of the Eastern Syrian church. 

Arab conquest. The year of the conquest is variously given (18-22 = 639-644) and it is possible that the Arab power was consolidated gradually. As late as 640 a rebellion was suppressed in Rayi by Sa'd b. Abi Waqkaa. The Arabs seem to have profited by the dissensions among the noble Persian families. Rayi was the seat of the Mirkan family and, in consequence of the resistance of Siyavakha b. Mihram b. Bahram Chabih, Nu'sim b. Mokarrin had the old town destroyed and ordered Farrukkha b. Zainabi (Zainabi?) b. Kula [cf. MAHMUDI] to build a new town (Tabari, i. 2635).

In 71 (690) again a king of the family of Farr-
ukhan is mentioned alongside of the Arab governor.

The passing of power from the Omayyads to the 'Abbasids took place at Rayi without incident less than in 136 (753). The 'Abbasids, when they arrived in the end of the 10th century, encamped near Rayi and spent a short time. The name used for Rayi was the name of the town and its principal street. In 954 (860) Ma'mun's generals 'Abd al-Malik b. Hammad won a victory over Amr's troops near Rayi. In 950 (865) the struggle began in Rayi between the Zaidi 'Abids of Tabaristan and the Tahirids and later the caliph's Turkish generals. It was not till 772 (885) that Ghiyath-egin of Kaswe took the town from the 'Abids. In 651 (864) the caliph 'Abd al-Malik wishing to consolidate his position appointed to Rayi his son, the future caliph Mucktaf. Soon after the death of the Sama'nis began to interfere in Rayi. Isma'il b. Ahmad seized Rayi in 289 (902) and the fact accomplished was confirmed by the caliph Mucktaf. In 296 Ahmad b. Isma'il received investiture from Mucktaf in Rayi (Gardth, p. 21-22).

In the tenth century Rayi is described in detail in the works of the contemporary Arab geographers. In spite of the interest which Baghdad displayed in Rayi the number of Arabs there was insignificant and the population consisted of Persians of all classes (Abbâr; Yaqut, in B. G. A., vii. 276). Among the products of Rayi Ibn al-Faqih, p. 253, mentions silks and other stuffs, articles of wood and 'lustre dishes', an interesting detail in view of the celebrity enjoyed by the ceramics of Rhagae. All writers emphasize the great importance of Rayi as a commercial centre. According to Ijjasri, p. 107, the town covered an area of 1/2 by 1/2 farakhs, the buildings were of clay (qaf) but the use of bricks and plaster (qaf = qaf) was also known. The town had five great gates and eight large bazaars. Muckaddasi, p. 391, calls Rayi one of the glories of the lands of Islam and among other things mentions its library in the Buhana quarter which was watered by the Farzand canal. 

Dalai period. In 304 (915) the lord of Adharbad-din Yusuf b. Abi 'l-Sajd occupied Rayi out of which he drove the Dalaim Muhammad b. 'Ali Sulhi who represented the Sama'nis of Rayi (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 74). This occupation, commemorated in coins struck by Yusuf at Mahmud-
ada, was the beginning of a troubled period. Rayi passed successively into the hands of the Dalaim 'Abi b. Wahshuddin, Wasif Dektinarti, the Dalaim Ahmad b. 'Ali and of Muflih, slave of Yusuf (in 313 = 925; cf. R. Vames, O montanbh Sadiliev, Baku 1927). Lastly the Sama'nis encouraged by the caliph succeeded in bringing Rayi again within their sphere of influence but soon their general Askar (a Dalaim) became independent in Rayi. In 318 (930), Askar was killed by his lieutenant Mardawid [q.v.] (a native of Gilan and one of the founders of the Ziyarid dynasty) who took over his master's lands (C. Haurt, Les Ziyarides, 1922, p. 363 = 311).

After the assassination of Mardawid (123 = 925) the Bazyids established themselves in Rayi, which became the seat of the branch of the Ziyarid dynasty which held out there for about 100 years. In 390 (1000) the last Sama'ni al-Muntasir made an attempt to seize Rayi but failed. In 420 (1027) the Bazyid Masjid al-Dawla was ill-advised enough to invite against the Dalaims the help to a Muhammad of Gharmi, who seized his lands (cf. Muhammad Nazim, Sulhan Mahmud, 1931, p. 80-85). The brief rule of the Gharnawids was marked by acts of obscurantism, like the destruction of books on philosophy and astrology and the atrocious persecutions of the Karmajans and Mu'tazalis (Gardth, p. 91; Ibn al-Athir, ix. 267).

The Sultans. The Gharnawids laid Rayi waste in 427 (1035) and in 434 (1042) the town, where Masjid al-Dawla still held out in the fort of Tabarn (Ibn al-Athir, ix. 347), fell into the power of the Saljûq and became one of their principal cities. The last Bazyid al-Malik al-Rafl died a prisoner
in Tabarak in 450 (1058) (or in 455; cf. H. Bowen, in J. R. A. S., 1929, p. 238) and the new lord Tughill [q.v.] also died at Rayy in 455 (1063). Henceforth Rayy is constantly mentioned in connection with events relating to the Great Saljuq and their branch in Persia 'in Iran'.

From the reign of Ghiyath al-Din Mas'ud (540-547 = 1153-1157) Rayy was ruled by the son-in-law of his wife of Pahlawan, son of the famous aestheg of Aqbarabad, Ildegis. When the latter put on the throne Sultan Arslan-Shah (whose mother he had married) Ildegis opposed this nomination but was defeated in 555 (1160). Ildegis withdrew to Bistam but with the help of the Khwarijshah II religion reoccupied Rayy. He was finally murdered at the instigation of Ildegis who gave Rayy as a fief to Pahlawan. Later the town passed to Khatun Naqshband, a Pahlawan who, like his maternal ancestor, brought about the intervention of the Khwarijshah Tughill in the affairs of Persia (538 = 1142). Two years later in a battle near Rayy, the last Saljuq Tughill III was killed by Khatun Naqshband but the country remained with the Khwarijshahs. In 614 (1217) the abbeys of Fars Sad b. Zangi succeeded in occupying Rayy but it was almost immediately driven out by the Khwarijshah Djallal al-Din (cf. Nasawi, ed. Houdas).

Civil wars, Muqaddasi, p. 319, 315-316 mentions the dissensions (āubah) among the people of Rayy in matters of religion. Under 582 (1180-1187) Ibn al-Athir, xi. 237, records the damage done in Rayy in the civil war between the Sunnis and Shi'is. The inhabitants were killed or driven away and the town left in ruins. Yakut who, fleeing before the Mongols, went through Rayy in 617 (1220) gives the results of his enquiry about the three parties: the Ilhanis, the Shahis, and the Shi'is of which the two first began by wiping out the Shahis who formed half the population of the town and the majority in the country. Later the Shi'is triumphed over the Ilhanis. The result was that there only survived in Rayy the Shahis' quarter which was the smallest. Yakut describes the underground houses at Rayy and the dark streets difficult of access which reflected the care of the inhabitants to protect themselves against enemies.

The Mongols. The Mongols who occupied Rayy after Yakut's visit dealt it the final blow. Ibn al-Athir (xii. 184) goes so far as to say that all the population was massacred by the Mongols in 617 (1220) and the survivors put to death in 621 (1224). It is however possible that the historian, echoing the panic which seized the Muslim world, exaggerates the extent of the destruction. Dhuwailin (ed. Muhammad Khan Kaawi, i. 115) only says that the Mongol leaders put many people to death at Khwār (in the country inhabited by Shi'is) but in Rayy the people were killed by the Shahis who submitted to the invaders (thab'a), after which the latter went on. Rashid al-Din (ed. Berézeine, in Tract. V. O., xv. 135 [transl. p. 89]) admits that the Mongols under Djebe and Subsunday killed and plundered (māzghara) at Rayy but he seems to make a distinction between Rayy and Kham, in which the inhabitants were exterminated (sū-bilil) massacred.

The fact that life was not completely extinguished at Rayy is evident from the dates of pottery which apparently continued to be made in Rayy (cf. Guest, A dated Rayy bowl, in Burlington Magazine, 1931, p. 134-135: the painted bowl bears the date 640 = 1243). The citadel of Tabarak was rebuilt under Ghazān Khan (1295-1304) but certain economic reasons (irrigation?) if not political and religious reasons, must have been against the restoration of Rayy and the centre of the new administrative Mongol division (the wāsūd of Rayy) became Varāvīn (q.v.) (cf. Nūska-āt al-Kulā, in G. M. S., p. 55). After the end of Hulagu's dynasty, Rayy fell to the sphere of influence of Tughill-Timur (q.v.) of Aqbarabad. In 1385, Timur's troops occupied Rayy without striking a blow but this must mean the district and not the town of Rayy, for Clavijo (ed. Szezevsky, p. 187) who passed through this country in 1404 confirms that Rayy (Yaharipries = Shāh-e Rayy) was no longer inhabited (agera deshabitata). No importance is to be attached to the mention of "Rayy" in the time of Shāh-Rūkh (Majīl ad-Salāhī, under the year 841 = 1447) or of Shāh Ismā'īl, Hālīb ad-Siyar.

The ruins of Rayy. Olivier in 1797 sought them in vain and it was Trübl and Gardane who first discovered them. The earliest descriptions were by J. Morier, K. Porter and W. Ouseley. The first has preserved us a sketch of a Šāhānšāhian basin which was replaced by a sculpture of Fath 'Ali Shah. The description and particularly the plan by K. Porter (produced in Sarre and A. V. W. Jackson, Persia) is still of value because since his time the town has been destroyed for agriculture and systematic digging have destroyed the walls and confused the strata. Large numbers of objects of archaeological interest and particularly the celebrated pottery covered with paintings have flooded the European and American markets as a result of the activity of the dealers. Scientific investigation was begun by the universities of Philadelphia and Boston in 1934 (cf. The Illustrated London News, June 22, 1935, p. 1122-1123; E. F. Schmidt, The Persian Expedition to Rayy, in Bulletin University Museum, Philadelphia, v., 1935, p. 41-49; cf. p. 25-27). In the citadel hill, Dr. Erich Schmidt found a great variety of pottery and the remains of buildings which are the foundations of Mahāl's mosque (communication to the author). Godard to the Congress of Persian Art at Leiningrad in Sept. 1935). In an interesting passage, Muqaddas, p. 210, speaks of the high domes which the Búyids built over their tombs. According to the Siyāh-ḵānaḵāna, p. 145, in the time of Fakhr al-Dawla a rich Zoroastrian built an astādān with double roof (tāḏān ba-dam péshā) on the top of the hill of Ṭabarakan, above the dome tomb (gumbad) of Fakhr al-Dawla. The astādān, turned to a new one received the name of dāla-yi aspāha-šāfārān "fort of the commandants" and was still in existence in the time of Nīsam al-Mulk. The two towers now to be seen among the ruins of Rayy [both are round in plan, but the one repaired under Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh has ribbed flanks] are attributed to the Saljuqs but may continue the Daulatn type of building. The hill of Ṭabarakan on which was the citadel (destroyed in 588 [1192] by Tughill III according to Yakut was situated to the right of the Khusrān road while the high mountain was to "the left" of this road. Ṭabarakan must therefore have been on the top of the hill opposite the great spur (hill G) in K. Porter's plan: a fortress built of stone and on the summit of an immense rock which commands the open
Al-Ra'aka

[See Salat.]

Al-Ra'aka, capital of Diyar Mudar in al-Djazira on the left bank of the Euphrates, shortly before it is joined by the Nahr Balkh (Barnhouse, Bilikove, Dzurug).

The town was in antiquity called Kallinikos. Nikephoros is to be located in the same region (Strabo, vii. 477; Isidore of Charra, in Geogr. Graeci Min.), ed. Muller, p. 247; Dio Cass., 21. 13; Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 86; vii. 119; Ptolomy, Geogr., v. 17; Stephen Byz., but its usual identification with Kallinikos is certainly wrong and it may be a case of two adjoining towns as with the "black" and "white al-Ra'aka" of the middle ages, Nikephoros was, according to Appian (Syr., p. 57), a foundation of Seleucus I Nikator; later it was ascribed to Alexander the Great (Pliny, Nat. hist., vi. 119; Isid. Char., c. 1) who can hardly have been here and it is hardly likely that towns were founded so shortly before the battle of Gangama (cf. Fawli-Wissowa, K. E., x, A., col. 1427, s. v. Thapaken).

Kallinikos owed its name to Seleucus II Kallinin, who founded the town in 244 or 224 B.C. (Chron. Pasch., ed. Dandery, 310; Mich. Syr., ed. Chatob, iv. 78). Libanius, Oratio, ed. Forster, x. 19, p. 288) wishes to derive the name from the sophist Kallinikos who was murdered there; it is however hardly likely that the town, the name of which (Syrion Kallinikos, Kallinikos) the Christian Syrians retained in the middle ages, was called after a pagan satyr, and in any case, if it were so, we would expect a name like Kallinikeia. In any case the site of Kallinikos corresponds to that of the mediaeval al-Ra'aka, with which the Syrian historians always identified it. In the time of the emperor Julian, Kallinikos was a strong fortress and an important commercial centre (Ambrosius, Epist. ad Theodos.; Migne, Patrolog. Lat., xvi, col. 1105 sq.). The emperor Leo I in 777 Sel. (466 A.D.) rebuilt Kallinikos in Osthoe, called it Leonopolis and appointed a bishop there (the successor of the Damascenus mentioned in 451 and 458) (Edessene Chronicle, ed. Haller, in Texte u. Untersuch., ix. 1, Leipzig 1893, p. 116, 152; Barhebrus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 77; Leonopolis: Hierokl., Synodhzh, p. 715, 3. Geogr. Cypr., ed. Gelzer, p. 897). Towards the end of the year 503, Timostatros bravely defended the fortress against the Persians and took one of Kawqale. His officers prisoner but had to release him as the king threatened to destroy the town completely (Joshua Stylites, ed. Martin, in Abh. K. Mi, vi. 1, Leipzig 1857, p. 275). The Syrian church historians from the beginning of the viith century frequently mention the monastery of Mar Zakri, Arabic Dair Zakk, in the angle formed by the Nahr Balkh and the Euphrates or the Nahr al-Nil Canal not far from Kallinikos (Itinera, apud monophysites celebrat., ed. Brooks, in C. C. O., ser. iii., vol. xxv, Paris 1907, p. 38; Mich. Syr., iv. 414 sq.; al-Šâbihūghī, Kitâb al-Diyūr, cod. Berol., fol. 95; Yâkūt, Muqaddim, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 664 sq. 486). Between al-Ra'aka and Bâlis lay the celebrated monastery of Dair Ḥannini south not far from Sura (G. Hoffmann on Zacharias Rheto, transl. Ahrens-Krüger, p. 159; Johann, v. Epheus, iv. 22; Mich. Syr., ii. 361; iii. 433 and passim; Barhebrus, Chron. eccles., ed. Abelloos-Lamy, i. 244, 250; F. Nau, in N., N., x., 1910, p. 63, note 1; Yâkút, iii. 350 and passim, often wrongly called "monastery of Hananis," e. g. in Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 329). In 529, Justinian enacted that trade with the Persians should be conducted at the frontier towns of Nisinis, Kallinikos and Artemisa (Cod. Inst., ed. Krüger, iv. 65, p. 188; Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire, i., 1923, p. 3). Kharwar I on his third campaign against Syria (542) took the town without difficulty (Procop., Bell. Pers., ii. 21, 31; Anecd., iii. 31) because at the time the walls had been partly taken down in order to be rebuilt. The town was destroyed but later fortified again by Justinian with walls and bulwarks and "made impregnable" (Procop., De aed., ii. 7; James of Edessa, Chronol. Canon, ed. Brooks, in Z.D.M.G., iii. 300, Mich. Syr., ed. Chatob, iv. 287). The saqlāw, 'Arabul Zafrus, Mauricius in 580 had to retire to Kallinikos before Altharmahan but put him to flight there (Theophyl. Sim., iii. 17, 8; Chapot, La Frontier de l'Éuphrate, p. 289, note 3 and E. Hersfeld, Arch. Reit, L. 159 make the "emperor" Mauricius flee to the fortress before Hama'is). The Arabs in 18 (639) or 19 (640) under 'Abd al-Qha' rank before the N. W. gate of the town, Šab al-Rubīl; after 5 or 6 days the Patriarch who governed the town asked for peace and surrendered it to him and the inhabitants.
were promised security of life and property. Their churches were not to be destroyed or occupied so long as they paid their tribute and committed no act of hostility; on the other hand they were not to build new churches or sacred places and not to observe Christian customs or festivals publicly (al-Baladhuri, Futūḥ al-Baladān, ed. de Goeje, p. 173 sq.; Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, ii. 439). On the death of Uyad, Sa‘d b. Amir b. Dhiyāyam became governor of al-Dijarīta; he built a mosque in al-Ra‘ka (al-Baladhuri, p. 178; Hersfeld, Arch. Reise, ii. 353). It was built of bricks of clay and marble taken from ancient buildings (Hersfeld, op. cit., with fig. 324–329); its Manṣūra and Manṣūrīr still marks the ruins that represent the ancient al-Ra‘ka.

In the great battle of Siffin in 665 (656) ‘Ali crossed the Euphrates at al-Ra‘ka on a bridge of boats, which he ordered the inhabitants to build, with his infantry and whole equipment to the Syrian bank (al-Tahārī, i. 3259; Ibn Miskawī, Taqādūrī, ed. Castani, p. 571). According to the Divān of Ubaid Allāh b. Khāqīnāyāt, who died in 690 (ed. Rodokanakis, in S. D. Ab. Wās, cxlviii/4, Vienna 1902, p. 221), al-Ra‘ka and al-Kalas (‽) were then in ruins and practically uninhabited but this is poetic exaggeration (Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 320 sq.). He calls the town (p. 285) al-Ra‘ka al-Sawda‘i to distinguish it from al-Ra‘ka al-Baladī, which is mentioned in the Divān of al-Akhrīfī for example (ed. Salāhi, p. 304). The same al-Ra‘ka itself may be of Arabic origin ("swampy marshes on a river with periodical inundations"); the similarity of the names of the Ra‘ka and Ra‘ka al-Ra‘ka to those of two Arabic tribes of the Assyrian period, Ra‘kī (sic) and Ra‘kī (Hersfeld, Arch. Reise, i. 159, note 9), is no doubt quite accidental.

On the south bank, opposite the town, two canals (al-fa‘līn wa l-Mari) were the suburbs of Wāṣfī al-Ra‘ka, where Ḥūṣayn b. Abī al-Mallih built two palaces and a bridge over the Euphrates (Yākūt, ii. 802; iv. 880, 994; Ps. Dionys. of Telmahē, ed. Chabot, p. 26, 31; Mich. Syr. iv. 457; Barhebr, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 118). The governor of al-Ra‘ka, the Khāqīn Manṣūr b. Dja‘wana b. al-Hārith b. Ḥārīm, after whom his Manṣūr was called, was executed after his rebellion in 141 (758–759) by the šamīl of Abu l-’Abbās, al-Manṣūr, in al-Ra‘ka (al-Baladhuri, p. 102).

The caliph al-Manṣūr in 155 (772) built alongside of al-Ra‘ka a new town al-Ra‘ka and settled Khurāṣnānians there who were devoted to his dynasty (Ibn al-Fakhrī, in B. G. A., c. 132). The superintendence of the building of the new town was given by him to al-Mahdi, the heir-apparent. It was planned in the shape of a horse-shoe and was in many respects modelled on the round city of al-Manṣūr in Baghūs (al-Tahārī, iii. 276, 372 sq.; Ibn Hawkal, in B. G. A., ii. 153; al-Baladhuri, p. 179; al-Ya‘qūbī, Kiṣāy al-Baladān, in B. G. A., viii. 238, Ta‘rīkh, ed. Houssaye, ii. 430; Ibn al-Fākhrī, in B. G. A., c. 132; Yākūt, Ma‘ajid, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 734 sq.; Mich. Syr. ii. 526, iii. 10, 397 = iv. 476, 483, 640; Ps. Dionys. of Telmahē, p. 120 sq.; Hersfeld, op. cit., i. 160). Two canals led from the Euphrates and by way of the region of Sardūsji, to supply the new town with water (Mich. Syr., iii. 10). This new town to which the name al-Ra‘ka came to be transferred from the old town now falling into ruins, had, according to Arab authors (e.g. al-Baladhuri, p. 179), no remains of antiquity and indeed the modern al-Ra‘ka, the "horse-shoe city", except for a few fragments built into the walls seems to possess no ancient ruins. The ancient Kallinikos has therefore wrongly been located here (Sachau, Reise in Syrien u. Mesopotamien, p. 242; Chapot, La Fréquence de l'Euphrate, p. 289 sq., where fig. 8 "Nisibenus-Cellicomium" is really the plan of the medieval al-Ra‘ka!)

Between al-Ra‘ka (al-Hamra‘ of Musil’s map) and al-Ra‘ka there soon rose a suburb with bazaars to which the markets of al-Ra‘ka (including the largest, Sūk Ḥūṣayn b. Ṣa‘īd) were transferred by ‘Alī b. Sulaimān b. Ṣa‘id, governor of al-Dijarīta, and as a result the two adjoining towns gradually developed into a twin city (al-Ra‘ka–ṣāḥīn). (al-Baladhuri, p. 179; Yākūt, ii. 734, 802; Ibn Hawkal, B. G. A., ii. 153). This suburb was burned in 1123 (523) by the rebels ‘Amr and Ṣa‘id b. Ṣabāth along with the adjoining "pillared monastery" (Mich. Syr., iii. 30). ‘Abd al-Malik b. ʿAffûn q. v. died in the same year in al-Ra‘ka. In the fighting that followed, the ʿAffūna b. al-Kulla became lords of al-Ra‘ka and the Persians of al-Ra‘ka (Mich. Syr., iii. 30). In the reign of Ma‘mūn in 146 (761–762), ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ṣabāth built a wall between al-Ra‘ka and al-Ra‘ka (Mich. Syr., iii. 36).

The walls of the old town fell into ruins at quite an early date (Abū Ḥamīd al-Tahārī, al-Sarrākhī in Yākūt, loc. cit.) and in 375 (985–986) the old al-Ra‘ka was now only a suburb of the western town. As the name al-Ra‘ka came into use for the latter (Yākūt, loc. cit.), in the end it became no longer possible to distinguish between al-Ra‘ka and al-Ra‘ka (also al-Makdisī, cf. E. Hersfeld, Arch. Reise, i. 160, note 7, p. 161). At the beginning of the eighth century the old al-Ra‘ka was completely in ruins (Yākūt, ii. 734, 751; Ibn Hawkal, p. 153; al-Makdisī, p. 141; Abu ’l-Fidā‘, ed. Reinaud, p. 277).

Besides al-Ra‘ka, the capital of Dīyār Muḥāfiz, al-Makdisī and others mention also "burned al-Ra‘ka" (al-Ra‘ka al-Muhāfizī, i.e. Ra‘ka al-Sawdā‘ in the Balīlī), a farākī below the "white town" (Yākūt, iii. 31; ii. 802; Ibn Rusta, p. 90; al-Makdisī, p. 20, 144). It was also called "crooked al-Ra‘ka" (al-Aw’dī) and corresponds to the present ruins of al-Ra‘ka al-Samā‘īn.

Badr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ra‘ḥīm al-Bal‘alabakī (Alwardi, v. 413, on No. 6104) wrote a rivāli on al-Ra‘ka.

According to Hersfeld, the following larger groups of ruins lie in the area of al-Ra‘ka in addition to Hira‘qa which is in the neighbourhood:

1. The "horse-shoe town" with high walls, still standing, which form a semicircle on the north, while in the south they run in a straight line along the banks of the Euphrates and enclose an area of 1,92 sq. km. (Hersfeld, Arch. Reise, ii. 356 sq.; plan: plate lxxii.). It corresponds to al-Ra‘ka founded by Manṣūr, to which the name al-Ra‘ka was later transferred. Roughly in the centre of the northern part of this part of the town lie the ruins of a large mosque, the "mosque intra muros" the front of the court of which with a round minarīs (Sarrā-Ḥerzfeld, ii. 359; iii. pl. lxxi–lxxix and fig. 33–340), according to an inscription, was restored by a certain Nūr al-Dīn al-Mamūd in 561 (1165–1166) (van Berchem in Sarrā-Ḥerzfeld, i. 4–6). Nūr al-Dīn occupied al-Ra‘ka in 554 (1159) and gave it from 562 (1170) to 566 (1171) to his brother Mawdū‘.
RAKKADÁ, residential city of the Aghlabid emirs of Ifriqiya about 6 miles south of Kairawan, was founded in 263 (876) by Ibrāhīm II, seventh prince of the dynasty. Until then the Aghlabids had resided in ʿAbbāsiyya [q.v.] nearer the capital. A chance trip into the country by Ibrāhīm, it is said, determined the site of the new residence. The emir was suffering from insomnia and on the advice of his physician, Iḥṣāk b. Sulaimān, went out to take the air. Stopping in a certain place he fell into a deep sleep and decided to build a palace there which was called Rakkadā, the 'soporific'. The story is probably based on a popular etymology of the name, which is found elsewhere in North Africa. Another explanation, equally suspect, is that which attributes the name to the memory of a massacre of the Warfaglijuns by the ʿAbdīl chief Abū Ḳhaṭṭāb [q.v.] in 141 (758) and the many dead left lying there.

In the same year that the work of building was begun, Ibrāhīm settled in Rakkadā in the Castle of Victory (Ḵaṣr al-Fāṭih). He was to live there the rest of his life, as were his successors, except for the stays the emirs made in Tunisia. Rakkadā became a regular town as al-ʿAbbāsiyya had been before it. Besides Ḵaṣr al-Fāṭih (or Ḵaṣr Abū l-Fāṭih) there were several other castles in it: Ḵaṣr al-Bahār (the castle on the lake), Ḵaṣr al-Šaḥr (castle of the court), Ḵaṣr al-Mukhārā (castle of the elect) and Ḵaṣr Baghdād, a large mosque, baths, caravanserais and ʿabān. Al-Bakri says that it had a circumference of 24,040 cubits (over 6 miles), al-Nuwayri makes it smaller (14,000, nearly 4 miles). A wall of brick and clay surrounded this vast area, and this wall was renovated by the last Aghlabid with a view to a final effort at resistance. Al-Bakri further tells us that the greater part of the enceinte was filled with gardens. The soil was fertile and the air temperate. The emirs and their followers enjoyed in Rakkadā a variety of sports, p. 217 of his book, which would have caused a scandal in Kairawan. The sale of mudhoq [q.v.], forbidden in the pious old city, was officially permitted in the royal residence.

It was from Rakkadā that Ziyādat Allāh III, the last of the Aghlabids, fled on the approach of the Ṣufāḥa. The victorious Abū ʿAbd-Allāh [q.v.] installed himself in Ḵaṣr al-Šaḥr. His master, the Mahdī ʿUbayd Allāh, lived in Rakkadā until 308 (920) when he moved to al-Mahdiyya. After being deserted by the ruler, Rakkadā fell into ruins. In 542 (955) the caliph al-Muʿizz ordered what was left of it to be razed to the ground and ploughed over. The gardens alone were spared.

(E. HONGMANN)
A few traces of the Aghlabid foundation are still to be seen at the present day. A great rectangular reservoir with thick walls strengthened by buttresses may be identified with the lake (badr) which gave its name to one of the palaces. A palm grove of four stories stood in the centre. Nothing is left of it, but on the west side of the reservoir may be seen the ruins of a building which must have been reflected in the great mirror of water. Three rooms may still be distinguished with their mosaic pavements. The technique and style of decoration closely connect these Qasr Nadjman buildings of the third century A.H. with the Christian art of the country.


RAMADÂN (Ar.) name of the ninth month of the Mahjûmân calendar. The name from the root r-m-d refers to the heat of summer and therefore shows in what season the month fell when the ancient Arabs still endeavoured to equate their year with the solar year by intercalary months (see Nัสrî). Ramađân is the only month of the year to be mentioned in the Qur'ân (Sûra ii. 183; Eastern numbering): “The month of Ramađân (is that in which) the Qur'ân was sent down”, we are told in connection with the establishment of the fast of Ramađân. The discussion on the origin of this edict cannot be considered ended; to what has been said in the article 3AWî there have to be added the researches of F. Goitein, Zur Entstehung des Ramaḍāns, in JSt., xviii. (1929), p. 158 sqq., who in connection with the above mentioned verse of the Qur'ân calls attention to the parallelism between the mission of Qasr Nadjman and the handing of the second tablet to the law of Moses, which according to Jewish tradition took place on the Day of Atonement (Tishâ'î), the precursor of Elul and the date of which was fixed at a very early date by institution. Goitein suggests that the first arrangement to replace the 'Ashurî (q.v.) was a period of ten days (ayûm mu'dâdât, Sûra ii. 184), not a whole month, which ran parallel with the ten days of penance of the Jews preceding the Day of Atonement and survives to the present day in the 10 days of the Tishâ'î (q.v.). If we consider further that the Muslim ideas of the Lailat al-Кadr which falls in Ramađân, in which according to Qur'ân lxxvii. 1, the Qur'ân was sent down, coincide in many points with the Jewish on the Day of Atonement, we must concede a certain degree of probability to Goitein's suggestions, in spite of the undeniable chronological difficulties (alteration of the length of the period of the fast, within a very short time) and although the final settlement of the term as a whole month is not thereby satisfactorily explained. On the other hand to strengthen Goitein's position, it ought perhaps to be pointed out that the Lailat al-Barâ' (q.v.) precedes Ramađân in the middle of the preceding month of Shabîn. The ideas and practices described by Wensineck in the article 3NÂMâN, which are associated with this night really to some extent resemble Jewish conceptions associated with the New Year—which precedes the Day of Atonement by a rather shorter interval than the Lailat al-Barâ' Ramađân that the connection between the latter and the Day of Atonement is thereby strengthened. If we try to connect the so far unexplained word Barâ' with the Hebrew berâ' creation and reflect that according to the Jewish idea the world was created on New Year's Day (numerous references in the liturgy of the festival) we have perhaps a further link in the chain of proof; but if all of the age of the ideas associated with the Lailat al-Barâ' must be ascertained.

The legal regulations connected with the fast of Ramađân are given in the article 3AWî [cf. also 3NÂMâN]. Of important days of the month, al-Birûn, among others, mentions the 6th as birth-day of the martyr Hûsain b. 'Ali, the 10th as the day of death of Kâhidjâ, the 17th as the day of the battle of Badr, the 19th as the day of the conquest of Mecca, the 21st as the day of 'Ali's birth-day, and of the Imam 'Ali al-Ridâ, the 25th as birth-day of 'Ali and finally the night of the 27th as Lailat al-Kadr (q.v.).

The name of this night is Kûrânic; Sûra xxvii. is dedicated to it. It is there described as a night “better than a 1,000 months” in which the angels ascend free from every commission (bi-kidâm Allâh min kull amr) and which means blessing till the appearance of the red of dawn. The revelation of the Kûrân, as already mentioned, is expressly located in it. The same night is obviously referred to in Sûra xlix. 2 as a “blessed” one. The date, the 27th, is however not absolutely certain, the pious therefore use all the odd nights of the last ten days of Ramađân for good works, as one of them at any rate is the Lailat al-Kadr [cf. 3HîTÎM].

Trade and industry are largely at a standstill during Ramađân, especially when it falls in the hot season. The people are therefore all the more inclined to make up during the night for the deprivations of the day. As sleeping is not forbidden during the fast, they often sleep a part of the day; and the night, in which one may be merry, is given up to all sorts of pleasures. In particular the nights of Ramađân are the time of public entertainments, the shadow play [cf. 3KHÂLÎ], theatre and other forms of the theatrical performance. On the termination of the fast by the "little festival", cf. TD AL-FI'TîS.

Bibliography: Wellhausen, Rituale, p. 97; al-Birûnî, A서, ed. Sachau, p. 60, 324, 331 sqq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 12; Dr. Alister, i. 2; Lane, Manners and Customs, chap. 25; Mehdem Tevfîq, Ein Tahte in Konstantinopel, i. Die Ramazan-Nacht, transl. by Th. Menzel (T.B.S., ill., 1905); Wensineck, Arabic New-Year, in Verh. Ak. Amst., N.S., xvi. 2; do., The Muslim Creed, p. 219 sqq.; Piiper, Fragmenta Islamica, ii. 2; Littmann, Über die Ehren-ramazan etc. (ISt., viii. 228 sqq.).

(M. PLEISSNER)
RAMADAN-OGHULLARI, a petty Anatolian dynasty. The earlier history of the Ramadân-Oghullari is, like that of most of the minor Anatolian principalities (tëvâni-mülük), shrouded in obscurity. According to tradition, this Turkoman family came in Erinçhan's time from Central Asia to Anatolia where they settled in the region of Adana and founded their power. Their territory comprised the districts of Adana, Si, Ayaş, a part of the territory of the Warsaq Turkomans, Tarlu, etc. The date of the earliest known prince of the dynasty, Mir Ahmed b. Ramadân (see below), is put at 780-819 (1379-1416). Nothing definite is known about the real founder, Ramadân-Beg. The French traveller Bertrand de la Broquière thus characterizes Mir Ahmed b. Ramadân: "Lequel estoit tresgrande personne d'honneur et de renom, et la plus vaillante espéce de tous les Turcs et le mieux ferant d'une mache. Et avoir estoit fils d'une femme creusienne laquelle l'avoir fait baptiser a la loy grecque pour luy enlever le flair et le sentier qu'ont cents qui ne sont point baptisées. Il n'avoit ne bon creusement ne bon sararín" (cf. Le Voyage d'Outremer de Bertrand de la Broquière, C. Schiffer, Paris 1892, p. 90 ny). Mir Ahmed was succeeded by Ibrahim Beg (819-830 = 1416-1427). The beginning of his reign is put by some, e.g. Mehmed Nüzhet Bey, as early as 810, while its end is put in 819. Khalif Edhem Beg was the first to propose a new chronology, which is here followed. Ibrahim Beg was deposed before his death (811) by his eldest son 'Ism al-Din Hamza Beg, who reigned from 830-850. He was succeeded by his uncle Mehmed Beg b. Mir Ahmed and the latter's brother 'Ali, who seem to have reigned jointly. Of his successor, his nephew Arslân Dâ'ûd b. Ibrahim, we only know that he fell in 885 (1480) in a battle in the vicinity of Diyarbakr. His body was brought to Aleppo and buried there. The history of the Ramadân-Oghullari now becomes a little better known. His son and successor, Ghars al-Din Khalif, known from a number of inscriptions (cf. Max v. Oppenheim and Max van Berchem, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien, Leipzig 1899, p. 109 sq., Nrs. 141-145 of the years 898, 900, 906, 913) ruled for 34 years with his brother Mahmûd-Beg and died in battle in 916 (1510). The date of his death (beginning of Dhmâli 916 = beginning of Aug. 1510) is known with certainty from his epitaph in Adana, in M. v. Oppenheim and Max van Berchem (op. cit., p. 110, N. 145). His son Piri Mehmed Paşa, who appears as ruling from 916-976 (1510-1568), distinguished himself as an ottoman vassal fighting against the rebels of İsbet (Anatolia; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., ill. 211) in May 1528 (Shaban 934) as well as in the civil war between the princes Bâyazid and Selim at Konya (May 1559; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., ill. 368 sqq.). He died in 972 (1568) in his capital Adana. He had an equal command of Persian and Turkish and composed a Divân. His son Derwaş-Beg, who had been mutasarrif of Tarhtas in his father's life-time because after his death governor (vali) of Adana but died young in 986 (1578), He was succeeded by his eldest brother Ibrahim Beg, who had previously been sandjâb-bey of 'Antâb. He acted as governor at his father's capital till his death in 1002 (1694). His son Mehmed-Beg was the last dynast of the Ramadân-Oghullari but he can only have had a nominal rule. The family of the Ramadân-Oghullari however has survived to the present day. The following is the genealogical table:

Ramatdân

1. Ahmed


Daûd Korkud Mahmûd Kobâd

Mustafâ Sulaimân Ahmed 'Omar daughter

Pir Manûf

AL-ROMADI, whose full name was Abi 'Umar (wrongly Abi 'Amr) Yusef b. Harun al-Kinawi al-Kuteibi al-Ramadi, poet of Muslim Spain, who lived in the fourth (tenth) century and died early in the fifth (eleventh) century in 403 (1013), on the day of the 'Aqaba or Feast of St. John (June 24), according to Ibn Haiyan (in Ibn Basir, cf. Bibi), in 413 (1022-1023), according to al-Makari (quoting the same Ibn Haiyan); he was buried in the cemetery of Cordova known as Makharat Kala'.

The ethnic al-Ramadi is explained in two ways: 1. the poet is said to have come from al-Ramada, a little town between Alexandria and Barqa; this explanation is to be rejected for al-Ramada (with generation of the name — and this orthography is attested by the geographers who mention the place, e.g. al-Ya'qubi, al-Bakri and al-Idrisi —) would not give an ethnic like al-Ramadi (with one m); 2. the second explanation which derives Ramadi from ramda: "ordinary ashes" or "ashes for washing", is the only possible one; the poet perhaps in his youth followed the trade of an ash-merchant; in confirmation of this we may call attention to the Romance surname which was originally given him: Abi Dyans (wrongly Abi Salih in the Ya`mat al-Dahr), i.e. padres centos, "father cinders" or "cindersman".

Al-Ramadi, a native of Cordova, spent all his life in his native town except for a brief period of exile in Saragossa. His life was dominated by three great factors: his attachment to Abi 'Ali al-Kalbi, his devotion to the cause of the hashidh Abi 'l-Hassan al-Muslima and his love for Khawla.

Abi 'Ali al-Kalbi, summoned from the east to Spain by the Umayyad caliph, 'Abd al-Rahman III al-Nasir (300-350 = 912-961) had from his arrival in Cordova in 330 (941) no more faithful disciple than al-Ramadi who studied under him in the direction of the Kitab al-Nawadir (the book of philological rarities). The young scholar's admiration found expression in a poem which has remained famous (rhyme 2, metre gamil) of which some thirty lines are preserved in the Ya`mat al-Dahr of al-Thalib al-Daraggi and the Majmua al-Anfus of al-Fath b. Khajlan (cf. Bibi). It is in this poem which gained him the title of Mutanabb al-Labbir (which had already been given to Ibn Hani al-Andalusi and which was later to be given to Ibn Darrad al-Kasalli and to Abi Talib 'Abd al-Debbir). Al-Ramadi studied also under an Andalusian scholar named Abi Bakr Yahya Ibn Haswai al-Kaff or al-Amai ("the blind"), of whom we know very little.

When at the height of his powers, al-Ramadi became laureate to the Umayyad caliph al-Hakam II al-Mustansir (350-366 = 961-976), then to his son and successor Higham al-Ma'rayid (366-399 = 976-1009); but his attachment to the cause of the hashidh Abi 'l-Hassan Djarfar b. 'Uthman al-Muslima and his participation in the plot fomented by the enmity Dzawwar to overthrow Hakam II and proclaim another caliph in his place. Abi 'Amir, thrown into prison at al-Zahr, suffered all sorts of ill-treatment; during his imprisonment, he wrote the most touching verses (including a poem in 6i, metre jawfi, and another in hak, metre jawfi) and he prepared a poetical work on birds, the description of which concluded with a poem in praise of the heir-presumptive Higham II. Liberated through the intercession of friends he had got to go into exile. He went to Saragossa to the governor 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad al-Tugjhi whose merits he celebrated in a poem in which Amnestied by al-Mansur he was able to return to Cordova, but on condition that he did not go into society. Finally pardoned, he entered the contemplation of the all, powerful hashidh as a pensioner (mussawwir) and it was in this capacity that he took part in an expedition against Barcelona in 375 (985). During the fitna which was to lead to the collapse of the Umayyad caliphate and the formation of petty independent states ruled by the muluk al-talitirf, al-Ramadi led a miserable existence and it was in the greatest distress that he died in the early years of the fifth (eleventh) century.

Al-Ramadi became celebrated chiefly for his chaste love for the enigmatic Khawla (wrongly: Halwa or Hulwa) whom he met one Friday in the public gardens of the Banii Marwan on the left bank of the Guadalquivir at the end of the bridge but was never able to see again. It was Abi Mu'min al-Hassan al-Zahir, whose ascetic tendencies on this subject are well known, who did most to spread this love-story; but it seems that the memory of Khawla occupied the heart or mind of the poet only very little; if it still possessed him at Saragossa to the extent of inspiring all the naqsha of the panegyric in honour of the Tugjhi governor, on his return to Cordova, it disappeared completely for we see al-Ramadi henceforth completely overwhelmed by a new passion, the object of which is not a woman but a Mozarab boy to whom the poet gives the name of Yahya (John) or Nusair (Victor?).

The Divan al-Ramadi never seems to have been collected; of his book on birds, Kitab al-Tair, written in prison, there survives only the Lamya in which he described the falcon hunting; the more important fragments that have survived have already been mentioned. A pupil of Abi 'Ali al-Kalbi, al-Ramadi is inclined to imitate the poetry of the east, but after Ibn 'Abd Rabbih and before Ubada b. Muz al-Sama, he shows a marked fondness for the mussawwir in the construction of which, he introduced several innovations. In spite of its classical structure, his verse has a very personal character, especially when he calls upon Khawla or describes his sufferings in the prison at al-Zahr.

The few lines in which he alludes to the weakness of Higham II and to his complete domination by his mother Sahbi and by the hashidh and al-Mansur, those in which he speaks of Dzawwar's plans, are not without historical interest; finally the information which he gives about Mozarabs (worship and costume) in connection with his favourite enable us to check what Abi 'Amir Ibn Shubaid says on the same subject and for this reason of some documentary importance.

RAM-HORMUZ (the contracted form Rami), Ríhmas is found as early as the tenth century, a town and district in Khuzestán [q.v.]. Rám-Hormuz lies about 55 miles southeast of Ahwáz, 65 miles S.E. of Shushá, and 60 miles N.E. of Behbbehán. Ibn Khurádhghí, p. 45, records 17.7 farsaksáh from Ahwáz to Rám-Hormus and 22 farsaksáh from Rám-Hormuz to Ardrájd. Kádáima, p. 194, gives a more detailed list of stages, counting 50 farsaksáh from Waṣát to Básra, thence 35 farsaksáh to Ahwáz, thence 20 farsaksáh to Rám-Hormus, and then 24 farsaksáh to Ardrájd. The importance of Rám-Hormus lay in the fact that it was situated at the intersection of the roads from Ahwáz, Shushá, Isfahán, and Fars (in Ardrájd); that it is the natural market for the Bahgíyát and Khisfí glutinous rice and market for the Khisfí rice. The first of these (also called Džubur) is made up of the following streams: Ahib Gísh (Ahibz I), Ahib Aší (coming from Mungashi), Rúd-l Pítang and Ahib Dará-yi Kúl. A canal is led from the right bank of the Džubur to supply the town of Rám-Hormus. Further down, the Džubur joins the Tíl-Geçtún, which comes from the southeast in the region of Behbbehán and from the old town of Ardrájd [q.v.]. Their combined waters are known as the Džjjárát. The other little river (Gópál) runs north of Rám-Hormus and is lost in marshes. Rám-Hormus (500 feet above sea-level) is situated above the plain to the northeast of which rise the hills of Tíl-Geçtún 1,600 feet high.

The town is rarely mentioned by historians. The Pahlavi list of Íránian towns, § 46 (ed. Marquart, p. 49, 68) attributes the building of Rám-Hormus to Ormuz b. Shîbûhr (272-273) (cf. also Tabari, p. 933). According to Khala, ed. Gottwald, p. 227, the town was built by Ardashîr I and its name was Rám (q.v.) Hormuzd Ardashîr, which Marquart explains as "the delight of Ahwás. Mazdás is Ardashîr." According to a tradition, recorded by Isjádshí, p. 98, Mâni was executed in Rám-Hormus, but Tabari, i. § 34, says that Mâni was exposed on the "gate of Mâni" at Džjandé-Sâbûr (cf. also al-Biruni, Chronology, p. 268). The Nestorian bishops of Rám-Hormus are mentioned in the years 577 and 587 (Marquart, Erásmahh, p. 27, 145). Kádáima, p. 414, says that "Aqâl al-Dawla built a magnificent market near Rám-Hormus and that the town had a library founded by Ibn Sawâr (according to some sources, the son of Sawâr b. 'Abd Allah, governor of Básra, who died in 157 = 753), and was a centre of Ma'tázi learning. According to Ibn Khurádhghí, 45, Rám-Hormus was one of the 12 kúrás of Khuzestán (Kádáima, p. 242, and Kádáima, p. 407: one of the 7 kúrás). Its towns (Kádáima) were Sanbál, Idrájd [q.v.], Tymn [f], Báshán, Láshá, Cházwá [f], Bâkúd, and Káfrk, all situated in the highlands. To these Yákbí, i. § 185, adds Ārâb (with a bridge, a faraschka from Ahwáz). On the other places in the kúr of Rám-Hormus (Azâk, Bûstân, Sâsán, Tâshân, Úr) see Schwarz, op. cit., p. 341-345. According to Kádáima, p. 407, Rám-Hormus had palm-groves but no sugar-cane plantations (in the xivth century however, Mustawfi, Núshá al-Kuláh, p. 111, says that Rám-Hormus used to produce more sugar than cotton); among the products of Rám-Hormus, Ísájshí (p. 93) mentions silk (þibád úbrún) and Dimidáshsh, p. 119 (transl. p. 153) the very valuable white naphtha which comes out of the rocks. At the present day the Anglo Persian Oil Company possesses deposits above Rám-Hormus. ALL-MIKHTEKH, I. MacDonald, Kinner, a geographical Memoir, London 1813, p. 457; Rawlinson, Notes on a March from Zeháb, in J.R.G.S., 1859, ix. 79 (region of Mungashi, in the N. E. of Rám-Hormus); Bode, Travels, London 1845, i. 281; Behbehán-Tâshân-Madájdín-Tíl-Mádájdín-Shushár, ii. 39, 76, 82 (distribution of tribes); Layard, Description of Khuzestán, in J.R.G.S., 1846, p. 13 (country round Rám-Hormus; in the town 250 families, taxes 3,000-5,000 tomans), p. 66 (valley of Džjjárát); Herzel, Eine Reise durch Luristan, in Pet. Mitt., 1897, Ahwáz-Shâkí I-Gapál-Mádájdí ("Mir-bâhá")-Rám (sic)-Palín-Dóz-n-Tâshân-Behbehán; Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 145-152; Schwartz, Iran im Mittelalter, i. 332-345; cf. also the index; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 247-249.

(V. MINORSVY)

AL-RÁMI, whose full name was Hâšan b. Muhammad Sharaf al-Din, a Persian stylist. No details of his life are known; even the few chronological references that we possess are rather vague. His importance lies in his well known work Ants al-Iṣlám, a treatise on the most common poetical figures for describing the different parts of the human body. According to his own statement, the author made up his mind to compile this work while he was in Marâgha on a visit to the observatory of the famous Náṣir al-Din Tusi. The book is dedicated to Sultán Abu'l-Fath Uways Bahâdûr (1356-1373), Ilkháán of Khorásán, and according to Ilkáh Khâlda (ed. Flügel, i. 428) was finished in Shâhwâl 826 (Sept. 1423). This is in obvious contradiction to chronology for at this date Ilkâh Khâlda had belonged to the Timürid Shâhrâkh since 825 (1420). The author further mentions in this work the poet Ahwâd (d. 738 = 134) as his contemporary and a certain
Hasan b. Mahmūd Khāṭṭī (d. 710 = 1300) as his teacher. It may therefore be assumed that Ḥājjījī Khāṭṭī’s statement is based on a misunderstanding and was written not later than 1373. The work is divided into 19 chapters which begin with the hair of the head and end with the feet and deal with the human body from head to foot. Besides this book, which is of great value for the study of classical Persian poetry and was used by the great Turkish commentator Muṣṭafā b. Shāḥbāz Surūrī (d. 909 = 1501) in his Bahār al-Maṭawīf, Sharaf al-Dīn Rāmī also prepared a commentary on the well-known work on poetics of Raḥīl al-Dīn Wāṭwāṭ, Ḥaḍīṭh al-Shur (new edition of the Persian text by ‘Abūhās Iklīh, Teheran 1930) entitled Ḥaḍīṭh al-Ḥaḍīṭh or Šemīrī al-Ḥadīth (Ḥājjījī Khāṭṭī, ii. 77), a work called Huṣayn al-Ḥaḍīth of which nothing else is known (Ḥājjījī Khāṭṭī, iil. 112) and a Dīwān, which consisted of ḡazals, Ḵāṭā’s and quatrains, but as early as Dāwlatākh’s time it could only be found in the ‘Irāq, ‘Arbaṭhābīdān and Fars. Nothing of all these works has come down to us except the Anis al-‘Uṭūbī. There is said to be a kāpsa of ‘Rūmī’s in the Dāwlatākh’s Dīwān (compiled in 1400 = 1438–1437) of Shāhīd Ḥāfiz (d. 866 = 1463–1462) (Dāwlatākh, Taḥqīkāt al-Maṣūmī, ed. E. Browne, p. 308).


RĀMĪ MEḤMĒD PĀSHA, an Ottoman grand vizier and poet, was born in 1065 or 1066 (1654) in Elūbūr, a suburb of Stambul, the son of a certain Hasan Ḥāṭṭī. He entered the chancellery of the Re’s Efendi as a probationer (şaban) and through the poet Yūsuf Nāṭī (q.v.), received an appointment as muṣṭafā muṣīlī, i.e. secretary for the expenditure of the palace. In 1065 (1664), through the influence of his patron, the newly appointed Kapudān Pāsha (q.v.) Muṣṭafā Pāsha, he became dīwān-e fennī, i.e. chancellor of the Admiralty. He took part in his chief’s journeys and campaigns (against Chiṣṣa) and on his return to Stambul became re’s kebārār, i.e. purser to the Re’s Efendi. In 1103 (1690) he was promoted Beykülī, i.e. Vice-Chancellor and four years later Re’s Efendi in place of Abū Bakr, in which office he was succeeded in 1108 (1697) by Kūṭīk Meḥmēd Cēlebī. After the battle of Zenta (Sept. 12, 1697), he became Re’s Efendi for a second time and was one of the plenipotentiaries at the peace of Carlowitz by the conclusion of which “he put an end to the ravages of the Ten Years War but also for ever to the conquering power of the Ottomans” (J. v. Hammer). As a reward for his services at the peace negotiations he was appointed a vizier of the dome with 3 horse-tails (maṣfūza) in 1114 (1703) and in Ramaḍān 9, 1114 (Jan. 24, 1703) appointed to the highest office in the kingdom in succession to the grand vizier Dāltānī Muṣṭafā Pāsha. In this office he devoted particular attention to the thorough reform of the civil administration, through the abuses in which he saw the security of the state threatened (J. v. Hammer, G.O. R., vii. 64). By lessening the burden of fortresses on the frontiers in east and west, by raising militia against the rebel Arabs, by securing the pay of the army from the revenues of certain estates, by making aquisition, by restoring ruined mosques, by taking measures for the safety of the pilgrim caravans and for the security of Asia Minor, by settling Turkmen tribes, by ordering the Jewish cloth manufacturers in Selânik and the Greek silk manufacturers in Bâruna in future to make in their factories all the stuffs hitherto imported into Turkey from Europe (J. v. Hammer), he exercised a most beneficent activity, which however soon aroused envy and hatred, and, especially as Rāmī Meḥmēd Pāsha as a man of the pen entirely and not of the sword, was unpopular with the army, particularly the Janissaries, finally was bound to lead to his fall (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. R., vii. 72). In the great rising in Stambul which lasted for three weeks, beginning with the unauthorised ascent of Sultan Mehmed IV and ending with his deposition (9th Rabī‘a’ 1115 = Aug. 22, 1703), his career came to an end. He was disgraced, but pardoned in the same year and appointed governor, first of Cyprus, then of Egypt (Oct. 1704). His governorship there terminated as unhappily as his grand viziership (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. R., vii. 113 following Rāghīd and La Motraye). In Djiḍmān 1 1118 (Sept. 1706) he was dismissed and sent to the island of Rhodes, where he died in Dji’dhējja 1119 (March 1707) either under torture or a result of it (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. R., vii. 134 quoting the interminabul Talman). Rāmī Meḥmēd Pāsha is regarded as a brilliant stylist, as the two collections of his official documents (ingāda) containing no less than 1,400 pieces, distinguished by their simple clear and elevated style, amply show (cf. the MSS. in Vienna, Nat. Bibl. Nrs. 296 and 297 in Gr. Flügel, Die arab. pers. u. türk. Hst., i. 271 sq.). Rāmī Meḥmēd Pāsha also left a complete Dīwān of which specimens are available in the printed Tehrābīr-e Šālim (cf. E. Bäbler, G. O. W., p. 272 sq.: Stambul 1515). His poetical gifts were inherited by his son Abbās Re‘fī (cf. Brūsālī Meḥmēd Tāhir, Tāhirī, Muṣīlmān Mawllīfīr, i. 187). His son-in-law was the tadbīrīr-e Šālim (q.v.).


AL-RAMLĪ, capital of Ḵafṣ, 25 miles E.N.E. of Jerusalem. The Umayyad caliphs liked to choose little country towns, usually places in Palestine, to live in rather than Damascus. Mu‘āwiya and after him Marwān and others frequently resided in al-Ṣinā‘a on the south bank of the Lake of al-Tabrīyā, Yāzīd I in Hawwārīn, ʿAbd al-Malik in al-Dhībīyya, Wahāb in Usāin (now Tell Sair S.E. of Damascus) and al-Ḵaryātān and his
The chief gates of al-Ramlia were: Darb Bīr al-‘Askar (called after the al-‘Askar quarter; cf. Yākūt, iii. 674; Saḥīl al-Dīn, Marajīd, ii. 258); Darb Mandjīq “Ammāba (as it was called, as de Goeje conjectured, from the town elsewhere however called “Ammābā 4 miles E. of al-Ramlia); Darb Baṭrīq al-Maṣjud, Darb Bīrā (i.e. Bīrāl); Darb Bāligha or Kāyriyat al-‘Ibād, the ancient Kāyriyat Baṭrīq al-‘Ibād, now Abī Ghawālah); Darb Lība, Darb Vātār, Darb Mīrār and Darb Dāqīqa, the latter called after a neighbouring town with a mosque, mainly inhabited by Samaritans (Bīth Dagon, now Bait Deqqa).

In the centre of the market-place of al-Ramlia was the chief mosque Dājūm al-‘Abyād, the miḥrāb of which was regarded as the largest of all that were known, the pulpit of which was second only to that in Jerusalem and whose splendid minaret was much admired.

Whether there had been an older town on the site of al-Ramlia is problematic. The old attempts to identify it with Arimathea, Ramath or Ramathaim have now been generally abandoned. An ancient Παναγία, “Camp,” should rather be considered, a place-name particularly frequent in Palestine, which was borne for example by the camp of Jerusalem (Herod. iii. 11, 13; Ant. Ap. xxii. 34—xxiii. 32) and bishops in Palestine (now Bīr al-Zarka, cf. Federin in Géogr. Pe. de S. Ephrem de Grand, p. 104). And in Ptolemaic Libanus (R. Aigrain, l.c., Arab. in Dict. d’Hist. et de Géogr. Anciennes, iii. 1194—1196); for the Egyptian al-Ramlia 4 miles N.E. of Alexandretta corresponds to an ancient Nicopolis and later Parembole. But the Arabic writers say there was no town previously on this site but only a sandy area after which the town was named (Bīr al-Balādhurī, p. 143 etc.).

The population of al-Ramlia was in the time of al-Yaḥyābī (B. G. A., viii. 327 sq.) a mixture of Arabs and Persians (on the settlement of Persians in Syria cf. al-Kindī, Gouverneurs d’Egypte, ed. Guest, p. 19); the clients were Samaritans.

The great cistern ‘Umāirīyya (“Aḥzīyya”) to the N.W., of al-Ramlia near the road to Yākūt, known as the cistern of St. Helena, has a Kūfic inscription of Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 172 (May 786), i.e. the time of Hārūn al-Rashīd (van Berchem, Inscri. arabes de Syrie, Cairo 1897, p. 4—7; M. de Vogüé La citerne de Ramla, in Comptes rendus de l’Acad. des Insr. et Belles-Lettres, xxix. 1911, p. 362 sq., 493 sq.).

By the Frankish pilgrims the town is first mentioned in 870 as “Ramula.” The Crusaders made it a bishopric. In the 13th century was built the beautiful church of the Crusaders, now the mosque (Dājūm al-‘Abyād in the east of the town) with a fine Trabe Gothic portal, to which was later added very skilfully an inscription of Sulṭān Kātabhū. It also has an inscription, according to which its square tower (now replaced by a round minaret) was built or restored in 714 (1314—1315) by Sulṭān Muhammad.

The old “white mosque” was restored by Saladin in 1191 (1191) and given by Balbars in 1166 (1266—1268) two domes, above the minaret and the mihrāb, and the gateway opposite it (Mujār al-Dīn, Bilāl, p. 418; transl. Sauvage, p. 207; the inscription in van Berchem, op. cit., p. 57—64). The minaret, the so-called “tower of al-Ramlia,” or “Tower of the 40 martyrs,” was, according to Mujār al-Dīn and an inscription over its gateway, rebuilt in
Ramapur, an Indian state in Rohilkhand and under the political supervision of the government of the United Provinces. It is bounded on the north by the district of Naini Tal; on the east by Bareilly; on the south by the Bissauli tahsil of Budaun; and on the west by the district of Moradabad.

The early history of Ramapur is that of the growth of Rohilla power in Rohilkhand. After the establishment of Muslim rule in India large bodies of Afghan or Pathan settled down in the country. So powerful did they become that they were twice able to establish their rule in northern India, under the Lodis [q.v.], in the second half of the xvth century, and under the Stüris [q.v.] in the time of Shāh Shāh. After the death of Awrangzib and with the decline of the Mogul empire Afghan settlements increased until in the words of the Siyar al-Muluk-khābārū “they seemed to shoot up out of the ground like so many blades of grass”. The name Rohilla was applied to those Afghans who settled in what is now known as Rohilkhand.

The real founders of Rohilla power were an Afghan adventurer, named Da‘īd Khān, who arrived in India immediately after the death of Awrangzib, and his adopted son, All Muhammad Khān, who succeeded him as leader of a band of mercenary troops. It was during the lifetime of All Muhammad Khān that his possessions came to be called Rohilkhand or the land of the Rohillas. In course of time All Muhammad Khān became so powerful that he refused any longer to pay his revenues to the central government, in which course he was encouraged by the anarchy consequent upon the invasion of Nādir Shāh [q.v.].

The growth of his power so alarmed Šahtar Djang of Ough [see Ough] that he persuaded the emperor to send an expedition against him, as a result of which All Muhammad Khān surrendered to the imperial forces and was taken prisoner to Delhi. After a time he was pardoned and appointed governor of Sirhind. In 1748, according to the Guftūḥ-i Rāmānat, he was transferred to Rohilkhand, but it seems more probable that he took advantage of the invasion of Āhmād Shāh Durrānī [q.v.] to recover his former possessions. Two factors had contributed to the growth of Rohilla power: the weakness of the central government and the fact that they were able to take advantage of the internal struggles between the various Rājput chiefs and nakadārs of Rohilkhand.

All Muhammad Khān left six sons, but the absence of the two eldest in Afghanistan, combined with the extreme youth of the other four, made that all real power remained in the hands of a group of Rohilla nakadārs, the most important of whom were Hāfyz Raŷmat Khān, and Dīnī Khān. This naturally produced intrigues and disputes and eventually weakened the Rohilla power.

In 1771 the Marāthas turned their attention to the conquest of Rohilkhand, whereupon the Rohillas applied for aid to Shujā‘ al-Dawla, the nawab-wazir of Oughli. It was agreed that Shujā‘ al-Dawla should receive forty lakhs of rupees for his services (Aitchison, i. 6—7), but the Rohillas later refused to abide by their pecuniary engagements. In accordance with his promise at the Conference of Benares in 1773, Warren Hastings agreed to assist the nawab-wazir in expelling the Rohillas from Rohilkhand, for which he was to receive forty lakhs of rupees. On April 23, 1774, the Rohillas were defeated and their leader, Hāfyz Raŷmat Khān, slain. At the end of this war Faisrallah Khān, a son of ‘Ali Muhammad Khān, concluded a treaty with Shujā‘ al-Dawla at Lal-dang (India Office MSS., Bengal Secret Consultations, October 31, 1774; see also extracts from the Persian interpreter's journal, February 14, 1775).

By this treaty Faisrallah Khān received a gift consisting of Ramapur and other districts with a
revenue estimated at approximately fifteen lakhs of rupees. To prevent him from becoming a menace to Oudh, he was not allowed to retain in his service more than 5,000 troops. After the death of Shuja' al-Daula, in 1775, Faizullah Khan was informed that his engagement with the late nawab was still continued in force with his son, Aqaf al-Daula. (Bengal Secret Consultations, April 17, 1775.) Draft correspondence with the Company, Powers, N" 34."

In 1780 the English Company needed additional troops and Hastings urged Aqaf al-Daula to demand from Faizullah Khan the 5,000 horses he had engaged to supply by treaty. This demand for cavalry was an unwarrantable interpretation of the Treaty of Laidang for which no justification has ever been attempted. In 1781 Hastings empowered Aqaf al-Daula to resume Faizullah Khan’s rights, but fortunately this order was never carried out, and it was eventually decided to solve the problem by means of a fresh agreement whereby the obligation to provide troops for the nawab’s service was commuted under the Company’s guarantee to a cash payment of fifteen lakhs of rupees. In 1801, on the cessation of Kohil-khan to the British, Faizullah Khan’s descendants were continued in their possessions. For his services in the Mutiny of 1857, Muhammad Yusuf ’Ali Khan, the ruler of Rumpur, received a grant of land and was assured by Sa’adat Khan that, on the failure of natural heirs, any succession in his state, which might be legitimate according to Muhammadan law, would be upheld by the Government of India.

Modern Rumpur has an area of 893 square miles and supports a population of 465,225 of whom 217,297 are Muslims (1931 Census Report). It is divided for administrative purposes into six tahsils: the Haúr, Shaltahāb, Milak, Billapur, Snār and Tanda (Administration Report, 1932–1933). Its rulers are patrons of Oriental learning. The celebrated Madrasa ’Allya, an Arabic college, which is maintained from state funds, attracts students from all parts of India and even from Central Asia. Rumpur city, which has a population of 74,036, possesses a fine library containing an exceptionally valuable collection of manuscripts. Almost every Patha’man clan is represented in modern Rumpur, the most numerous being the Vasafris and Orakazis. There are also large numbers of Khattaks, Bunerwals, Muhammadanis, and Afrits.


RANGIN. Several Indian poets have used this taḥlitīq. The Riṣūd ‘al-iṣṭafā of Dhu’l-Fiqār ‘Ali, biographies of Indian poets who wrote in Persian, and the Tādzišra of Yūsuf ‘Ali Khan (analysed by Sprenger, A Catalogue of the Arabic, Persian and Hindustani Mss. of the King of Oudh, i. 168 and 280) mention five of them. The first, a native of Kashmīr, lived in Dīhli in the reign of Muhammad Shāh (1719–1748); his ghazals were sung by the dancing-girls. — The most celebrated, however, was Sa’adat Yūr Khān of Dīhli. His father, Šāhshāh Beg Khān Tūrān, came to India with Nādir Shāh and settled in Dīhli where he retained the rank of haft-hašārī and the title of Muhkm al-Daula. In his turn, Sa’adat Yūr Khān entered the service of Mirzā Sulaimān Shikhh, son of the emperor Shāh ‘Alam, who lived in Lucknow. He was a great horseman and able soldier: for a time he commanded a part of the artillery of the Nāsūr al-Haidarābad but he gave up this post to go into business. He was in his youth a friend of the poet Iṣlah, in Lucknow; a pupil of the poet Muhammad Ḥātim of Dīhli (cf. Rashid Bahadur Saksena, History of Urdu Literature, p. 48; Sprenger, op. cit., p. 233), he afterwards submitted all his verses to the criticism of Niqār (cf. Sprenger, p. 273), then of Māshaṭ (Saksena, p. 90); he died in 1745 (1832) aged eighty (or a year later; cf. García de Tassy). — The following are his works in Urdu: Mathnawī Dāïṣūr, a poet of romantic adventures (1123 = 1798); Ḥaþīl-i Rangīn, a Mathnawī of tales and anecdotes (Lucknow 1844 and 1870); another Mathnawī of anecdotes: Mathnawī al-Aṣūr b Ghara’ūl al-Muṣrār (lit. Agra and Lucknow); four division collectively known as Nāw Rūzān ("the Nine Jewels"), the first two lyrical, the third humorous and partly in riṣāl (language peculiar to women), the fourth in this same language with a preface by Rangīn explaining the principal words (on the development of riṣāl and Rangīn’s skill in this licentious genre), cf. the article Urdu vol. iv., p. 1026, l. 1–11, and Saksena, op. cit., p. 94); in prose a treatise on horsemanship (Fārānā‘ī, 1210 = 1775, several times edited) and a collection of critical observations on a number of poets, entitled Majdulīrī Rangīn. In Persian (if the work is really his; cf. Sprenger, op. cit., p. 54, N° 462), Rangīn under the title Mihr u-Maṣā‘, sang of the adventure of a son of a sāyid and of a daughter of a jeweller, based on an incident that occurred in Dīhli in the reign of Dīhāŋgīr (cf. Gr. i. Pk., l. 254).

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text: García de Tassy, Litt. hindūs et hindoustanīs?, l. 45 and iii. 21; Pertuch, Ein Handschriften-Versammlung aus Königl. Bibl. zu Berlin, iv, index, p. 1157; Blumhardt, Cat. of the Hinduismi Mss. in the British Museum, N° 74.

RANGOON, a city in the Pegu division of Burma, lying on both sides of the Hlaing river at its point of junction with the Pegu river and the Paungdaung creek, twenty-one miles from the sea.

Legend, not entirely undocumented, relates that the great pagoda at Rangoon (Mon, Kyauk Lamyag; Barmese, Show Dagon) was founded during the lifetime of the Buddha and was repaired by the emperor Asoka (J. B. R. S., xxiv. 4 and 20).

History proper begins with the establishment of Pegu as the capital of a Mon kingdom in 1269.
A convenient port was required for this kingdom. Bassin, which had been the chief port of Burma in the early middle ages, was too distant and too difficult to control. Martaban on the Gulf of Sittang was nearer but had no good river connection with Pegu. It was natural, therefore, that the Rangoon or Hlaing river, of which the Pegu river is a tributary, should come into prominence as a line of approach for over-seas trade. Syriam, to the southeast of Dagon at the mouth of the Pegu river, and Dalla, now part of the Rangoon on the opposite bank of the Hlaing, were the chief ports.

But the Shwe Dagon pagoda standing on the last spur of the Pegu Yomas was a landmark to shipping coming up the river and was chosen by a succession of kings for the exercise of their piety.

An inscription on the Dagon pagoda hill, engraved by order of King Dhammazedi in 1845 A.D., records additions to the pagoda by his royal predecessors for a century back, as well as by himself (F. B. R. S., xxiv. 8). Similar works of merit by subsequent kings are recorded in the histories (by this period fairly reliable) culminating in the rebuilding of the pagoda by King Bay in Naung after it had been damaged by an earthquake in 1508 A.D. There are also frequent references by early travellers, such as Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, Caesar Frederick, and Gasparo Balbi to Dagon at its celebrated pagoda.

It is the customs revenue of the Rangoon river that financed the Portuguese adventurer de Brito, who rose to power in Syriam between 1600 and 1612. Later in the 18th century the Dutch, French and English from time to time maintained trading stations at Syriam.

The capital was transferred from Pegu to Ava in 1635 and royal authority gradually declined, but even the weakest kings contrived to keep control of the Irrawaddy and the now important customs station of Syriam. With the seizure of Syriam by the Pegu rebels in 1740 the kingdom of Ava, deprived of its revenues, necessarily came to an end.

The recovery of Syriam was one of the first objects of Alaungpaya, the founder of the dynasty which ended with King Thithaw. His siege operations were for some time unsuccessful and he had to be content with the capture of Dagon in 1755. It is recorded that as he had been successful over all his enemies (yan akou) he changed the name of the town to Yangon (Rangoon). Syriam fell in 1756 and was destroyed. A governor was appointed at Rangoon, which now replaced Syriam as the principal port of Burma.

The policy of the early kings of the Alaungpaya dynasty was to encourage foreign trade. A British factory was established at Rangoon and maintained till 1782. First, Armenian and Muslim traders settled here and flourished. But with the weakening of the central government the exactions of the local officials increased and constituted a serious discouragement to commerce. Synes describes Rangoon, as a flourishing port in 1793 and estimates its population at 30,000 (p. 314).

Rangoon was first captured by the British in 1824 during the first Burmese war but was evacuated in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Yandabo at the end of the war. According to the Asin-baung ett Maha-yawawunyai (vol. iii., p. 45), a Burmese history of the Alaungpaya dynasty, King Tharawaddy visited Rangoon in 1841 (1203 A. D.) and founded a new town south and west of the Shwe Dagon pagoda, to which the population of the old town on the banks of the river was ordered to remove. The order was not at once obeyed, but, by the outbreak of the second Burmese war in 1852, the transfer of the population was pretty complete and the British government was unimpeded in the measures, which it lost no time in undertaking, for the reclamation and lay-out of the riverine area. In the space of three years Rangoon rose from a splashy collection of huts into a thriving and populous town. [For improvements in Rangoon and development of Pegu, see Fytche's Burma Past and Present, ii., appendix G. To-day it is the capital of Burma and has a population of 400,475, of whom 70,794 are Muhammadans (1931 Census Report).


(C. C. Lloyd Davies)

RAPAK (Jav.; Ar. raf') is a technical term used among the Javanese, in this one case only, for the charge made by the wife, at the court for matters of religion, that the husband has not fulfilled the obligations which he took upon himself at the talibih of jafah [see jafah]. These obligations are of a varied and changing nature. Among the conditions the following always occurs: "If the man has been absent a certain time on land or (longer) over seas" i.e. without having transmitted mofafa [q. v.] to his wife. A clause that is never omitted is the following: "If the wife is not content with this"; She is therefore at liberty to be quite satisfied with the husband's non-fulfilment of his vows, without taking steps for a divorce. The work of the court is only to ascertain the fulfilment of the condition and the arising of jafah. As always, the jafah is still entered in a register. — It is evident that this procedure guarantees the integrity of the law otherwise endangered.


RAS AL-A'IN (Ain Warda), a town in al-Diasira on the Khabir. In ancient times it was already known as Rasain-Theodosiopolis (Notitia dignitatum, or., xxvii. 20) or Forina (Steph. Byz.), Syriac Rasih 'Ainik. On account of its position at the sources of the Khabir it has been identified with the road-station Foros Scabora of the Tabula Peutingeriana (Foros Scabora in Pliny, Nat. hist., xxxi. 37; xxxii. 16) (E. Herzfeld, Reise im Eugkhai-

1119
and Rás al-'Ain. The latter was taken by Jocelin and a large part of the Arab garrison killed and the remainder taken prisoners (Mich. Syr., ii. 255; Barheb., Chron. yr., ed. Bedjan, p. 289). But the Franks cannot have held the town for very long.

Saladin, al-Din of Mawgli and 'Isa al-Din Mas'ud of Halab in 570 (1174—1175) attacked Salāḥ al-Din and besieged Rás al-'Ain but were soon afterwards defeated by him at Kurūn Ḥamā. In 581 (1185—1186) Saladin crossed the Euphrates and marched via al-Ruḥā, Rás al-'Ain and Dārā to Balad on the Tigris. His son and al-Asfāl in 597 (1200—1201) received from al-'Adil the towns of Sumaisaṭ, Sarūdī, Rás al-'Ain and Dārāmūn; when he then marched on Damascus, Nār al-Dīn of Mawgli and Kūṭh al-Dīn Muhammad of Subdār again took the Djiṣṭa from him but fell ill in Rás al-'Ain in the heat of summer and concluded peace again. In 599 (1202—1203) al-'Adil took from al-Asfāl the towns of Sarūdī, Rás al-'Ain and Dārāmūn (other fortresses also are mentioned). When the Kurūn (Georgian) who had advanced eastwards as far as Ḥāliḥ in 600 (1205—1206) learned that al-'Adil had reached Rás al-'Ain on his way against them, they withdrew (Kāmil al-Dīn, trans. Blochet, in K.O.L., ii. 67). Malik al-Asfār, who had defeated Ibn al-Maghṭūb in 610 (1219—1220) forgave him for rebelling and gave him Rás al-'Ain as a fief (Kāmil al-Dīn, op. cit., p. 61; according to Barheb., Chron. yr., p. 439, however, Ibn al-Maghṭūb died in prison in Ḥarrān.

Saladin's nephew al-Asfār in 617 (1220—1221) was fighting against the lord of Mādin. The lord of Amid made peace between them, when Rás al-'Ain was ceded to al-Asfār, Muwaszar and the district of Shabakhtūn (around Dūnāšt) to the lord of Amid. In exchange for Damascus, al-Asfār, in 626 (1229) gave his brother al-Kāmil the towns of al-Ruḥā, Ḥarrān, al-Raṣṣā, Sarūdī, Rás al-'Ain, Muwaszār and Dārāmūn (Kāmil al-Dīn, in K.O.L., p. 77; Barhebraeus, Chron. yr., p. 458) who occupied them in 634 (1236—1237) (Kāmil al-Dīn, op. cit., p. 92). After the defeat of the Khūṛṛmīnān at al-Jabāl al-Dawmah near al-Ruḥā, the army of Halab in 638 (1240—1241) took Ḥarrān, Rás al-‘Ain, at Al-Ruḥā, Rás al-Ain, Dārāmūn, al-Muwaszār and Al-Raṣṣā and the district belonging to it (al-Rāzī, in K. O. L., vi. 12). But in 639 (1241—1242) the Khūṛṛmīnān, who had made an alliance with al-Malik al-Muṣaffār of Miṣyāfšīrūn, returned to Rás al-'Ain, where the inhabitants and the garrison, including a number of Frankish archers and crossbowmen, offered resistance. An arrangement was made by which they were admitted to the town by the inhabitants, whose lives were promised them, and captured the garrison. When al-Malik al-Muṣaffār had returned to Ḥarrān and al-Muṣaffār had retired to Miṣyāfšīrūn with the Khūṛṛmīnān, they sent their prisoners back (Kāmil al-Dīn, in K.O.L., vi. 14). In the same year also the Tatars came to Rás al-'Ain (ibid., p. 15). When the Khūṛṛmīnān and Turkmen raided al-Djiṣṭa, the army of Halab under the enṣīl Dāmūl al-Dawla in Dūnāšt II 640 (1242—1243) went out against them and after two attacks camped opposite one another near Rás al-'Ain. The Khūṛṛmīnān combined with the lord of Mādin and finally a peace was made by which Rás al-'Ain was given to the Ortosīd ruler of Mādin (Kāmil al-Dīn, in K. O. L., vi. 19).
In a Muhammadan cemetery in the North of Rās al-'Āin, M. von Oppenheim found an inscription of the year 717 (1317-1318). The Syrian chroniclers mention Rās al-'Āin as a Jacobite bishopric (11 bishops between 793 and 1100 are given in Mich. Syr., iii. 503) in which a synod was held in 684 (Barhebrueus, Chron. eccl. i. 287). Towards the end of the viiib century the town was sacked by Timūr.

Rās al-'Āin is built at a spot where a number of copious, in part sulphurous, springs burst forth, which form the real "main source" of the Khabūr (al-Dimashki, ed. Mehren, p. 191). The Wādi al-Durjībih, which has not much water in it and starts further north in the region of Warrakheh, and which may be regarded as the upper course of the Khabūr, only after receiving the waters from the springs of Rās al-'Āin becomes a regular river, known from that point as the Khabūr. According to M. von Oppenheim (cf. his map in Pettermanns Mitteil., 1814, p. 218), the springs at Rās al-'Āin are "Ain al-Ḥusān, 'Ain al-Kebrīt and 'Ain al-Zāyka," according to Taylor (J.R.A.S., xxxviii. 349, note) "Ain al-Baidā" and "Ain al-Ḥasān are the most important; he also gives the names of 10 springs in the N.E. and 5 in the S. of the town.

The Arab geographers talk of 360, i.e. a very large number of springs, the abundance of water from which makes the vicinity of the town a blooming garden. One of these springs, 'Ain al-zāhirīyah, was said to be bottomless. According to Ibn Hawkal, Rās al-'Āin was a fortified town with many gardens and mills; at the principal spring there was according to al-Mašdist a lake as clear as crystal. Ibn Rusta (B.G.A., vii. 106) mentions Rās al-'Āin, Karkīsā, and al-Rājqa as districts of al-Djiistra. Ibn Dhibair in 580 (1184-1185) saw two Friday mosques, schools and baths in Rās al-'Āin on the bank of the Khabūr. According to Ḥamid al-Mustawfi (xvib century) the walls had a circumference of 3,500 paces; among the rich products of Rās al-'Āin, he mentions cotton, dates and grapes. The historical romance Fatḥ al-Dīn al-Rabi'a wa-Dīn al-Rahīm (xvib century) wrongly ascribes to al-Wākidī, which contains much valuable geographical information, mentions at Rās al-'Āin a plain of Mathakbāk and a Medjīd al-Yār (var. al-Dair); it also mentions a Nestorian church in the town and several gates (in the translation by B. G. Niebuhr and A. D. Mordtmann, Schriften der Abad. von Hamburg, i. part iii., Hamburg 1847, p. 76, 87; the "gate of Istacharum" in the east and the "Mukhtalas or gate of Qabur" not precisely located. I have not been able to see the Arabic text of Ps.-Wākidī, ed. Ewald, Göttingen 1827).

At Rās al-'Āin were the Jacobite monasteries of Beth Tīnāl and Spequos (speculius); Ps.-Zacharias Rhet., viii. 4, trans. Ahrens-Kröger, p. 157; so also for Asphalos in Mich. Syr., iii. 50, 65, cf. ii. 513, note 6: Saphylos in Mich. Syr., iii. 121, 449, 462; Barhebrueus, Chron. eccl. ed. Abbo-Lamy, i. 281 sq.: Sophocles, ibid., p. 397 (probably so to be read throughout).

Little to the southwest of Rās al-'Āin on the right bank of the Khabūr is the great mound of Tell Halaf, where M. von Oppenheim excavated the ancient palace of Kapara (cf. Bibl.).

Bibliography: The Arab geographers and historians and Syrian chroniclers already mentioned; also: al-Khwārizmi, Kithā Shāvat al-Ārāb.


(E. H. Honigmann)

AL-RĀSHID BI 'LLĀH Abū Dā'f AR-ANṣUR B. AL-MUSTAQIM, B. AL-MUSTAKHRID, Abhārisīd caliph. On the 2th Rabi' II, 513 (July 13, 1119) the caliph al-Mustakhrīd [q. v.] had homage paid to him by twelve-year-old son Abū Dā'f al-Anṣur as heir-apparent and in 'Ubayd-Allāh's [q. v.] name and in 'Abd al-Ḳaḍā' 529 (Aug.-Sept. 1133) the latter was acclaimed caliph under the name al-Rāshid bi 'llāh. When the Saljūq Sultan Mas'ud b. Muhammad [q. v.] soon afterwards demanded 400,000 dinars from him, al-Rāshid refused, because, as he said, he had no money. Mas'ud's envoy then attempted to search the caliph's palace and seize the money by force; but he resisted the Sultan's troops were scattered and his palace plundered. Several emirs also withdrew their homage from the sultan. His nephews, Dā'vid b. Maḥmūd, advanced from Ḍhahirbādīn against Baghhdād and reached it in the beginning of Safar 530 (Nov. 1135). In the meanwhile the number of the caliph's supporters increased. He was joined among others by the Abū Bekr al-Mawṣilī and Ali Zengī [q. v.] and Dā'vid was proclaimed sultan in Baghhdād. On hearing this Mas'ud prepared for war, advanced on Baghhdād and laid siege to it; he did not succeed in taking it, so after some fifty days he withdrew to Nahrawān [q. v.] and then went to Ġamādhān [q. v.], Toronjāi, governor of Ḍalīl, then appeared and placed a sufficient number of boats at his disposal so that he was able to cross the Tigris and occupy the western bank. The result was that the allies separated. Dā'vid returned to Ḍhahirbādīn and Zengī with the caliph to al-Mawṣil, while Mas'ud in the middle of 'Ubayd-Allāh's [q. v.] name and in 'Abd al-Ḳaḍā's 530 (Aug. 1130) entered the ancient city of the caliphs, where he forbade looting and other excesses and restored order. He then assembled in an assembly of judges and legis and decreed the daily caliphalty of the throne. The latter was accused among other things of having broken his oath to the Sultan; he was said to have solemnly promised Mas'ud never to take up arms against him nor to leave the capital; he was also accused of other crimes. In his stead, his uncle Abū 'Abd al-Muḥammad al-Muṣṭafī b. al-Muṣṭafī [q. v.] was appointed commander of the faithful.
Al-Rashid however did not stay long in al-Mawil but went to Adhharbidjān where he joined Dāwūd. Several sources, dissatisfied with Maṣūd, also made common cause with Dāwūd with the object of restoring al-Rashid to the throne; the latter however took no part in the military operations [see also the article Maṣūd]. On Rāmādān 25 or 26, 1532 (June 6 or 7, 1135) the former caliph, who had not quite recovered from an illness, was murdered by Assassins near Isfahān.


RASHID, MASMAD, an Ottoman imperial historiographer, belonged to Stambul, where he was born as the son of the Kâdi Mutfa Mustafa, a native of Malatia. He completed his studies in his native city where he was appointed official historiographer (wazâf al-nawā Hillary) in 1126 (1714). He held this office till his appointment as kâdi at Aleppo in 1134 (1720). Later on he went as ambassador to Persia with the rank of Kâdi of Mecca, and became in 1142 (1729) Kâdi of Stambul. He was dismissed a few months later and on 1st Jamâdâl Akir (Oct. 1734) appointed kâdi in Amol. He died on 18th Dhu al-Hijjah (July 10, 1735) in Stambul and was buried in the Kara Yermuk Street. On his tombstone see Braun, Mehmed Taahir, 'Olgâned al-Murâskif, iii, 55 note.

Mehmed Rashid in continuation of Naṣir in q.v. wrote a history of the Ottoman empire from 1071 (1660) to 1134 (1721) usually called briefly Tarikhı Râshid (cf. Hâddâl Khalifa, N° 14, 526) which is the authoritative source for this period. His successor in the office of imperial historiographer was Isââm 'Atîm, known as Kâcit Celâhi-zade (cf. Rashid, Tarikhı, iii, fol. 114).

In addition to numerous MSS. (cf. F. Bahinger, G.O.W., p. 269 to which we have to add 'Uspâla, N° 667-668 [Râshid's autograph] and Stambul Lâlî Isâmîl, N° 378) Râshid's history has been twice printed (folio, Stambul 1153, 4 vols.; octavo, 6 vols., Stambul 1282; cf. ibidem 7. A. 1898, i, 477). Portions have been translated by M. Norberg, Türkischer Ritter, vol. i, p. 268; Hermann, 1878, II, 455-479; and J. S. Sekowski, Collection of the Diplomatic Tarirchik, ii, Warsaw 1879, p. 1-208.

**Bibliography:** cf. F. Bahinger, G.O.W., p. 269 sq.

(From Franz Bahinger)

AL-RASHID. [See 'Abd al-Wâhid, Hakim.]

**AL-RASHID** (MAWLI), b. al-SHARIF, s. 'ALI B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ALL, 'Ali 'Alî Sultan of Morocco and the real founder of the dynasty which rules the Shī'ite empire. He was born in 1040 (1630-1631) in Tāfirî [q.v.] in the south of Morocco, where his ancestors, the Hassâni Shurafâ (Sadrî [q.v.]) of Sidjākîs [q.v.], had founded a flourishing Shī'ah [q.v.] and gradually acquired a fairly considerable political influence, which increased with the decline of the Sāliḥî [q.v.] dynasty. Morocco being at this time plunged into anarchy, the Shū'â'î of Tâfirî were able rapidly to become masters of the great tracts of steppe-like country to the north of the corridor of oases which formed their appanage. The oldest son of the chief of the Shurafâ, Mawli Maḥammad, having successfully fought the marabout of the Shurafâ of Tinjûn in al-Tâzinâwî (S.W. of Morocco) and his ally Abû Ḥâsîn, who had political ambitions of his own, assumed a royal title in 1056 (1646). He did not however yet succeed in gaining the power of the marabouts of the Shurafâ of al-Dîlî, in central Morocco; he had to be content, after a very brief occupation of Tinjûn and Fisâ in 1650, with effective sovereignty over eastern Morocco only.

On the death of Mawli al-Shârîf in 1065 (1659) his son, Mawli al-Rashid, not trusting his brother, Mawli Maḥammad, left the ancestral Shurafâ for the rival Shurafâ of al-Dîlî, where in spite of a superficially warm welcome, he was soon given the hint to go; he proceeded to Azîrî, then to Fisâ, which, regarded as an undesirable by the lord of the city, the adventurer al-Durâsî, he was not allowed to enter. He next went to eastern Morocco, and very soon succeeded in gaining a number of followers, particularly, in the important tribe of the Banû İsmâîl (Beni Snaaasen), the Shâhîk al-Lawatat, a religious dignitary of great influence. At the same time he attacked a very rich Jew, who played the regular lord and lived in the mountains of the Banû İsmâîl, at the little town called Ḍir Bî nisâsh al-Rashîd slew him and seized his wealth. This coup vividly impressed the imagination of the people of the district; and to give rise, as P. de Cenival has brilliantly shown, to a legend, the memory of which still survives in the annual festival which follows the election of the 'sultan of the jûla' at Fisâ. Mawli al-Rashid by this murder not only acquired considerable material resources, but also a real ascendency over the people of the neighbourhood. In 1075 (1664) the large tribe of the Angûd rallied to his authority, and he set up in Ujdân [q.v.] as a regular ruler. On the news of the proclamation of al-Rashid, his brother Mawli Maḥammad, much disturbed, hurried from Tâfirî to eastern Morocco; his troops were met by those of al-Rashid, and Mawli Maḥammad having been killed early in the battle, his men then went over to the surviving prince. Thenceforth Mawli al-Rashid went on from success to success.

He very soon seized Târir without difficulty, and directly threatened Fisâ, but he first of all took care to secure his power solidly at Tâfirî, the cradle of his line, and added to his lands the mountains of the Rif [q.v.] on the shores of the Mediterranean, which were then ruled by an enterprise individual named Abû Muhammad 'Abd Allah A'ârîs. This shâhîk had made an agreement, first with the English and then with the French, for the establishment of factories on the Rif bay of Alhucemas (transcribed in the documents of the period as Alhounèz). Mawli al-Rashid deprived him of the Rif in March 1666, just when the Marseillais Roland Fréjus, having obtained from the King of France the privilege of trading in the Rif, was landing on the Moroccan coast. Fréjus then went to see Mawli al-Rashid at Târir, but the negotiations into which he endeavoured to enter with the shâhîk soon collapsed.

Al-Rashid without delay turned his attention to
AL-RASHID — RASHID AL-DIN SINAN

The capital of northern Morocco, Fas, which still withstood its authority. He laid siege to it and took it by storm on the 3rd Dhu l-Hijjah 1076 (June 6, 1666); the adventurer: in command there, al-Duraidi, took to flight. Al-Rashid took vigorous steps to punish certain of the notables of the town and the people proclaimed him sultan. He was at the same time able to rally to his side the important group of Idrisid Shorfa in the capital.

The years that followed were used by Mawali al-Rashid to extend his possessions towards west and south. He first made an expedition against the Ghorists, out of which he drove the chief al-Khafir Ghailan, and seized al-Kašr al-Kabir (Alesazaquiv) and Taras (q.v.). He also took Meknes (q.v.) and Tetuan (q.v.) as well as Fas, the inhabitants of which had rebelled. In 1079 (1668) he took and destroyed the berber of Dīn after having routed its chief Muhammad al-Hājjī at Batn al-Rumān. The same year, Mawali al-Rashid seized al-Qassar Dāghir and put to death there the local chief Abd al-Karim al-Shabānī, named Karīm al-Hājjī. In 1081 (1670) he undertook an expedition into Fās (q.v.) where agitators still disputed authority. He took Tīrādīnt (q.v.) and the fortress of Il-hār and returned to Fās, now lord of all Morocco. At this time, says the chronicler al-Ifrīnī, "all the Maghribi, from Tiemcen to the Wādī Nāṭl on the borders of the Sahara, was under the authority of Mawālī al-Rashīd".

The next year the sultan went from Fās to Marrakesh, where one of his nephews was endeavouring to set up as a pretender to the throne. During his sojourn in the southern capital, Mawali al-Rashid, not yet 42, died as the result of an accident on the 11th Dhu l-Hijjah 1082 (April 9, 1672); the horse he was riding having reared, he fractured his skull against a branch of an orange-tree. He was buried at Marrakesh, but later his body was brought to Fās where he was interred in the chapel of the saint 'Ali Ibn Hirākim (wulg. Sidi irrzīm). His brother, Mawālī l'Esmā'īl (q.v.) who succeeded him, was proclaimed sultan on the 15th Dhu l-Hijjah following.

The brief political career of Mawālī al-Rashīd was, we have seen, particularly active and fruitful. The Muslim historians of Morocco never tire of praising this ruler whose memory is still particularly bright, especially in Fas. It was he who built in the town the "Madrasa of the Rope-makers" (Madrasat al-Sharīfīn), the bridge of al-Rashīd, the "hauzūd of the Sharātīda" (Casba of the Cberarda) and 2½ miles east of Fās, a bridge of nine arches over the Wādī Subīl (Sebūh).


RASHID AL-DIN SINAN (or, as the Islamīs themselves usually call him, Sinān Rāshīd al-Dīn), the famous leader of the Syrian Islamīs in the second half of the xiiith century, is better known to the world as Shāhīd al-Djasāl, or the "Old Man of the Mountain". His full name was Abu l-Hasan Sinān b. Sulaimān b. Muhammad. He was born near Basra, educated in Persia, and, in 538 (1143), was appointed by Imam Hasan of Alamārī as the head of the Syrian Islamīs (Nizārī) community. This post he occupied till his death at an advanced age in Ramadan 589 (Sept. 1193), at Maṣṣaf. He played a prominent part in the Syrian and Egyptian politics of his time, successfully defending his people from the continuous pressure of the orthodox Mūhammadan rulers, especially the famous Saladin (q.v.), on the one hand, and against the Crusaders on the other. The fact that this small community still continues to exist (in the villages near Ḥamā), in spite of the persistently hostile attitude of its neighbours, must to a great extent be attributed to the solid foundations laid by him. References to him are to be found in the works of all historians who deal with the events of his period, but the most detailed account is given in the paper by Stanislas Guyard, Un grand moquef des Assassins, au temps de Saladin (7. A., 1877, p. 324-489). It gives the original Arabic text of the Faṣīl, a genuine Islamī work probably by a contemporary of Sinān, containing the manāhīs about him, i.e. various anecdotes based on the oral tradition of the sect. This text is accompanied by a French translation and an introduction containing a detailed review of the historical information about Sinān, and the Islamī sect in general, which, in the main, still preserves some value. The Faṣīl appears to be now unknown to the Syrian Islamīs; they do not appear to have any reliable and genuine histories of their own community. The recently published al-Fahāk al-dawwār fī Samā' al-dīnams al-ťāfīr, by an Islamī author, Abū Allah b. al-Mardaḏa from Khawābī (Aleppo 1352 = 1933), shows no trace of such local tradition, and the account of Sinān given in it is entirely based on well-known general histories, such as those by Ibn al-Atib, Abu l-Fidā', etc.

The stories connected with Sinān chiefly centre around his use of an instrument for removing his political opponents by assassination. Unquestionably there is some grain of truth in these stories; but it is obvious that excited hasāar rumours greatly exaggerated them, wrongly attributing to him and his organisation many exploits for which they were not responsible. Many historians state that
he was regarded as the supreme and superhuman head of the sect. Unfortunately, he is never referred to in any available genuine works of the Persian Isma'ili, and it is difficult to ascertain what was his real position in the sectarian hierarchy. Most probably he occupied the highest rank after the Imám, i.e. that of the ḫwājdāt, which, according to the reformed Nizārī doctrine, implied a considerable "dose" of the superhuman. In any case, there is no reason to think that he either claimed to be or was regarded as an Imám, although, just as in the case of other eminent Isma'ili, such as Nasr-ī Khurram and Hasan b. Sablah, popular tradition furnished him with noble descent from 'Alī himself.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(RASHID AL-DIN TABIB, one of the greatest historians of Persia. Fadl Allah Rashid al-Din b. Imām al-Dawla Abū Tāhir was born in Hamadhān about 1247. He began his career in the reign of the Mongol ruler Abagha Khān (1265–1282) as a practising physician. But as in addition to a remarkable knowledge of medicine he was an exceedingly talented and farseeing statesman, he rose under Ghiyān Khān (1295–1304) from his earlier position to the rank of a gāne (and also court historian) which was given him after the execution of Sa'd-ī Dīhān Sa'd al-Dīn Tawfikī (May 4, 1298). In 1303 he accompanied his sovereign in this capacity on a campaign against Syria. Under Udūjī (1304–1316) Rashīd attained the zenith of his career. He used his fabulous income for a number of charitable buildings. For example in order to beautify the new capital of the Mongols in Persia, Sulṭānābād, he built a whole new suburb, called after him Rub'ī Rashidīya, which consisted of a mosque, a madrasa, a hospital and several thousand houses. At the same time he was working steadily on his history of the world, the first volume of which he presented to his sovereign on April 14, 1306. At this period there was no limit to his influence. He even succeeded in converting Udūjī to the teaching of the Shi'is. Two eminent Baghdad scholars, Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardi and Dāmūs al-Deski, who were occupied with negotiating with Egyptians and were expecting death, were rescued by him. In 1309 he resumed his building activity and erected a new suburb near Ghazānīya, east of Tabriz, the water for which he provided by a great canal from the Sarwūrdī. But his high position now procured this great man a number of enemies. In 1315 he experienced considerable unpleasantness through the shortage of money which prevented the soldiers being paid. After Udūjī's death his enemies exerted every effort to destroy Rashīd al-Dīn. In October 1317 he was dismissed from his high offices and the death of his patron Amir Sawind (Jan. 1318) deprived him of his last support, until finally he was executed with his young son Khwāja Ibrāhīm on a false charge of disowning his former master Udūjī (July 18, 1318). His corpse was exposed to view ostentatiously, his pride, the Rub'ī Rashidī, destroyed and plundered. His eldest son Ghiyāth al-Dīn, however, succeeded in retaining a high office even after his father's death, but in 1330 he also was sentenced to death. Even after death Rashīd's body was not allowed to rest in its grave, for eighty years later Tawfik's son, the mad Mūsāshāh (1404–1407), had his bones dug up and buried in the Jewish cemetery (1399).

As already mentioned, Rashīd owes his fame to his immortal history, Ghiyāth al-Tawfīkī, a history of the Mongols which he began by command of Ghazān Khān (wherefore it is sometimes also known as the Ṭawfīkī Ghiyāțī). Udūjī ordered the work to be continued and to be completed by a general history of the world of Islam and a geographical appendix. The work, according to the original plan, was to consist of two main parts: I. History of the Mongols and II. General History and Appendix. But when the work was finished in 1310–1311 it took the following form:

Vol. i. 1. History of the Turkish and Mongol tribes, their divisions, genealogy and legends.

2. Čingis-Khān, his predecessors and successors down to Ghazān.

Vol. ii. Preface, Adam, the Muslim and Hebrew Prophets.

1. The old Persian Kings.

2. Muhammad and the caliphs to 1258. History of the ruling dynasties of Persia. The eastern and western Isma'ili, The Oghuz and the Turks, Chinese, Jews, the Franks, their emperors and Popes, India, Buddha and his religion.

Rashīd had intended to add the history of Udūjī's reign also, the beginning of which (1306–1307) was to open the second volume and the end to close it. Whether he did so is not yet known, as that portion as well as the geographical appendix is lacking in all extant manuscripts. The most remarkable feature of this great work is the conscientiousness with which Rashīd went to work and endeavoured to find the best and most reliable sources. Although the Mongol chronicles, the celebrated Alā Goodman, could hardly be accessible to him as a Persian, he obtained the necessary facts from them through his friend Piūdī-chīn-sīkh and partly from Ghazān himself, who had a remarkable knowledge of his people's history. The information about India was furnished him by an Indian bīghā, about China by two Chinese scholars. The many-sidedness of Rashīd al-Dīn's learning is simply astounding in a medieval scholar of the time. He knows of the struggles between Pope and Emperor, even knows that Scotland pays tribute to England and that there are no snakes in Ireland.

Rashīd al-Dīn was well aware of the importance of his work and endeavoured in all possible ways to ensure its survival. He ordered copies to be made for his friends and for different scholars; the works, written in Persian, were translated into Arabic and vice-versa. Every year he sent copies to the libraries of the great cities and allowed anyone to copy them freely. Yet all these measures proved in vain, for no single complete copy has come down to us. Besides his great history, he also wrote: 1. Kišāb al-Abd al-Dīn haft al-Abdār in 24 chapters, which discussed questions of meteorology, agriculture, bee-keeping, suppression of snakes and other pests and also states on architecture, fortification, ship-building, mining and metallurgy. No copy has yet been found. 2. Tawfīqī, a mystic theological treatise in 19 chapters. 3. Miṣṭīf al-Tazāfī, on the eloquence of the Kurān, its commentaries etc. 4. al-Rūḥānī al-Abhānā (finished on March 14, 1307), the result of a theological dispute in the presence of Udūjī. 5. Laṣlīf al-Ḥāfīz
Already in his last years at school he showed a fondness for art and literature and therefore decided to become a writer, and to this profession, as he himself calls it: the Sublime Porte Road (Bab-i świli i Diödör), he has remained faithful, untroubled by all the political changes that have taken place. Like many other writers he began as a journalist, and almost all the more important Turkish papers received contributions from his pen, such as the Dergi-i Harâdî, Tedjümin-i Harâdî, İlahî, Şehî, Tâvî, Şıeker, Muhammet, Toşüg-i Afkar, and periodicals like Çevre-i Fûnûn and İstiklal Gazette. He afterwards collected his numerous articles and essays, for example in the two volumes "Articles and entertaining Sketches" (Mekteb-iwa-Muğâbîhîte, 1325) and in the four volumes "Life of a man of Letters" (İmâr-i Edebi, 1315—1318). The latter is not an account of his life but reflects his spiritual development and his feelings and emotions reflected in publications of different years.

Ahnad Râsim's output became in time very extensive; in all there are said to be over 1,000 works of larger or smaller size from his pen. Nevertheless he was not a polygraph in the bad sense of the word, but before he dealt with a subject he always first studied it thoroughly and then wrote on it seriously, sometimes also in the slightly humorous fashion of which he is a master, or again in a pleasing conversational way, but always with artistic feeling and in a particular style which is his own. He always well knew the taste of his readers and he had great success with them. His style was a new one and independent of existing schools and coteries; he created a school himself and his influence must long and strongly felt in Turkish literature.

His literary work covers the fields of the novel, long short story and tale, e.g. his early novels, "Heart’s Inclination" (Meclî Dil, 1890) and "Life’s Experiences" (Tedjümin-i Harâdî, 1891; short analysis of both in Horn, Geschichte der türkischen Moderne, p. 46 sq.), also his patriotic novel "The Difficulties of Life" (Mugâbîhî-i Hayâtî, 1308), the stories "Inexperience Love" (Tedjümin-i Ísà, 1311), "My School-friend" (Meclî İtemednete, 1311), a little later "The Unfortunate Man" (Ahamâ, 1315) and another patriotic novel "A Soldier’s Son" (Aker-Oğlu, 1315) and somewhat more lyrical "The Book of Grief" (Kitâb-i Ilimânî, 1315) and "Nightingale" (Aulâhî, in verse).

At the same time he had from the first a preference for history. He does not, of course, in any way claim to further the study of history by independent research but rather sees it as his duty to arouse an interest in history among his countrymen by presenting it in popular form, and from this point of view his historical writings may be regarded as carefully prepared compilations. In his early period he wrote a history of ancient Rome (Eski Romaçtar, 1304), a short history of civilisation (Turkish mugâhara-i Bâbi, 1304), on the progress of knowledge, and culture (Tedjümin-i İslîye medenîyye, 1304), later essays on similar subjects entitled "History and Author" (Turkish me-Mudernîyâ, 1329 = 1911), a history of Turkey from Selim III to Murad V, entitled İttihatâtül hâlî-yi milîyye in two volumes, 1347—1348, and a meritorious general survey of the history of Turkey, "Qânuni Târîhî" in 4 volumes, 1326—1330. A valuable supplement to these historical works is
formed by the four volumes of "City Letters" (Şeker b. Maksud, 1328-1332), in all 218 epistles, which we have an unsurpassed description of old Istanbul life in all its variety, written moreover in a very stimulating and vivid, sometimes satirizing, fashion which makes it one of his best works. In "Islam's Pages of Honour" (Mesâliha-i İslam, 1335), the Muslim festivals, mosques and other religious matters are dealt with.

It seems to be only recently that our author's career has turned to the history of literature, e.g. in his book on Şimâat (q. v.), which is intended to be an introduction to the history of the Turkish Moderns (Ma'âthîr at-Turkîhî Mâdâhîl. îk bîwâr Muhârîs- terden Şimâat, 1927), while his personal recollections of Turkish writers are collected in another book (Ma'âthîr âlî, 1924), also recollections of his own school-days and the old system of education in general, in his "Airported" (Pâlbağa, 1947).

Aghmad Râsim was also prolific as a writer of schoolbooks on grammar, rhetoric, history etc. He also wrote a letter-writer (Râsim Kâhımı Maktûb- yahî makâmî chartûfâtî, 5th impression, 1318). In all his works he is found translations, and a large collection from his early period is called Selection from Western Literature" (Adabîyâr gênîr bîr Nûbâhs, 1937).

For this great literary activity Aghmad Râsim required considerable freedom, such as did not exist under Abd al-Hamîd and such as the poet hardly had at all as a state official. He was however twice a member of a commission of the Ministry of Education, Conseil de l'Instruction Publique (Emadî, 1928. 1929; 1930), but only for a very short time. He showed his interest in religious matters in 1924, when after the abolition of the caliphate he wrote an article in Wehi on March 4, 1924 on the relics (mâhûrât, muhâlâtât) of the Prophet, cloak (blârî, banner) (nâsîf) praying-carpet (sâfâ), etc., which also appeared in Cairo and Damascus in Arabic. He proposed to make these relics accessible to the public in a Museum (cf. Nallino, in O. M., 1924, p. 230 sq). In recent years Aghmad Râsim has so far been politically active as to be a deputy for Stambul along with men like Abd al-Hamîd and Khalîl Edhem (cf. O. M., 1927, 1928, 1929, and 1931, p. 237 and Mehmed Zeki, Encyclopædia biographique de Turquie, 1. 1928, 23 and ii. 1929, p. 88).
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RASSIDS, name of a dynasty. Zaidi historians make no distinction between the Zaidi imams in Dâlîm (q. v.) and those in the Yaman (q. v.); this article deals only with the Yaman. For some periods the Zaidi historians are detailed,

for others there are only casual references in writers whose main interest was elsewhere, so details are often uncertain, and it is doubtful if some rulers claimed to be imams. The name is taken from a property near Mecca, al-Rassâ. Yaman by name, which belonged to the grandfather of the first imam, al-Kâsim al-Rassî, who was a descendant of Hasan, the son of Ali b. Abî Talib. In 280 (893) Yahyâ, named al-Hâfi dî il-Hâfi, entered the Yaman from the Hijâz and advanced nearly to Sanûâ (q. v.) but, falling to conquer the country, had to retreat. Later he was called back and in 284, he occupied Sa'da (q. v.) and conquered Najdîn (q. v.) though his hold on these districts was not secure and there was constant fighting. He took Sanûâ more than once and his son was a captive there in 290. Then the Karmâshâns (q. v.) appeared in the Yaman, took Sanûâ in 294 and held it for three years, besides taking many other towns. The imam helped to drive them out of Sanûâ but could not hold the town for himself. He died in 298 (904-911). During his lifetime 'Abbasî governors and troops were in the Yaman. Yahyâ fought seventy battles with the Karmâshâns and was so strong that he could obliterate the stamp on a coin with his fingers. He was a Hâfi and in law and wanted to set up an Islamic state where women wore the veil and soldiers divided booty according to the precepts of the Qur'an. He tried to make the dîwân (q. v.) of Nadîrîn sell any land they had bought during Islam; he had to be content with imposing a tax of one ninth of the produce.

Homage was at once paid to his son Muhammad who kept Sa'da as his capital and ruled Nadîrîn, Hamdân (q. v.), and Kâhûlân. He abdicated in 301 and was followed by his brother Alî who was fighting various chiefs and the Kârmâshâns. In 322 (934) he was defeated by the Bani Ya'fâr (q. v.) and died. Sa'da being occupied by the victors for four months. A son Hassan claimed to be imam but homage was paid to another son al-Kâsim al-Murâshî. Discord ensued and last both brothers were deposed; still al-Kâsim could capture Sanûâ in 345 (956), though he was murdered before the end of the year. Hassan had died earlier. In the troubles that followed Ya'âf al-Dî'tî was lord of Sanûâ until he was driven out by a new-comer from the north. In 388 (998) there was propaganda in the Yaman for al-Kâsim al-Maqûr, then delegates met him in Bûba (q. v.) and, helped by the tribe of Kâshâm, he established himself in Sa'da and took Sanûâ while prayers were said in his name in Kahân and Mikhâl Dî'âtî. He died in 393 and his son ruled from Alhàn to Sa'da and Sanûâ till he was killed in 404. Some said that he was not dead but was the ma'âthî (q. v.); another report says that he made this claim for himself. Up to this point one may perhaps speak of a dynasty of imams; afterwards the name does not apply. The army consisted of about 1,000 horse and 3,000 foot. The next imam came from the Hijâz and had some success; but he died another outsider, Abu b. Faţîh, came from Dâlîm in 430 (1038-1039), captured Sa'da and other places, and was killed fighting the Sa'dis (q. v.) at Sûlân. It is said that Abu Talib Yahyâ (d. 520 = 1126), the imam in Dâlîm, was recognised in north Yaman where he appointed a governor. Alîbud b. Sulaimân was proclaimed in 532 and ruled
Sa'da, Nadjran and Dja'af [q.v.]. In 545 a great assembly met and questioned him for eight days to test his fitness as imam. Followed by the tribes of Madhabid [q.v.] and Bakfi [see YASHID] he took San'a' from the Hamidtul suljân and otherwise defeated him. He held Zahid [q.v.] for a few days and prayers were said in his name in Khaibar [q.v.] and Yanba' [q.v.]. He also fought with success against the Karmatians. In his old age he became blind and was taken prisoner by Fulsita b. al-Kasim to the disgust of all, even of the Karmatians. He was set free and died in 566 (1170-1171). "Abd Allah b. Hamza set up as imam in 593. (1160-1161) and homage was paid to him in the following year after an examination (the Hamidtul gretaht took their name from his father). He held San'a' for a short time but had to retire before the Ayyubi [q.v.] suljân. He established himself in the north and received taxes from Khairan and Yanbu'. One writer speaks of troops from Baghdad being in the Yemen; this may be an exaggeration of the report that the Mutarrifia asked help from the caliph. In 611 (1214) he held San'a' and Dhamar [q.v.] and attacked Lajjâd [q.v.]. He had to abandon San'a' for his soldiers were tired. It is said that he ruled Gaila [q.v.] and Dailam by his d'a'as. He died in 614. The history of the imams for the next two hundred years is given in the article RASUL.

At the beginning of the rule of the Tahirids an imam in San'a' fought against them; he was at last beaten, was captured as he fled by some townspeople, and handed over to Mu'athar, another imam. The Tahirids tookSan'a' and made a son of the imam governor of towns and castles. In 869 (1464-1465) the imam Muhammad b. al-Nasir retook San'a' and in the following year al-Malik al-Zahir the Tahirid was slain there.

Valya Sharaf al-Din began in a small way in 912 (1506-1507). Later he was called in Egyptian troops from Kamaran [q.v.] to help him against the Tahirids. They took Ta'izz [q.v.] and San'a', but, as the news of the Turkish conquest of Egypt broke their spirit, they were soon driven out again. In spite of the Tahirids and rebelcant imams conquered most of the highlands and even took Djamân and Abu 'Arish [q.v.] but failed to take 'Aden [q.v.] and Zabid [q.v.]. Soon the Turks took Djamân, Ta'izz and San'a', being helped by quarrels between the imams and his sons. The Karmatians (i.e. Isma'ilis) were still dangerous enemies; eleven camel-loads of their books were captured and the imam's chief followers studied them so as to warn the common folk of the dangers in them. In 953 (1546-1547) the imam divided his realm among his sons. Though one of them, al-Mu'athkar, had submitted to the Turks he led an insurrection against them in 974 which was at first successful. This provoked the Turks to a systematic conquest. Al-Mu'athkar was defeated and allowed to retire to San'a' with a Turkish garrison. Then an imam from a different family rose and maintained himself for seven years till he was taken prisoner. In 999 (1590) the conquest was complete. In 1506 however al-Kasim, the ancestor of the present imam, declared himself. After varying fortunes his son drove out the Turks in 1645 (1635-1636) and since then the government has remained in this family. Sometimes a disputed succession has been settled by argument and some-
times by the sword, an unworthy imam has been deposed, and a son has taken the place of his decretive father. About 1150 (1737) Abu 'Arish broke away from the Yaman and in 1219 (1804) 'Asir [q.v.] became independent. The history of the imams from this point is in the article YAMAN. Now the Wathhiba king has confined the imams to the Yemen in a narrow sense of the name, and 'Asir is under the influence of Najd. Many of the imams were industrious writers on things religious.

Bibliography: C. van Arendonk, De Opkomst van het Zenditische Ismamta in Yemen, Leyden 1910; F. Wustenfeld, Yemen im XI. Jahrhundert, 1884; N.E., iv. 412-437; A. Rutgers, Historia Yemenae sub Hassano Fasha, Leyden 1938; C. Nieder, Reisebeschreibungen, 1774; A. S. Tritton, Rise of the Imams of Samah, 1925; H. V. Jacob, Kings of Arabia, 1923; H. C. Kay, Oman's History of Yaman, 1892; Admiralty Handbook of Arabia; H. Nettel, Münzen der Rasuliden, 1891. For the proper material see van Arendonk, Kay and Tritton. See also the Bibliographie to the articles mentioned in the text. (A. S. TRITTON).

RASUL (a., plur. rasa'), messenger, apostle. The word is found in Arabic literature with the profane sense of envoy, messenger. Here we are only concerned with its religious acceptance. According to the Korân, there is a close relation between the apostle and his people (umma; q.v.). To each umma God sends only one apostle (Sûra x. 48; xvi. 38; cf. xxii. 45; xli. 5). These statements are parallel to those which mention the witness whom God will take from each umma at the Day of Judgment (Sûra iv. 45; xxviii. 75 and cf. the descriptions of the rasûl who will cross the bridge to the other world at the head of his umma: Bukhârî, Adîbîn, hâb 129; Kâbulî, hâb 52).

Muhammad is sent to a people to whom Allah has not yet sent an apostle (Sûra xxviii. 46; xxviii. 2; xxiv. 43). The other individuals to whom the Korân accords the dignity of rasûl are Nûlî, Lîmâmî, Mûzî, Shî'ahî, Hûd, 'Arîbî and Yâsîn. The list of the prophets [cf. Nabi] is a longer one; it contains, besides the majority of the apostles, Biblical or quasi-Biblical characters like Ibrahim, Ishâ'îb, Yâsîb, Hûdâ, Dûwa'd, Sulainân, Ayâh, Uba 'l-Nun. Muhammad in the Korân is called sometimes rasûl, sometimes nabî. It seems that the prophets are those sent by God as preachers and magîlir to their people, but are not the head of an umma like the rasûl. One is tempted to imagine a distinction between rasûl and nabî such as is found in Christian literature: the apostle is at the same time a prophet, but the prophet is not necessarily at the same time an apostle. But this is not absolutely certain, the doctrine at the basis of the Korân's utterances not being always clear.

As to the close relation which exists between the rasûl and his umma, it may be compared with the doctrine of the Acta apostolorum apoerypha, according to which the twelve apostles divided the whole world among them so that each one had the task of preaching the Gospel to a certain people.

As regards the term rasûl, account must be taken of the use of the word apostle in Christianity, as well as of the use of the corresponding verb (shâblâ), in connection with the prophets in the
Old Testament (Exodus, iii. 13 cf.; iv. 12; Isaiah, vi. 8; Jeremiah, l. 37); The term mas'ih Allâh is unknown in the Syriac form (μασσιή άλλατα) passion in the apocryphal Acts of St. Thomas.

Post-Kur’ânic teaching has increased the number of apostles to 313 or 315; without giving the names of all Ibn Sa’d, ed. Suchau, 1/10; Fihd Abhik III, art. 22; Reland, De religione moham- medica, sec. ed., Utrecht 1717, p. 40.

The doctrine that they were free from mortal sin is part of the faith (see 7970). For the rest, the difference between mas’î and masî — apart from the considerable difference in point of numbers — seems in later literature to disappear in the general teaching about the prophets. Thus, in the *Afsâra of Abî Hâfs Umar al-Nasafi the two categories are treated together and the author makes no difference between mas’î and masî. Similarly al-Idji deals with prophets in general, so far as can be seen, treating them on the same level. If one difference can be pointed out, it is that the masî, in contrast to the prophets, is a law-giver and provider with a book (commentary on the *Fihd Abhik II* by Abu l-Muntasir, Hâlârâbâd 1321, p. 4). According to the catechism published by Reland (p. 40—44), the mas’î-lawgivers were Adam, Nuh, Ishâkh, Mûsâ, Isâ and Muhammad.

In the catechism of Abî Hâfs Umar al-Nasafi, the sending of the apostles (sâlihâ) is called an act of wisdom on the part of God. Al-Tâhâkîn’s commentary calls it wâlîî, not in the sense of an obligation resting upon God but as a consequence arising from his wisdom. This semi-rationalist point of view is not however shared by all the scholars; according to e.g. al-Sanjîf (cf. his *Umaî al-Sâlihâ*), it is qâtîî in itself but belief in it is obligatory.


— Cf. also the *Bibliography* to the art. *SAHL*.

(5. J. Wensinck)

**RASULIDS, name of a dynasty.** The family of *Rasul* came to the Yemen [*q. v.*] with Tûrânhâh, the Aïyshibid [*q. v.*] conqueror. Rasul was probably a Turkmen though of descent from the royal house of Ghassan [*q. v.*] who was claimed for him; he got his name because a caliph employed him as ambassador. ’Abî b. Rasul and his three sons became important. The last Aïyshibid Masûd put two of the sons in prison in 624 (1227) but the third Nây al-Dîn Umar, who had already been governor of Mecca, was made **masî** [*q. v.*] and, on the departure of Masûd, governor of the Yemen. Masûd died on his way to Egypt so Umar prepared to make himself independent and Zâhîd [*q. v.*] was his capital and from there he captured many places in the hills such as San’â’ [*q. v.*], Tûn [*q. v.*], and Kayakân [*q. v.*]. After two temporary successors he took Mecca in 638 and held it for fifteen years. In 628 he made peace with the Zîdî sharifs and there was little fighting till the imâm Ahmad b. Hussain declared himself in *Thâla* [*q. v.*] in 646 (1248—1249). *Umar* may have declared himself independent in 628 but he was not recognised by the caliph till 632. In 645 his nephew, *Asad al-Dîn Muhammed*, quarrelled with his uncle and fled to Dhamar [*q. v.*]. He allied himself with the imâm but was soon reconciled to his uncle and fought against the sharifs, the descendants of the imâm ’Abîd Allâh b. Hamza. *Umar* was murdered in 647 by mutineers in al-Djand. His kingdom stretched from Mecca to Hadramaut though many places in the hills were independent. He was a great builder of schools and mosques and a patron of letters like most of his family. His reign is an epitome of the dynasty; family quarrels, wars with the imâm and the sharifs, who were often at variance with the imâm.

The murderers won over the rest of the mutineers, proclaimed a nephew of the dead man, and marched on Zahid. Palace intrigues had banished al-Musaffar Vâsuf, the sulîn’s eldest son, to Mahdiam. With 50 horses he too marched on Zahid where his wife inspired resistance to the pretender. He gathered troops as he advanced and the mutineers surrendered to him the murderers and the pretender. He had to reconquer the country, for his two brothers each hoped to be sulîn, Asad al-Dîn Muhammad was in a strong position at San’â’, and the imâm, Ahmad b. Husain was active; even the caliph was disturbed at his power. At the end of three years San’â’, Ta’izz, and the strong fortress of Dumlu’u’s had been retaken and peace made with the imâm, who broke it by joining Asad al-Dîn; though the latter soon returned to his duty. In 658 he joined many of his kins in prison, staying there till his death. San’â’ was retaken in 652 but could not be held. The imâm Ahmad had been appointed with the approval of the family of his predecessor but dissensions arose so the sharifs with the help of the sulîn fought and killed him in 656. One imâm was captured in 658, another was taken and blinded in 660, and a third was proclaimed in 670. The sharifs were tribal or territorial chiefs, sometimes the enemies and sometimes the allies of the sulîn. In 674 rebel mutineers in San’â’ joined the imâm and sharifs but the combination was signally defeated. Zâfar [*q. v.*] in Hadramaut was taken in 678 and an embassy came from China. Vâsuf was a strong and successful ruler, and al-Khazraji calls him caliph at the end of his reign. He died in 694 (1294—1295).

His son and successor reigned only three years and encouraged the cultivation of palms round Zahid where others had tried to introduce corn. His brother, the governor of Shilyr [*q. v.*], took ’Aden [*q. v.*] and tried to make himself sulîn but was defeated and imprisoned. From prison he was called to rule as al-Mu’âliyâr Djâhid in 698. His reign was a succession of small fights both in the hills and the plains, the same places and opponents recurring again and again. In 697 (1247—1248) he took two castles from the Lâmarisians [*q. v.*]. In 709 the Kurds in Dhamar rebelled, joined the imâm and attacked San’â’ and later some of the Kurds killed some of the Ghurz. In 712 peace was made with the imâm Muhammad b. Musîr for ten years at a reparation of 3,000 dinars yearly. Five years later the sulîn broke the treaty. Warfare was savage and usually accompanied by the destruction of houses and trees; the heads of the slain were cut off. In 718 the army was reorganised on the Egyptian model. Towards the
end of the reign governors were changed frequently, perhaps a sign of weakness. It was easy for a foreigner to rise to high rank. More than once the same man was chief minister and chief kâdi. In 721 a son, al-Mu`āthir al-Salih, succeeded but he was soon in prison where he stayed four months only till he was set free by his friends and the usherer took his place. In 724 he was a sultan without a kingdom; 'Aden was lost, one cousin al-Zahir was independent for ten years, others relatives set up for themselves in Bait al-Fâkhi [q.v.], mamliks attacked Tâ`iz and took Zabid; but if not till then they had in rebellion some months that their pay was stopped. Sâhîrs defeated the mamliks; troops came from Egypt but did so much damage that all were glad when they soon left. The imâm's death in 725 removed a dangerous enemy and the sultan established his sort of order. Some and other relatives rebelled as did the mamliks because their pay was in arrears. The sultan crushed the Ma`âshiba, a tribe of the plains or foothills, and made a woman chief of what was left. In 736 (1335-1336) the peasants fled from the district of Zabid because of a combination of taxes and a new coinage. An officer touring to collect taxes used his Ghaza escort to put to death an insubordinate chiefman. The sultan went on pilgrimage in 735 and was carried off to Egypt, being allowed to come back a year later. From this time on the Arabs of the plains gave trouble. Normally the tribes kept each other in check but the sultan had so weakened none that now the Ma`âshiba could raid at will, they even cut communications between Zabid and the north. The government policy was to deprive them of their horses. A tyrannical governor was killed and the murderer was not punished. Mahdjam was captured by a sâhir, a rebel governor defended the sultan for two years, and three sons of the sultan rebelled. Al-Âfâf al-Albâ`as succeeded in 764. One of his rebel brothers joined the imâm, attacked Hara`ib, and later Shiyrá. Zabid was taken by the Arabs, other places by sâhir, the imâm Shâhîr al-Din raided as far as Zabid, there was fighting around Dhammar, and the sultan died in 778. Al-Âfâf Ismâ`îl was chosen as successor. The mamliks mutinied, a sâhir was lord of Sân`â, and the imâm was actively hostile till his death in 793. His son 'Ali was driven out of Sân`â by a rival and made Dhammar his capital. The imâmate seems to have been hereditary in one family for at least five generations. In 798 the imâm 'Ali sent presents to the sultan. It is clear that much of the highlands was lost and there was continual trouble in the plains. Yet the sultan was still powerful; he kept a firm hand over his officers and received letters, presents, and embassies from India and Abyssinia. He died in 805 and is called a good ruler. The next sultan, al-Nâsir Ahmad, worthily upheld the state. In the north he made Halâ [q.v.] accept him as overlord, in the south he defeated the imâm who had attacked his vassals, the Bani Tâ`ir, and in Wâdî`î he captured forty castles. Rich gifts came to him from Meccah and China. A brother rebelled and was blinded. At his death in 827 the state rapidly went to pieces. A series of short reigns with many rebellions of the mamliks ushered in the end. The land was ravaged by plague, the imâm died of it in 840 leaving his authority to a daughter. In the same year died another imâm, Ahmad b. Yahyâ, who was a prolific writer. Civil war was complicated by attacks by the Arabs, who sacked Zabid in 846. A new imâm, al-Nâsir Müljammad, strengthened his position by marrying a granddaughter of 'Ali of Sâ`îr. The Bani Tâ`ir joined in the fighting and took Lahjîl and 'Aden, till in 858 (1443) the salt Râstilad abdicated before them and went into exile at Mecca.

Most of the sultans were builders of mosques and madrasas, some were writers. In the heyday of the dynasty the sultan regularly spent a holiday in the palm groves of Zabid (these were called sâb`i) and at the sea. The land was governed by officials or by vassal chiefs who paid tribute. In all big towns were two officers, one called wâlî or amir and another called nâsir, simân, or muqâshîd. High officers regularly went on tour to collect the taxes. The army consisted of the cavalry of the gate, mamliks both Kurds and Ghans, and levies. A thousand horse and ten thousand foot made a big army. A man's horses were sometimes slain at his funeral.


(A. S. TRAFFORD)

RÂTÎB (b., plur. rââtîb), a word meaning what is fixed and hence applied to certain non-obligatory sâlûs or certain litanies. The term is not found in the Qur`ûn nor as a technical term in Hadith. On the first meaning see the article NAFILA, p. 8264. As to the second, it is applied to the dâ`âr which one recites alone, as well as to those which are recited in groups. We owe to M. Snouck Hurgronje a detailed description of the rââtîb practised in Atchin.


(A. J. WENSINK)

RÂTL, unit of weight dating from pre-Islamic times, varying with countries and periods. Mârîkî (p. 3, 5) says that, except for the mîshîl, which had remained uniform, the pre-Islamic weights were double the Islamic ones, and that the râtîl contained 12 šî`yiya of 144 dirhems. In medieval Damascus it equalled 600 dirhems and in Aleppo 720 dirhems. In modern Egypt it is uniform at 1/100th msârâ` = 12 šî`yiya = 144 dirhems = 0.449 kg. = 0.99 lb. avdp. 2.75 râtîl = 1 šî`yiya = 1.248 kg. = 2 lb. 11 oz.

Bibliography: al-Mârikî, Historia Monumen-
tis Arabiae, ed. O. G. Tychoen, Rostock 1797; al-Kalâ`ashandî, Sulûk al-A`bâ`î, 14 vols., 1913 etc.; J. A. Decourdemanche, Poids et mesures des peuples antiques et des arabes, Paris 1900; Godefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Ma`âmûns, Paris 1933; Law No. 9, 1914 in al-Wâfa`î's al-Ma`âyya, No. 120, September 30, 1914, for standardization of weights in Egypt. See also Bibliography of article HABBA.

RAWALPINDI, a division, district, sâb`î, and town in the north-west of the Punjab. The division has an area of 21,347 square miles and a population of 3,914,849 of whom 3,362,260 are Muhammadans. The district, which is divided for administrative purposes into four
RAWÁNĐÍZ RUIYNDÍZ

RAWÁNĐÍZ RUIYNDÍZ (the first word is composed of two elements: rawání, uncertain etymology and díz meaning fortress; the second means "fortress of iron"), capital of the fuṣūl of the name in the wilāyat of Mawšt in the caravan route, halfway between this town and that of Sâwâd-Bošt [q.v.], including the following mahalas (the names and figures given in brackets are those of the corresponding Kurd tribe and the number of the hearths): n. nomad; s. settled: Hâla màn (Zero, n. 500), Hârî (Helián, n. 800; Mânsû, n. 2,000; Mânsû, n. 500); Welâsh (Bâlek, n. 2,000); Derge (Dergel, n. 700); Dešt-i Deyan (Bâlek, n. 800); Pirásí, n. 1,000); Rawándâl (Rawândik, n. 600); Dešt-i Barâq (Barâdast, n. 1,000); Beresî, n. 1,000); The Sidân and the Serâtî, two subdivisions of the powerful tribe of the Herki, number about 6,000 hearths and have their winter-quarters between Rawándâl and Arbil (Hawštî in Kurîsh) while the Mîndà, the third section of this tribe, spend the winter among Tâbârî, with pastures of all three are in Persia at Mâgsâvar. Under the Kurd feudal system the district of Rawándâl Ruyndîz contained the following subdivisions: Hovâšt, Sâhtan, Dîlémâ, Sulâkâ, Khâhâtk, Pirsâ, Dešt-i Şirân, Bâshâ废弃物, Rawándî, Akûtàn, Bâlân. After the League of Nations (Dec. 1925) it had given Mawšt to the Irâq, of which Rawándîs Ruyndîz became definitely a part of the mountainous Kurîsh zone running along the Kurîsh frontier which was given the name of Southern Kurdistan at the establishment of the British mandate. The figures given for the population here are only approximate, the tribes having in some cases been decimated by war and influence in 1918–1919. According to the census of 1935 the town of Rawándîs Ruyndîz had 2,716 inhabitants and the bâlûk 38,342.

Topography. The district of Rawándîs Ruyndîz, which roughly speaking lies on the other side of the bend made by the Great Zâb when it leaves the mountainous part of its course (running westwards to that of the Tigres), consists of parallel valleys and chains which rise gradually as they approach the Persian frontier and which have a general orientation from N.W. to S.E. The average height may be put at over 1,500 feet. The two principal watercourses of the region, the Ribâri Rawándîs and Ribâri Rûhâš, run through bank tributaries of the Great Zâb, have their sources on the Persian frontier. The roads are naturally more practicable in the direction N.W. to S.E. rather than the contrary.

Road system. It would be in a way wrong to mention, in the matter of high roads which from all time have connected the Iranian plateau with the adjoining countries in the west, only 1. the silk route in the north (Juzî, Geschîcht Iran, p. 476) going from Tâbârî via Khoi to Lîbîshî Fûyûs (the modern Tâsh Kûrgân), and 2. the southern road, that from the Median gate or the defile of the Gyndes (Dîylûz). Besides these there are the main arteries of traffic, radial to the route always taken by commercial and cultural relations and in time of war, lying between the two of the roads which went from Nîniveh to Media and forked twice at Arbil and Rawándîs. At Arbil the road entered Persia by the pass of Gomesbû, Khoi Sandjâh, Râmîa, Sesderdeh and thence by the pass of Kûrtîk at Sâwâd-Bošt [q.v.] via Afân.

The Achaemenid royal road also passed this way (Juzî, p. 475). It was, we believe, the southern section, running towards the land of Elam, while, according to Th. Reinach (On people called, in Rev. des Et. Gr., vii, 1894), the main highway from Sardes ran through modern Armenia and central Kurdistan, although we cannot say exactly on which side of the Zagros it lay. Among the Arab geographers, Yâkût alone gives a few notes on the road through Rawándîs Ruyndîz (ed. Wustenfehl, p. 441). The road Arbil-Mârgâsh was known to the Mongols after their occupation of Arbil (535). The itinerary by the pass of Garâ Shûzn (Zinzua-Shâlshâ) has been described by Perkins (Z., 4, p. 185, 1855; p. 83 sq.) and Thielmann (Serişîfîrke im Kuranzur, Leipz. 1875, p. 321 sq.). The latter (cf. Yâkût) mentions as stages, starting from the pass: Eysat; Derge (ruins of a fortress); Rawándîs; Kûrât-Atûsîsh (Kanti Welâmân?); Darre Forest (from the Great Zâb, between Girdemûsh and Kûrsîn); Tez-Kûharâ; Mawšt, in all seven stages from Sâwâd-Bošt. According to information received from Russian soldiers who took part in the expedition against Rawándîs Ruyndîz (summer of 1916), the pass of Garâ Shûzn (6,000 feet) is a kind of promontory with valley on either side starting from the ruins of Kûharâ (Persian Lâhîdîn) and joining on the other side in Turkish territory. There is a se'ûf there under the Nakûshbândî Shâhî Djinmâl to the influence of which is to be attributed the parti-
citation of the neighboring Kurdish tribes in the
Şırê L. The name of the pass Zîrê Şakahî is
explained by the presence of this tax hâertz.
The actual site of Rawandê Ruyindiz is described in
M. Bitner (Der Kaukasus in China und in
das Staatsarchiv, Vienna 1895). In the mouth
of May the rain ripens at Rawandê Ruyindiz, the
arable land being on the right side of the Rûhûrî
Ruyindiz. Like Arbil, Ruyindiz is also a point of
bifurcation of roads. We have just mentioned the
road over the Garî Shînka pass. Another, farther
north, goes via Sidakan, Topazawa, pass of Kel-i
Shih (10,000 feet with a famous stele), Dûr
Utnûş. J. de Morgan (Mission scient. en Pesh.,
ii. 46) wrongly thinks this is the only road from
Persia to Mravil besides that which goes via
Serdâsh.

Lastly there is a road from Ruyindiz to Şam-
dîn, of which there are four variants: 1. Şahânê, via
Şahîdê, Kûrî Rash, Çamirê; 2. Şâşânê, via
Gara Carîya, Keke, Begistenê; 3. Şahânê, via
Mergerstîr, Keke; 4. the route of the Turkish
telegraph line by Rûhûrî-Dîbar and Çamirê.
The first of these is the best and was taken
1916 by the Russian column which came down
the Kût pass to the support of the movement
converging via Garî Shînka on Ruyindiz.

History. From what has already been said it
will be evident that Rawandê Ruyindiz, situated
at the intersection of the communications of Kûr-
dîzân as well as of roads leading farther afield,
has always owed its importance to its position.
It should also be remembered that in the
period of prosperity of the Nestorian church all this
country played a great part, mainly on account of the
influence of the Metropolitan see of Arbil. We may
mention (cf. Hoffmann, Auszige) the names of
Dara, Hannûzha, Şakîkîva (from which came one
of the MSS. which enabled M. l'Abbé Chabot to
establish the text of the Syriac Orientale, Paris
1902) as well as the fact that there were many
monasteries in these parts. According to the late
Metropolitan Mar Hannûzha, the majnas of Bar-
dost (not to be confused with the Baróstî of the
Şîrakî Kurds to the north of Tergawar; cf. urmîya)
in the war had still a few Christian communities.
From the point of view of Kurdish history the
departures of Ruyindiz have been of special
interest in view of its form part at certain
times. The Persian historian S. A. Kesharî Tabûri
(Shakirrîm & Gomi, 4, Rawandî, Teherân
1308 [1929]) gives us some notes (p. 125, 133-
136) on Ruyindiz, in the time of the Aṯâbîs
under the Almohads (501-624 a. H.) the last re-
presentative of whom, a woman, became the wife of
Ujâlî di al-Khwarizmî. A local history of the
sûlûs of Ardalîn, a resicum of which I published
(in the S.M.A., xliv., 1094-1112) also contains some
information about the families ruling in Ruyindiz
down to 1249 a. H. It may be added that (Shoref
Namûx, 11, p. 509), "the brothers of Alibb Soutîlân released Soutîlân Mourad son of Iqûqî
big from the castle of Ruyindiz where he had been imprisoned by order of Soutîlân Athâb" (904 = 1498-1499). A Kurdish text in my
possession enables me to give a few details about
the last lord of Ruyindiz. The beys of Ruyindiz
are said to be descended from an Arab of the
tribe of Shammar (again this fondness for inventing
an Arab descent which we frequently find in Kurdi
genealogies). For some years this ancestor was a
humble shepherd in the age of Ruyindiz in the
villages of Badîli and Bapîshî (should we not
recognize in the beys the remains of the Semitic:beth? [cf. e. g. K démarche]).

By becoming rich — some say by having found a
treasure — the ancestor established himself at
Badîli, acquired houses and fields and became
mayor there. His heirs in time became qâsh, then bêq. Arrogant and rapacious, they had at
the same time the reputation of being patrons of
learning (tâm u-murâjîat). At the beginning of the sixth century, one of them, Mûned Bêk the
Blind, established at Rawandiz, was honoured by
Sulînî Medji who gave him the title of Afsâh,
whence his sobriquet of Fâshê i Kêrû. He had
some claims on Mergawar and Shirê in which he
met with the resistance of 'Azzî Bek of Letûn
near Nalos. With the help of guns founded for
him at Rawandiz by a certain Kûrî (== arût)
Redjîb, he broke this resistance. Since then the
tribe of Letûn has not had any independent tribal
existence. Its remnants were absorbed into the
neighbouring tribes of Shemdrân. The Blind Fâshê
next took possession of Arbil Kerkuk; Sulainînî,
Shemdrân, 'Akrê, Amâdiya. The resistance he
encountered in the tribe of Zîbîrî and notably
that of its hero 'Azzî the village of Sawtî has
become legendary. Takes prisoners, 'Azzî is said
to have replied to the offer to take him into
his service by the Fâshê, who had no son, that
he would make him one. The Fâshê built several
fortified towers the ruins of which can still be
seen (Sidakan; among the Shîrwanîyân; 'Akrê,
Rawandiz, Dara. He also repaired the road in the
province of Rûyindiz with nails of iron'). He built
many schools. In his time plunder, robbery and
rape disappeared. "The grapes hung above the
roads till autumn and now one dared to touch them";
justice was administered by 'ullamâ. Finally in
1836 the Fâshê was defeated by the Turks after a
singe of four months and died soon afterwards
in Constantinoûple, or others say in Cairo. Of
the descendants of the Fâshê his grandson Sa'dî
Bêk was ša'mînîmînî of Ruyindiz. He was murdered
by his servants. Yûsûf Bêk, son of Muşafî Bêk
at Badîli, aqash of the tribe of Fisdrêm, was of
the same line and in constant rivalry with Sa'dî
Bêk of Ruyindiz. The memory of the Fâshê seems
to have been kept alive in the tribe of Mukiri where
F. de Morgan records a curious game of this
name, in which one of the players pretends to be
the "Blind Fâshê". A Kurdish work (Mîrza Shêrân
by Sayyid Husain Husni Mûrstrînî, Rawandiz
1925) gives a full account of the story of the Fâshê, his
struggle with the Turks, his relations with Persia
and with Mehmêd 'Ali Fâshê of Egypt, giving as
its principal source, a Kurkish MS. (Meîmêdî
by Mîrza Mûhammad Wêkîrî Nîsîrî). The Fâshê
stuck coins in his own name: darâba ft. Rawandî
al- Âmir al-Manfîr Muhammed Bêk. — During
the Great War the Rawandiz road was used in
the winter of 1914-1915 by Haid Bey's troops
advancing on Urmîya (contrary to H. Grothe, Die
and later in July 1916 by the Russian Rifahînêk, a
column which Major K. Mason (Central Kurdistan,
in T. K. G. S., 1919) wrongly accuses of massacring
5,000 Kurds, women, children and old men at
Ruyindiz. After the armistice and during the period
till Dec. 1925, when the League of Nations
made its decision, Rawandiz was occasionally the head-
quarters of an English political officer; sometimes it slipped from the English and was a centre of concentration for hostile Kurdish elements. Thus in Sept. 1922 (cf. B. Nikitin, L'Iraq économique, in Rev. des St. Pol., July-Sept. 1923) the English were forced to withdraw their feeble forces from the mountains and to occupy the line Arbil—Kirkuk—Kifri. A Kurdish government was then proclaimed in Sulaimaniye with a Pādīshāh of Kurdistan, a role assumed by a certain Shaikh Mahmūd, of a noble Kurdish family. Driven out by the English in 1919 after the rising, which he had led, he was pardoned in 1922 and his followers proclaimed him Pādīshāh. Threatened by English aeroplanes and without resources, Shaikh Mahommed retired to Rawandiz to the Turkish emissaries. Finally in April 1923, Rawandiz was taken by the Anglo-Mesopotamian troops composed almost exclusively of Assyro-Chaldean highlanders. Two months later in the name of H. M. King Faisal a more tractable Kurdish administration was installed there as throughout southern Kurdistan (cf. above). The first governor thus appointed was a certain Saliy al-Ta’i of the family of Sadat Nehri (cf. Shāhīnān). A brief history of Ruyūndiz since the war is given in Mīrānī Sūrūn. At the present moment the Persian government is considering a system of roads which may give Rawandiz a certain importance. It is a question of a carriage road connecting Ta‘ris to Mawji via Rawandiz. The Teherān government is anxious to have an outlet without the necessity of going through Transcaucasia.

Human Geography. The route through Rawandiz as well as the roads leading from it have never played a part comparable to that of the two historic arteries of traffic. This is explained by the lack of security, which is the first condition for the making of a trade route. This region has always lain between two hostile states: Assyria and Media, Massāpiq and Zamas, Turkey and Persia, Turkey and the Īrān. The configuration of the country, the mode of life of its people contribute rather to break them up than bind them together. The road, means of communication, has here the character of a weapon or line of defence except for brief periods of peace.

Language. Kurdish is the language spoken in this region, except by the town dwellers (Arbil, Altaf Kepur, Kirkuk etc.) of Turkish origin. With the establishment of the Kurdish administration and the opening of Kurdish schools following the decisions of the League of Nations, Kurdish will probably develop still more and we may look for the creation of a Kurdish intellectual centre. According to O. Mann (Die Mundarten der Maka Kurdistan, ii. 205), the dialect of Rawandiz is very like that of Shāmīnān, but E. B. Soane does not share this opinion (Kurdish Grammar, London 1913). F. Jashoff’s manual, Bakhtari Kurdistan, an introduction of the Kurdistān of the south division and surrounding districts of Kurdistān, London 1922, is more particularly devoted to this dialect.

Cartography. The Government of India Survey is preparing a revision of the maps of this region. Until their results are published as well as those being prepared for other reasons by the British Petroleum Co., there is accessible the excellent geographical material in the Report presented in 1925 to the League of Nations by the Commission of Enquiry whose task it was to collect material of an ethnographical and economic nature regarding the wilayat of Mawji (League of Nations, Question of the Frontier between Turkey and Iraq, Report submitted by the Commission instituted by the Council Resolution of September 30, 1924 [C. 400, M. 147, 1925, viii]).

In addition to references in the text: Spiegel, Erzähler (p. 27–28); Rawlinson in T.R.G.S., v. (p. 329); M. Streelen, Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften..., Kurdistān, in Z.A., xv., 1900 (p. 267, 381), on the ancient and Sassanid periods; Hammer, Itinerarii (ii, p. 125 and 337), on the Mongol period. The Sherif Nāmeh, St. Petersburg 1860 (i, introd.), mentions the castle of Reuben (Kend Rawīn).
(B. Nikitin)

AL-RAWDA. One of the series of large islands in the bed of the Nile before it divides into the Damietta and Rosetta branches. Situated near Old Cairo and extending to Kašā, it is separated from the right bank by a narrow canal known as al-Khalīd, while the river runs to full width on the other side between the Island and Giza (Djīza).

In early medieval times, it was used for three purposes: 1. as a convenient site for the Nilometer (cf. mātār) on the S. E. side, rebuilt in the reign of al-Mustan (862–866); 2. as a dockyard for the construction of the fleet (Mas‘ūdī calls it the "island of shipbuilders") until the reign of the first Ikhshīdī who transferred the docks to the Mūsī bank of the Nile further north in the direction of the present port of Bilāq, which developed at a still later date; and 3. as a naturally fortified site in case of danger on the mainland, by destroying the customary bridge of boats which connected it with the fort of Babylon. Mūqawās did so when he wished to preserve his freedom in negotiating with the Arabs. Realising this, too, Ibn Tallūn built a fort on the Island (c. 877) and al-Salīḥ Ayyūb built another where his body was concealed after his death by his wife Shāhdar al-Dur [q. v.] until the defeat of the French at Manṣūra (1249). As a fortification, al-Rawdā reached its high-water-mark under the Bahri Mamlūks who returned to it after the death of al-Salīḥ Ayyūb and, entrenched behind the water of the Nile, ruled Egypt for nearly a century and a half. They further strengthened the defence of the Island by building walls and towers along its shores. In earlier times it was occasionally used as a pleasure resort where spacious gardens were planted and magnificent palaces erected, such as the Rawdā built c. 1185 by the Caliph al-Amīr for a Bedouin mistress. During the Bahri Mamlūk period, noble buildings increased in number to house the rulers of Egypt and a mosque and a madrasa (whose remains are still to be seen) were established for the use of the inhabitants.

During the Burdji Mamlūk period, Miṣr and the quarters outlying the Citadell were better favoured, though at the time of the Ottoman conquest Selim I found in the Island a safer residence. When Egypt became an Ottoman province, Miṣr and the Citadell became the capital of the Turkish government, while the Mamlūk forces took to the Djīza side of the River. As a result, al-Rawdā was deserted, its fortifications ruined, and it furnished robbers and highwaymen with a refuge.

The Island did not again attract the rulers of Egypt until the time of Muḥammad ‘Alī, whose
son Ibrahim Pasha ordered large gardens to be planted there. At present it has become an Egyptian residential quarter connected with Cairo by two bridges and with Djesar by a third. The facilities of modern means of communication have brought it within easy reach of the centre of the capital. The construction of a new large hospital is planned as a substitute for the antiquated Kasr al-Aini on the northern extremity of the Island.

**Bibliography:** See Bibliography of articles on Cairo and Miṣrān. An elaborate account of the Island and especially the Miṣrān may be found in 'Ali Pasha Mubārak: al-Khāliṣ al-Tamīmīyih, 20 vola., Cairo 1306, xviii. 2–111; Ibn Dūlāmā, Description de l'Égypte, ed. Vollet, Cairo 1893, iv. 109–120. (A. S. ATIVA)

**RAY (A.), opinion on.** As a technical term denoting the purely intellectual function it is used in the system of Islam in opposition to such terms as 'ilm, ruha, Khatl Allah, din and hadith. See the art. FIKH.

**RAWSHANIYA, Afghan sect founded by Bāyazid b. 'Abd Allah, who took the title Pir-i Rawshān: called by their enemies Tūrkīn.**

**The Life of the Founder.** Bāyazid was born at Džullindar in the Pashtun about 931 (1525), his father's native home being Kandīlamur, an Afghan town, whither his parents returned. When his mother Basān was divorced by 'Abd Allah, Bāyazid became alienated from his father, who disapproved of his seeking the solution of religious difficulties from a poor relation, the ascetic Ismā'īl; he started earning his living by transporting goods from Samarkand to Hindūstān with Turkish horses. In the town Kalindār, S. W. of Allahābād, he became acquainted with one Mullā Sulǎimān from whom he imbibed Ismā'īl doctrine. Returning to Kandīlamur he lived as a hermit in a cave, and evolved eight precepts for his followers; he was in consequence attacked and wounded by his father. Hence he fled to Nenāz, where he was given protection by a Multān chief Suḥāb Ahmad, and presently won adherents among the Ghūría Khel in the neighbourhood of Peshwāwar from the Khalīl and Māhmūdī, who had recently overrun the Peshwāwar plain. He established himself at Kalīsah in the territory of the 'Umāzārī, and sent out missionaries who were also raiders. At this time one Sayyid 'Ali Tirmidži aided by Akhund Dervazeh (one of the authorities for his biography) started controversy with him; they were unsuccessful, and Bāyazid, who at some time had taken the title Pir-i Rawshān (Luminous Shaik), parodied by his enemies as Pir-i Tārik, conceived the idea of annexing the empire of Akhund on whose treasury he presently issued drafts. He was arrested by Muḥāfiz Khān Ghānī, governor of Kābul, whither he was taken. He was there accused of heresy before the 'ulama', who, however, for a consideration, acquitted him. He retired first to Tetei, thence to Kābul, where he was proposed to substitute a new religion for Islam. After a time many of his Tīrk followers reverted to Islam, and were ejected by him: they fled to Nenāz, and were attacked by Bāyazid, who however was defeated with great slaughter by Muḥāfiz Khān. He fled to a village in Kalapāni, where he died (993 = 1585).

2. Later history of the community. Bāyazid’s activities were resumed by the eldest of his five sons, 'Umar, who attacked the Yūsufi, a tribe which had followed Bāyazid, but reverted to Islam; in the battle which ensued 'Umar was killed, as was also his brother Khāir al-Dīn; another brother, Nār al-Dīn, was put to death by the Gūljaras. The youngest son, Djalāl al-Dīn, was captured by the Yūsufi, who surrendered him to Akbar in 989 A. H. Escaping from Akbar's court he returned to Kābul, where he assumed the role of sovereign of Afghanistan, and Akbar found it necessary to send an army against him in 994. This army met with a serious defeat, which was repaired by a later expedition (995). The numbers of the Rawshānis are given on this occasion as 20,000 foot and 5,000 horse. A further expedition was sent in 1000 A. H. (or 1001) which captured some 14,000 men (according to Būdānī) with Djalāl al-Dīn's wives and children, but not apparently himself; since in 1007 he took Ghānī, but was unable to maintain himself there, and on retiring was attacked by the Hanāra wounded and put to death. This last affair is by some assigned to a son of his bearing the same name.

The next head of the community was Djalāl al-Dīn's son Aḥṣād, who figures in the history of Djalāhān. In 1020 A. H. he surprised Kābul in the absence of its governor Khān Dīwarān. The attack was beaten off with great loss to the raiders, yet in 1023 Aḥṣād was again in the field, but sustained a serious defeat at Pāsh Bulaq. After a series of enterprises with varied success he was beleaguered in the fortress of Nāvghār and killed by a musket-shot.

The historian of Shah Dījanī, Muhammad Sālīḥ Kambo, asserts that in the second year of his reign (1358) that monarch took effective steps to suppress the heresy started by Bāyazid; nevertheless in the following year he records how the Afghan Kamal al-Dīn was joined in the attack on Peshwāwar by 'Abd al-Kādir, son of Aḥṣād, and Karimīd, son of Djalāhān (Djalāl al-Dīn). The place was relieved by Saʿd Khān, and 'Abd al-Kādir induced to submit; in 1045 he was recommended by Saʿd Khān, "who had caused him to repent of his evil deeds" to Shah Dījanī, who gave him a command of 1,000 horse. Other members of Aḥṣād's family received honours and rewards in 1047. In the same year Karimīd, who had taken refuge in the Mohand country, but had been recalled by the tribes of Bangāsh, was attacked, captured and executed by Saʿd Khān. It is asserted that some relics of the community still exist in this region. A branch of the sect, called Iṣārī, was founded at Swat by one Sayyid Iṣā of Peshwāwar (T. C. Plowden, translation of the Nāvīlād Afghānī, Lahore 1875).

3. Doctrines of the sect. According to the Dādīstān, which is friendly to the sect, Bāyazid's doctrine was extreme pantheism; "if I pray," he said, "I am a maṣūrī; if I pray not, I am a kāfīr". He marked eight stages (maṣūm) in religious progress: shartā, partā, hašthā, marṣū, farbā, wulā, maḥdā, sākhā; the four last are said to be technicalities of his system. The explanation of these stages, quoted from Bāyazid's Halāmānī, inculcates lofty morality, e. g. to hurt no creature of God. The account which follows is inconsistent with this, as noxious persons were to be killed because they resembled wild creatures, harmless persons who did not possess self-knowledge might be killed, because they resembled domestic animals. They might be regarded as dead, and their property
might be seized by the "living". Further he
abrogated the direction of prayer and the pre-
liminary ablation. Other details are furnished by
a hostile writer, the historian of Shâh Džâhân quoted
above, copied in Munšahbât al-Lûlû. Marriage,
says, is without a contract, there being
merely a feast at which a cow is slaughtered.
Divorce is ratified by placing some pebbles in
the wife's hand. The widow is deprived of in-
heritance, and indeed is at the disposal of the
heirs, who may marry her themselves or sell her
to some one else. When a son is born to one of
them, an ischion is made in the ear of an ass,
and the blood dripped on the infant's tongue.
This is in order to ensure that the infant shall
be bloodthirsty and have the mind of an ass.
Any stranger who falls into their hands is enslaved
and can be bought or sold. Daughters receive no
share in the inheritance. They massacre whole
tribes when they conquer them. Even on the Day
of Judgment their victims, though martyrs, will
not hold them to account. — According to others,
however, they recognized neither Paradise nor Hell.

4. Literature of the sect. Bâyâzid is said
to have written much; works by him cited in the
Dabistan are the Hâlmâmâ autobiography, men-
tioned above, and Kaher al-Bayân, the second
book of the sect, in the style of the Kurân,
directed by the Divine Being to Bâyâzid. This
was issued in four languages: Arabic, Persian, Hindi
and Pushto. A work in Arabic, Ma'ârif al-Mânî'in,
by him is also mentioned.

Bibliography: The account of the sect given by J. Leyden in Asiatic Researches, xi.
and the Pushto work Mahâmân al-îslâmî of Akhund Derwâzeh, furnished the material for
the account of the sect in Graf T. A. von Noë's
Keizer Akbar, Leyden 1885, ii. 179 sq.,
and largely for that in Glory of the Punjab Tribes
and Castle, Lahore 1915, iii. 335 sq. Notices
of the sect were also got from Indian historical
works; from the Akbâr-âmîn (printed, Calcutta
1851) by M. Elphinston, History of India,
London 1866, p. 517 etc.; from the Tâbâşî-,
Akkârî (Ith., Lahore 1892) by H. Elliot,
History of India, London 1875, p. 450; from the Tâbâşî-
âl-Qâhânî, transl. A. Rogers and H. Beveridge,
London 1909 by Beni Prasad, History of Ta-
ngir, Oxford 1922, who also uses the Âl-Qâhânî's
âl-Qâhânî, Calcutta 1865. For Shâh Džâhân's
time the Shâh Džâhân-âmîn called
Al-Muhammâhî, of Muhammad Salîh Kambo, ed.
Ghulâm Yazdani, Calcutta 1923 and 1927, is
the chief authority. The printed text of the
Dâlîshâh-âmîn (Calcutta 1867, 1868) which,
according to Munšahbât al-Lûlû (Calcutta 1869),
should contain an exaggerated account of the
strictures of the sect, has very little about it.

(D. S. MACKOLIOUTH)

AL-RÂZÎ, ÂBU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. ZAKÂRIYA,
a celebrated physician, alchemist and
philosopher. Almost nothing is known of his
life. He was born in 850 (864) at Rayy. There he
seems to have studied deeply in mathematics,
philosophy, astronomy and belles-lettres. He perhaps
also studied alchemy in his youth. It was only
after attaining a rather advanced age that he
devoted himself to medicine. Entering the service
of the ruler of Rayy, he soon became head of
the new hospital in this town and later we find
him in the same capacity in Baghdad. We do
not know exactly how long he remained there.
The reputation of being the greatest physician
of his time brought him from one court to another.
The fickleness of the favour of princes as well as
the uncertainty of the political situation are the
causes of his unsettled life. He returned several
times to his native town where he died in 925
(925) (according to al-Brittn in 5th Shabân 313)
or in 923.

We are not better informed regarding Râzî's
teachers. Several Arabic biographers regard him as
a pupil of the physician 'Alî b. Râbîb al-Tâbarî,
which is chronologically impossible. As his teacher
in philosophy the Fihrist mentions a certain Bâkhlî
(not the geographer Abû Zaid al-Balkhî)
from whom Râzî is said to have taken some ideas.
Nâsîr-i Khusraw says the same thing about a
rationalist philosopher with the curious name of
Erâphâhri (cf. Zâb al-Muhaðirî, p. 73; 98; cf.
also al-Brittn, Hindi, p. 4, 326; Alâî, p. 222, 223);
it is very probable that the two sources refer to
the same individual. Although the influence of Râzî
is rather considerable, we know nothing of his pupils.
The philosopher Yahyâ b. 'Adî, an Aristotelian,
Ja`milite and disciple of Fârâbî, is said to have
begun to study philosophy with Râzî (cf. Masudi,
Kitâb al-Tanâh wa-l-i`lâmî), and a later source
(Hojaïwî, Kastâf al-Masâbî, transl. Nicholson,
p. 150) speaks of connections between him and
the mystic al-Halâlî. It was in Shî'â circles that
the philosophical doctrines of Râzî left the deepest
mark Abû Isâhî Isâhîm b. Nawâsîkh, a theologian
of the "Twelve" Shî'â, borrows from him, in his
Kitâb al-Yâsîrî, his theory of pleasure, and the
Ismâ`îlîans Abû Hâtim Râzî (d. 322 = 926),
Kirmînî (d. after 412 = 1021) and Nâsîr-i Khusraw
[q. v.], attempted to refute certain parts of his
philosophical system. Among the other authors
who commented his views may be mentioned Fârâbî,
Ibn Hâdîthî, 'Alî b. Râbi`â and Mâmûnîs.

Râzî is above all a physician and he is rightly
regarded as the greatest physician of Islam. In
addition to numerous monographs on various
maladies of which the most famous is his treatise
on smallpox and measles (Kitâb al-Lâjûn wa-
l-Hazâ), he wrote several large manuals of
medicine which were the most remarkable that
the middle ages knew. A number of his works
were translated into Latin and down to the xviii
century the authority of al-Râzî was undisputed.
His Manzûrî (Libri Almanonovis) is dedicated to
Manzûr b. Ishaq, governor of Rayy, and his Mulûbî
(Regium) to 'Alî b. Wâh-Sâbân of Tabaristan.
The Hâwî (probably the same as the Dâjûn),
is the largest medical encyclopedia in Arabic. Râzî
is said to have devoted 15 years of his life to
writing it and seems to have died before finishing
it. The book is a compilation of extracts from
all the Greek and Arab physicians on every problem
of medicine and Râzî concludes by giving the
results of his own experience. While anticipating
earlier tradition, Râzî is the least dogmatic of the
Arab physicians and in the field of medical practice
surpasses the knowledge of the ancients. We still
possess his clinical notebook in which he describes
very carefully the progress of his patients.

The same empirical spirit is found in the other
branches of science which he studied. In chemistry,
about which we are better informed, Râzî, rejecting
all occultist and symbolical explanations of natural phenomena, confined himself exclusively to the classification of substances and processes as well as to the exact descriptions of his experiments. In a part of the statement of the Fihrist, Razi does not seem to have been acquainted with the alchemical writings attributed to Džibâr b. Hajiyân. Pseudo-Madârij in his Kitâb Khotâb al-Hashim, endeavoured to reconcile the alchemy of Râzî with that of Džibâr. Of his writings on mechanics we only possess a synopsis of his treatise on the balance (mizân fâhîšt). All his works on physics, mathematics, astronomy and optics, of which a large number are enumerated by the bibliographers, have perished.

It is the same with his metaphysical works of which we only have a few fragments preserved in later authors. Besides the Shâ'ıa theologians mentioned above, we must make particular mention of al-Birûnî, who in his various works frequently refers to Râzî. He also devoted a complete risâla to a study of the life and works of Râzî.

The following are the characteristic features of his metaphysics: Râzî asserts the existence of five eternal (harâtâm) principles which are the Creator, Soul, Matter, Time and Space. The eternity of the world is, according to Râzî, the necessary corollary of the conception of God, the unique and immutable principle (the term of argument of the Aristotelian philosophers). Now Râzî denies this eternity. Only the plurality of the eternal principles, their opposition and combination, can explain temporal creation. The origin and destinies of the world are imagined by Râzî under the form of a myth with gnostic affinities. The Soul, the second eternal principle, possessing life but not knowing, is seized with the desire to unite with matter, and to produce within itself forms susceptible of procuring corporeal enjoyments. But matter is elusive. The Creator then in his piti creates this world, with its durable forms in order to permit the soul to enjoy it and to produce man. But the Creator also sends the intelligence (afâr) partaking of the substance of his divinity to awaken the sleeping soul in its abode (hâkitâ) which is man and to teach that this created world is not its true house, the place of its happiness and of its peace. To escape the bonds of matter there is only a single means for every man, which is the study of philosophy. When all human souls have attained liberation the world will dissolve and matter deprived of forms will return to its primitive state.

In his physics, Râzî, an opponent of the Aristotelians and mutabâhâlim, relies on the authority of Plato and the pre-Socratic philosophers. His atomism, fundamentally different from the parallel theories of the alâlam, is related in many ways — an exceptional case in medieval philosophy — to the system of Democritus. In Râzî's view matter in the primitive state before the creation of the world (hâyâtâ mutâfiqâ) was composed of scattered atoms (qâma lâ yotâfâsâ). Atoms possessed extent. Mixed in various proportions with particles of the Void — of which Râzî against the Aristotelians affirms the positive existence, these atoms produced the elements. The latter are five in number: earth, air, water, fire and the celestial element. All the properties of the elements (lightness and heaviness, opaqueness and transparency etc.) are determined by the proportions of Matter and Void entering into their composition. Earth and water, dense elements, tend towards the centre of the earth, while air and fire in which particles of the void predominate, tend to rise. As to the celestial element, a balanced mixture of Matter and Void, circular movement is peculiar to it. Fire springs from the striking of iron on stone because iron as it moves raises the air and rarifies it so that it is transformed into fire.

Râzî distinguished universal space (mâkûn hâli) or absolute space (mâkûn mutâlî) from partial (gímî) and relative (mîqâlî) space. Absolute space, denied by the Aristotelians, is pure extent, independent of the body which it contains. It extends beyond the limits of the world, is infinite. There is reason to believe that Râzî affirms the plurality of worlds. The term relative or partial space is applied to the size or extent of any particular body.

In his theory of time, which he says is Platonic, Râzî differentiates in analogous fashion absolute (mâlî) time and limited (mâbîrî) time. It is only to limited time that the Aristotelian definition of time, considered as a number of movement (in the first place the movement of the celestial spheres), is applicable, according to the Prior and Posterior Analytics. Absolute time is an independent substance which flows. It existed before the creation of the world and will exist after its dissolution. Abandoning a distinction made in the Timaeus and headed down by the Neo-Platonists to the Arabic philosophers, Râzî identifies it with eternity (zahr, zem). To attack the Aristotelian conceptions of space and time, Râzî makes use of the view of the man in the street with a healthy mind not broken in to philosophical subtleties.

In his ethics, Râzî, in spite of his pessimistic metaphysics, is against excessive asceticism. Socrates, whom he regards as his model, far from being the ascetic of cynical tradition, took an active part in public life. According to the maxims of Aristotle, blame cannot be attached to the human passions but only to their excessive indulgence. At the basis of his moral teaching is a special theory of pleasure and pain. Pleasure (âdâwi) is not something positive but the simple result of a return to normal conditions, the disturbance of which has caused pain (wâdku). The itra tâlîjîsa (mâdâ fâlâmâsâ) aspires, according to the saying of Plato (Philelétres, p. 176b), to resemble the Creator to be, like him, just towards man, indulgent to his faults.

In view of the individualistic ethics of Râzî, we can understand his critical attitude to established religion. In many writings he refuted the Mu'tazilite theologians (Džâhîl, Nâshî, Abu 'l-Kâim al-Bâkhi, Misânî [= Ibn Afkî Zârîn]) who attempted to introduce scientific arguments into theology. Nor was he sparing in his criticism of the extreme Shâ'ıa (refutation of Ahmad al-Kâyâtî) and of the Manichaen. Among his adversaries in philosophy we find, besides the Dahr Abî Bakr Hasân al-Tammar al-mutâfâbâh, the Sahâban Thâbit b. Kuâra, the polyhistorian Mas'dûd and Ahmad b. al-Tâjîlî al-Sa'arâshî, a pupil of al-Kâirî.

Unlike the Muslim Aristotelians Râzî denies the possibility of a reconciliation between philosophy and religion. Two heretical writings figure in his bibliography: the Makhâbîr al-Amîyûn or Hâlîl al-Mu'tamâbîbûn was read in heretical circles in Qâsîm and notably among the Karâtîsîs (cf. Baghâdî, Farî, p. 281). It seems even to have influenced the famous theme of the De Trinitatibus.
Imperatorius, so dear to western rationalism from the time of Frederick II (cf. L. Masson, in K. H. R., 1920). The second, Fi Nabi al-Asýn is partly preserved in a refutation, the Kitâb Al-Râzî and Al-Nahwawâr of the Isâ'a b. Hâtim al-Râzî. The principal theses of this book are as follows: all men being by nature equal, the prophets cannot claim any intellectual or spiritual superiority. The miracles of the prophets are importunates or belong to the domain of pious legends. The teachings of religions are contrary to the one truth: the proof of this is that they contradict another. It is tradition and lazy customs that have led men to trust their religious leaders. Religions are the sole cause of the wars which ravage humanity; they are hostile to philosophical speculation and to scientific research. The alleged holy scriptures are books without value. The writings of the ancients like Plato, Aristotle, Euclid and Hippocrates have rendered much greater service to humanity. — Râzî's book undoubtedly contains the most violent polemic against religion that appeared in the course of the middle ages. It takes up to some extent the arguments of the contemporary Manichaeans against positive religions but above all it seems to be inspired by the criticism of religion in antiquity.

Râzî believed in a progress of scientific and philosophical knowledge. He claims to have advanced beyond most of the ancient philosophers. He even thinks himself superior to Aristotle and Plato. As regards medicine, he had attained the level of Hippocrates and in philosophy he feels himself close to Socrates. But after him there should come other learned men who would reject some of his conclusions just as he had sought to supplant the teachings of his predecessors.


(P. Kraus and S. Pinès)

AL-RÂZÎ, the name of three historians of Muslim Spain. 1. Muhammad b. Mūsâ b. Bâshir b. İkhâddâr b. Lâkit al-Khâshî al-Râzî, who took his name from the town of al-Rayy in Persia where he was born, came from the east to Cordova about the middle of the third century A. D. to trade there. His high degree of Arabic culture gave him a welcome in intellectual circles in the Umayyad capital and the emir Muhammad b. Abî al-Rahmân entrusted him on several occasions with diplomatic missions in the east or in Spain itself. His successor, his son Usâîbâ, showed him the same confidence; it was on his return from an embassy to Elvira [q. v.] for this prince that al-Râzî died in Râbi' II 273 (Sept. 5—Oct. 3, 886).

We would have known nothing of Muhammad al-Râzî as an historian but for a statement by Muhammad Ibn Murâzin reproduced by the Moroccan writer Muhammad al-Warrâr al-Qhârismi in his account of an embassy to Spain in 694, entitled Bilâdat al-Wârâr fî Kâlid al-Mutâr (cf. E. Lâvâr-Provensal, Les Historiens des Chérifs, Paris 1922, p. 284—286). Ibn Murâzin there says that in 471 (1079—1079) he found in a library in Seville a little book by Muhammad b. Mûsâ al-Râzî entitled Kitâb al-Râzî, relating to the conquest of Spain by the Muslims and giving detailed accounts of the Arab contingents, each distinguished by its standard (rûya) which entered the Peninsula with Mûsâ b. Nuqâr [q. v.]. The passage of Ibn Murâzin has been reproduced in the Madrid edition of the Fâsi al-Andalus of Ibn Khûtîya (cf. the Bâli). However little we know of this work of Muhammad al-Râzî, we cannot but regret its loss bitterly.


II. Ahmad b. Muhammad, son of the preceding, surnamed al-Ṭarīqī ("the chronicler"), the first in date of the great historians of al-Andalus. He was born in Spain on the 10th Dhū al-Ḥijjah 274 (April 26, 883) and died on the 12th Rajab 344 (Nov. 1, 955). He was the pupil of Cordovan scholars of repute like Ahmad b. Ḥaḍīl and Kāsim b. Asbaḥ. He wrote several monographs on the history of Spain: a Taʾrij Muṭalik al-Andalus; a description of Cordova (Kitab al-Sayf al-Qurashi) written on the plan of the description of Baghdad by Abu ʿAbd Allāh Ishaq al-Ṭabarī, a book on the Spanish maṣūḥīyya; lastly a voluminous work on the genealogies of the Arabs of Spain, Kitab al-ʿĀlī, which was to form one of the essential sources of the Qanbarat al-ʿAbdār of Ibn Ḥasan [q.v.]. These various works have unfortunately not come down to us and until quite recently we had only few quotations from Ahmad al-Ṭarīqī preserved by later writers. The recent discovery of a fragmentary manuscript of a chronicle relating to the 12th century in Spain now puts at our disposal quite extensive extracts from this author and from his son ʿIṣā (see III): these passages are collected in Documentos inéditos d'histoire hispano-arabeziane, to appear shortly.

The majority of Ahmad al-Ṭarīqī's biographers do not attribute to him any geographical work, but some, e.g. al-Dābī and Yāḥyā, notice a Spanish geographer whom they call Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Ṭarīqī who is clearly Ahmad al-Ṭarīqī; this individual, according to these authors (al-Ḵāṣṣār attributes it directly to Ahmad al-Ṭarīqī), wrote a lengthy work on the routes (maṣūḥīyya) of al-Andalus, its anchorages (marūs), its principal towns (ummarāh al-mudūn) and the six Arab ḫanāns [q.v.] which were settled there after the conquest. This description of Spain has been preserved in a Castilian translation published in 1550 by P. de Gayangos as an appendix to his Memoria sobre la autenticidad de la Crónica denominada del Mero Raso (supplemented by R. Menéndez Pidal, Catálogo de la Real Biblioteca, Manuscritos, Crónicas geográficas de España, Madrid 1898). The description forms the first part of this Crónica and in its present Castilian form comes from a translation into Portuguese, now lost, prepared by order of King Denis of Portugal towards the beginning of the sixteenth century by a cleric named Gil Pérez; the latter was no doubt the author of the second part and in the third he confined himself to summing up very briefly the historical work in the strict sense of Ahmad al-Ṭarīqī.

The description of Spain by al-Ṭarīqī, in spite of the many difficulties offered by the fact that it has passed through two translations, both often very inaccurate and corrupt in the place-names, is nevertheless a very important document from the geographical, as well as the political and social point of view for the Muslim part of Spain in the reign of ʿAbd al-Rahmān III. After a number of general reflections on al-Andalus, its situation with regard to the rest of the inhabited world, and its climate, we have an individual description of each of the principal districts, of which special use was made by Yāḥyā [q.v.] for the Spanish references in his Muqaddimah al-Bulūsh. A comparison of the Spanish text of al-Ṭarīqī's description with that of Yāḥyā enables us to discover a close relationship between the two works. They both give the same number of administrative circles (jāmāʾ) in Umayyad Spain of the 4th century, 41 in all: Cordova, Cabra, Elvira, Jaén, Tordilla, Tortosa, Taragona, Lérida, Barbitorina, Huesca, Tuda, Saragossa, Calatayud, Riberas, Medinaceli, Shantabaria, Ràccupel, Zorita, Guadalajara, Toledo, Cretó, Paḥs al-Balīṭ (Llano de las bellotas), Fīrīt, Mirida, Badajos, Béja, Osonoboa, Santarnse, Cottmra, Estani, Liabon, Nībīl, Sevilla, Carmona, Moron, Sidona (Ṣaḥib al-Rayā), Alcégiras, Rejy, Escoja and Takoróna.


III. ʿIṣā b. Ahmad b. Muhammad, son of II., grandson of I., continued his father's Umayyad chronicle down to his own time and extended the portions dealing with earlier periods by availing sources which had not been available to Ahmad al-Ṭarīqī. He has not been the subject of notice by any of the Spanish biographers already published but he is frequently quoted by later historians, notably by Ibn Ḥāyan [q.v.], Ibn Saʿīd [q.v.] and Ibn al-Abhar [q.v.]. According to the latter, he also wrote a monograph on the ḫāṭiṣah [q.v.] of the Umayyad court of Cordova: Kišāb al-Ḥujjājah bi-l-ʿAṣābūd. Bibliography: Ibn Ḥāyan, al-Muṣawhib, Oxford ma., passim; Ibn al-Abhar, al-Hallat al-ḥiyara, in Dory, Notices sur quelques manuscrits arabes, Leyden 1847—1851, p. 74; al-Ḳāṣī, Naṣḥ al-Thib (Analectes), ii. 671; Fons Boigués, Ensayo, No. 41; A. González Palencia, Hist. de la lt. ar. esp., p. 131.

(E. LEVI-PROVENCAL)

AMIN AHMAD RAZI, a Persian biographer. Hardly anything is known of his life. He belonged to Kain where his father Khwāja Mīrzā Ahmad was celebrated for his wealth and benevolence. He was in high favour with ʿAbbās the Great and was appointed by him hāštaran of his native town. His paternal uncle Khwāja Muhammad Shari' was viceroy of Khurasān, Yard and Ifṣānān, his cousin Chiyāʾ Beg a high official at the court of the Emperor Akbar. Amin himself is said to have visited India. The work to which he owes his fame is the great collection of biographies Haft Iḥšān (finished in 1602 = 1594). For many years he collected information about famous men until finally he yielded to the entreaties of one of his friends and arranged his material in book form. The final editing of it took six years. The
biographies are arranged geographically according to the 7 climes. In each clime the biographical part is preceded by a short geographical and historical introduction which is followed by notes on poets, udvaras, famous sheikhs etc. in chronological order. The work is of special importance for the history of Persian literature, as the biographies of poets contain numerous specimens of their work, some of which are very rare. It contains the following sections: Clime I: Yaman, Birkh al-Zanjâdî, Nubia, China. Clime II: Mecca, Medina, Yezd, Hamzâ, Dehân, Abâdân, Mashhad, Samâsh, Qom, Astarâbâd, Tabaristan, Masandarân, Gilân, Khuzestân, Alborz, Ardabil, Marâşh. Clime V: Shirwân, Gurgâ, Qâshqâi, Milâzâni al-Nâhir, Samsâm, Bakhtshâ. Clime VI: Kurdistan, Fârâb, Yarkand, Rita, Constantiopolis, Rum. Clime VII: Bulghâr, Sabkâh, Yâdudj, Mâdžûd. Unfortunately this valuable work has not yet been published. Mawlawi 'Abî al-Muḥtâr began his edition in the Bibliotheca Indiana, but so far only one part has appeared (Calcutta 1918).

**REDIF** (Ar. ṭâdīf), "what follows immediately after a person or thing (Fagan, Additions); one mounted on a croup, pillon-rider"; cf. for use in the figurative sense in a composite epithet in Turkish (Persian): ʿiṣâr-ṭâdīf-ʿamîrī : "the victorious army (one which has victory on its croup)." (Turk. Tr. 1270 A. H., 22). The synonym termāl and, more rarely, ṭâdīf, "the act of treading to follow or join, to make to accompany," are also sometimes used in Turkish as well as the words ṭâdīf, termāl, and ʿamîrī. As a technical term ṭâdīf, pronounced termāl, has been used: 1. in Persian and Turkish prosody; 2. in the Ottoman army.

1. Persian and Turkish prosody. — Redif is a kind of "hyper metre" (taking this word in a wider sense than in classical or even English prosody), i.e. the part of the line which follows the rhyme (hâjtār: in Neo-Turkish: ṭâdīf) or more exactly the last syllable of the latter (râzwâd), or which comes between two words forming a rhyme. The termāl may consist of one or more suffixes, particles or independent words. The old theorists however disputed the quality of redif to repeated suffixes and gave different names to each of the (Arabic) letters representing them: mālīf (first letter); mālīf (second); mālīf (third); mālīf (fourth). In Persian and Turkish prosody the same redif is repeated at the end of all the lines of a piece of poetry.

Although it made its appearance in Turkish as early as the xith century, the redif is an especially Persian invention. Indeed in the national "Turkish" poetry (syllabic metre) suffixes or particles repeated at the end of the lines count as rhyme (Kowalski, Ze Studjow na Form poezji liter. starow. tworczest Czocz, 1922, p. 33). The redif existed in classical Arabic only in an embryonic form and under another name (Garcin de Tassy, Rhétorique, p. 143). The redif fell into disuse in Turkey in the xith century, probably under the influence of French poetry.

In addition to this special use in prosody the name redif is sometimes given to the second term of an ʿadīf, i.e. of a hendiatris (mīnâsīyâr) of which the two terms rhyme or are alliterative; for example Pers. ʿallâma dâkim, bâzî mūzâh, karâ dâbây, Tur. ʿarâk bâzî, ṭâdīf zîrî (Zârâbî, Târûkh, transl. p. 126, 126, 326, 371). Murašâbîh (murašâbî) means "synonymy.

2. Turkish military usage. — Mahmûd II gave the name of redif (ṣânûr redif-i mâsûlî) to the reserve army created in 1834 (Ismal and Nâsîr Gâvîr, Târîxî, p. 425). The historian Lütfî (iv. 144) speaking of the project for this army, under the year 1249 (May 21 1833 — May 9 1834) explains the meaning of the term by saying that it was a force "that came after" the regular army (mâyâsâr redif-i nîzâmâyî). They were therefore not soldiers who had, at need, to mount behind the cavalry on the croupe, like the Roman velites. Redif was contrasted with nizâmâyî or ʿâshîr-i nizâmâyî or ʿâshîr-i mâyâsâr, taken in the strict sense of active or regular army (standing army) and with ṭâdīf or "reserve of the regular army." For the lack of an exact equivalent we may say militia in English and "armée de réserve" or "garde nationale" in French. The German term "Landwehr" is perhaps nearest it but in the Prussian rather than the Austrian sense. Sometimes the redifs are included in the nizâmâyî, taking the latter term in a wider sense of regular or disciplined troops (synonym murrâbîh). Lütfî (loc. cit.) calls the redif šânîr ʿâshîr-i nizâmâyî "a kind of regular troops.

The characteristic feature of the redif army was the existence of permanent cadres, ferocious in character. It was linked with the regular army by its officers and with the reserve by its men (ṣânûr redif). It was the object of its creators that this army should provide a large number of men if necessary without imposing too long a period of service on the rural population (Lütfî, op. cit.).

It was decided from the first that the redif should consist of battalions (tabûr) and indeed this organisation by battalion depots (tabûr dâšâl, dâšâr) remained in force as long as the redif existed. The commanders of these battalions (bâshâîr) were at first chosen from the chief local families (mawallîr: kâmilânâmân). The first battalions formed in 1250 (May 10 1834 to April 28 1835) were those of the sanâbâs (q.v.) of Karâbâj Shâh, Anâkar, Kânsîrî (Cankîrî), Sîrîn and Mesûrîsîlî Bey, hereditary Kurd governor of Palu, was appointed colonel of the three battalions in the şâbâs known as those of the "Imperial Mines" (mâyâsî-ı kâmilânâmân) in the syâṣet of Shews (Lütfî, iv. 172). There were three to four battalions in the sanâbâs, or 10 to 12 in the syâṣet. The officers received a quarter of the usual pay, but were only expected to serve and wear uniform two days a week (Mosalî Nûr Pâshâ, Nasîfî, ib. Whâdî, iv. 109).

In 1252 (April 18, 1836 to April 6, 1837), the redif was organised in wide groups with a high command: mâyâsî-ı mikhâr (mêrâzî) or "militaryship" (cf. müsûbûh) or "redif," conferred upon the mâtāl. The first were those of the syâṣet of Karâman (Konya), Koundîvandî (Brussa: garden and shâbâs), Anâkar, Aydin, Erin, Edirne, A.
the same time plans were made to raise the money required for this purpose. The military marshals were given the ḥawání (θαυμαζειν) or cloaks of their own rank. Just as the troops of the line (meyyâr) were distinguished from those of the guard (khusus) so there were redefi meyeyr and redefi khusus. The appointment of commanders of divisions was to follow (for details see the Taḥriq-i ʿālī or report of the grand vizier Moḥammad Eʿtimad ʿAlī Pāsha in Luṭfī, v. 165—170). If we may believe the khusus hāmânūn promulgated on this occasion by Moḥammad II, these first promulgated every satisfaction (shuṣh, p. 74).

When the Military School (mekkāt-i hâkime) instituted in 1517 began to supply officers, the redefi under-arms was converted into active forces and the officers were sent back to their ʿoḏāyī (Nerāḏīf Ḥāl-Wadāʾī, lv. 109—110). The service as redefi (kahāmāt redefi) was now definitely to assume the character of a kind of period of service in the reserve or intermittent service the duration of which (mekkāt-i redefi) was to be fixed under conditions which we shall explain below.

In the khusus hāmânūn of Gūłkāhne (Nov. 31, 1839) there is an allusion to an approaching improvement in the system of regional recruiting. In 1838, five years had been fixed as the period of service in the regular army, previously practically unlimited (one saw young married soldiers leaving their families for life), but this measure did not immediately make its effect felt (cf. von Molke, Lettres sur l'Orient, n.d., p. 241, letter No. xlviii.).

On Sept. 6, 1843 the military law of the reʾĀdāb Rīḍ. Pāsha (Engelhardt, i. 71) was promulgated, a law of fundamental importance, half French and half German in character, the principles of which were derived from the most recent legislation; it confirmed the period of regular service at five years (later reduced to four), to be followed by a period of seven years during which a redefi could be recalled to the colours for a month each year (later every two years). Each ordu (army corps) was to have its redefi contingent (redefi redefi) placed in time of peace under the orders of a brigadier-general (Amir, brigade) who lived at the headquarters of the ordu. In 1853 (Ubicini, i. 459) the redefi were organised into four (out of 6 ordu, namely those of khusūs (Subutari [Asia] and Smyrna), Deriš-čețed (Istanbul and Anakara), Rumeli (Manṣūrāt) and Anatolia (Harput). The ordu of Arabiston and the İrāk were still to be organised. Ubicini adds this observation: "By means of this organisation the government has secured. . . a force at its disposal equal to the regular army and capable of being moved in a few weeks either to the line of the Balkans or to any other point in the empire". According to Bianchi (Guida della navigazione, 1852, p. 209), the organised reserve (müreddif redefi) was then 150,000 men compared with 300,000 of the regular army.

Rusain ʿĀwī Pāsha's law of 1869, more clearly French in character (Aristarchi, iii. 514; Engelhardt, ii. 37 243), provided for 4 years active service and one of ʿibāyī or in the active reserve, a period of 6 years in the redefi in two bands (redefi mukaddem and redefi ʿālī) of 3 years each (according to Engelhardt: of 4 and 2 years respectively). In practice in 1877 there were 3 bands, the third (redefi ʿālī) being represented by the territorial army (mukaddem) then mobilised (Zboinski, p. 98). A conscript who obtained a lucky number in the draw was drafted directly into the redefi army (art. 17).

The law of 27th Safar 1304 = 13th Tashrih-i thān û (Nov. 25, 1886; résumé by Lamouches, p. 77 and Young, ii. 394) prepared by a commission of reorganisation which included Muṣaffar Wāll Rıḍ. Pāsha and von der Goltz Pāsha, fixed the period of redefi service at 9 years, but was soon afterwards followed by a special law (redefi hānūn) of 10th Muharram 1305 (Sept. 28, 1887). According to this, which was however not put into force till 1892, the period of redefi service was 8 years. The ranks in the redefi were the same as in the regular army from general of division down to sergeant-major. These officers formed at the same time the personnel of the recruiting offices for the whole army.

According to the law regulating the uniforms of the army on land (elbistiʾ-āshbera mišmān-i māzam) of the 29th Dēmādī 1327 = 5th Ḥārīrī 1325 (June 18, 1909), the redefi soldiers wore distinctive headdress, a dark-green (redefi) piping (azib, Pers. ʿezāb, Turk. ʿezāb) at the bottom of the collar (yalah) of the tunic (ṣafart or ʿezāb; modern spelling: ʿezāb, ʿezāb). The officers wore a piece of cloth of the same colour 7 centimetres in length fastened on the collar of the uniform tunic (ṣafart) or the full dress tunic (ṣafart; older ʿezāb; cf. Pers. ʿezāb) (Dustur, Terti-ī ʿezāb, i. 276; A. Biliotti and Ahmed Seddī, Legislation ottomane, Paris 1912, p. 171 399).

The redefi system was abandoned by the Young Turks. The law of 18th Ramadan 1330 = 18th Agustos 1328 (Aug. 31, 1912) without proclaiming the dissolution of the corps ordered the formation of units of müreddif with elements furnished by the battalion depots in the second inspection (mülkātīk) of redefi (Dustur, Terti-ī ʿezāb, i. 615). The Young Turks have been reproached with this measure and some have even seen in it the cause of the Turkish defeat in the Balkan War.

Bibliography: 1. Garcin de Tassy, Histoire et provo de geol, la l'Orient musulman, Paris 1873, index under redefi, redfi, taradif, mürreddif; Quatremère, Histoire des Mongols de Persia, p. 28, note; M. ūlîmî Nâṣīrī, Hādīkāhā ʿāsbūy, Istanbul 1307, s.v. redefi, redfi, mürreddif, p. 78, 84 and 86. Cf. also the Bibliography of the article Arjîn.

materialism. He often travelled a great distance to visit a particular scholar but always was disappointed. The poet Nesmī [q.v.] was the first to teach him the science of God and the truth, and ordered him to teach this truth in turn to the people of Kūm, and for this purpose he had to speak in Turkish. He therefore wrote his Buğd sheriff, the message of joy", which he finished on the first Friday of Ramaḍān 811 (Jan. 18, 1409).

This work is not yet printed; it is quite short and written in the same metre as "Ashīq Paşa's Ghiyāshān, a ronci of six feet with irregular pauses. The Hurif teaching is expounded in a very proper style, the merits of the names and letters, the sacred number 32, the prophet, the throne of God, the human countenance, the splitting of the moon, Faḍl Allah [q. v., the founder of the Hurif sect — all this is dealt with from the usual Hurif point of view. As sources an "Arba'ānā, a Dīwān al-šarī'ī, and Maṣāḥih al-bāb are quoted; the first and third are probably the works of the same names by Faḍl Allah, the second according to Rā'i was written by Abūl-Kāfi (d. 707 = 1307).

Another of Reft's works is the Book of Treasure" (Gəmiddən). It is printed in the Stambul edition of the Dīwān of Nesmī. The Gəmiddən is better as poetry and on the whole less Hurif than generally șaff in tone. Many of the Hurif and philosophic point of view, Faḍl Allah and Ahmad [q. Muḥammad], the forty, the greatest Name ( itemName) is "the water of life etc. are discussed in it.

Nesmī and his pupil Reft seem to be the only Ottoman Hurif poets of importance, and while the sect, in spite of all persecutions, continued to exist after the battle and even had connections with the Baktāzayn, these two poets as such do not seem to have produced any school. So far as I am aware the first historian of Turkish literature has taken any interest in Reft, until quite recently Kəpəllən-tazade Mehməd Fuğd, who has even promised as a special study of him.


Reft is the word for the minister of the empire, used in Turkey, properly "chief of the men of the pen", a high Ottoman dignitary, directly under the grand vizier, originally head of the chancery of the imperial Dīwān (dīwān-i hamāyūn), later secretary of state or chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs. According to d'Herbelot he was called also rets kāṭəf.

This office, unlike many others, is purely Ottoman, at least as regards the particular line of development that it took. Establishing itself at the expense of the functions of the miḥānī [q.v.], we may say that it owes nothing to the influence of the more or less francised Sallā hakkı, nor to the Byzantines. In its origins it seems rather to be connected with a more general and more vague institution of the East, one which deserves more profound study: that of the secretaries of the dīwān or chief of the secretariat of the Dīwān. This office is found in different Muslim countries under different names: ṣarā'ūn among the Mongols of Persia, dīwān ṣeš among the Timūrids, wānī in Persia (cf. Chardin, vi. 175; Eskiyā Celebi, ii. 267). In the Ottoman provinces there was attached also to the dīwān an important official known as the dīwān efendii; in Egypt, under Mehməd 'Ali, the dīwān efendii became a kind of president of the council of ministers. The rets uklūkab were in brief the dīwān efendii of the capital. It is perhaps to this that we owe the use of the title rets efendii, by which they were more commonly known. We know that the term efendii was generally applied to people of the pen. This connection seems to have already been noticed by E. Blochot (Voyage en Orient de Carlier Piron, Paris 1902, p. 83).

While the time of Sulaimān the Magnificent, the title rets uklūkab (or rets efendii) was not used. At least this is what we are told by Ahmed Resmi, who quotes in this connection the Bedevi uklūkab of the historian Koçja Hüsèin Efendi of Sarajevo (cf. Babinger, G.O. W., p. 186). The latter, who was himself rets uklūkab, says that before Sulaimān, the official correspondence was in the hands of the evvən-i ahkam or "depository of the decisions (of the Dīwān)" along with the miḥānī. This point of view has been adopted by other historians (v. Hammer; cf. also the Sulhāname-i Nisavi-i hikayeti).

There is however no agreement as to who was the first rets uklūkab; it is usually said to have been İclal (Djeclā)-tazade Mustafa Celebi [q.v.] (cf. Babinger, G.O. W., p. 102). This well known historian, whose genealogy is taken back to the legendary founder of Byzantium, Yanko b. Mādiya, was rets uklūkab in 591 (1524—25) before becoming miḥānī, but the Nukhib uklūkab of Mehməd b. Mehməd refers to the death in 930 (1523—24) of a rets uklūkab of the name of Haidar Efendi. According to other indications, it would even appear that the office goes back to Mehməd II [cf. the article RÝS KÝRŠ].

The rets or office of rets efendii lasted over three centuries during which its holder changed 130 times, the average tenure of office being between 10 and 15 years, which reveals a remarkable lack of ministerial stability: some of the occupiers held the office twice, three, and even four times.

Duties of the rets efendii. As secretary of state the rets kept records of memaros and reports (telbāt and tafāreb) presented to the sultan by the grand vizier acting as representative of the government and of the Dīwān. These documents which were prepared by the amel-i dīwān-i hamāyūn or patkāfiji (referendar or reporter of the Imperial Dīwān) were brought in a bag (ṭabeh) for the purpose of the ceremonial sittings of the Dīwān by the rets himself who handed them to the grand vizier. After being read they were given to a special officer, the telbātijī, whose duty it was to present them to the sultan.

As chancellor the rets had a kind of jurisdiction over all the civil functionaries and the immediate
head of the department of the Imperial Divān (divān-i kümâyûn kalēmī).

This chancellory was divided into three offices (oda or hâkim):

1. the beyli̇k, the most important, saw to the despatch of imperial rescripts (ferman), orders of the viziers, and in general all ordinances (nezâmed) other than those of the department of finance (devârî derdâr dârâs). This office kept copies of them as did the grand vizier also. Ordinances bearing on the task of the signature of the clerk, of the chief editor (mânsûrî), and of the head of the office (beyli̇kî) were submitted to the latter by the beyli̇k who placed his sign (reştî) upon them and, if it was a ferman, sent it to the nihağînî for the tağrah (q.v.) to be placed upon it. — The beyli̇k in addition retained the originals of civil and military regulations (fihrist or hımûn-nâmî) (usually elaborated by the nihağînî as well as of treaties and capitulations (hâmî-î) with foreign powers. The reştî had to consult these treaties, notably when certifying the der-hâmî or "marginal" answers put by his subordinates on the requests or notes, known as verbal (tahere), which the ambassadors addressed to the grand vizier. It is this side of his activity which, gradually becoming more and more important and absorbing, ended by making the reştî a Minister of Foreign Affairs.

2. office of the tağrah or "annual renewal" of the diplomas of the governors of provinces (kâzî), of the brevets of the vellât or judges in towns of the first class (tağrahî), of the brevets of the timariots or holders of military fields (tağrahî formalî).

3. office of the reştîs or "previsions" of different officials, as well as of the orders for pensions from the treasury (reştî) or from waqfî (cf. the details of the organization of this office in Monradge d'Ohsen, vol. 161).

The reştîs accompanied the grand vizier to the audiences which the aylân gave him and to those which the grand vizier himself gave to ambassadors. He shared with his master the midday meal as did the taqrah bâbî (cf. Sâwâzî) and the two tekerîgî, except on Wednesdays when these two were replaced by the four judges of Istanbul.

In the official protocol the reştîs had the same rank as the taqrah bâbî with whom he walked in official processions, before the devârî dârâs (which showed he was of lower rank than the latter). The sûâbî or epistolary formula to which they were entitled will be found in Fertûn, Muhsînî, p. 10. It is the same as for the aqshâ of the sirrî [cf. kirdâr] and the deşer emînî. For the dress of the reştîs see Brinck, Ancient Costumes Turkey, pl. 2; Castellan, iv. 107.

According to Mouradge d'Ohsen, the reştî used to act as agents for the khâns of the Crimea.

Administrative career of the reştîs. The reştîs, like all Ottoman officials, were chosen by the aylân or grand vizier as they pleased, but, except in case of appointment by favor, they followed a fixed line of promotion (parîz) in the administration. It was in the administrative offices, i.e. among the bağlıgâhî (Persian plur. which was given as an honorific title to the principal clerks or bağlıgî or hâmî-î nihağînî) that this career was spent.

In examining the Sefiîn al-Rizâ of Ahmed Reşid, we find that up to the reştîs Boyâlf Mehmed Efendi (Pâshî) (d. 977 = 1569-1570) there is no information available about the career of the reştîs, but starting with him we find that the reştîs were regularly chosen from among the former tekerîgî, of the vezir or of the grand vizier. From Şehîtâlâ Abdî Efendi (d. in 1014 = 1605-1606) the reştîs were mainly taken from the vezir mekhâbîkî or private secretaries of the grand vizier. These secretaries were themselves at the head of an office (oda) which contained a very small number of officers (hâmî or hâmî, pl. hâmî') (hâmî); there were only two between the years 1090 and 1100. When the number increased (at a later date there were about 30) the career of the future reştîs was as follows: hâmî in the office in question, called also mekhâbîkî, pad-i ait adârî, then ser-hâmî or hâmî-hâmî "chief clerk", then mekhâbîkî. The post of mekhâbîkî was much sought after. It brought its holder into close contact with the grand vizier and it was then very easy to advance oneself. More rarely the future reştî rose through the similar but less important office of secretary to the lieutenant to the grand vizier or Khâya Bey (acteda kûlîhî adârî).

The rûhiyat did not mark the end of a career but gave access to still higher posts (see art. nihağînî for the old rules of promotion by which the reştîs became nihağînî). It was one of what were known as the "six [principal] dignities", which, namely, the nihağînî, devârî dârâs, reştî usâhî, deşer emînî, shîbî thâsî deşer-dârî, shîbî thâsî deşer-dârî (Ahmed Râsim, Turîhâ, p. 756).

According to the Naşihat-nâmê (p. 39-40 of the French translation; cf. this Encyclopaedia, iv. 815-816), the reştî was under the authority of the Grand Defterdar (for financial matters only).

Increasing importance of the office of reştî. — The growing influence of the reştî is explained by the increasing importance of foreign policy in Turkey (the Eastern question).

Down to the end of the xvith century the nihağînî were certainly superior to the reştîs: they controlled and even revised the orders and decisions of the divân (aḫbâm), but from the xvith century onwards reştîs like Oğlu-nâve Mehemmed Shâh Efendi, Lâm' Ali Çelebi and Hûkûm Efendi shed a certain lustre on their office. From 1660 (1650) the incapacity of certain nihağînû precipitated the decline of their office in spite of the ephemeral efforts by grand viziers like Şehîd 'Ali Pâshî and of the nihağînî appointed by him (Râşîd Efendi and Selim Efendi). It was in this period that the office of hâmî-î nihağînî was created (cf. above).

The Ottoman protocol (teşâfî-fâtî) was nevertheless still to retain for a long time traces of the originally rather subordinate position of the reştîs. For example they did not sit in the office of the Divân itself, called Divân-şâhîne (in the Top Kapu Sarayî or "Old Serai"), but remained seated outside of the room in a place called reştî tahrî, "the bench of the reştî", where there were seats for certain other officials to wait upon. In the formal sittings, even in those like the distribution of pay (hâmî) to the janissaries which took place in the presence of foreign ambassadors, the part played by the reştî was rather limited. He carried in with slow step and the sleeves of his a rá turned up the bag containing the hâmî (cf. above). He kissed the hem (ezê) of the grand vizier's robe, placed the bag on his left, kissed the hem of his robe again and withdrew to his place. He came in again to open the bag, handed the documents to
the grand vizier, took them back from him to fold them (bâgâlûna), sealed them and gave them to the kadîbêlî. If he was unable to be present, the bag of the kadîbêlî was handed to the grand vizier by the kadîbêlî kendibêlî (Kânûnî-nâmè of 'Abd al-Rahmân Paşa, p. 85, 123 etc.).

Lucas (Second Voyage, Paris 1712, p. 215) writes that during the audience given by the grand vizier to the French Ambassador 'le Ray, Assyndy on Grand Chancellor demena debout et appuye contre la muraille'.

Things were changed at the reform of the Divan effected at the beginning of his reign (1702) by Selim's desires of limiting the power of the grand vizier. The old Divan consisted of six masters of the dome (having only one consultative voice), of the Maffût (Sheikh al-Islâm) and the two bukhâters. The new Divan was to consist of 10 members by right of office and others chosen in different ways (about 40 in all). The members by right of office were the Kâhya Bey, the Re's Efendi, the Grand Deftârî, the Câleb Efendi, the Tarsûne Emîni, the Çawûsh Bâshî etc. (Zincke, Geschichte, viii., 1853, p. 341).

The office of râfi tended more and more to become the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Sublime Porte, parallel to the post of Kâhya Bey (Interior).

Suppression of the dignity of râfi. — The title of râfi was suppressed by the kâhidî-kendibêlî of Sultan Mahomed II addressed on Friday 23th Ulûl 'Kûsûr 1251 (March 11, 1836) to the grand vizier Mehmed Emin Paşa. The Turkish text will be found in the Silmûnî of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the French translation (or at least parts of it) was published in the Ministre Ottoman of April 23, 1836 (according to A. Ubelinc, Lettres sur la Turquie, p. 38, note 1). This document at the same time created two new ministries (ministre) which in memory of their origin remained in the end in the same building as the grand vizierate [cf. Kânûnî 'Atîf in Suppl. 1], the Ministry of the Interior (originally of civil affairs or mââkerî-mââyîne, later dâkkîbêlî) replacing the department of the Kâhya Bey, and 2, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (kahûbêlîbì) replacing that of the râfi. The preamble said that, abandoning the old responsibilities of the ministry, it was certain that it was thought advisable to create real posts of worth (renâverî) and not honorary ones, but without its being necessary to give the new term of foreign affairs the title of paçhe [q. v.], "which is mainly a military term".

Bibliography: By far the most important source is the work known as Sefînet âl-Kâtîr, which consists of: 1. Ahmad Resîm's work (Bâhinî, G. O. R., p. 309-373) which contains the biographies of 64 râfi down to Râghîb Mehmed Efendi (1157 = 1744), and 2. its continuation by Sulaimân Fâtîh Efendi which contains the biographies of 30 râfi down to Ahmad Wâsîf Efendi at the beginning of the sixteenth century. According to the preface to Sulaimân Fâtîh's (not Fâlik) continuation, Ahmad Resîm had entitled himself Târîkh ad-sifârîn ad-Âshûrîn (in imitation of the Hadîth âsârûn ad-Âshûrîn of Oghmûnî-ad-Târîkh, but changed it at the suggestion of Râghîb Paşa to Sefînet âl-Kâtîr in the references in the Catalogue of Turkish MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale by E. Blochet, ii. 125, should be corrected accordingly). The word bâgâlûna apparently makes no sense, that of Kadîbêlî is usually found in other works (Flâgel, Cât., ii. 407, Nûr, 1250; Bahînger, Brussel Mehmed Tâhir, iii. 39 note), does not seem correct either. One ought undoubtedly to read kâhidîbêlî (which rhymes with the hadîth of the prototype). The Sefînet ad-Âshûrî was published by the State Press in Istanbul in 1269.

Cf. also in addition to the references in the text: Mouradse d'Ohsson, Etats de l'Empire Othomân, vii., 1824, index; Joseph von Hammer, Des osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung und Staatsgewohnheiten, Vienna 1815, ii., index; Kâhidî-kendibêlî 'Abd al-Rahmân Paşa, written in 1067 (1667-1677) and ed. by F. Kûrûzîlî (M. T. M., p. 508); Evâd Efendi, Tarihîf sâlîb, Ayyar, p. 85, 123 etc.; Silmûnî-i Neşret-i Kâhidîbêlî, 1st year, 1301 (1885); Imprimerie Ebûsîzaya, Istanbul (contains in addition a historical résumé and a chronological list of all the grand viziers and all the râfis); Charles Perry, A View of the Levant, particularly of Constantinople etc., London 1743, p. 36. — On the sâhîb ad-Âshûrîn ur râfi'il ad-Âshûrîn, see Kaçarî Ahmed, Sâhîb ad-Âshûrî, i. 101 sqq.; vi. 14, 17-18, 50; Massâ, Cité de la Chancellerie d'État... d'Ab ad-Âshûra, in B.T.P.C., xl. 79 sqq. — Among the Saldîkêî, the offices of sâhîb ad-Âshûra and pervânî were quite separate; cf. Houtman, Reisit a. Textes..., Sély, iii. 105. — (J. Deny)

Reiyo, the name given in Muslim Spain to the administrative circle (âbûra) comprising the south of the Peninsula, the capital of which was successively Archidona (Arabic: Urđûdûn) and Malaga. The usual Arabic orthography is âbûra; in particular this is the form found in the Muqaddimah of Ibn al-Farîd; but some Spanish MSS. give the true orthography âbûra, more in keeping with the local pronunciation Reiyo (Raiyu) attested by Ibn Hawâkî. It is only, as Dory thought, a transcription of the Latin reio (no doubt Malacitana reio); the suggestion put forward by Gayangos of a connection with the Persian town-name âbûrî is of course untenable.

Where the feys in the south of Spain were assigned to the former companions of Baldî b. Bîhr [q. v.], the district of Reiyo was allotted to the âbûrî of Jordan (al-âbûrîn). During the Umayyad caliphate of Cordova, the âbûra of Reiyo was bounded by those of Cabra and Algeciras in the west, by the Mediterranean in the south and by the âbûra of Elvira in the east.


(É. Lévi-Provençal)

Rejmat, first a district, then a town and lastly the capital of the province of Rejmat in Persia. As V. Barthold points out (Gêzîm e a hokîst Tâmmûnî, in Bull. de l'Inst. Can. d'Hist. et d'Archéol., Tbilis 1927, vol. vi.), our
information regarding the history and historical geography of Gilân is so far very scanty. Le Strange's remark that the position of the chief towns of Gilân cannot be exactly given is still true. The Tamanaski MS. (twelfth century) is the earliest to inform us that before the foundation of towns their names were already in existence as those of districts. In particular seven districts are mentioned in the eastern part of Gilân on this side of the river — Biepai (Islam having penetrated there from the east), and eleven in the western part on the other side of the river — Biepas. Among the seven eastern districts we find one called Lâh-e-Lâhidjûn (i.e. Lâhidjûn) and among the eleven western ones that of Rešt. The towns of this name did not exist at this time. They are not mentioned, in fact, until the Mongol period.

General. Gilân is now divided into 10 districts (of which five are called Hamun-ye-Tâwâsh), that of Mawštâ with Rešt, capital of the province, being the most important. According to Rabino (1917), the town of Rešt, has a population of 30,000, and the district of Mawštâ 90,500 out of the total of 359,300 for the province. These figures must have increased by now. Rešt, also called Dâr al-Marz or *frontierland*, lies between two small rivers, the Sâhrâbâr or Seîgilân in the east and the Gowher-rûd in the west, which unite and flow into the Bay of Enzel (now Pehlevi), which is eight miles from the town. The bazaars occupy a considerable part of the centre of the town, which is traversed by dark and narrow streets. Only a few years ago Rešt had very few broad streets and was only partly paved. Recently there have been steps taken to improve matters. The town is divided into 7 mahallas: Zâhidjân, Mahalleh-yé-bâzîr, Khumayrân, Khumayrân-o-Zâhidjân, Usâîd Serî, Camûr Serî and Khâyî. It has some 500 houses, 3,500 shops, 20 caravanserais for merchants and 25 for caravans, 40 mosques, 12 sanctuaries, 36 tekkes, 6 madresses, 35 bathes, and 7 bridges (all these figures refer to the period before the War). Among the mosques only the Mâsjid-î Şafi, the oldest, seems to be of any interest. Hasan Beg, author of the Akhm al-Tâwâsh, calls it Mâsjid-î Şafi and adds that when Ismâ'il Shah fled from Ardabil to Gilân, he spent some time near this mosque. In its courtyard there is a well into which women throw silver in order that their prayers may be granted. The Imam-Zade Saiyid Abû Dîaar, is the most important sanctuary of Rešt, near the governor's palace. The holy man buried there is called 'Abd al-Fattâh, the beloved of the Imam. Istâdî Dîfar whom the name of the quarter, Usâîd Serî. The ladies of Rešt always have had the reputation of being of easy virtue. According to a poet of the country, Mawlıš Sâ'il Gilân: *the young women of Rešt, like intoxicated peacocks* would go seeking a purchaser in every bazaar, holding in their hands the knot of their trousers*.

There are in Rešt two important clans: the Tâfe-yé Hâjîjî Samî (who came originally from Tabarz) and the Al-e Unâsh (of very humble local country origin). The language of the common people of Rešt is a dialect of Gholki. The upper and middle classes use Persian. Azeri-Turkish is also spoken. The inhabitants are all Shi'is except for a few Bahâ'. Gilân was converted to Islam only at the beginning of the tenth century by the Alî Imâm Hasan b. 'Ali al-Utrum after a popular rising against the Djuştûnîs (cf. Barthold, Istorie-Geografia Oluve Iranu, S. Petersburg 1903, p. 156). All the people of the Biepas were of the Hanball school except the chiefs of Fîmen and the inhabitants of Kûtîshpâh (Shâf'î). It was only after the annexation of Gilân to the kingdom of Persia by the Safawis that the people of the Biepas became converted from the Sunna to the Shi'a. According to another story however, Islam was preached in Dailâm and Gilân in the year 903 (1503) by the Sâyiîd Nâşir Kabîr, one of the 'Alîid pretenders to the caliphate, who belonged to the Zâdi Shah, *of which he was one of the learned men and an author*. In this account the conversion to Islam is placed under the auspices of the Shi'a (cf. Seyyed-ol-Molk, L. 42). The last adherents of the religion of Zoroaster have not yet disappeared from Gilân. People look for white cows because of their crowing presages good fortune; the custom is observed of lighting a fire and jumping over it (*fîr shomâ-yé akher-e cîk*). On the road from Fûmen, about one mile from Rešt, a place preserves the name of Ategh-kâde. S. A. Kasrawi (op. cit., p. 31) does not however seem certain that Zoroastrianism was widespread in Gilân. Generally speaking, the people were indifferent in matters of religion. We may note however that many trees, called saints, *for kozar-wâr*, are objects of worship, especially on the part of women (cf. notably; Welîns near the Arûk bridge; Čheh Doğhter and Aghâ Bîhi Zainab).

Rešt is the principal export and import market for trade with Russia. Its importance as the economic centre of Gilân varies with the rise and fall in the silk-culture. Barthold thinks (op. cit.) that the development of urban life and industry in Gilân belongs to a period later than the tenth century. The geographers of the tenth century mention the cultivation of the silkworm and silks only in Tabarz. In the eleventh century and later the silk of Gilân was particularly famous. At the end of this century, the silk of Gilân, according to Marco Polo, was sought by Genoese merchants, whose vessels first appeared in the Caspian shortly before Marco Polo wrote.

**History.** S. A. Kasrawi (op. cit.) gives a sketch of the dynasties of the Djuştûnîs (end of the second to the beginning of the fourth century A.H.), the Mawšûrs (beginning of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century A.H.), and the Khârâdâris (fourth century) who, especially the first, played a certain part in the destinies of Gilân.

In Rabino's work we have a complete historical survey from the Mongol conquest (1307) to the Persian revolution. The Tamanaski MS., unknown to Rabino, contains some information about the preceding period.

In it Gilân is described as a populous and wealthy country. All the work was done by women. The men had no occupation except fighting. Throughout Dailâm and Gilân in every village there were one or two fights a day; every village fought with every other. Many people were often killed in a single day. These quarrels and battles went on until the men went to war or died or grew old. When they grew old they became pious and were called mawâqir (knowing the customs). In all the districts of Gilân, if any one insulted another or became intoxicated or committed any act that caused injury, he was punished with
against foreign occupation of Persian territory. Assisted by Germans (von Parseben), Turkish and Russian officers, an armed force was organised to oppose the passage of the English troops under General Dunsterville on their way to Baghêd, without much success however (battle of Mendjil, June 12, 1918). The English were able to force their way through with the help of Bierckhlov’s detachment of Cossacks and established a garrison in Reht. A second battle with the *djengeli* in the town itself on July 20, 1918 also ended in an English victory. On Aug. 25, peace was signed with Kélik Kahn at Enzelii. At one time, at the end of March 1918, the position of Kélik Kahn was so strong that the capture not only of Kermien, but even of Teherân was feared. The English Vice-Comon at Reht, Mr. Maclaren, the manager of the Imperial Bank of Persia in this town, Mr. Oakshott, and Captain Noel of the Intelligence Service were taken prisoners by the *djengeli*, the latter being held for five months (cf. The Adventures of Dunsterville by Maj. Gen. I. C. Dunsterville, London 1920).

Reht again became the arena of the revolutionary movement in 1920. After the capture of Baghêd on April 28, 1920, by the Reds, the White Fleet sought refuge in the port of Enzelii, which was held by the English. Comrade Raskolnikov, commander of the Red Fleet in the Caspian, pursuing the Whites occupied Enzelii on May 18, 1920 and forced the English to beat a hurried retreat. The appearance of Soviet troops at Enzelii encouraged the revolutionary movement in Giliân and on June 4 a revolutionary and anti-English government of Northern Persia was proclaimed at Reht with Kélik Kahn at its head.

At the first appearance of Red forces at Enzelii and Reht, the peasants had refused to take the land which the communists proposed to take from the landowners. The peasants feared that the khans would return and make them pay dearly for their expropriation. But at the second occupation (Oct. 1920) of Reht by the Reds the peasants greeted them frantically. Large numbers of them came among the Red soldiers and said that now they would not deliver rice to the landowners any longer and that they would seize all the harvest. The military situation was however confused. After the evacuation of Enzelii the English at first remained on in expectation of events, but they were forced to retire from Reht in June, setting fire to all their military stores. A month later they left Mendjil blowing up the bridge over the Sefid Râd and hastened to return to Baghêd. In the meantime the Teherân Government had sent a military expedition against the revolutionaries in Reht. After initial successes, the Persian Cossack brigade suffered checks. It was after this that the second occupation of Reht by the Reds mentioned above took place.

On their side, the English demanded on Oct. 25, 1920 the dismissal of the Russian (White) officers, the instructors of the brigade, who were to be replaced by English. Mughir al-Dawla’s government refused to agree to this and resigned on Oct. 27. It was replaced on Nov. 1 by that of Sepéhdar, which acceded to the English demands, so that all the armed forces of Persia were now under English control. The latter then on Dec. 19, 1920, sent an ultimatum to the Teherân government ordering the *mughrîs* to be summoned with a view
to the ratification of the Anglo-Persian treaty of Aug. 9, 1919. The English plans were however thwarted by the rapprochement between Persia and the Soviets. On May 20, 1920, Teherán notified Moscow of her recognition of the Soviet Republic of Ādārḫābād, and her desire to enter into pourparlers with the R. S. F. S. R. Having reached Moscow at the beginning of November the Persian delegate Mughāwar al-Memliḳ openness negotiated for the conclusion of a treaty with the Soviets. On Nov. 28, Moscow asked Teherán to accept the Soviet envoy, M. Rothstein. After an attempt in June 1921 to regain the position lost in the north of Persia, where the Soviets still had their troops, by inspiring the Persian note of Jan. 23, which demanded that the Soviets should withdraw their forces from Gilān, the English, in view of Moscow's firm refusal, took the first steps to remove their troops from Persia and on Feb. 26, 1921 Persia and the R. S. F. S. R. signed a treaty restablishing diplomatic relations between the two countries. On April 25, 1921, M. Rothstein came to Teherán and in the course of the year the Soviet and English troops left Persian territory, Gilān and Rejāḵ then returned definitively to Persia. The last echoes of the revolution in Gilān were the risings of Kerhāli Irshām and of Saiyid Djalāl in 1921 and 1922.

**Bibliography:** H. L. Rabino's work, Les Provinces Caspiques de la Perse, Le Gêloûn, in *R. M. M.*, xxiii., 1915–1916, is authoritative. It contains a very complete bibliography to which we can only add, in addition to a few books and articles mentioned above in the text, a curious brochure entitled *Tirzavar-e Ḥāḵūq,* written by Ḥāḏjadi Saiyid Mahmūd of Rejāḵ and published in 1910. It deals with the agrarian system in Gilān. — *La domination des Daimolms* by V. Minorsky (publ. by the Société des Études Iran., No. 3, Paris 1934) may also be mentioned. (B. NIKITINE)

**Resmi, Ahmād, Ottoman statesman and historian.** Ahmād b. Irshām known as Resmi, belonged to Rethmī (Tūrkmen, hence epithet) in Crete and was of Greek descent (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, viii. 202). He was born in 1112 (1700) and came in 1146 (1733) to Stambul where he was educated, married a daughter of the Reḥ Esfendi Taḵkūjī Muṣṭafā and entered the service of the Porte. He held a number of offices in various towns (cf. *Sīgīl-i Sīgīlān*, ii. 380 sq.). In Safar 1171 (Oct. 1757) he went as Ottoman envoy to Vienna and on his return made a written report of his impressions and experiences. In Dhu Tā'Kaḍ 1176 (May 1763) he was again sent to Europe, this time as ambassador to the Prussian court in Berlin. He also wrote a very full account of this mission, which early attracted attention, in the west also, for its views on Prussian policy. Its description of Berlin and its inhabitants and all sorts of observations on related topics. After filling a number of other important offices he died on the 3rd Shawwāl 1197 (Aug. 31, 1783); on this date cf. Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 309, note 2) in Stambul. His tomb is in the Selimīye quarter of Scutari. In addition to the descriptions already mentioned of his embassies (ṣerāʾeščehma) to Vienna and Berlin, Ahmād Resmi wrote in connection with the Russo-Turkish war and the peace of Kūlāḵ Kāhndārjān 1776–1774 a treatise entitled *Khalīfet al-Pilāš,* in which as a participant in the campaign and eye-witness, he gave his impressions of this important period in the history of Turkey. Of especial value are his biographical collections, particularly his *Khalīfet al-Rūḍān* (composed in 1152 = 1744) with the biographies of 64 chancellors (reḥ ṣāʾeʿeḥā) and his *Humāyid al-Rūḍān,* in which he gives the lives of the chief v滋养 of the Imperial Harem (*hūjār aḵtārān*). Of a similar nature is his continuation (written in 1177 = 1765) of the "deaths" of Mehmed Emin b. Ḥāḏjadi Mehmed called Alay-Beyl-zade, in which he gives in twelve lists the deaths of famous men and women (cf. the accurate list of contents in J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, xii. 187 sq. No. 14). He also wrote several other works on geography and proverb.

The reports of his embassies are available in numerous manuscripts (cf. the list in Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 311, to which should be added: Berlin, Staatsbibl., Ms. Ord. 4*<sup>+</sup> 1502, fol. 27<sup>+</sup> to 460<sup>+</sup> [incomplete], Paris Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Tarc No. 510 [?], Paris, Cl. Huard Coll.), printed editions and translations, which are listed by Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 311. To these is to be added the Polish translation *Podróż Resmy Ahmada Efendiego do Polski i po Estonii i Finlandii* by J. S. Sekowski, *Poznania, Dzieł śpiewnych Turczyków,* vol. ii., Warsaw 1825, pp. 232–289.


(FRANZ BARENGER)

**REWĀNĪ, an Ottoman poet.** His real name was *Ilyās* or *Ṣūḥār* and he belonged to Adrianoople. He is said to have taken his pen-name of Rewānī from the river Tandja which flowed past (rewānī) his garden. He entered the service of Sultan Bayazid II (1483–1512) in Stambul and was sent by him as administrator of the *ṣerāʾeš,* the annual sum for the poor of Mecca and Medina, to the four cities to circulate the money. He embellished a part of it however not by the amount of the Meccans his salary was stopped and he was laid to rest in the house of the eyes, which then affected Rewānī, was described by a poet hostile to him as the just punishment of God, whereupon Rewānī answered him, also in verse, and calmly confessed: "He who has money picks his fingers." He then fled to the court of Prince Selim in Trebizond and entered his service. But he had to disappear from here also as he had committed some indiscretion and his property was confiscated (some sources put his appointment to the *ṣerāʾeš* at this date); he was however pardoned by Selim and henceforth served him all the more faithfully. When Selim in 918 (1512) came to Stambul to dethrone his father Bayazid, Rewānī is said at the last decisive council of war to have thrown his turban in the air with joy and to have praised the day. After Selim's accession he was appointed superintendent of the kitchen (*mudārik eimin,* then entrusted with the administration of the Aya Sofya and of the hot baths (*hātun-baṭl)* in Brass. He built a mosque in the KIrç Çeşme quarter of Stambul which was called after him and he was buried there on his death in 930 (1533).

Rewānī left a *dīwān* and a *methnevis* entitled *Ifrānat-e Nam en Kūšāh e Wāsiʿ.* In the still unprinted *methnevis,* which is not very long, he describes the drinking bouts of his time in all
brought it within the range of Islamic expeditions on several occasions.

In the first century of the Hijra, the Caliph Mūsāīya [q.v.] sent a fleet under the command of Djinādā b. Abi Umiyya al-Azdi to invade Rhodes. The date is variously placed in 52 and 53 (672—73) (see Castani, Chronographia Islamicica, for this variance in the sources). Little is known about this early expedition, except that the Arabs founded a short-lived settlement, which was evacuated in 66 (679—80) by the order of the second Umayyad Caliph Yazid [q.v.]. The island was thus referred to from then on, whose historical sources the Arab occupation was long remembered by the complete destruction and sale of the famous bronze "Colossus of Rhodes" to a Jewish merchant of Emesa. The metal is said to have amounted to 880 camel-loads.

In 1308 or 1310 A.D., during the reign of Andronicus II Palaeologus, Rhodes was seized by the Knights Hospitallers, who had been expelled from 'Akkā in 1291 by Sultan Khalil [q.v.], son of Kālibtīn. The Order of Saint John of Jerusalem now came to be known as the Knights of Rhodes, under whose rule the island became a thorn in the side of Islam as one of the strongest outposts of Latin Christianity in the Levant. Hence the Knights played a prominent part in most of the forthcoming crusades against Turkey and Egypt, notably in the capture of Smyrna in 1344, the sack of Alexandria in 1356 and in the Crusade of Nikopolis [q.v.] in 1396. The second of these attacks determined the Egyptian story of counter-crusades against Cyprus and Rhodes. Three naval expeditions in 1424, 1425 and 1426 resulted in the annexation of Cyprus as a tributary state to Egypt.

The Mamlik then turned their plans to the conquest of Rhodes during the reign of Ṣalāḥ. In 1440, they manned a flotilla of 15 galleys with 200 regulars and several hundred volunteers. These sailed from Damietta to Cyprus for revictualling and to 'Alīya in Asia Minor, where its Muslim Amir reinforced them with more warriors and four galleys, then direct to Rhodes. The Knights were, however, prepared for the attack, and, after a few skirmishes, the Mamlik fleet retreated under cover of night. In 1443, another fleet sailed from Damietta to Bairat, Tripoli, Larnaca, Limasol and Adalia to collect free provisions from subject and friendly states. Their first objective was the little island of Châteauroux or Castellarina, known in the contemporary Arabic sources as Ḥabālayn. This island belonged to the Knights, and the Egyptians had no difficulty in reducing it. Afterwards they returned to Damietta owing to the approach of winter. In 1444, a third and more elaborate expedition was launched against Rhodes. The Egyptian fleet, carrying no less than a thousand Mamliks, sailed from Damietta to Tripoli and direct to Rhodes. This time they succeeded in landing on the Island and in setting siege to the city of Rhodes for a period of forty days, during which they pillaged all the neighbouring villages. Finally, the Knights sailed from the beleaguered town and took the offensive. Thus taken by surprise, the Egyptian army sustained considerable losses and sailed back to Damietta.

The success of the Knights in the repulse of so strong an enemy as the Mamlik may be ascribed to three main causes: first, the system
of espionage which the Order maintained in all hostile countries in order to keep their headquarters in perfect readiness for effective action at the appropriate moment; second, the great strength of the fortifications of Rhodes which was made possible by its prosperity as one of the chief centres of trade in the Levant; and third, the nature of the military training of the Knights, their unity and their extraordinary valour in battle. Peace was eventually established between Egypt and Rhodes through the mediation of Jacques Cœur, the great French merchant prince of the fifteenth century, who was in favour at the court of the Sultan. The task of a decisive counter-crusade against Rhodes remained for the Ottoman Sultan. Muhammad II besieged the capital with some slavemaster of success in 1480; but it was not till the reign of Sulaiman the Magnificent that the Knights were finally overthrown after one of the most heroic defences ever known. On December 24, 1522, the island became the seat of a Turkish Pasha, and remained under Ottoman sovereignty until it was captured by Italy during the war of 1912 and finally passed to Italian rule by virtue of the Treaty of Lausanne (July 24, 1923).


(A. S. Atiya)

In the year 1912, during the war between Turkey and Italy, the Italians occupied the island of Rhodes and the Southern Sporades and held them till 1923, when Turkey (treaty of Lausanne) renounced all claim to Rhodes and the islands, which are now under the sovereignty of Italy, and constituted the "Possedimento delle Isole Italiane dell'Egeo"; the principal islands, which are 14 in number, we give them here with their historical Turkish names which are really Greek, in brackets (with the exception of Indjirli): Rodi (Rados), Calcâ (Karki and Kharki), Calîno (Kalymnos), Kaso (Kâskha), Casteloro (Kastellorizo, Meyîs), Coo (İstanköy), Lero (Lerou), Lissor (Lipsos), Nisiro (Nissiros, Indjirli), Patmo (Patmos), Pucopî (Paikopis), Tîloa (Elêyki), Skarpanto (Kerpe), Simî (Simbaki), Stampalia (Astropolia).

The extent of the "Possedimento" is 2,697 km² and the total population 30,855 (census of April 21, 1931) of whom 5,818 are in the island of Rhodes. The inhabitants are distributed as regards language and religion as follows: 104,485 Greek Orthodox speaking Greek, 8,276 Muslims speaking Turkish, 4,481 Jews speaking Spanish Hebrew, 8,000 Roman Catholics speaking Italian. The Muslims are in the islands of Rhodes and Coo. Like the rest of the population, the Muslims are exempted from military service; they have elementary schools, a modern in Rhodes, special tribunals at Rhodes and Coo for questions of private law.

Turkish and Muhammadan monuments. The Turks did not modify very much the topography of Rhodes; at most they did something to intensify an appearance already generally oriental; they turned the churches into mosques and built new ones; the most remarkable are the mosque of Ilhâm Pasha (1547 = 1540—1541), the mosque of Redjep Pasha (1596 = 1587—1588), the mosque of Murad Re'îs (celebrated re'îs killed in a naval battle off Cyprus in 1609), built by Abû Bakr Pasha in 1646 (1636—1637) and repaired by Muradît Hassan Bey in 1712 (1717—1718), the mosque of Sulaiman Mustafa (1178 = 1764). The mosque of Sulaiman Sulaimân is modern.

We may also mention the library at Rhodes which contains Arabic, Persian and Turkish MSS., founded as a wakf between 1791—1792 and 1799 by the Rhodian Hâfiz Ahmed Agha.

The Muslim cemeteries, which lie under the walls of the fortress, go back in part to the siege of 1522; there are many tombs of men of note who died in captivity or exile in Rhodes in the enclosure of the teche of Murad Re'îs; among them we may mention: İljâî Girîy Khân (d. 1636), Şahîd Girîy Khân (killed 1640), Sâ'idî Girîy Khân (d. 1695); Stîfî (the pretended son of Hâfiz, Shaikh of Persia, d. 1715 = 1725—1726); the poet Hashmet (d. 1182 = 1768—1769), the grand vizier Yûnus Pasha (killed in 1715), the general 'Abd al-Karîm Pasha (d. 1302 = 1783—1785).

Bibliography: Bilotti and Cottret, L'île de Rhodes, Rhodes 1881; C. Torr, Rhodes la
the taking of interest; in any case the Kur’ān regards ribā as a practice of unbelievers and demands as a test of belief that it should be abandoned. It comes up again in Sūra iv. 161 (of the period between the end of the year 3 and the end of the year 5; this also gives a clue to the date of the preceding passage) in a passage which sums up the reproaches levelled against the Jews: “and because they take ribā, while it was forbidden them and devour uselessly the substance of the people”. The fact that the principal passages against interest belong to the Medina period and that the Jews are reproached with breaking the prohibition, suggests that the Muslim prohibition of ribā owes less to conditions in Mecca than to the Prophet’s closer acquaintance with Jewish doctrine and practice in Medina. In the later development of the teaching on the subject we find it in tradition, Jewish influence is in any case undeniable (cf. Jaynhöf, Hand-lecting, p. 286).

2. The traditions give varying answers to the question what forms of business come under the Kur’ānic prohibition of ribā, some of which can be regarded as authentic. The ignorance of the correct interpretation is emphasised in a tendentious tradition, obviously put into circulation by interested individuals (the tradition is probably older than ‘Ummān, aq., cit., p. 214, thinks); according to this view, the principal passage in Sūra ii. is the latest in the whole Kur’ān, which the Prophet could not expound before his death. That the rigid prohibition of usury in Muhammadan law only developed gradually is clear from many traditions. Alongside of the view repeatedly expressed, but also challenged, that ribā consists only in (the increase of substance in) a business agreement with a fixed period (musta‘a, maysir, dālin); we have the still more distinct statement that there is no ribā if the transfer of ownership takes place immediately (yadaa bi-yada). But even in arrangements with a time limit, a number of traditions presuppose a general ignorance of the later restrictions; for example we are told that in Baṣra under ‘Umayr ibn al-‘Abd Allah was paid on credit for silver (this may have been an anti-Umayr bias – cf. below on Mu‘āwiyah, but it is illuminating); but at a later date such forms of the traditions against ribā were to some extent dropped. What was generally understood in the earliest period as the ribā forbidden in the Kur’ān, seems only to have been interest on loans (chiefly of money and foodstuffs); anything that goes beyond this is to be regarded as a later development. The reason for such prohibitions is at different times said to be the fear of ribā and sometimes we have underlying the recognition that there is no tradition of the Prophet relating to this. This is also expressed in the form that nine-tenths of the permitted is renounced or that ribā was conceived as going as far as ten times the capital. The view which later became authoritative is laid down in a group of traditions of which one characteristic example is as follows: “gold for gold, silver for silver, wheat for wheat, barley for barley, dates for dates, salt for salt; the same thing for the same thing, like for like, measure for measure; but if these things are different, sell them as you please if it is (only) done measure for measure”.

Another common tradition expressly forbids the exchange of different quantities of the same thing but of different quality (cf. below).
Other traditions demand equality of quantity even in the sale of manufactured precious metals. This last case seems to have been especially discussed, and on more than one occasion Mu'āwiyah appears as champion of the opposite view and practice (this again has a distinctly anti-Umayyad bias). Particularly conscientious people went even farther in their limitation of ribā than the generality and would only exchange wheat for barley in equal quantities. Still stronger was the view that the exchange of even the same qualities of the same thing, especially of precious metals, was ribā. This view must be older than a difference from the usual opinion (e.g. Muslim, Ribā hai 'alā 'umār wa-mu'ābīn bi-māhi'ī); which is based on the secondary interpretation of an already recognised tradition, which obviously only forbade the exchange of different qualities of the same thing but of different quality (cf. above). This same general prohibition of exchange is also given for dates. The question whether one party to an agreement can voluntarily give the other a bonus, is denied for an exchange, but affirmed for a loan. The deduction of the amount of the debt when the loan is voluntarily paid before it falls due, is sometimes approved as the opposite of ribā, sometimes disapproved as being equivalent to ribā; in any case it is clear that the practice existed. On the sale of an animal for an animal on credit, opinion is also not unanimous.

Numerous traditions forbid ribā without defining it more closely; the Prophet is said to have uttered this prohibition at his farewell pilgrimage (scarcely historical). Ribā is one of the gravest sins. Even the least of its many forms is as bad as incest and so on. All who take part in transactions involving ribā are cursed, the guilty are threatened with hell, various kinds of punishment are described; in this world also gains from ribā will bring no good. In spite of all this tradition foresees that ribā will prevail.

In connection with ribā tradition mentions various antiquated forms of sale of special kinds, like maakhir, mukhabara, musballana etc., which concern the exchange of different stages in the manufacture or development of the same thing, or of different qualities, and which are forbidden: an exception is made obviously because of its undeniable practical and social necessity, of what is known as 'arivya (plur. 'arīya), fresh dates on trees intended to be eaten, which it is permitted to exchange in small quantities for dried dates.

3. While the existence of the Karāmic prohibition of ribā has never been doubted, the difference of opinion that finds expression in tradition regarding the relevant facts is continued in the earliest stages of development of Muhammadan law. Unanimity prevails regarding the main lines of the limitations to be imposed upon the exchange of goods capable of ribā (māl ribānu); it is only permitted if transfer of ownership takes place at the same time, and, so far as goods of the same kind are concerned, only in equal quantities. In the case of a loan it is forbidden to make a condition that a larger quantity shall be returned without regard to the kind of article. Gold and silver are generally regarded as māl ribānu (only quite exceptionally are coins of small denomination included). All the greater are the differences of opinion as to what things outside of the precious metals are liable to the ribā ordinances. In isolated cases one still finds views that show themselves uninfluenced in principle by the authoritative group of traditions (cf. above), e.g. when everything realisable is subjected to the ribā ordinances (Ibn Kaisān) or all business dealings in things of the same kind (Ibn Shīrīn, Hāmād) or when everything liable to zakāt is considered capable of ribā (Rahb b. 'Abd al-Rahmān). Other opinions differ in the treatment of property capable of ribā from that group of traditions, although it is not known what they understand by this; possibly it is not an exchange of the same kind of thing not equality of quantity, but equality of value in two quantities demanded (Hasan al-Baṣri); or equality or quantity also in the exchange of different kinds apparently within a limited circle of goods capable of ribā (Sa'd b. Dūhain). The old interpretation that there is no ribā if the transfer of possession takes place at once is ascribed to 'Aṭa' and the jurists of Medina. The views of most authorities however and in particular those which survive later in the law schools assume the literal acceptance of the text of that group of traditions and differ only in its interpretation. Thus there are mentioned as precursors of the later Zāhirī doctrine: Tawās, Masrīk, al-Shāhī, Kātūda, 'Othmān al-Battī; as precursors of the Hanafī view: al-Zahhār, al-Ḥakam, Hāmād (cf. however above), Sufyān al-Thawrī; as precursors of the earlier view of al-Shāhī: Sa'd b. al-Musayyib and others; as precursors of his later view: al-Zahhār (cf. however above) and Yahyā b. Sa'd. On the question whether a loan can be repaid in another kind and what is to be done if defects are revealed in an exchange of māl ribānu after it has changed hands, there are old differences of opinion.

4. In the above mentioned group of traditions the following goods in addition to gold and silver are expressly mentioned as bearing the prohibition of ribā at their exchange: wheat, barley, dates and salt (sometimes also raisins, butter and oil). The Zāhirīs, as a result of their refusal on principle to accept analogy (ḥiýa), assume that the prohibition applies only to the six things especially named (the other kinds are rejected as not well attested). The other schools of law, on the other hand, consider the kinds mentioned in tradition only as examples of the variety of things that come under māl ribānu, but differ from one another in their lists of these things. According to the Ḥanafīs and Za'idis (also al-Awaṣī), gold and silver represent examples of the class of things defined by weight (wāṣībat) and the four other things those sold by measure (masbāh). The Imāmī teaching is practically the same. According to the Mālikīs and Shāhīs, gold and silver represent the class of precious metals and the four other things the class of foodstuffs: the latter, in the Mālikī view including actual estables so far as they can be preserved, according to the older view of al-Shāhī, provisions which are sold by weight and measure; according to his later view, which is also that of his school, foodstuffs without any qualification. The teaching of the Ḥanbalis corresponds to that of the Ḥanafīs; as regards the "four kinds", two further opinions of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal are handed down which correspond to the two views held by al-Shāhī. In these, wheat and barley are regarded as two different kinds by the Ḥanafīs, the Shāhīs and the better known tradition of the Ḥanbalis (as well as Zāhirīs, Za'idis and Imāmīs); as one kind
not only on their formal negative rejection of deduction by analogy but also upon their positive estimation of the intention underlying the evasions. One of the oldest transactions of the kind, against which several traditions are already directed, is the double contract of sale (from one of its elements it is called бa't‘ al-lma‘, credit sale par excellence); one sells to someone who wants to lend money at interest something against the total sum of capital and interest which are to be due at a fixed date, and at the same time buys the article back for the capital which is at once handed over. This transaction was taken over in mediæval Europe under the name of mekaṭra (from the Ar. mukhabāra; cf. Jyubnî, Handl. u. H., p. 289, note 1, and E. Bassi, in Rivista di storia del diritto italiano, v., part 2). Another method of evasion consists of handing over to the creditor the use of a thing as interest by a fictitious agreement to sell or to pledge. All these practices are still in use and in spite of the prohibition of ribā money-lending is a flourishing business in most Muslim countries (50% is often regarded as moderate interest).


(Josef Schacht)
be kept in readiness for an expedition. Ribāṭ also has the closely related meanings of relay of horses for a courier, caravanserai. The word however was early applied to an establishment at once religious and military which seems quite specifically Muhammadan.

The institution of the ribāṭ is connected with the duty of the holy war [see ajnāb], the defence of the lands of Islam and their extension by force of arms. The Byzantine empire was acquainted with the fortified monastery, like Mandrakion built at Carthage near the sea, mentioned by Procopius: but it seems doubtful if the monks living in it played any military part. The regular or occasional occupants of the ribāṭ are essentially fighters for the faith. The ribāṭ are primarily fortresses, places of concentration of troops at exposed points on the Muhammadan frontier. Like western castles, they offer a refuge to the inhabitants of the surrounding country in time of danger. They serve as watch-towers from which an alarm can be given to the threatened populace and to the garrisons of the frontier and interior of the country who could support the efforts of the defenders. The structure of the ribāṭ therefore consisted of a fortified surrounding wall with living rooms, magazines of arms and storehouses for provisions and a tower for signalling. This architectural scheme, the development of which will be indicated below, was of course often very summarily treated. The ribāṭ in many cases was reduced to a watch-tower and a little fort like those the Byzantines built on their frontiers. This explains the considerable number of ribāṭ mentioned by the geographers. We are told that in Transoxiana alone there were no less than 10,000 (Ibn Khalikān, transl. de Siano, i. 139, No. 3). The coasts were also amply provided for. There were ribāṭ all along the coast of Palestine and of Africa. The first-towers, attached to the ribāṭ or isolated, enabled messages, we are told, to be sent in one night from Alexandria to Centa. This is clearly an exaggeration. Nevertheless we may note a fairly rapid system of signalling and the mention of Alexandria, the pharaoh of which seems to have served as a ribāṭ. The Spanish coast also had its ribāṭ, as had the frontier against the Christian kingdoms, especially after the coming of the Almoravids, which saw an intensification of the jihād. For Sicily, Ibn Hawkal gives some curious information about the ribāṭ near Palermo and we know the little town of Rabato in the island of Goro in the Maltese archipelago.

Devotion to religion stimulated individuals to multiply their foundations, notably in Ifriqiya in the vicinity of towns like Tripolis and Sfax. It was a work of piety to build a ribāṭ at one's own expense or strengthen its defences. It was equally meritorious to urge men to go there to serve the cause of Islam, to revictual the garrison,Lastly and above all to go there oneself. For the coast of Palestine, al-Ma'kaddasi tells us of another use of the ribāṭ equally pleasing to Allah. Their fires were used to signal the approach of Christian vessels bringing Muslim prisoners whose exchange had been arranged. Everyone endeavoured to take part in this according to his means.

The building of the large ribāṭ and of many of the smaller ones was naturally the task of the sovereigns of the country. In Ifriqiya the first was that of Monastir [q.v.] built by the 'Abbasid governor Harthama b. Ayyūn (179–795). The third (ninth) century was the golden age: the Aghlabids all along the eastern coasts multiplied ribāṭ in the strict sense and sīhās: this word means a fortified area containing a small garrison or a watch-tower. Monastir retained the pre-eminence which the Prophet himself is said to have foretold for it. In the 11th century the dead were brought from al-Mahdīya to enjoy the blessing of being buried there. But the ribāṭ of Sūs founded by the Aghlabid Ziyādāt Allah in 821 had assumed considerable importance. We know that Sīhās was the port from which the troops embarked for the conquest of Sicily.

Compared with the east coast of Ifriqiya, which was directly threatened by attacks of the Rūm or which was the base for expeditions across the sea, the rest of the Barbary coast was less well supplied. There were however ribāṭ on the coast of the extreme Maghrīb, at Nakūr and Arasil to prevent raiding by the Norman pirates, and at Sādīt to facilitate the war against the Barghawītā [q.v.] heretics.

If the majority of the ribāṭ were official foundations, the service done by the combatants in them does not seem to have been in any way compulsory. The men of the ribāṭ, the murābiṭūn, were volunteers, pious individuals who had taken a vow to devote themselves to the defence of Islam. Some may have entered the ribāṭ like a monastery, to end their days in it, but the great majority only stayed in them for longer or shorter periods, and the garrisons were changed completely several times a year. In the ribāṭ of Arasil, this change in the garrison took place with the festival of 'Aqā' (Nov./Dec.) and the beginning of Rūmān and al-Ya'th al-Kabīr. An important fair was held on the occasion. In case of a siege the garrisons were reinforced by able-bodied men from the country round, summoned by the beating of drums (Palestine, according to al-Ma'kaddasi).

Life in the ribāṭ was spent in military exercises and on guard, but also in devotional exercises. The murābiṭūn prepared themselves for martyrdom by long prayers under the direction of a venerated šahīkh. The traveller Ibn Hawkal however reveals a dark side to this edifying picture. Speaking of the ribāṭ of Palermo in the fourth (tenth) century, he tells us that "they were the rendezvous of the bad characters of the country who thus found a means of livelihood outside of regular society and at the expense of the pious and charitable".

The double character — military and religious — of the life of the murābiṭūn found expression in the architecture of the old ribāṭ that have survived. Tunisia has preserved those of Monastir and Sūs. The first is still very imposing but the frequent restorations have complicated the original plan. The second which is simple may be taken as typical. With its high square wall flanked with semi-circular towers at the corners and the middle of the sides, it recalls the Byzantine forts of the country. The only entrance was by one of the salients in the middle of the wall. A staircase went down in the interior into the central court surrounded by covered galleries and very simple cells. The first storey, reached by two staircases, also consisted of cells on three sides of the court. Along the fourth side was a hall with a mihrāb. This was the oratory of the ribāṭ. The sīhās wall was pierced with embrasures. On the level of the
terrace which are above this first storey, in the door of the signal tower, cylindrical in form, which rises from the square base of a salient at one corner and dominates the fortress from a height of about 60 feet. A little dome which also rises above the terrace crowns, as in the mosque of the period, the square area in front of the mihrab in the forecourt.

The ribāṭ of Sās takes us back to the heroic times when the institution had distinctly a warlike character and these frontier posts played a strategic role on the borders of the lands of Iblīm. It retained this character in the 8th-9th century in the extreme Maghrib where the struggle with the Christians in Spain kept alive the tradition of the gīhād. We know that a ribāṭ built on an island in the Lower Senegal was the starting place of the career of the Lamūna Berbers and gave them the name of Almoravids (al-mawrābīyīn) under which they became famous in history [see Almoravids]. The Almohads who succeeded them had also their ribāṭs, two of which at least are worth mentioning. The ribāṭ of Tabān (q.v.) was fortified in 528 (1135) by Abū al-Mu'min at the time when he was conducting the Almoravids against the Almoravids a campaign which had as its aim the appearance of a gīhād. The ribāṭ al-Fath, the name of which survives in that of the town of Kūtar (q.v.) [Kutub al-Hādī], is an important military station on the borders of the Marinid princes, who in being both a religious and a military institution, supported the faithful in the sacred cause of Islam.

In the 12th century to give warning of landings by the Christians on the coast, mākbar and signal towers were still being built "to serve as ribāṭs". Ibn Mattūyī, the historian of the Marinid Abu l-Haṣan, who tells of them, says however that these were occupied by paid soldiers. They were not true ribāṭs, the garrison of which consisted of volunteers. If however we look to the 13th century, in the extreme Maghrib, we find the ribāṭ like that of Asūf playing a military part in the struggle with the Portuguese, in the east, in the lands where the infidel began to threaten Iblīm, the institution had changed its character or rather the ascetic discipline and the pious resolutions which were the regular practices in the old ribāṭs had entirely taken the place of military exercises. From the 8th (9th) century or perhaps even earlier, the development of mysticism and the grouping of the Sufis into communities gave these barracks a new raison d'être by making them monasteries. From Persia, where it originated, this evolution of the ribāṭ rapidly spread through the Muslim world. In the east the ribāṭ merged into the Persian ʿāšābīyya, Ibn al-Qalbī (ed. Wright and de Goeje, p. 243) refers to a ʿāšābīyya founded by Sāfī which was also called a ribāṭ al-aṭīyan to the north of the Syrian desert. When however a writer like Ibn al-Shāhānah describing Aleppo seems to distinguish the ʿāšābīyya from the ribāṭ, the difference between them escapes us. It may be supposed that the ʿāšābīyya were inhabited by permanent residents who spent their whole lives there and that the ribāṭs, as before, received devout men for limited periods, but one cannot assert definitely that this was the distinction. In any case the four ribāṭs within the city of Aleppo (one attached to a madrasa and the mausoleum of its founder with Kūrān readers and Sūfīs) had no longer anything of a military character. It was the same with the two ribāṭs of Mecca mentioned by Ibn Bāṭtūta. In Cairo the only inscription found by Van Berchem in which a ribāṭ is mentioned is that of the convent of Malik Asghār al-ʿIndi (860 = 1455).

In Barbary, where the wave of eastern mysticism had reached in the 8th-9th century, the term ribāṭ was likewise retained but applied to the exterior qaṣas [q.v.] in which ascetics gathered round the shaikhs in their tombs. As a matter of fact Ibn Mattūyī in this connection makes a distinction which nevertheless still remains obscure. Speaking of the ʿāšābīyya founded by Abu l-Haṣan, his master, he tells us that the first ʿāšābī, a Persian word, has the same meaning as ribāṭ and adds: "In the terminology of the ṣafārīn, one understands by ribāṭ the act of devoting oneself to the holy war and to guarding the frontiers. Among the ʿāšābīn it means on the contrary the place in which a man shuts himself up to worship the divinity". This last use of the word seems to be the usual one in his time. The ribāṭ al-Ubshāl is the group of piass foundations near Tlemcen that have grown up around the tomb of the famous mystic Sīdī Bīr Masyān. The ribāṭ of Ta瞬kekelt to the west south of Oran is dedicated to a saint of the Baal Imānīn; the ribāṭ of Tīfert in the borders of the Wāli Sbit contains the tomb of a Marinid prince and an apartment for ribāṭī (Kūrān reader).

With this erroneous use of the old Arabic word we might connect the parallel change undergone by the word ʿāšābī (marabout) which is applied to a saint, an individual who by his own merits or the mystic initiation which he had received or his relationship with a maʿṣūf [q.v.] enjoys the veneration of those around him.

In Muslim Spain, the last land of the gīhād, we may suppose that the ribāṭs continued to act as successive fortresses which the *reconquista* imposed on the lands of Iblīm; but to be certain we must wait until the study of the texts and the enquiry being conducted by F. Hernández and H. Terrasse into the military architecture of Muslim Spain give us precise details regarding the date of the castles and their object. The evolution in meaning of the word ribāṭ would lead one to think it had ceased to mean a fortress. Among the Arabic authors of Spain and al-Makkari as among the ṣafārīn mentioned by Ibn Mattūyī, ribāṭ is often used to mean a holy war, generally defensive, and it passed into Spanish in the form rebate as J. Oliver Añón has shown with the meaning of "sudden attack executed by a body of horsemen in keeping with Muslim tactics". If the Arabic term had lost its original meaning, however, another word derived from it was commonly used in a slightly different meaning. Spain saw the ribāṭīs multiplying and their memory is preserved in place-names in the form Riba, Ríz, Ribad. The word ribāṭ was also known in Barbary. It meant "a hermitage to which a holy man retired where he lived surrounded by his disciples and his religious servants" (cf. Makār, transl. Colin, p. 240 and the article ʿĀSHĪYYA).

Everything points to its having been the same in the Peninsula. The multiplication of ribāṭīs in Spain and their possible confusion with ribāṭs are
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connected with the great movement of mystic piety which, starting in Fars, had spread to and about the monasteries — 

during the same troubles in Barbary — for the foundations, or even more than religious, of the heroic age of Islam.

The bibliographical section is extensive and covers a wide range of topics. It includes discussions on the life and works of Mehemmed Riza b. Mehemmed, also known as Zahr Marasi, who was a distinguished writer in the Ottoman period. His work is appreciated for its literary and historical value.

Rida Kuli Khan, a Persian scholar, was associated with the study of mystical poetry. His contributions are significant in preserving and analyzing the works of mystic poets during the Islamic era.

The Arabic section covers a variety of topics, including the mystical tradition and its influence on Islamic culture. It highlights the importance of these works in understanding the intellectual and spiritual development of the Islamic world.

The bibliography section provides a comprehensive list of works that are essential for further research in the field.

The thematic analysis of the documents reveals the cultural and intellectual significance of these works, particularly in the context of Persian and Ottoman cultural exchanges during the period in question.
RIDJA KULI KHAN — RIDWAN

The researches necessary for these last two works showed Hidayat the inadequacy of the dictionaries at his disposal; he intended to remedy this with his 
Munshi Farkhun-ud-Din and several other 
works. Hidayat in 1588, which, preceded by a remarkable 
text, provides the different meanings of each text, with quotations from the classical 
works. The work entitled 
Munshi Al-Balaghah 
(lith. 1531) is a glossary of rhetorical and poetical 
terms with many examples taken from different 
works. Lastly we owe to Hidayat the first editions of 
the 
Dirum of Mananthi (lith. Teheran 1927), of the 
As-Salat (ibid. 1275) and of the 
Najdat al-Majid (lith. the fall of the Khwarizm 
empire) of Muhammad Zaidari (publ. posthumously, 
Teheran 1308). Its autobiographical character gives the 
the attractive “Narrative of a Journey to Khwarizm” 
(Safar-nama-yi Khwārīm, ed. and trans. Schefrin, in 
P.É.L.O. V., Paris 1879) a special place among his 
works; he undertook this journey in 1851 as an 
ambassador sent to settle the differences between the courts 
of Teheran and Khiwa. This journal is a valuable 
document for the history of the Khßāsates and has 
been utilised by later Persian historians (notably 
Muhammad Ḥasan Khan; q.v.): besides valuable 
historical, archaeological and geographical material, 
the book, which is written in a simple and natural 
style, is a contribution to the study of the manners 
and customs of the period (notably conditions of 
travel); we find in it pretty pictures of native life 
and charming landscapes. Several of Hidayat’s 
descendants have taken a prominent part in 
literature, politics, and administration.

Bibliography: In addition to works already 
mentioned: Reis, Cat. of Persian MSS. in the 
British Museum, Suppl. (Index); Edwards, 
Persian prints and pictures in the British Museum; 
E.G. Browne, Persian Literature in Modern Times 
(index and portrait, p. 344); Gr. 1. Pk. (II. 
index); de Gobineau, Traité sur l’Asie (chap. 
*Les caractères*); S. Churchill, in F.R.A.S., 
aviii. 106-204; xix. 163; A. Kegli, Riti Khan 
Khan al-Dichter, in W.Z.K.M. 1897, al. 63- 
74; Niẓāmī, ‘Arba‘, Čahār Majāla, in G.M.S., 

(II. Masse)

RIDWA (1326-1340 A.D.), the only woman to 
succeed to the throne of Dhihl during the period of Muslim rule, and, with 
the exception of Sha‘lab Durr [q.v.] of 
Egypt, the only female sovereign in the history of Islam.

After the death of his eldest son, İhtimāl [q.v.], 
resigned the protests of his advisers, nominated 
his daughter Ridwa as his successor on the grounds of 
herself to rule. On the death of İhtimāl the 
courtiers, disregarding the late king’s wishes, 
raised one of his sons, Rukan al-Din Fūtūz, to the 
throne. The new king wasted his time in riotous 
living, all real power being in the hands of his 
mother, Sīhīr Turkān, whose cruelty disgusted the 
people and finally led to open revolt. Eventually 
in 634 (1236), despite the strong Muslim aversion 
to female rulers, Ridwa was proclaimed queen by 
the people of Dhihl and a certain section of 
the army. Although the war, Niẓām al-Mulk 
Muhammad Djamāl, refused to acknowledge her 
authority and was anxious enough to crush all opposition. She appointed 
Makhdhīs al-Din Ḥusain as her waiz and placed Malik Sefī al-Din 
in charge of the army with the title of fathāgh

İhtimāl. İhtimāl al-Din Aṭīmun was made amir-i 
ṣafiyyb. The Turkish amirs, however, took great 
exception to the favours shown to the queen by 
as an Abyssinian, Malik Djamāl al-Din Ākhtū who 
held the position of amir-i ḥārūr (Master of the 
Horse). Eventually the Turkish amirs rose in revolt, 
put the Abyssinian to death, imprisoned the queen, 
and placed her half-brother, Bahram Shīh, on the 
throne (Ramadan 636 = April 1240). Malik İhtimāl 
al-Din Aṭīmun, the governor of Bahram Shīh, 
in whose custody the deposed queen had been 
placed by his fellow conspirators, determined to 
champion her cause. With this object in view he married 
her and marched on Dhihl, but was defeated near 
Khalīl. On the day following this defeat both 
he and Ridwa were put to death.

The only original source for her reign is the 
Tahāba’, Nāṣirī of Minḥād al-Din [see Minḥād], 
the accounts of all later writers, such as Ibn Bāṭtūtā, 
Firuzā, Bādānī, and the author of the 
Tahāba’ Akhtū’s being untrustworthy. All that Minḥād al- 
Din relates is that she treated the 
Habāb with favour, but this was enough to enable the later 
historians to interpret it as undue fondness 
for the queen’s part. It was only towards the end 
of her reign that she laid aside her female 
attire and appeared in public clothed as a man 
and unveiled. The real cause of her downfall 
seems to have been the opposition of the Turkish amirs.

Bibliography: Minḥād al-Din, Tahāba’, 
Nāṣirī, translated by H. G. Cotton, London 
1881, i. 537-548.

RIDWAN (Syn.: RIDWAN), b. TUTUGH, FAKHR- 
AL-MULK (Mutlu), a Saliḫ ruler in Halab. 
Shortly before his death in Safar 438 (Feb. 1993) 
Tutugh b. Alp Arslān [q.v.] ordered his son Ridwan 
to go to the Irāq. The latter set out with a large 
army; on reaching the vicinity of Hīl [q.v.] he 
heard of his father’s death and returned to Halab, 
where he was recognised by the governor Abu 
'l-Kāsim al-Ḥasan b. 'Ali al-Khwārimi as the 
successor of Tutugh. He then attempted to seize Salīḥ 
[q.v.] but Šukrān b. Ortok [q.v.] anticipated 
him and defended himself so energetically that 
Ridwan had to withdraw; on the other hand, he 
succeeded in taking Edessa, the citadel of which 
he entrusted to the lord of Anṭīkīya, Yaghl Bāṣān 
b. Muhammad al-Turkāmī. Soon afterwards he 
returned to Halab because the emirs who were 
accompanying him, his step-father Djamāl al-Dawla 
al-Ḥasan b. Alītegī and Yaghl Bāṣān, quarrelled 
with one another; the former went to Halab and 
the latter to Anṭīkīya accompanied by Abu l-Kāsim 
al-Khwārimi. Ridwan was very soon involved in 
a war with his brother Dukāk, who had settled 
in Halab after the death of Tutugh and had been 
asked by Sawtugh, commandant of the citadel in 
Damasco, to take this town. He therefore left 
Halab, evaded the pursuit of the cavalry sent 
after him by his brother and reached Damascus 
where he was welcomed and recognised as lord 
of the city. He was joined by his step-father 
Tugtegī [q.v.] who soon afterwards appeared in 
Damasco with a number of officers who had served 
under Tutugh. After Dukāk and Tugtegī had 
established themselves securely, they had Sawtugh 
pursued to death. But Ridwan also coveted Damascus. 
The city however proved to be too strongly 
defended, so he went to Nāmis and then to 
Jerusalem which had fallen into the hands of the 
Fātimids. There also he met with a vigorous re-
Riďwan—Rīfā’ā Bey
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abstain, his troops scattered and there was nothing left for him but to return to Halab, Vaghtā Bašān then went over to Duḥṣāq and suggested he should besiege Riďwan in Halab. The latter however appealed to Saqānā b. Īrtqā in Sarāf, who at once hurried to his assistance, and when the two brothers met at Kinnārī [q.v.], Duḥṣāq was completely defeated and had to recognize Riďwan as his overlord (489 = 1096 or 490 = 1097). In order to receive financial and military support from the Fātimids, Riďwan for four weeks had prayed says for al-Mustaʿfā, the caliph in Egypt; but on the representations of Saqānā and Vaghtā Bašān, who had in the meanwhile made peace with him, he again paid homage to the ‘Abbaṣids and asked for forgiveness from the Caliph al-Mustaʿṣāfīr in Baghdad. About the same time Dānāf al-Dawla left Riďwan, settled in Himā and improved the defences of the town. He then took up a more independent attitude to his overlord Riďwan than before.

In June 1098 Aṃūḥīyā was stormed by the Crusaders and the Muslim army of relief, which included Riďwan, repulsed whereupon Bohemund was recognised as prince of Aṃūḥīyā. As his nearest neighbour, Riďwan was soon at war with him. In Shāhr bād 493 (July 1100), he set out to drive the Franks from the country round Halab but was defeated. He then joined forces with Dānāf al-Dawla; but when the Christians withdrew and Riďwan became jealous of his ally, Dānāf al-Dawla returned to Himā. Soon afterwards the Christians under Bohemund and Tańcred again threatened Aleppo; on the news of the siege of al-Malāya [q.v.] by a Muslim army [see Dānāf al-Dawla], they suddenly withdrew. Bohemund fell into an ambush and was taken prisoner; Riďwan and Dānāf al-Dawla won several successes, but in the end quarrelled with one another, and a year or two later (495 = 1102 or 496 = 1103), the latter was murdered at the instigation of the Assassins of Halab. In Shāhr bād 498 (April–May 1105) Tańcred, who had succeeded Bohemund as prince of Aṃūḥīyā and was also count of Edessa, won a brilliant victory over Riďwan. When Tańcred besieged the fortress of Arṭāth, the governor there appealed to Riďwan for help. The latter appeared at the head of a powerful army and the two forces met near Kinnārī. On seeing the superiority of the Muslim forces, Tańcred wanted to open peace negotiations; Riďwan for his part was not unwilling to meet him but allowed himself to be persuaded by a subordinate commander to refuse, and when the battle began, the Franks at once took to flight but returned and cut down the Muslims while they were plundering. Tańcred then occupied Arṭāth. In 499 (1105–1106) the latter also took the important fortress of Aṭṭimayā (Ayyamay). An Assassin named Abī Tāhir [cf. Aḥbab] who was on good terms with Riďwan, had disposed of the commandant there, Khalaf b. Malāḥ. One of his sons fled to Tańcred and asked him to exploit the supporters of Riďwan; Tańcred who had already received an appeal from the Christians of Aṭṭimayā, laid siege to the town. He withdrew after a time but soon returned and starred the town into surrender.

When Ĉawālī Saḵwān, governor of al-Mawārūn, lost the favour of the Sāljiḏ Sultān Muḥammad b. Malikāḏ [q.v.] and was replaced by Mawādī b. Alunţāqī, he gave count Baldwin and Joscélīn, who were prisoners there, their liberty on condition that they paid a ransom, liberated Muslim prisoners and assisted him against his enemies. But when Tańcred refused to restore the county of Edessa to Baldwin, hostilities broke out and the latter sought the help of Ĉawālī. After peace had been restored between the Frankish leaders and Edessa was restored to Baldwin, Riďwan were to Tańcred and warned him against Ĉawālī, who, he said, had already taken the town of Bālīs, and was now threatening Halab whereby he might become dangerous to Christian rule in this region. In Sāfr bād 492 (Sept.–Oct. 1108) Ĉawālī, who had joined Baldwin and Joscélīn, was defeated at Tell Bāhār [q.v.]. He lost Bālīs, and since he could not hold his own against Riďwan and Mawādī, he had to make his peace with the sułṭān. The Christian princes then combined to besiege Tripolī, Saqānā and Bālīs. Tańcred took the fortresses of al-Athārī and Bālīs and when the news reached them, the Muslims abandoned Mawādī and Bālīs also, and Riďwan had to purchase peace very dearly (504 = 1110–1111). When sulṭān Muḥammad summoned the princes, his vassals, for a vigorous attack on the Franks under the leadership of Mawādī, the latter was appealed to for help by Riďwan, whose lands the Christians were laying waste in revenge for the damage done by him in Syria. Mawādī came to his assistance but when he appeared before Halab, Riďwan, who no longer needed him, shut the gates and took no part in the war against the common enemy.

Riďwan died in the last days of Dijamāl I bād (Nov. 1113). As a part of the Ismāʿīlī Assāsins he had a bad reputation; he even had two of his brothers, Abī Tāhir and Bābārāshī, assassinated. Ibn al-ʿAthārī (x. 349) also says that his manner of life was by no means laudable (kānā mildur Riďwān ʿāqiṣ māḥīyā)...

Bibliography:

Rīfāʿā Bey al-Ṭartawī, a famous writer of the last century and one of the principal creators of the modern Arabic "Renaissance". He was born at Tahtā in upper Egypt in 1801. His parents, although of noble descent, were poor. When quite young, he devoted himself to the study of the Korān; when a young man, he went to al-Azhār, where he studied seriously under the direction of Shāhīţ Hāṣān al-ʿAthārī.

On leaving al-Azhār in 1824, he was appointed pay-master of the Egyptian army. At this period the celebrated Muḥammad (Meḥemet) Aḥī was ruling Egypt. The latter at the instigation of the French scholar Jomard sent to Paris in 1836 a group of students to learn French and study modern sciences. They were put under charge of Rīfāʿā. In Paris the latter made the acquaintance
of Oriental scholars like Janbert, Jomard, Sylvastre de Sacy and Canzani de Perceval. He made rapid progress and soon had a deep knowledge of the French language. From his stay in Paris dates a lively and interesting account entitled *Tahakkah al-dhahir* (Bilād 1325) in which every line reveals a charming wit, and the enthusiasm aroused in this oriental mind by the manifold aspects and lights and shades of French life and culture (cf. Carra de Vaux, *Pensées*, v. 237 sq.). On his return to Egypt (1832) he was attached as interpreter and professor of French to the school of Medicine directed by Dr. Clot Bey and also entrusted with the editorship of the *Informations égyptiennes* which later became the *Journal officiel*. In 1835 he was transferred to the School of Artillery and in 1838 appointed Director of the School of Foreign Languages (originally the "Translation Office").

He remained in this post until the accession of Abbas I. Unfortunately this ruler did not continue the brilliant work of his predecessor: the School of Languages was closed and its Director sent — a disgrace barely concealed — to the Sādān to organise the High School at Khartum.

On the death of Abbas, Rifā'a returned to Egypt. Sādīd Pasha appointed him Director of the Military School, but for a brief period, however, for the School in its turn was closed and Rifā'a found himself unemployed.

In the reign of Ismā'il in 1863, the School was reopened and our author again became Director of the "Translation Office". In 1870, he became editor-in-chief of the educational review *Ramādat al-Mu'allār* (fortnightly) and died in 1873.

Rifā'a Bey was one of the most important Arabic writers of the 19th century and his name is closely associated with the brilliant revival of literary and scientific activity in the modern world. An enquiring spirit of unusual intelligence, he left behind him a considerable amount of work in all fields: history, geography, grammar, law, literature, medicine, etc. Details will be found in Sarkis, *Dictionnaire bibliographique*, p. 943—947. We may note here only his translations of Télemán, of Malte-Brun's, *Geography* and the French *Code Civil*.

To appreciate the magnitude of the part he played, it must be remembered that at the dawn of the last century, the Arab world was in a state of semi-torpor and separated from European learning by a dense barrier; it was difficult that al-Asfar shed a dim light on the darkness that covered this period.

As a result of his works, his activity and the phalanx of experts and translators which he gave the country, Rifā'a accomplished the miracle of popularising European science, of opening the East to modern ideas, enlightening the minds of his contemporaries, awakening dormant energies and preparing the future.

We may measure the effort if we reflect that he and his pupils translated into Arabic and Turkish nearly 2,000 works.

On the other hand by expanding the framework of the old classical language and by vivifying it and widening it with a mass of new words, he enabled Arab thought to adapt itself to progress and to extend its light over modern Islam.


( *MAURICE CHEPROI*)

**AL-RIFA‘I, AHMAD B. 'ALI ABU L-‘ABBĀS**

Founder of the Rifā‘i order, died 22nd Dhu-l-Qa‘da 1221 (Sept. 23, 1123) at Umum Abidah, in the district of Wasi. The date of his birth is given by some authorities as Muharram 500 (Sept. 1100), but others say Rajab 512 (Oct.—Nov. 1118), at Kāryat Hamān, a village in the district of Basra. These places being in the region called al-Baṭā‘ī (i.e. what he has the further work in al-Baṭā‘ī); al-Rifa‘i is usually explained as referring to an ancestor Rifā‘a, but by some it is supposed to be a tribal name. This ancestor Rifā‘a is said to have migrated from Mecca to Seville in Spain in 317, whereas Ahmad’s grandfather came to Basra in 450. Hence he is also called al-Maghribi.

Ibn Khallīkān’s notice of him is meagre; more is given in Djalābī’s *Tarākhī al-Islām* (modern MS.), taken from a collection of his *Manāhī* by Mālik al-Dīn Abūl-Mulā ‘Abda al-Hamad bin Salāmān bin al-Hamad bin Qasim, cited by him to a disciple in 680. This work does not appear in the lists of treaties on the same subject furnished by Abu ‘l-Hadā ‘Efrāni, al-Ra‘ī al-Bahā‘idi al-Sayyādī in his work *Tawārīkh al-Abhār* (Cairo 1306) and *Ri‘ādat al-Dīran* (Bahri 1301), the latter of which is a copious biography, frequently citing *Tārikh al-Mu‘ūlār* by Taqī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Mahdūl, written al-Rifa‘i's work al-Baṭā‘ī and there are others. Al-Hamad bin al-Hamad bin Qasim, who was also called *manāhī al-Ma‘ālāt* for al-Rifa‘i’s. Great care is required in the use of the material.

Whereas according to some accounts he was a posthumous child, the majority date his father’s death as 519 in Baghchār, when Ahmad was seven years old. He was then brought up by his maternal uncle Manṣūr al-Ba‘thī, resident at Nahr Dākh in the neighbourhood of Basra. This Manṣūr (of whom there is a notice in Sha‘rī’s *Lauziq al-A‘māla* [p. 178]) is represented as the head of a religious community, called by Ahmad (if he is al-Rifa‘i’s great-grandson, *Kāfā‘ī, p. 33*) correctly reported by his grandson, *Kāfā‘ī, p. 38* al-Rifa‘i; he sent his nephew to Wāsi to study under a Shāfi‘i’s doctor Abu ‘l-Faqī al-Qādī wāsī and a maternal uncle Abū Bakr al-Wāsī. His studies lasted till his 27th year, when he received an *ijāza* from Abu ‘l-Faqī, and the *khāfa* from his uncle Manṣūr, who made him establish himself in Umum ‘Abidah, where (it would seem) his mother’s family had property, and where his father ‘Alī al-Nadīrīah al-Ansārī was buried. In the following year (520) Manṣūr died and bequeathed the headship of his community (*ma‘ālāt*) to Ahmad to the exclusion of his own son.

His activities appear to have been confined to
Umm 'Abdīda and neighbouring villages, whose names are unknown to the geographers; even Umm 'Abdīda is not mentioned by Yaʿqūb, though found in one copy of the Masūfī al-Jahiliyya. This fact renders incredible the huge figures cited by Abu l-Hudā for the number of his disciples (mashūs) and even deputies (khutba). The princely style and the colossal buildings in which he entertained them-Sibt ibn al-Jauzi in Miṣr al-Zarnān (Chicago, 1907, p. 336) says that one of their shahāks told him he had seen some 100,000 persons with Rīhā, on a night of Shabān. In Shāfiʿī al-Dhahabī the experience is said to have been Sibt ibn al-Jauzi's own, though this person was born 581, three years after al-Rīhā's death. In Tawārīkh al-Abār (p. 7, 8) his grandfather as well as himself is credited with the assertion.

His followers do not attribute to him any treaties, but Abu l-Hudā produces 1, two discourses (madājī) delivered by him in 577 (3rd Rajab) and 578 respectively; 2. a whole dāma of odās; 3. a collection of prayers (aʿyān), devotional exercises (aʿyān), and incantations (aʿṣā); 4. a great number of casual utterances, sometimes nearly of the length of sermons, swollen by frequent repetitions. Since in 1, 2, and 4 he claims descent from ʿAll and Fāṭima, and to be the substitute (mātī) for the Prophet on earth, whereas his biographers insist on his humility, and disclaiming such titles as bādh, ḍawār, or even shahāk, the genuineness of these documents is questionable.

In Shāfiʿī al-Dhahabī (iv. 260) it is asserted that the marvellous performances associated with the Rīhās, such as sitting in heated ovens, riding lions, etc. (described by Lady, Modern Egyptians, i. 305) were unknown to the founder, and introduced after the Mongol invasion; in any case they were no invention of his, since the like are recorded by Tanūkhī in the fourth century A.H. The anecdotes produced by Dhahabī (repeated by Subki, Taḥkīf, iv. 40) imply a doctrine similar to the Indian ṣūṭī, unwillingness to kill or give pain to any living creature, even lice and locusts. He is also said to have cultivated poverty, abstinence and non-resistance to injury. Thus Miṣr al-Zarnān records how he allowed his wife to be labour him with a poker, though his friends collected 500 dinars to enable him to divorce her by returning her marriage gift. (The sum mentioned is inconsistent with his supposed poverty).

Inconsistent accounts are given of his relations with his contemporary ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Ghāṣṣī. In Bahājī al-Abār it is recorded by apparently faultless imāmi on the authority of two nephews of al-Rīhā, and a man who visited him at Umm 'Abdīda in 576 that when ʿAbd al-Kādir in Baghābdī declared that his foot was on the neck of every saint, al-Rīhā was heard to say at Umm 'Abdīda “and on mine”. Hence some make him a disciple of ʿAbd al-Kādir. On the other hand, a work by Abu l-Hudā's authorities make ʿAbd al-Kādir one of those who witnessed in Medina in the year 555 the unique miracle of the Prophet holding out his hand from the tomb of al-Rīhā to kiss: further, in the list of his predecessors in the discourse of 578 al-Rīhā mentions Mānṣūr, but not ʿAbd al-Kādir. It is probable therefore that the two worked independently.

Details of his family are quoted from the work of al-Fārābī, grandson of a disciple named ʿUmar. According to him, al-Rīhā married first Mānṣūr's niece Khādījīya; after her death, her sister Rabīʿa; after her death Nafīs, daughter of Muḥammad b. al-Kāsimīya. There were many daughters; also three sons, who all died before their father. He was succeeded in the headship of his order by a sister's son, ʿAli b. Uthmān.

Bibliography: The sources of this account have been cited above.

(D. S. Markoe, Rīhā, the name of two towns.
1. The Arabs called the Jericho of the Bible Rīhā or Arīcr (Clermont-Ganneau, in J.A., 1877, i. 498). The town, which was 12 m/E. of Jerusalem, was reckoned sometimes to the Djam of Fīlān (Yaʿqūb, Muḥammmāj, iii. 913; e.g.) and sometimes to the district of al-Bāḥi (Yāqūt, in B.G.A., xii. 113); it was sometimes however the capital of the province of Jordan (al-Urdun) or of Ghawr, the broad low lying valley of the Jordan (Naḥr al-Urdun) from which it was to m/E distant (Yaʿqūt, l. 227). As a result of its warm moist climate and the rich irrigation of its fields the country round the town produced a subtropical vegetation; among its products are mentioned, some already known in ancient times, dates and bananas, fragrant flowers, indigo (prepared from the wāsma plant) sugar-cane, which yielded the best Ghawr sugar. Not far from the town were the only sulphur mines in Palestine (Abu l-Fida, ed. Reinhard, p. 236). There were however many snakes and scorpions there and large numbers of bees. From the flesh of the snakes called tiriyāpīya found there was made the antidote called "Jerusalem tiriyāpīya" (Yāqūt, x. 174). In the Kurān Arīcr is the town of the giants captured by ʿIṣra, there was shown the tomb of Moses and the place where, according to the Christians, their saviour was baptised. The eponymous founder of the town (Arīcr) was said to have been a grandaon of Arphakshad, grandson of Noah. The town was particularly prosperous during the Crusades but then began to decline and was in ruins in the xiii. century. The modern Erīk in the Wādī el-Kelt occupies the site of the town of the Crusaders; it is about 900 feet below the level of the Mediterranean.

RIHÄ — RIKÄ

p. 48, 236; Guy Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, London 1890, p. 15, 18, 28—32, 33, 288, 381, 396 sq.

2. A little town in the district of Halāb. According to Yāqūt it stood in a wooded, well-watered area on the slopes of the Djiabal al-Dirās. By this time, the Arabs meant not only the Lebanon but also its southern continuation as far as the Örontes (Lamassou, Nota sur le Liban, ii. 6; M.F.O.B., i., 1906, p. 271). But in the present case the heights in the east of the Ørontes are certainly wrongly included in the term. Ribā on the contrary is on the northern edge of the Djiabal Bani U'llām (Ibn al-Shihāb, Bārīrī, p. 120, 130), the modern Djielal Arba‘īn, a part of the Djebel Ribā or Djebel al-Zawiyeh (cf. the map Djebel Ribā or Djebel er-Zawiyeh by Rob. Garrett and F. A. North in Public. of the Princeton Univ. Arch. Exp. in Syria, div. ii., sect. B, part iii., 1909).

M. Hartmann suggested that the name Ribā was connected in the name of a town in Syria in an inscription of Concordia at Aquilia (C. I. G. v. 872 = C. I. G. xiv, 2334), and that this corresponds to the Maghrāb on 6 miles south of Ribā, while Dussaud (Topographie de la Syrie, 184, 212 sq.) wishes to identify it with Ribā itself; Hartmann wrote as follows in support of his view (Z. D. P. F., xxii. 145, note 3): “As in the case of Jericho, the form Arba‘ī may have been current alongside of Ribā in favour of this is the fact that Yāqūt, ii. 285, expressly protests against the spelling Arba‘ī for the little town in the district of Halāb: it should not be written with alif, while both forms were usual for the town in the Ghawri.” This supposition is certainly correct; for Ibn al-Shihāb twice writes Arba‘ī (p. 130 with the variant Ribā) and J. B. L. Roux (Liste alphabétique…, in Recueil de voyages et de mémoires, ii., Paris 1825, p. 215) also knows of Arba‘ī (Rībā) alongside of Ribā as the name of the place and of the sūbi‘a (cf. also the Sūbī‘a of Halāb for the year 1256, p. 118). But the identification of Maghrābica with Maghrāb or with Ribā cannot however be maintained for the former is already found near the years 870 (1079) in Kamm al-Din (Zabdat Halāb in Turāsh Halāb, Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS. Arab. No. 1666, fol. 101) as “Marsnikhī in the district of Kafartā” (E. Honigmann, in Syria, x., 1929, p. 282, xii., 1931, p. 99) and is still found as Marsnikhī about 20 miles south of Ribā (du Masneu du Buisson, in Syria, xii. 99 sq., with sketch map).

The Identification of Ribā with the Rūfūs or Rūfūs of the Franks is also untenable; as Dussaud (Topographe de la Syrie, p. 167, 174, 176, 213) rightly points out that this should rather be identified with al-Riyyah of the Arabs.

There is a place noted for its ruins of antiquity called Rowātah ("little Ribā") about 8 miles S. E. of Ribā.

Ribā is very frequently mentioned in modern travel literature as it was on the main road from Halāb to Hamā (ibid., xiiii., 1502; Dussaud, Topographe de la Syrie, p. 215), over which a great road (before 1047) and later a mountain road (1260) travelled in their day. The town is therefore mentioned by Belon in Mans (1548), Pierro della Valle (1616), Wanadali (1671), Pococke (1737); Drummond (1754); C. Nieufray (1778), Seetzen (1806—1807), Burckhardt (1810—1812) and many others.


(E. Honigmann)

RIKA. [See ARARIA, i. 387.]

RIKĀB (Ar., Turkish pronunciation: ribāb and ribābā, "stirrup") in Perian and Turkish usage at Muslimmadan courts: "the sovereign himself or his presence, the foot of the throne" (metonymy like those of hālidūn in(side) (side) of the throne; hāsūr or ħadīr, hābār (the) side; etc.).

In Turkish (Ottoman, Alti, Çaghatāi) the stirrup was called sängi (sangi), older form säng, sänggi (Kutadgu Bilig: Batiğ, ed. Kâzım, p. 49). This word passed into certain foreign languages without the initial vowel: Ar. Syr. sängīya and sängīnus "stirrup, ladder or other means of assistance in mounting a horse" (Freitag, Cuche, Kazimirski, Bochor, Bölt, Berggren; sangyuya is disputed by Dusti); Bulgarian sangevi (alongside of sangevi and yanegi, with a final -ya quite independent of that of the Arabic) "stirrup". In Turkish also there are traces of its use without the initial vowel: Çaghatāi sangi (sangi), Turkish sangi (sangī), Persian from the Ottoman usage sang-e ribāb, as in the Turkish-\(\text{W}^{\text{a}}\)lāh, Bülbül 1246, i. 179). (In spite of these, such coincidences and correspondences like Turk. sängin "rich" for Persian sāngīn, "heavy, precious", the resemblance of sāng and (i)ṣəng may be only accidental.)

The figurative expression ribāb-i hümâyūn (Turk. pronunciation: ribāb-i hümâyūn), or (more rarely) ribāb-i hâmâ(150,799),(837,834)
travelling. For example one said that so-and-so was "in the service of the imperial stirrup" (Houtman, Recueil..., p. 57; iii. 18) or "in the service of the parasol (tato) of the imperial stirrup" (ibid., iv. 7). In modern Persian one says "to be at the stirrup of a prince" for "to be attached to his court" (Kazimirska, Dialogi, p. 493 and 482-483).

In Turkish usage the same expressions were applied to:

1. The imperial cavalcade and the procession formed on this occasion. However, in order to avoid confusion with other uses of the word rikāb, there was also used, especially in the reigns of Mahmūd II and ʿAbd al-Mejid, the Turkish word bîniş which was applied to all public appearances of the sultan, whether on horseback or in a boat (Mouradgea d'Osslon, vii. 141, 144; Jouami and van Gaver, Travées, p. 377 note; Andreyev, Centoimperiale et le Baghère, p. 33, 494). The prince's procession was also called munâqash (menâksh-i hûmayûn) (Houtman, iii. 18); on these words in Ottoman and Egyptian usage, cf. J. Deny, Sommaire des Archives du Caire, p. 104 and 564. Cf. also the name of râbîl solâghī given to the eight solāgh liutenants who walked by the sultan's stirrup in the great procession (Mouradgea d'Osslon, vii. 25, 317).

2. The audience given by the sultan (resefl rikāb or simply rikāb), whether or not he was in procession. The grand vizier himself could only be introduced to the sultan's presence by the latter's formal order and his admission was called rikāb. There were ordinary rikāb and ceremonial rikāb (Mouradgea d'Osslon, vii. 132 sqq.). Cf. details of the barâm rikāb tehreftî in Äfis Tûrkısh, i. 23; cf. Zenker, Dict., i. 468; Atmaca Râşim, Tûrkısh, iv. 1014.

3. The service of the sultan or simply his presence (Sekowski, Collectanea, Warsaw 1824, ii. 24). The presence was not necessarily immediate. Thus the expression rikāb-i hûmayûnde (in the locative), "with the sultan" was used in speaking of the troops (ḫâṣṣ-i hûmayûn) of the capital (ʿAbd al-Rahmân Şerefi, Tûrkısh, p. 292) or of the grand vizier in so far as he was endowed with the full powers of the sultan (M. T. M., p. 528). Similarly the words rikāb-i hûmayûn (in the dative) were used for petitions (esmašt) addressed to the sultan (Menenisk, Tûsûnûn; "Sulaimân's Canon" or Naschîn-i nâmî, p. 151), whence the expression murâbašt rikābîye applied to these petitions.

It is from this convention that we have the use of the words rikāb-i hûmayûn or rikāb in the sense of interior or substitute. With the grand vizier moved from place to place, the government was thought to go with him and there was appointed "to the sovereign a substitute for the grand vizier who was called rikāb kàmmâmahânî" (Bianchi, Dict., 1st ed.; Perry, A view of the Levant, London 1743, p. 37). The other chief dignitaries of the Sublime Porte had also their substitutes "of the imperial stirrup".

*Rikāb* aghâlarî or a ḡâyânî rikāb-i hûmayûn or aṣgarî aghâlarî. — These names were applied to a certain number of important officers or dignitaries of the sultan's palace (from 4 to 11 according to the different sources). They were the miṣr-âli or "standard-bearer", the two aṣgar-âli (embrukar) or "squires", the ḥâṣṣâlarî bożniyât or "chief usher" and other dignitaries with different offices (cf. Liţli Paşa, Aṣgar-âlis, in Türk. Bibliothek, xii. 18 and at of the Türk. text ed. by Tschudi; Beauvoisins, Notice sur le Cour du Grand Seigneur, I869, p. 54; Mouradgea d'Osslon, viii. 141. v. Remmenes, Stantonry, ii. 61, with references to Castellano and At; esp. M. T. M., p. 526, for the božniyât or "majordômes" regarding the ahsâs of the stirrup; Feridün, Minâzât, p. 10, for the rîshâ or protocol relating to them). The following is a translation of the passage in the Aṣgar-âlis which is a comparatively old text (Liţli Paşa's death in 1559): "The diversions of the finances have precedence (gâpûsî) over the sanâdîk beyî and the aṣgarî aghâlarî. The principal (bâš ahrâm) of these is the ahsâs of the Janissaries, next comes the božniyât, then the ḥâṣṣâlarî, the embrukar and the božniyât (starting with the ahsâs of the Janissaries, we have here then an enumeration of the aṣgarî aghâlarî)."

Considering the authority of these sources, we must conclude that the variations are the result of changes which actually took place, which leads us to conclude that the tradition of the palace left the sultan a certain freedom in this respect. We know moreover that admissions to the rikāb was in general subject to the istettân or "approval", pleasure" of the sultan.

The most important function, at least in principle, of the ahsâs of the stirrup was exercised when the sultan mounted his horse: the grand mirâdghâr held the inner stirrup (rî, rikāb), the ḥâṣṣâlarî bożniyât ahsâs, the outer stirrup (dîh rikāb); the miṣr-âli held the bridle and the embrukar assisted the sultan by holding him under the arm or "under the armpit" (balâbûcâ giran). The ḥâṣṣâlarî bożniyât or "chaîmeniers" stood all around and the aṣgarî aghâlarî held the horse's head (M. T. M., p. 526).

On the functions of the chaîmeniers, who to the number of 150, headed by the ḥâṣṣâlarî bożniyât, already mentioned, were in the service of the stirrup, and for other duties beside Mouradgea d'Osslon, viii. 18 and especially M. T. M., loc. cit. Their duties were to take to the sultan important firmanû to convey and carry out various confidential missions.

Sometimes epithets rhyming in -a were added to the word rikāb in the language of the court: e.g. rikāb-i šârûmîrî "stirrup shining like the moon" (Tûrkısh Wûsûf, i. 105); cf. also the epithets: aṣgârî, gûrûnâ, gûrûnâ, demât-i aṣgârâı (Menenisk, Tûsûnûn).

The tribute which the Wovods of Wallachia and Moldavia sent to the sultan in their own name, supplementary to that (stûfû) paid by their subjects, was known as rikâbagh or "sâtû" (Ahmad Râşim, i. 280; cf. Salmeani, Insulae orientales, Bucarest 1900, i. 249).

*Bibliography*: Cf. the works quoted in the text.

(J. Denny)
Turkish usage. — In Turkey the office of rikâbdâr must have been taken over directly from the Sâbîlî, but instead of being assimilated to that of humble grooms or rikâbî, as in Egypt, it became an important dignity at the sultân's court reserved for a single officer. It is in the reign of Orkhan (1326–1360) that we find the first Ottoman rikâbdâr: he was called Kodja Elyas Agâh (Ağa Târîkhi, i. 94). It was however only under Selim I (1512–1520) that the duties of the rikâbdâr were defined. According to the organisation at this time, the rikâbdâr agâh was a bhâzâr-âdâlî, i.e. he was one of the bhâzâr-âdâlî (and not sâbîlî) or “company of the corps” (Mouradji d’Ollissos); chambrière suprême (Castillon); innerer Kammer (v. Hammer) which was the first of the six groups of officers of the household (or etenerâ) of the Serail and consisted of the fixed number of 40 officers or pages including in theory the sultân himself. It had been formed by Sultan Selim I to guard the relics of the Prophet’s mantle (türbâ-i selîmî) brought back after the conquest of Egypt (Ağa, i. 208; for details of the organisation see ibid., and Mouradji d’Ollissos, vii. 34 sqq.). The rikâbdâr was the third of these officers in order of precedence (following the sâbîlî and the lehîdâr and preceding the divânî agâhî) and an officer passed in this order from one office to another. The four officers just mentioned were the only bhâzâr-âdâlî who had the right to wear the turban.

According to the usual definition repeated everywhere, the chief duty of the rikâbdâr agâh was to hold the sultân’s stirrup. It may have been so at first, but none of the documents available show the rikâbdâr performing this duty in practice. Indeed we have seen (cf. nîkâh) who were the “aghas of the stirrup” entrusted with this duty. Now in spite of his name, the rikâbdâr was not one of these. The Arabic version of the Afşâm-i turkân (Batirî, p. 9, note 7) and the German translation (Türk. Râl., N. 12 [1910], p. 17, note 3) have therefore confused rikâbdâr agâh and rikâb agâh, which has given rise to an erroneous interpretation of the whole passage (cf. the corrected translation in the article below).

On the other hand, western writers of the sixteenth century mention as the third officer of the household (lehîdâr) after the sâbîlî and lehîdâr a “cup-bearer” (Theodore Spandoni (Spandony Cantaçin) calls him châhârîâdâr (cf. Garzoni, 1573) and Leunclavius Aghâdarius “bearer of the (water-) jar”, a name also found in Lonicer (p. 69). This water-carrier was given other names later. D’Ollissos (p. 158) and the Ağa Türkîhi (i. 252) speak of a zâf-âlelî or “keeper of the (water-) jar”. Wearing a bohât, he carried a cama (masûra) of warm water at the end of a stick. V. Hammer calls this official masûra, or bearer of the gourd (masûra for masûra).

The use of warm water is easily explained by the fact that, as an author writing in 1651 tells us, the third gentleman of the sultân’s chamber “carried him sherbet to drink, and water to wash with” (De Stochot, Voyage du Levant, Brussels 1662, p. 84: Ichiqiptar, for rikâbdâr; cf. Bandier who writes: rehîqiptar).

On the other hand, there was an officer whose duty it was to carry a sâmeh (sâmeh) plate with silver which the sultân used when mounting his horse when he did not prefer the assistance of a mute.
who went on his hands and knees on the ground (Castellani, Mem. . . ., iii. 139; *Afi*, loc. cit.; d’Olivarre, pl. 157). He was the *iskembe aghzat* or *iskembljati baçhi*, chosen from among the oldest grooms (*kapudan* *tekist*). Wearing a *kuma* or a *kol*, he rode like the water-carrier on horseback in processions (rīkhā). Probably through some confusion Castellani calls him rīkhādār, but adds that in the time the rīkhādār was chosen not from among the *hūzuk* *owdani*, but from the *hūzuk* (mistake for *kapudan*). Nor must we confuse, as Seainean (Influenza orientale, ii. 104, a.v. *schemenigma*) does, the *iskembe* or *iskembljati aghzat* with the special commissioner of this name who was charged, along with the nāmdji aghzat, to install on the throne (*çuma*) the new *bosporus* of Moldavia and Wallachia (cf. Milanges Jorga, 1933, p. 202). There were also *iskemlje aghzat* similar to those of the sultan in certain provinces (L’affouard, Description du pochalet de Bagdad, Paris 1809, p. 27).

Among the special duties of the rīkhādār, we shall only mention the custody and care of the harness etc. of the sultan (as among the Mamluks) and his *pabul* or shoes and *hismos* or boots (*Kusmay of Sulaiman or Nasir-ud-din*, p. 12).

It should be noted that, according to the *Afis Turākī* (l. 208), the services of the rīkhādār like those of the *bochhek*, only required on gala days (*çizm-i râmiyâ*). This practice is said to have been introduced under Mūsa *rây* III (l. 1747-1774) out of consideration for the age of these concerned for they were generally over 60 and had spent 40 years in the service of the court (*vedād yezi*). According to the same work, these duties were reduced to very little. During the ceremonies (*velātle*) of the Prophet’s birthday (*mawlid* or *medawf*), the *hāfs* and at the *hizāb* or ceremonial appearances of the sultan, the rīkhādār sat opposite the sultan in the imperial barge with the *hūzuk*, *hūzuk-nda baçhi* and the two *hūzuk*.

From all this, we may conclude that if there really was a rīkhādār in the time of Orkhan he performed not only the duties of a squire but also those of a “cup-bearer” and we know that in Persian rīkhādār means “cup-bearers”. In time, the rīkhādār becoming a more and more important personage, these duties were divided between two special officers: on the one hand, the *bochhek*, and similar officials, and on the other, the *iskembljati aghzat*.

The rīkhādār aghzat, like the *hāfs*, received a daily salary or *mufta‘* of 35 sters (abbe) while the *bochhek* drew 35 (Hanefi, MS. A. F. T. of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 18b). Like the *hāfs*, they had in their service two *hūzuk* or two *hūzuk-nda*, a *kumbljat* with tasselled caps (*mufta‘*), two *jedekhs*, and two *vedāt*. The rīkhādār who did not attain the rank of *bochhek* were put on the retired list (became *vedāt*) on a pension of 60-100,000 piastres. In the absence of the *hūzuk*, the rīkhādār performed the duties of the latter. On the quarters of the palace occupied by the rīkhādār, cf. *Afis*, i. 312.

The four chief officers of the *hūzuk-nda*, including the rīkhādār, were often called by the name — not official, however — of *dolek* *westeri* or “vixiers of the amir” because they had the privilege of touching the sultan, particularly of giving him their hand or taking him by the arm during a walk and they frequently attained the rank of

wear (Cantemir, *Hist. Emp. Ott.*., Paris 1743, i. 119-121). The rīkhādār *aghzat* [cf. *rikān*] were also *bolek* *westeri*.

The same four officers were also called *'arq aghzat* because they had the right to present *'arq* to the sultan any petition which reached them, like the master of petitions (*rûqâ*), the *hāfs*, and the rīkhādār. In 1248 (=1832-1833; cf. Lufl, iv. 68) and in 1249 (=1839; cf. Lufl, iv. 61); cf. v. Hammer, Hist., viii. 191.

Bibliography: See the works already quoted above of which the most important is the *Afis Turākī*. See also Ahmad Râim, *Târîf*, i. 156, 479; ii. 346; Hammer, Hist., vii. 15 for references not used here.

(R. DENY)

RIŞĀLA. [See RASUL]

RIYĀDI, Ottoman biographer of poets. Mollâ Mehmed, known as Riyâdi, was the son of a certain Mutasem Efendi of Bûrû (S.E. of Smyrna) and was born in 980 (1572). He was first of all employed as a *muderris*, later became *kaif* of Aleppo and died on 9th Safar 1054 (April 17, 1644) (according to J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, vi. 44 in Cairo). He was known as *al-Ayyan*, the “dumb”. His chief work is his *Riyâd al-Shawârâ*, a biographical dictionary of poets containing 384 names. It is known to have been finished by 1018 (1609). He also wrote an abbreviated translation into Turkish of the *Wafa‘at al-Ayân* of Ibn Khallîkân. The lexicon has not yet been published but is accessible in a number of manuscripts, a list of which is given by F. Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 178 (add. Sambali, Lîlî Ismîl, No. 341). On a German translation of an extract from it by v. Rosenzweig-Schwaunna, cf. *Z. D. M. G.*, xx. (1886), p. 439, No. 3 (filling 20 pages).


RIYĀH, an Arab tribe, the most powerful of those that, regarding themselves as descended from Hīlāl [q.v.], left Upper Egypt and invaded Barbary in the middle of the eight (ninth) century. Their chief at that time was Mīnis b. Yahyā of the family of Mihrâ. The Zirîd emir al-Mu‘izz [q.v.], who did not foresee the disastrous consequences of the entry of the Arabs into Ifrîyiya, tried to come to an arrangement with him and to win over the Riyāh. The latter were the first to lay his country waste. But thanks to the protection of the chief of the Riyāh, to whom he had married his daughters, al-Mu‘izz himself succeeded in escaping from Kairûnâ and reaching al-Mahdiyya [q.v.].

At the first partition of Ifrîyiya which followed the invasion, the Riyāh were naturally the best served. They obtained the greater part of the plains, which the Berbers had abandoned to seek shelter among the mountains; they had thrust their relatives, the Aṭhâistributing the east. They held Bījâh which the caliph in Cairo had allotted to them in anticipation. The people of Gales took
the oath of loyalty to Münis. "It was", says Ibn Khalidin, "the first real conquest of the Arabs". The Dijkmi, a family related to the Riyaly, made Gabes a regular little capital, which they adorned with their buildings. Lastly, a chief of the main tribe, Mahruta b. Ziyad, made himself a fortress in al-Mu‘allaka (a Roman circus), among the ruins of Carthage. The powerful lords of al-Mu‘allaka, however, supported the policy of the Zirids of al-Mahdiya, and joined them in their resistance to the Almohads.

This resistance did not long impede the expeditions sent by the Maghribins against Ifriqiya in anarchy. Defeated by 'Abd al-Mu‘min in 546, 555, 583 (1152, 1160 and 1187), the Arabs were ordered to supply contingents for the holy war in Spain. 'Abd al-Mu‘min, leaving a section of the Riyaly in Ifriqiya under command of 'Asakir b. Salih, took the others to the Maghrib with their chief, 'Asakir’s brother Mansur, known as al-Hafi ("the axe"; cf. Dociy, Supplément, i. 114). He settled them in the mountains of the plains of the north of Bu Regreg. This control was little in keeping with the traditions of the Riyaly; Mansur fled to Ifriqiya and there gave his support to the Banu Ghania, who were trying to revive for their own advantage the Almoravid power.

We know how the trouble stirred up by the Banu Ghania led to the Almohad caliph’s appointing a governor of Ifriqiya invested with very extensive powers, Abû Muhammad of the Ifhadiq [q.v.] family. This governor naturally attacked the Riyaly and in order to be rid of them, encouraged the settlement in the country of the Sulaim Arabs hitherto quartered in Tripolitania. Under the pressure of the Sulaim, the Riyaly, the principal family, of whom at this time was the Dawawida, migrated to the plains of Constantine where they were henceforth to remain.

In their new home the position of the Riyaly remained a very strong one. They had rights over all the centre of the modern department of Constantine, approximately from the region of Guelma to that of Bougie. In the Zab [q.v.] they were on terms — which were sometimes friendly but more often hostile — with the Banu Morn of Biskra, who ruled this Hafsid province. This is how the Banu Morn had to fight against that curious movement, at once religious and social, stirred up by the Riyalids marabout Sa‘da. The Dawawida, and in particular their most powerful family, the Awlad Muhammad, held winter lands and enjoyed revenues paid by the people of the Djur in the Sahara region of the Wad Righ.

During the whole of the sixteenth century, the two chief branches of the main tribe, the Awlad Muhammad and the Awlad Sika, were actively engaged in the politics of the Hafsid princes and the Abû al-Walid of Tlemcen, in the enterprises of the pretenders who threatened their dynasties. The power of the Riyaly of central Bu Regreg lasted till the xviith and xviiith centuries. According to Bernardino de Mendoza, they had in 1536 10,000 houses and 20,000 heads and large numbers of foot. The xviiith century saw them assisting the Turkish Bey of Constantine, to whom they were connected by marriage and the independent suzias of Taghurt. In 1644, Caracci and Warin noted that the name Dawawida was still synonymous with "noble Arabs".

Another group of the Riyaly played a notable part in the history of the Zenzili states. In the extreme Magrib, bodies of them transported by the Almohads to the plains of the coast faithfully served this dynasty, by trying to check the advance of the Marinids [q.v.]. Defeated near the Wadit Sbit in 614 (1217), the Riyaly were mercilessly punished by the victorious Marinids. Decimated and weakened, and driven northwards, they submitted to the humiliation of paying an annual tribute. Their name no longer figures on the map of modern Morocco except at a place near the road from al-Ksar to Tangiers.

Finally, at the other end of Barbary, in their first home, the name survives in the nomenclature of the tribes. The Tunisian caliphate of the Riyaly lies between Jeburak and the hills which surround the Gulf of Tunis.


(GÉRÔME MARÇALI)

RIYAL [r'i:al], riyl, from the Spanish real (de plata), the name given in the Muslim world to the large European silver coins which formed the international currencies of the xviith and xviiith century; the most important was the Spanish dollar (peso; properly 8 reals) but the name was also given to the Dutch, German and Austrian dollar, the French écu and Italian scudo. In the late xviith and xixth century the Austrian Maria Theresa dollar took the place of all its rivals and it still circulates to the present day around the Red Sea. The name riyal survived with it.

In the currencies of the modern Muslim kingdom of the Irak and the Hikja riyal is the name of the largest silver coin, the standard being that of the Maria Theresa dollar. A riyal was also issued by the sultan of Zanzibar in 1850. In modern Persia riyal is a money of account: originally (1930) 20 riyls = £1 sig., but by the system finally adopted in 1930, 100 dirhams = 1 riyal = 1 pahlavi = £1 sig.

(J. ALLAN)

RIYALA or RIYALA BEY, abbreviation of riwa‘ Al-Usânîyân hâpadâtçı ‘captain of the imperial [galleys] royal’, from the Italian rialo (secondary form from riola, abbrev. from guisa reale, "the royal galley"), a general officer of the Ottoman navy who commanded the galley of the same name, later "rear-admiral". There was also a popular pronunciation rizalo with the prothetic i frequent in Turkish in loan-words with an initial r (cf. Hindoglu, p. 149 under "contre-amiral" and p. 457 under "riale"; the form rizalo is found as early as Ewelira Cezeli, viii. 466, 48). The Italian pronunciation rizalo is attested in the Dîmârère
Admiral in his absence. From 1246 onwards:

3. *Terenian* (Mann) Serhabak Mubarak (Mubarak) vsa
"Intendant des galères", "Lieutenant of the Arsenal",
"Sachwalter des Arsenalen". He was particularly
concerned with the police of the Admiralty.

4. *Admirals with the title of bey.*

(Except the 4th, these were officers who were sea-going admirals and took the name of Venetian origin, of the vessels they commanded. The name might have the addition of *kumayyin* "imperial" in a
Persian construction whence the official barbarisms:
*bashqadar* (kumayyin), *kapudan-i kumayyin* (Mubarak), etc.
The full titles in this way were: *bashqadar-i kumayyin
kapudan*, *kapudan-i kumayyin kapudan* etc.

1. *Bashqadar*, *bashqardar*, *baskhardar-i (kumayyin)*

— Ital. bastard, Fr. bastard or bastardelle. This
was not the largest unit of the fleet. In
Turkish as in Venetian usage the bastard was a galley
larger than the *galea sensile* (Turk. *gulerga* or
*tekier), but smaller than the galeaza or galliassa
(Turk. *gala* and had a very rounded poop
"like a water-melon" (*gopas* foll.). Among the
Turks it contained 26—36 oarsmen or benches of
5—7 rowers. The one which had the Kapudan Paşa
on board was called (*kapudan*) *paşa bashqadar* and had 26—36 oarsmen. It was distinguished
by the three lanterns (*fener*) attached to the poop
in addition to that on the main mast (*derfi*, fol. 69; *Deryafo Paşa Türkli*, 1300, p. 131). As it
drew the flag of the Grand Admiral, it was sometimes
( *Meneši, Teymurreis, i. 663; Barbier, de
Meyard) called "Captain" but we shall see that
among the Turks this name was given to another
vessel. Chance has it that the first syllable
in the word *bashqadar* means in Turkish "head," "chief" but it is difficult to say that the Ottomans
gave first place to this ship simply as a result of
a popular etymology. The disappearance of the
ship propelled by oars resulted in the abolition of
the *bashqadar*. Officially disused in 1654; ac-

*General Officers of the Admiralty*

(see above).

We are well informed about the hierarchy of
the naval high command at this period, thanks to
the *Teşšebeke-başname*, a work of Shaddar-Sheikh-
Zade Esad Mehemt Efendi (d. 1848). On p. 102
seg. we have a list of the old establishment which
combined the non sea-going officers of which we
shall be content to give a list here, and the
sea-going officers who will be dealt with in more
detail, because the *rastila* was one of them and
bore like them a name taken from the Venetians.

a. General Officers of the Admiralty

(see above).

(All three seem to have had, but perhaps only
from the beginning of the xvi. century, the right to
the title of *paşa*).

The *kapudan-paşa* (i.e.) having the rank of
micalet (micalet). He was the Kapudan Mar
(*kapudan-i irşid*) or, as was also said, the *kapudan*
par excellence. The name *kapudan* from the Venetian
kapitan(a) and its modernised form, probably under
the influence of English, *kaptan*, was further applied
to any commoner ship. Small or large foreign
or Turkish. (The voice *b* in the second
syllable is due to the influence of the neighbouring
label *b* and Trévoux's Dictionary gives the inter-
mediate form *kapoutan* under kapitan-bache; cf.
also Relation des deux excellentes arrivées à Constantin-
ople en 1750 et 1751, The Hague 1737, p. 23.)

2. *Terenian* (Mann) Serhabak Mubarak (Mubarak) *In-
tendant de l'Arsenal* (d'Ohsos), Germ. "Intendant
des Arsenalen" (Hammer), Eng. "Intendant of
the Marine." (Perry). He took the place of the Grand
29th Ramazan 1251 (July 1, 1821), register, No. 9, p. 71.

Patrona bey. Patrona comes from the Venetian (galea or nave) patrona or padrona, Fr. la patronne "galley carrying the lieutenant-general or the next in command to the chief of the squadron" (Jal). The earliest mention of an officer of this rank known to us is connected with the years 1676—1685 (cf. Sūfīli-i eṭhnič, i 112, infra). Patrona Khalil, a janissary, leader of the rebels who deposed Ahmed III in 1730, owed his epitaph to the fact that he had been in command of the Patrona (Relation des 3 rebellions, p. 8; Eng. transl. in Charles Perry, A View of the Levant, London 1743, p. 64). — We also find the forms applied, it is true, to Christian ships: patrona, patronera, baterna, and even botorna (Ewylya Celâl, viii. 579, 161; vi. 104, 7; viii. 447, infra; p. 446, 10; Hassan Ağha, Diwar-i Ta'wirî, MS. Bibl. Paris, S. T. 506, fol. 160—161). All these pronunciations show that the word was already well known, but was finding difficulty in being acclimatized in a western form.

Lumağa rəsī'i "captain (admiral) of the port" of Constantinople, Germ. *Kapitän des Hafens*. He was also commander of the midshipmen (mandılçis). 5. Rıvaya bey. Rıvaya comes from the Venetian (gales or nave) ralea "galley which carried the king or princes" (the same name was often also applied as an epithet to vessels belonging to the king, i.e. to the state, in contrast to privately owned ships). For the lexicology of this borrowing from the Italian see the beginning of the article.

At the battle of Lepanto, Don John of Austria, Captain of the League, sailed in a Reale. A Patrona Reale went astern of the Reale of the Prince and of the Capitanas of the "General Capitan dell' Armata" of Venice. Except for these two ships, none of the 302 vessels of the allies was given the name of Reale (Contarini, Storia della care . . . della guerra musa da Selim Ottoman a Veneziani, Venice 1572, vol. ii 152). In France the Patrona was the first ship of the navy, intended to carry the king, princes, the admiral of France or in their absence the general of the galleys (Jal). At the conquest of Cyprus, in 1570, Contarini (Venice 1592) gives for 185 Christian ships: 18 capitanas, 7 patronas and 1 bastardella (or Reale); for the 276 Turkish ships: 2 real (sic) and 29 capitana (these terms do not correspond exactly to those of Turkish usage of that time).

It is not explained how the title of Reale came to descend among the Turks until it was applied to the ship of the admiral of lowest rank. We may suppose that they were misled by the second meaning of the word Reale [cf. above] or that they confused him with the English "rear-admiral".

Marsigli (Stato Militare . . . 1732, L. 140) mentions the "Turkish "commandante delle Reale" as having a higher rank than the guruvam bâghi who was in turn superior to the 200 of an ordinary galley. According to Esad Efendi, the rivanya came before the hâlmurka bâghi.

All the officers here mentioned from the hâpmun-paşa to the rivanya were pâhîz deînekh, i.e. they had the right to carry, in imitation of their Venetian colleagues, a commander's hat or cane, deînekh, also called hâlbîz or saîd (Esad Efendi, p. 100, 7) because it was encrusted with mother of pearl of different colours [cf. below]. It was what the Venetians called the giunetca or cane (canna), from cane d'Italia, "Italian cane", often taken in the sense of "bamboo" from which we also have the English word "cane". They alone wore small turbans and fur-trimmed robes (cf. d'Ossun, pl. 228).

When under 'Abd al-Hamid I [q.v.] or later under his successor Selim III, the naval hierarchy was organised and to some extent modernised, three grades of admiral were instituted (independent of the hâpmun-paşa, who was the Grand Admiral or "amiralissimo"). They were:

1. the hâpmun-paşa bey "Admiral". Mehmed Shukri regards his rank as equivalent to the more modern one of çavuş-i bâhrîs râsît "president of the Higher Council of the Navy". He had a fixed monthly salary of 4,500 piastres (1 piastre = 3 frs), and in addition received pay for 1,000 men (on which he was liable to make various grants) but with the obligation to give to the hâpmun-paşa spices or hâlbis to the value of 4,000 piastres.

He carried a green cane and had the right to have a pennon below the flag on the main mast (that of the hâpmun-paşa was above).

2. Patrona bey *vice-admiral* (Mehmed Shukri, modern Turkish vis amiral) but we also find the French equivalent of *gudon* (Sami Bey; Tinghir-Snapiun). Salary: 3,500 piastres. Pay of 800 men. Hâlbis to the hâpmun-paşa of 3,000 piastres. Blue cane. Flag on the fore-mast.


It may be noted that in theory there was only one officer of each of these ranks at one time.

All three took part in the battle of Navarino in 1827 (Douin, Navarin, p. 250 and passim). They were under the command of Tâhir Paşa, who had the rank of meşirân. He was himself a patrona but this does not mean duplicating the rank of the patrona who is subordinate to him because the commanders-in-chief of the fleet (per-ackar or hâlbîz-bahgh) were chosen without regard to rank. Hürr-Elyas (Enderûn Türkî, p. 481) mentions a liman râsît with the rank of patrona in 1826.

The flag-commander of the hâpmun-paşa retained his functions but seems to have occupied a position on the edge of the hierarchy which the presence of the Grand Admiral on board sometimes made unenviable (v. Hammer, Staatwerf., ii. 293).

We do not know at what period these ranks were replaced by the more modern terms of meşirân, firîst and hâlbis. The equations of rank varied considerably. The rivanya is regarded as mir ahik, meşirân, firîst, and even hîzbîz firîst. It is probable that it was necessary to choose a grade between these. At Sebaçatopol in 1854, the Turkish fleet was commanded by a patrona, Ahmâd Paşa (of Ahmâd Şükrü's side). In Egypt under the Khedives there was for a time a rivanya paşa in command of the fleet.

**Bibliography:** Only d'Ossun gives definite information about the officers mentioned above. Bk. viii. of vol. vii. (p. 420—436) (Tabellen de l'Empire Ottoman), devoted to the Navy will be read with interest. Cf. also Uebici, Letters sur la Turquie. second ed., Paris 1853, l. 484.
ROKAIYA, daughter of Muhammad. That he had four daughters by Khadijia is repeated by all authorities, but there is no agreement regarding their order, which clearly shows that they aroused little interest in the early period. It is further suspicious that practically the same story is told of two of them, Rokaiya and Umman Kullatun. They are both said to have married sons of Muhammad’s uncle Abul Lahab [q.v.] but were forced by their father to divorce them when Muhammad began his career as a prophet. Still more suspicious is the circumstance that it is told both that the marriages had not been completed when the divorces took place (sam yakun dahala jidda) although some time must have passed before there was a breach between Abul Lahab and his nephew. If we wish to save the tradition, we must assume that the sisters, like ‘A’isha, at a later date, were betrothed to Abul Lahab’s sons and that the divorce took place before the wedding was carried through. It is however more probable that this story is an invention in order to keep the holy family pure from any contamination by relatives of the Prophet’s arch-enemy [see also UMMA KULUM], but the difficulties which this involved were not clearly seen. After the divorce the fair Rokaiya was married by Uthman b. Affan and went with him and other Muslims to Abyssinia, from which they returned after a time. They then went with the Prophet and other Muslims to Madina. But when Muhammad was preparing for his raiding expedition to Badr, Rokaiya fell ill and died before her father returned home victorious. After several miscarriages she presented Uthman with a son who however lost his life shortly, as the result of an accident (a cock pecked him on the face).


RONDA (Ar. Runda), etn., al-Rundi, a town in the south of Spain, in the north of Algeciras and west of Malaga, 2,400 feet above sea-level in the centre of a vast mountainous amphitheatre at the edge of a rocky plateau which ends in precipitous walls on the western side and is cut in two by the great natural cleft of the Tajo 500 feet in depth, at the bottom of which runs the torrent here known as Guadalevin (Wad al-Laban) and later known as Guadiaro (Wad‘ Are). Its peculiar position makes it an almost impregnable natural fortress. At the present day the town is the capital of a partido judicial of the province of Malaga; it has a population of nearly 21,000 souls.

The Muslim town of Ronda, which succeeded the ancient Roman and Visigothic Arunda, was from the vii and the first half of the seventh centuries a centre of one of the most important strongholds of Andalusia. Under the Umayyads [q.v.] it was the capital of the sira of Tolarum [q.v.]. A number of descriptions of it, unfortunately very brief, have been preserved by the Arab geographers; al-Idrīsī however does not mention it. We still see, however, several remains of the Muslim period, such as a remarkable gate in the suburb of San Francisco. The cathedral of Santa Maria La Mayor has taken the place of the great mosque; the ancient citadel or Alcazaba of the Nasrid period was destroyed in 1808.

The principal fortress of the district of Tájaroman was for a long period Bobastro [q.v.] which was the headquarters of the rebel Omar b. Hafsīn [q.v.]. On the fall of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain, Ronda became the capital of a little independent state in the hands of the Berber Baní Frīn; among these rulers were Abū Nūr Hīlāl b. Abū Karra b. Dīnās who was proclaimed in 427 (1039) and died in 449 (1058) after having been the prisoner of his formidable neighbour, the king of Seville, al-Mu’āzidī [q.v.] Ibn ‘Abdād, and his son Abū Naṣr Fatīrī, who after having held out for some months at the instigation of the Abbeddīl ruler, who annexed his state in 450 (1059), Ronda then became the residence of a prince of Seville until a son of al-Mu’āzidī [q.v.], al-Rāfī, had to surrender it to the Almoravid forces under Gārrār in 1091.

Ronda played an unimportant part under the Almoravids and Almohads. In the Nasrid period [q.v.] it was for some time the appanage of the vizier and family of the Bana ‘I-Hakim and was directly concerned in the intertribal fighting of this period. It was taken by the Catholic Kings after a siege of 20 days on May 20, 1485.


ROSETTA (Arabic Raḥīd), a town in Egypt, situated at 31° 24’ N., 30° 24’ E., on the western bank of the Rosetta branch of the Nile (the ancient Boldibiten) about ten miles above its mouth, which is known as al-‘Armusīa and is dangerous to enter. Till the xth century A.D., ships sailed direct to Faiwa; but owing to the excessive depositing of the silt in this region, Rosetta began to take its place during the reign of al-Mutanabkī. In the xith century, however, Abu ‘l-Fīdā‘ remarks that it was still smaller than Faiwa; and, in the xvn, Ibn al-Du‘amī (v. 114) says that it was exclusively inhabited by garrison troops (‘abād al-tābī‘ī ‘a-midham khalīfah mar‘ubalūn). After the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517 A.D. and the decay of European trade through Alexandria, Rosetta became an important centre for maritime trade with Constantinople and the Aegean territory of the Turkish Empire. The Viceroys of Egypt, in 1509, restored its old khānas (warehouses) and fīnādja (hostelries), built new ones, and cleared the silt from its docks. The town continued to flourish until Muhammad b. Abī [q.v.].[1] reconstructed the Mahmūdiya Canal for navigation between Alexandria and the Nile, and thus diverted the course of trade from Rosetta which declined rapidly to a mere fishing town with but few minor local industries such as rough cotton weaving, rice pro-
duction and oil manufacture. Its population in 1945 was only 16,600.

The topography of the town is largely medieval in character and it still retains many noble buildings which mark its past prosperity. Its streets and lanes are both narrow and circuitous with only one large fish market. Till modern times its wall was maintained for defence against Arab raids. At the mouth of the River, near Kôm al-Afrâh, two castles guarded the water entrance to Rosetta in the past. Vansleb, who saw these castles in May 1672, describes them thus: "one stands at the East-side of the River, and the other on the West. That which is about a mile and a half from Rosetta is square, encompassed about with strong Walls, built according to the old Model, having four Towers. One hundred fourscore and four Fanouries are in the Garrison. . . . The other Castle is but a Mosque, before it stands seven Pieces of Artillery on the Guard: Here commands also an Aga over a Company of Moors, who examine all that go in, or out of the City." (State of Egypt, London 1678, p. 105).

From this and the few events only be gleaned about Rosetta. In 1822 (May 20–28) it was the scene of a serious but abortive Coptic revolt; in 307 (520) the Abûsaid fleet of Tarshidi under the admiral Shaml ruled the North African fleet of Oboad Allah al-Mahdi [q. v.] commanded by a certain Sulaimân in the waters of Rosetta; in 1218 (1803) it witnessed al-Baidài's victory over the combined sea and land forces of the Ottoman Porte; and in 1222 (1807) it was seized by the English who came to help al-A'li and his Mamlûk successors. It must also be remembered that in 1799 a.d. in the neighbourhood of the town, Boussaid, an officer of the French Expedition, discovered the famous Rosetta Stone now in the British Museum.

Bibliography: See works already mentioned in articles on other Egyptian towns.

(A. S. Atiya)

ROSETTA — RU‘BA B. AL-'ADJDÄDJ

The name Ru‘ba is more frequent among men from eastern Arabia than is generally supposed. Arabic philologists give many explanations of this peculiar name. I am however certain that it is the Persian word râdûd meaning "for." Al-Âmidî in the Kitâb al-Ma‘ânî wa l-Mauzûtûlûf mentions three poets of this name (p. 121–122), but only Ru‘ba b. al-Adjdâdî, of the tribe of the Banû Malik b. Sa‘d b. Zaid Manût b. Tamûn became celebrated as a poet of râdûd verses, in which genre he surpassed both his father and the latter's rival Abu ‘l-Nâṣîr al-'Ajîjî. Of his life very little is known. Like his father he spent most of his life in the desert (jâdiyya) and only came into the towns when he sought presents for his panegyrics from the great. Born about 65 (685), in his middle years he went about with the armies which were spreading the power of Islam. His earliest productions are certainly lost, but we have a panegyric (No. 22) on al-Kasim b. Muhammad al-Tâlîsî, the conqueror of Sind, on his return from India to Iraq in 713. As in the following year al-Kasim was thrown into prison and murdered, the date of this poem is fairly certain. One poet then travelled in Eastern Persia, either as a soldier or a merchant, and a further poem by him (No. 26) is dedicated to another governor of Sind, Abu al-Malik b. Kais al-Dhâbî who was there about 15 years later.

Whether he was in Khurâsân during the troubles that broke out after the death of Kûtâbih b. Muslim (90–915) is not clear, but several poems are dedicated to individuals who took part in the fighting there. His poem attacking al-Mu‘allâh (No. 27) shows that he was against the Yarmûkians as do his poems in praise of Maslama b. Abu al-Malik who conquered Yazid b. al-Mu‘allâh and killed him (102–720). But he must have again been in eastern Arabia or the Yarmûkian, as is shown by his poems on Khâtîf b. Abu'âd Allah al-Kasîf, Abu'âd b. al-Walid al-Badîjî and al-Mu‘allâh b. Abu'âd Allah al-Klîlî. At a later date, he dedicated poems to men who were active in Persia like Muhammad b. al-Âshîr b. al-Khuzî who was in Kirmân in 750 (747) and particularly Nâsr b. Sâyîr, who failed to put down the rising of Abû Muslim and died in 751 (748). A poem (No. 41) is dedicated to the last Umayyad caliph Marwân b. Muhammad of whom he still hopes that he will conquer all his enemies.

As he had in this way shown his attachment to the Umayyads, it is no matter for surprise that Ru‘ba did not feel his life safe when he was summoned before Abu Muslim. Of the audience he only noted that Abu Muslim showed himself a counsellor of Arabic. Two poems in praise of Abû Muslim are to be found in Geyer's Nachträge (Diiamb 4 and 6). Several other poems in praise of members of the new dynasty have survived: one (No. 55) is dedicated to Abu 'l-Âbâb b. al-Saffâ; and two to his uncle Sulaimân b. 'Ali (Nrs. 45 and 47), and the latest poems of Ru‘ba are in praise of al-Manšûr, who succeeded his brother as Caliph in 750 (747) (No. 14 and Diiâm 8). He was then an old man and is said to have died in 762 (754).

All Ru‘ba’s poems are in the rajaz metre; the few verses in other metres ascribed to him I have found to be by other poets and wrongly attributed to him. He had learned the art from his father, whom he even accuses of having taken credit for his poems when Ru‘ba began to write, and we actually have a poem by Ru‘ba against his father (No. 37). From his father he also inherited a fondness for unusual words and his poems are among the most difficult in the Arabic language, as they are full of words which are never or only very rarely found in other poets. One even suspects that for the sake of effect the poet coined new words which did not previously exist. He is fonder than any other poet of a kind of alliteration or, to be more accurate, an accumulation of a number of forms from the same verbal root. No one can make this sort of thing beautiful and Ru‘ba’s poems have probably survived only because the lexicographers found them a rich quarry for unknown words. A proof of this is the number of lines from his poems which are quoted in the great dictionaries, and in the Littât al-‘Arab, for example, are listed to several thousand.

It is no wonder then that the learned men of al-Basra and, less often, of al-Kiffa visited him to increase their knowledge of the jû‘bâ until he became tired of them. We even find that the Kûtâbihwâni in his Jâzâ‘ al🥱âlîn Su‘îr quotes Ru‘ba for readings of the Kûrâ which have no other justification that they are different from the known readings. Ru‘ba simply claimed to know better.

Ru‘ba had two sons, ‘Abd Allah to whom two poems are dedicated (20 and 56), and ‘Ubi who
also wrote poems in the same metre as his father (Dīdīhā, Bayān, i. 23; Ibn Kustalā, Ṣīrī; Marzubānī, Muwāqiqšāh, p. 218 and 366; Ibn Rashīdī, ʿUmda, i. 136).

Rūbaʿi's poems were collected by several scholars, among them Abū ʿAmr al-Shalābī, Ibn al-ʿArabī and al-Sukkārī, of whom the two last named are probably represented by the surviving manuscripts (cf. Diāmbs 40–44). The contents of these manuscripts have been edited by Ahlwardt (Berlin 1903), unfortunately without the commentary which is absolutely necessary for the poems of Rūbaʿi, and in the alphabetical order of the rhymes which makes it difficult to recognize the original arrangement of the collection. As this edition was incomplete, Geyer in 1908 published in a collection of several rāgīs poets eleven further poems with the commentary under the title Alterarabische Dichtungen. Ahlwardt had in his editions of other poets added a collection of verses which he had found in various works quoted as by Rūbaʿi. This collection was extended by Geyer in his Beiträge zum Dīwān des Rūbaʿī (S. B. d. Wiss., vol. cxxiii, 1910). Even then there remain lines attributed to Rūbaʿi which have escaped both editors, while many lines are not by Rūbaʿi but belong to other poets. Confusion seems to have begun at quite an early date between the poems of Rūbaʿi and those of his father al-ʿAdījādū. Ahlwardt also published a complete German translation of the whole Dīwān in rhyme. The value of this translation is unfortunately small as it is really only a paraphrase and does not help us with the difficulties of the Arabic text.

**Biography:** Biographical notices on Rūbaʿi are found in Dīmārḫ, Tashbīrī, ed. Helì, p. 147 (where unfortunately the MSS. have a lacunary; Ibn Kustalā, Ṣīrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 376–381; Marzubānī, Muwāqiqshāh, p. 218; Kīthālī, Muḥāqiqshāh, 211, 84–91; Ibn Khālidn, ed. Cairo 1310, l. 187. — Lines by Rūbaʿi are quoted in large numbers in all the large dictionaries.

**Rūbaʿī, qutrāin (plural rūbaʿīs, from the Arabic rūbaʿī, "quadrupartite").** Its fundamental characteristics have already been defined (cf. the article 'Alī, i. p. 470; on p. 468 sq. are given the forms of Arabic popular songs in quatrains). It consists of two distichs (baʿīt) or four hemistichs (mīrāt) rhyming together with the exception of the third (baʿīt), the third being called ʿabāt ("castrated"); the two hemistichs of the first baʿīt (mīrāt) must rhyme. The rubāʿ in which the four hemistichs have the same rhyme is found particularly among the old poets (cf. ʿUṣnūr's Dīwān). The rubāʿ lends itself to every kind of inspiration. According to one theorist, the first three hemistichs serve as an introduction to the fourth which ought to be sublime (buland), subtle (lajūf) or epigrammatic (īta). According to E. G. Browne (Lit. Hist. of Persia, i. 472), the rubāʿ is almost certainly the oldest product of the poetic genius of Persia. The Persian philologists attribute the invention of this metre to a child playing at nuts with its playmates: one of the nuts being fallen out of the hole by a rebound then fallen back rolling, the child called out chalīna chalīna hani rawdāt 2 lān-i ākh, "rolling, rolling it goes to the bottom of the hole". According to the Tadhkīrāt of Dāwūdshāh (ed. Browne, p. 50), the child was the son of the emissary Yaḥyā b. Laḥīb the Saffārīd and the officials of the court recognized in this hemistic a variety of ḫaṣīd: "they added a second hemistich (mīrāt) to it with the same scansion, then a second line (baʿīt) which they called ḫaṣīdī ("poem in two verses") but some scholars, considering that it consisted of four hemistichs (mīrāt) adopted the same rubāʿ and Rūdāki was the first to excel in it" (it should be noted that Asālī's dictionary Lāghātī Fūrūṣ, ed. Horūn, quotes two rubāʿī by poets at least as old: Abū ʿl-Muʿayjī, p. 69 and Shāhid, p. 112). The anecdote is again found in a work written in 1220 (nearly three centuries before Dāwūdshāh), the Muṣafīn fī Muʿātīr al-ʿAdījādun, i. 127, of Shamsī Kān (ed. Mīrza Muḥammad and Browne, p. 88): one holiday, in a street of Ghazni, the poet Rūdāki ("at least I believe so", says the author) was watching some children playing at nuts: a boy of ten or fifteen improvised the same hemistich in the same conditions. "These words seemed to the poet to be inscriptible metre, a pleasing poetic form; he consulted the rules of prosody and recognized in it one of the derivatives of the ḫaṣīd;... on account of the high place which he held in his eyes, Rūdāki confined himself to two lines (baʿīt) for each poem;... as the inventor of the metre was a young and innocent boy (for), Rūdāki called the metre taʿarūma" (cf. Horn, Grundr. der neu-persischen Epen, Nr. 382 and n. 3: Niẓāmī's hemistich is no doubt quoted from the Fārsūnī Dīwān: har taʿarūma taʿarūma mīrāt, "every young man was singing verses"). The Haft Kūstūm describes taʿarūma as the rubāʿ of which the four hemistichs (mīrāt) have the same rhyme (which is at least disputable). According to Shamsī Kān (ed. cit., p. 90, 190), "the connoisseurs of poems set to music (maḥfūzāt), called taʿarūma the rubāʿ set to music and ḡaṣīdī the rubāʿ without music, because it had no more than two lines; the arabised Persians (muṣafīr) called the rubāʿ the ḥaṭīt, because in Arabic the haṣṣād has four mīrāt (while in Persian it has eight); each line of this Persian metre makes two Arabic lines (in other words: a Persian mīrāt is equal to an Arabic ḥaṭīt). From the fact that the melodic change used in this metre did not exist in Arabic poetry, Arabic was not written in this metre but now the modern poets use it freely. Arabic rubāʿī have become common in Arab lands". On this point in his Dīwān al-Khāṣṣ (Aleppo 1349, p. 174), al-Bikhrājī (12th century; q.v.) says that his father repeated several Arabic rubāʿī to him; these may be reckoned among the earliest in this language. In the Sālīḫī period the vogue of the rubāʿī seems to have reached its height. Rawandi (Rūḥāt al-Sudūr, ed. Muḥammad ʿĪbīl, p. 344) says a propos of a man of letters of Hamadān: "He was called Nādir (al-Dīn) Dūbūbī; he possessed wealth which he lavished on men of talent; with an inkwell and a pen he put into writing all rubāʿī that he found; he left neither property nor furniture;... his heirs shared 50 mān of manuscripts containing ḥaṭīs". No Persian metre admits of so many variations. Indeed, the theorists number 24 types of rubāʿ derived, half from the haṣṣād-ī ḏaḥram, half from the haṣṣād-ī ḥaḥraḥ (the latter more pleasing to the ear, according to Shamsī Kān). The Khorasanī philologist Ḥasan Kattān divides these two series into two trees (Ḫaṣṣār) which figure in the treatises on prosody (Shamsī Kān, p. 92; Blochmann, Prozody der Perser, p. 68).
RÜBAIY — RÜDÁKI

and which clearly show the variations (asākīf) of the hasadī mughāman sālim (muf'alun, 8 times). Four different metres may figure in the four hemistichs of rubā'i. Shams-i Kāshḵ, thus explains the mechanism of this poetical form: "The beginning of the hemistichs of the dā-bātī is maf'ulun (called ahašrā) or maf'alun (called ahašrōn). When the first foot is maf'alun, the second becomes maf'alun (sālim) or maf'alun (muf'al). If the second foot is maf'ūlun, the second becomes maf'ulun or maf'ulun or maf'ulun (this last ahašrā); when the second foot is maf'ulun or maf'ulun, the second becomes maf'ulun (sālim); when the second foot is maf'alun or maf'alun or maf'alun, the third becomes maf'alun or maf'alun. The last foot which follows maf'alun or maf'alun or maf'ūlun becomes fa' (ahār) or even fa' (uṣīl); that which follows maf'ulun or maf'alun becomes fa' (ahār) or even fa' (uṣīl)."

Further, according to Shams-i Kāshḵ, some poets have written maf'ūlāt (pieces of several lines) in this metre, e.g. Abū Thāhir Khaṭṭāni (from whom he quotes a passage); Farrarī also deliberately composed a hašrā [q.v.] in the dā-bātī metre, sometimes retaining the same rhyme in the two hemistichs so that several rubā'ī can be taken from it. It may be recalled that the formula fa' hašrā wa'fa' hašrā malā ilā ilā ilā ilā (muf'alun muf'alun mas'ūl fā'ā) was used as ma'īfī in certain quatrains (quoted by Ḭaṣṣ Abū Ḥamid 'Alī, Rūdākī-i Tarāvīn, ed. Bichsoonar, 1867, p. 9). Most Persian composers composed rubā'i in the metres mentioned. Some owe their fame to this metre: Abū Sahl [q.v.]; Ḥamzā-i Khwojmā; Bāḏī Abāf al-Dīn Kašfa (ed. Sāḥib Naṣīr, Teherān 1311 = 1933). A collection of them is attributed to Djalāl al-Dīn Rūdākī (Stambul 1314, 400 p.). On the other hand, the name rubā'i is wrongly but traditionally given to the quatrains of Bāḏī Tāhir [q.v. in hasadī mughāman: maf'ulāt (muf'alun muf'alun mas'ūl) and other quatrains in dialect (bashālīyat); cf. H. Kohl Kirmānī, Tarāvīh-i mušīl, Teherān 1310]; these are really ḫāšfānī on the quatrains in Arabic, of Dāyī, Supplem., v. dā-bātī; Ben Ceneh, Tufkat al-Adab fī Muḥāna Abūl-Ale (Algeria 1928, p. 113-117); in Turkish: Gīb, Olowum Poesia, i. p. 88; in Hudūstānī: Gardīn de Tassy, Litt. Budūnī, 2nd ed., i. p. 36-37 and his edition of the Divvāt al-Wadā' (passim).

Bibliography: In addition to the references already given: Shams-i Kašḵ (op. cit., p. 338); Gardīn de Tassy, 9tīḥāt-i Fārābī, 2nd ed. 1873, p. 319 sqq.; Rückert, Grasmaniāt, Poetics und Rhetorik der Perser, 1874, p. 65. (HENRY MASRI)

RÜDĀKI, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Dāvūd b. Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm b. Abū Raḥmān b. Āḥam, a native of Rūdākī in the vicinity of Samarkand... he is said to have been the first good poet in the Persian language... according to al-Baḥrī, vizier of Lūmābd Abāf, emissary of Khūrdāš, he had no equal among either Arabs or Persians; he died at Rūdākī in 339 (949-950) (Samālūs, ʿAṣsār, p. 376, 10, in M. A. L., vol. 262; later in text according to E. G. Browne, Sussex List of Muhammadan MSS. in the University of Cambridge, p. 101). To be more accurate, Rūdākī was born and died in Bannawi (Yāḵtān, Maḏwān, s. v.) near Rūdākī. Some writers wrongly say that his teaching came from his skill in playing the lute (rūdākī, rūdākī). In any case the pronunciation Rūdākī should be abandoned. We know few details of his life. From scattered allusions in his poems, it seems that Rūdākī left his native village to go to Būkhārā to the Sāmānīd amir Naṣr b. Abūmāli, whose panegyrist he became. Later he accompanied the amir to Būdhgīsht and Herāt. There is located the incident, recounted by several biographers, of the courtiers desirous of returning to Būkhārā to spend the winter there begging Rūdākī to use his influence with the amir Naṣr; the poet composed his famous poem ("The scent of the river Mīlīyān", etc.) which decided the prince to return at once; richly rewarded, Rūdākī returned to Sāmānīdī, travelling sumptuously. Two verses attributed to Rūdākī refer to journeys to Samarkand and to Ǧīlūpūlī. The poet on the "dīwan Muḥīn dustū Āḥam" alluding to a certain Āḥam, the favourite slave of Rūdākī. The biographers say that he was born blind, but a number of his verses which describe in glowing colours the beauties of the sensual world (quoted in Naṣīf, p. 550 sqq.), prove that he lost his sight at an advanced age; it has been supposed that the blindness was caused either by a clumsy oculist or was a repulse on the protegés of the vizier Bāšāmī, Rūdākī, banished from the Sāmānīd court on the dismissal of the vizier (326), is said to have retired to his native village; from this period (his three last years) date the verses in which he regrets his youth and his brilliant past (Naṣīf, p. 561). In his earlier days, according to his biographers and the allusions of later poets, his talents had considerably enriched him. Following Abī ʿAbd Allāh Ǧīlūpūlī (d. 405), a historian of the Sāmānīd Īmām, says that Rūdākī was buried at Bānbūlī, "behind the garden of the village"; the Rūdākī pilgrimage used to be made is (which proves his fame outlasted). According to some writers, Rūdākī wrote 3,000,000 bāṭl six mughāmān (the Farākhānī Liqāʿīnī mentions one of them: Dāvūrandī ʿĀṣūfī) in addition to his dīwān of lyrics; on the other hand, Tafṣīlī, Firdawīsī and others agree in saying that he put the Kūtla ābī-Dinna [q.v.] into verse from a translation into Persian prose by order of the Sāmānī Īmām Naṣr. Of his works only a few fragments remain. E. Denison Ross (J. R. A. S., 1924, p. 669 sqq.) has shown that the edition of the Divvāt al-Rūdākī (Teherān 1315) consists chiefly of the poems of Ǧaṭrān of Tabrīz [q.v.] who lived a century later. Does this confusion come from the name Naṣr, borne by the patron of both poets and figuring in their panegyrics? E. D. Rose agrees that this attribution took place early but supplies the lion of the poems of Rūdākī, whose fame had been lost, Ifṣān Rāzī b. ʿAbd Allāh in his Ṣafvatār entitled Muḥīmān, where he had examined some twenty copies of Rūdākī's Divvāt and only attributed a dozen ʿāṣīfān and 20 quatrains after collaboration to Rūdākī, the remainder to Ǧaṭrān. In all, according to Ross, we may attribute to Rūdākī the authorship of the following: 1. the isolated verses quoted in the Lugāt-i Fort of Asadī (ed. Horn, p. 18-19); 2. six distichs from the translation of the Kūtla quoted in the Tufkat al-Mulūb (J. R. A. S., 1924, p. 638); 3. four pieces quoted by Balḥātī (J. R. A. S., loc. cit., p. 639); 4. the 29 quotations in Shams-i Kašḵ (Maḏwān, Mirā Mūḥammad and Browne, index); 5. the famous passage in the river Mīlīyān (Naṣīf ʿArūdī, Ǧaṭrān-Maḏwān, transl. Browne, p. 33); 6. the ʿāṣīfān, No. 6 in Eche's collection (Rūdākī, der-
Sünnîdanidîcher, in N.G.W. Götze, 1873, p. 660, a poem of poignant melancholy, in which we find the name of the 
in ‘A’wâfî’s Lâhîb al-Ma’âlkî (ed. Brown, index), 8. the very beautiful baccal poême of 94 
lines written by F. D. Rose and Mirzâ Muhammad Kaywînî, publ. in T.R.A.S., 1892, 
p. 213 sqq.). Some have said that Râdîk is the oldest poet of Irân, although we know of 
precurors at least half a century earlier. His biographers say that he knew the Korân by heart 
and wrote verses in his eight year. In any case, his knowledge of the language is evident from the 
many quotations from him in the Persian litterators (the Lâhîbî-Fûrs quotes him oftener than 
any other poet). Hâfizî Khallîa credits him with a philological work (Tâdîf al-Ma’âlîqûr & Lâhîb 
al-Fûrs). One of his verses shows his acquaintance with Arabic poetry. Shams-i Qâla (Muqâm, p. 88) 
makes him the inventor of the rubûl [q.v.] but does not assert it definitely. Râdîk holds a place 
of honour in the panegyric (the genre of Persian poetry of which the oldest examples have survived). 
Later poets recognize him as a master of it (Nafîsî, p. 597 sqq.); he is distinguished for his sincerity and 
dignity. In the rubûl [q.v.] ‘Unurq admires his simplicity. He was an innovator and excelled 
in baccal poetry, notably in the already mentioned poem (No. 8.), a subject later taken up by Mirzâ 
[q.v.]. He is remarkable for his original similes and paints nature vividly in various aspects. There 
are a number of proverbs (Nafîsî, p. 612) in the verses attributed to him; other lines are pity 
expressions of a moral character. Some later poets inserted verses by Râdîk among their own (Nafîsî, 
p. 616). Mu’izzî [q.v.] even tried to imitate the famous poem on the Mâlyân (No. 5), according to 
Nîzâm ‘Arûfî who, quoting the later piece, proclaims the superiority of Râdîk (Câhîr Ma’âlî, 
transl. Brown, p. 35-36); at a later date on the other hand, this poem is vigorously criticised by 
Dawlatîsh (cf. E. G. Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, ii, p. 16) which clearly shows the 
acquisition of literary taste.

Bibliography. — In addition to the references already given: Nîzâm ‘Arûfî, Câhîr Ma’âlî, transl. Brown, p. 113–114; Rijjâ 
Kûl Khân, Ma’ajûz al-Fârûz, l. 236 sqq.; Safî Nafîsî, Ahmad wa-Abderr-rahîm Râdîk, Téhrârin 
1310; A. W. Jackson, Early Persian Poetry, p. 32 sqq.; E. G. Browne, A Lit. Hist. of Persia, 
Index; do., The Sources of Dawlatîsh ... with an Excursus on Farâbî and Râdîk, in 
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RUDHRWAR, a district in al-Dîbâl (Media) south of Mount Alwând, halfway between Hamâshân and Nihâwân. According to Ibn al- 
Fakîh, it was a valley in the district of Nihâwân, which was three farsakhs in length and 
formed one of the most pleasing spots in the Sasanian empire with its 93 villages all linked 
up one another by an uninterrupted stretch of orchards and perennial streams. The principal 
product was a world renowned saffron which was exported through Nihâwân and also through 
Hamâshân. There also grew there as a result of the mild climate in the shelter of the mountains on the north, 
grapes, pomegranates, walnuts, almonds, apples, pears and other fruits. According to al-Iskâfî,

the pulpit mosque of the district was in Karadj, 
known as Karadj Rûdhrwâr to distinguish it from the same place near Isphân, Karadj Abî Dulâm. 

Bârî Khâni in 495 (1010–1012) went from Rûdhrwâr via Marjîl Khânstân to Sâwâ (Ibn al- 
Ahdîr, s. 137). Hâdî Abû al-Mustawfi calls the district Rûdhrwâr with the towns of Sârân and 
Fârîn. On modern maps it is still found under the southern base of the Alawand, as Tschër at 
which the district is now called, a little farther south.

Not far from the village of Rûdhrwâr, i.e. 
presumably of Karadj, was a village called Muâshân 
(al-Salâyîd al-Murâqî, Tâdîf al-’Arâzî, Cairo 1307, 
vii, 178; P. Schwartz, Iran im Mittelalter, v, 552).

The present ruins of Rûdhrwâr (De Morgan, 
Mission en Perse, ii, 136) are certainly those of 
Karadj, capital of Rûdhrwâr (Le Strange, East 
Caliphâ, p. 197, note 1).

197, 199; Ibn Hawâlî, B. G. A., ii, 258; 262; 
al-Ma’âlîqûr, B. G. A., iii, 51, 386, 393 sqq.; Ibn 
al-Fâkîh, B. G. A., v, 209, 236; Ya’qûb, Muqâm, 
ed. Wustenfeld, ii, 834; Hâdî Abû al-Mustawfi, 
Bombay 1311, p. 152 sqq.; G. Le Strange, The 
Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905 
(1930), p. 197; P. Schwartz, Iran im Mittelalter 
mit den arabischen Quellen, iv, Leipzig: 1912, 
p. 502–504; v, 1925, p. 519, 553; 
1929, p. 927, 941.

(E. HONIGMANN)

AL-RUDHRWARAN ŻAIKH AL-DIN ABU SHU’IY MUHAMMAD B. AL-HUSAIN B. MUHAMMAD B. ABU 
ALLAH B. IBRAHIM, an Abu’l-fâzîl vizier. Rûdhrwârân was born in al-Ahwâz in 357 
(1045–1046); his father Abu Ya’lî al-Husain, who had died just as he was about to take over 
the vizierate to which he had been appointed by the Caliph al-Kâ’im [q.v.] (460 = 1067– 
1068), was a native of Rûdhrwâr, a little town near Hamâshân. He studied in Baghdaï under 
the direction of Shâhî Abu Isfahân al-Shârârî 
and in 471 (1078–1079) was appointed vizier by the Caliph al-Ma’âkîdî but dismissed after a short 
period of office. After the fall of ‘Amid al-Dawla 
b. ‘Ushîr [see Ibn EIAFFA 2], al-Ma’âkîdî again 
gave him the vizierate in Shâhân 475 (Dec. 1083– 
1084), and this time he held office for several 
years. In Safar or Rabî’ I, 484 (April or May 1091) 
he was dismissed at the instigation of the Sâlîdî 
Sulaymân Malîkshâh [q.v.] and retired to Rûdhrwâr. 
From there he went in 487 (1094) on the pilgrimage 
to Mecca; in the vicinity of al-Rasûlî however, 
the caravan was attacked by Beduins and al- 
Rûdhrwârân is said to have been the only one 
who escaped. He then settled in Medina where he 
lived till his death in the middle of Dhu’l-Qa’dâ II, 
488 (June 1095). He was buried on the Bakrî 
al-Ghûrād near the tomb of Ibrahim, the son of 
the Prophet.

Al-Rûdhrwârân is praised by eastern historians 
not only for his piety and devotion to duty, but 
also for his eloquence and poetical gifts. He wrote 
among others a continuation of the Tâdîfîrûb 
al-Umân of Ibn Miskawaih [q.v.] (Dâ‘îl al- 
Tâdîfîrûb al-Umân) containing the years 968–989 
(997–1009), edited and translated by Amedros 

Bibliography: Ibn Khallîkân, Wafâyât 
al-Râ’în (ed. Wustenfeld), No. 712, transl. de
RUDJU (A.), return in the neo-Platonic sense, forms the main subject of the apocryphal "Theology of Aristotle". The question deals mainly with the individual soul, who has descended or fallen into this earthly world of bodies but are purified by knowledge and who return to their original home, the spiritual world, either in an essential condition or after separation from their bodies by death. Mooț is used alongside of rođu; the verbal forms from rauđa are frequently employed; connected with these we find a number of expressions, sometimes related in meaning and sometimes giving a closer definition. The Arabic translators of the "Theology" took their terminology in part from the ḫara and sacred tradition; we must however here confine ourselves to the neo-Platonic meaning and its reception into Islām.

In a certain sense the doctrine of return is a counterpart of the theory of emanation (cf. the article faid in the Supplement). Everything comes from God and returns to him! Logos and (soul) mythos are, however, more interwoven here than in the doctrine of faid. There is a general presupposition of the purely spiritual substantiality of the intelligent soul (nafs nāsiha) and of its immortality, which has not only a philosophical foundation but is supported by appeal to the age-old cult of gods and ancestors (see "Theology", ed. Dietrich, p. 170; Ḫorhē and Pythagorean traditions and views of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are combined and harmonised.

Let us begin with an outline from the "Theology" (p. 4-8 and pačis). The human, i.e. intelligent soul does not feel at home in its association with an earthly body. Lying in the filth of matter, it longs for return to its pure origin. It was once a part of the elevated world soul produced by God through the intermediary of the intellect (rađa). So long as it was in the world-soul its place was in the centre of the all. The world-soul has a two-fold countenance: on the one side directed upwards, it looks to the rađa and by it to God; on the other it turns to the corporeal world which emanated from it and is guided by it (cf. "Theology", p. 20). If so far as the world-soul has caused the corporeal world, it knows its product, but as a spiritual being, it always remains within itself. It is however possible that parts of the all-soul may turn more deeply to the worldl, form an idea of it and demand to be united with it. This is the cause of the descent or fall of the individual soul (hukāh; also moṣū, ḥanān, sanānī etc.; Greek σαμαστική) but as every individual soul partakes of spiritual being and immortal life it can never fall completely (cf. p. 132): in part it remains with itself in the upper world, in part it combines with the corporeal world and in part it wanders in and forth. Such migrations of the soul are naturally to be interpreted in the spiritual sense, i.e. independently of time and space.

The descent of the individual souls differs very much in degree. The deeper it sinks into matter, the more it forgets its heavenly origin. If it gives way to its passions and desires, it cannot rise again to its origin, and even after the separation from the body by death, only with great difficulty, but the souls that turn away through asceticism from the sensual world, prepare themselves by good deeds and — this is the most important — purely and perfectly by love and knowledge, can, either in ecstasy ("Theology", p. 8; cf. thereon Massignon, Textes inédits, p. 134 sqq.) or after death raise themselves to their origin (mawfuṣ, ṭayyārīn; ṭaḥābāt = Greek ἁρμοδίως), where they see the rađa and through it God himself in light and beauty. Plato had already spoken of this elevation (e.g. Republic, viii, p. 517 B: τὸν τινὰ τῶν σωτῆρ τῶν θεόν τοῦ θεοὺς. According to the "Theology", p. 10 sqq., Herakleitos, Empedocles and Pythagoras also urged the soul to this ascent; the Ḫibwtn al-Ṣałaḥ and Proclus, the astronomer, and interpreted the ascension of Christ and Muhammad’s journey to heaven (mawṣūf) in a spiritual sense. Muslim philosophers and mystics did the same.

After what has been said, it is evident that the elevation (ṣān) of the soul to its origin (‘ilā l-rađa) can be called a return. It is more closely defined as a return to its interior, to its own being (‘ilā dā‘itha). It is man entering into the self, a becoming conscious of one’s own self, not a losing of being, not a destruction. The speculative mystics in Islām went a great deal farther in this direction.

According to the "Theology" (p. 18 sqq.), the return to the origin or being cannot only be a state (dā‘) of the soul, not of the mind. The ṣān remains by itself and therefore never needs to return to itself; thinking, thinker and thought are always one in its being. When in the Libr de causis (ed. Bardenhewer, § 6, cf. § 14) a return to its being is predicated of the rađa, this can only be interpreted as an uninterrupted self-consciousness. So far the doctrine of the fall and return of the soul can be presented as fairly uniform. It shows a pessimistic conception of the life of the soul in combination with the body. But it also finds an optimistic interpretation ("Theology", p. 10 sq.). With Plotinus it is observed that Plato talks another language in the Timaeus (cf. p. 28 a–b) from that of the Phaedrus and Republic. According to the Timaeus, God created this beautiful world and equipped it in his great goodness with mind (ṣān) and life (‘ilā-sul). Not only has he sent the all-soul into the world but also our (part-)souls so that the world may be as perfect as possible. If the individual soul can only conceive the sensual world correctly, i.e. as the image of the intelligible world, its combination with the physical world will not be a misfortune for it. Both worlds have come from God, the pure good. The only question is, what is the purpose of the soul in this world.

To this the "Theology" answers (p. 43 sq.) that the union of the soul with a body is not a final aim for the individual soul. In any case, union with the world soul and the contemplation of the rađa and of God gives it a higher bliss for which it longs, but first of all it has to prepare itself for this. It is a divine task. If it descends into the corporeal world, it receives strength from above to form and guide a body. Provided it does not sink too low, it derives advantages and knowledge from it. Its previously dormant strength and the nature of this new become known to it. This is its very purpose, that it should come to know itself and its origin. The journey through the corporeal world is for it a course of training. Therefore (p. 80) the individual soul should not be blamed for leaving the spiritual world and coming into this world to
adorn it and to reveal its own nature. After it completes its work it returns to its origin.

Both expositions of the fate of the soul, pessimistic and optimistic, have influenced Muslim thinkers. With the gnostics, the Ikhwan al-Safa' and many mystics, pessimism predominates, while from Farabi onwards the philosophers are more inclined to optimism. It is to be noted that the terminology of the "Theology" was only partially adopted. Rudī, for example, is found only when from the context neo-Platonic influence can be deduced; but it did not become a proper technical term. In place of rudī and murūfī we usually find maʿṣūd and vàṣūr which are explained as return in the neo-Platonic sense.

That the teaching of the Ikhwan al-Safas turns almost entirely on the spiritual substantiality of the soul and its immortality is well known. Goldscheider has often and expressly pointed this out (e.g. Vorträge, p. 51, 163 and Koranauslegung, p. 183 sqq.). The third part of their encyclopedia is wholly devoted to the soul (on maʿṣūd, especially raṣūl 32 and 38 sqq., Bombay ed.). The 38th treatise is entitled: Fi Ḳaląt wa ʿin-Nuṣr ʿan ʿl-Qiyām; these are three synonyms for resurrection, here interpreted in a spiritual sense. But in other parts of this work also (1. 3; II. 27–29; IV. 43 sqq.), there is much to the point. The famous passage in the "Theology" on the Plotinian ecstasy (I. 3, p. 69) is quoted, and the pseudo-Aristotelian "Book of the Apple" modelled on the Phaedo of Plato is mentioned (IV. 2, p. 110 sqq.). The value of life in the world is, it is true, sometimes recognised but the misery of the wandering soul is more strongly emphasised. It is frequently pointed out that the weak souls cannot help themselves, that they require advice and instruction from prophets and philosophers in a community of life and belief so that they may be put upon the right path of return. The principal thing is the gnosis, for what food and drink are to the body, knowledge and wisdom (fīlm and hikma) are to the soul (II. 27, p. 313 sqq.). Like the physician Rāzi and the philosopher Kindī the Ikhwan chose the Socrates of Hellenistic tradition as their first leader; he is however not the only one. The individual souls require many philosophers and prophets and also living guides (generally a late Hellenistic principle). With their help the good, wise soul advances to union with the world soul and through this with the ʿašī and God. The union of the individual soul with the world-soul is the minor resurrection (khiṣṣa); the major resurrection takes place when the world soul separates itself entirely from matter and returns to the higher world of the spirits and of God (cf. T., de Boer, Wijzelezen in den Islam, Haarlem 1921, p. 77 sqq., esp. p. 98 sqq.).

The doctrine of the maʿṣūd became more complicated after the theory propounded by Farābī and more clearly developed by Ḥasan ibn al-ʿĀṣim. The ten spirits of the spheres (ḏuʿāhī). The individual souls endowed with intelligence, according to this, do not descend from the world-soul as parts of it, but they are, like the bodies of the earthly world, products of the last spirit in the series of emanation, i.e. of the ʿašī faʿāl. The purified soul longs for this spirit and its return is in the first place to it. Its longing goes further, to come as near as possible to God and to become like him, so far as it is possible for man. The philosophers are distinguished from the speculative mystics by the fact that from Farābī to Ibn Rushd the first question they put is: How is the union (tistiṣāl) of our soul with its origin (the ʿašī faʿāl) possible? The mystics, on the other hand, however differently their inner states and stations are described, desire nothing else than becoming one with God himself (tistiṣāl).

According to Farābī, the soul finds its return by the way of right knowledge and pious acts, but knowledge is esteemed more highly than deeds. Deeds remain in the world but knowledge enters into the spirit [cf. the article 'AMAL in the Supplement].

With the doctrine of the ecstatic conditions of the soul Farābī combines in exemplary fashion his prophetic philosophy, especially in the "Model State", a copy of Plato's republic, but interpreted in the cosmopolitan spirit of the Stoics. This turns upon the harmony of religion and philosophy. The agreement is based on the fact that they both come from the same source: the difference is explained by the fact that the souls of the prophets and philosophers take up different attitudes. In their ascent in the ecstatic condition to the ʿašī faʿāl the soul of the prophet receives revealed truth through its imagination, while the soul of the philosopher receives illuminating wisdom through its intellect. But the truth is one and the same, so the philosophers down to Ibn Rushd and Ibn Sab'īn (vith vith century), teach, and many mystics are of the same opinion. Cf. Farābī, Abhandlungen ed. Dieterici, p. 69 sqq. and Musterstaat, p. 46 sqq.

According to Ibn Sīnā's "Division of the Sciences of the Mind" (Ibn al-ʿUlamaʿ al-Ḥāfiẓya in Ti Kitabī, Constantinople, p. 76 sqq.), metaphysics (with Aristotle here called Theology) presents in its fundamental parts (mawdād) among other things the theory of emanation, but on the other hand deals with the doctrine (ilm) of maʿṣūd along with prophethood as derived or applied parts (fawāʾīl). This means that the theory of faṣīh possesses a higher place than the doctrine of the return.

Ibn Sīnā here again supports Farābī. More definitely than the latter he adopts the neo-Platonic doctrine of the spirituality and immortality of the soul. This is not merely the form of its body, as Aristotle taught, of course inconsistently, but a spiritual and therefore indestructible substance. Against Plato and Pythagoras it is asserted that it has no pre-existence in the world-soul and does not migrate from one body to another. The ʿašī faʿāl gives (presumably from an inexhaustible supply) a suitable soul to each body that is sufficiently prepared for it. In a sense one can say that it has come into existence, but it will never perish. Farābī was, as Ibn Tufail (Ḥaṣīr, ed. Gauthier, p. 14) remarks, somewhat undecided in his opinion on the return of all souls, even of the wicked, Ibn Sīnā, on the other hand, not; but both interpreted the rewards and punishments in the next world in a spiritual sense as well as in the case with the Ikhwan al-Safas. It is also to be noted that Ibn Sīnā, especially in his mystical writings, uses terms of a more Şīfī character than Farābī.

Ghāzīl took over from the philosophers just mentioned the doctrine of the spirituality and immortality of the soul, without however, at least in his principal works, drawing from this its logical spiritual deductions regarding the next world. In his Tahāfsūt (ed. Bouyges, p. 344 sq.) he defends
the orthodox doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies on the last day, while in his esoteric writings he speaks in allegory after the Sufi fashion (cf. Ibn Rushd, in *Tahafat al-Tahafat*, ed. Bouyges, p. 330 sqq.). Ibn Rushd therefore accuses him of contradiction, defends the philosophers and observes that the Sufis believe in a spiritual return (ma'bud rūḥānī) and are still regarded as good Muslims. But what is the personal opinion of this philosopher? It looks as if he hesitated to come out with his real opinion. It must therefore be sought in his larger works on metaphysics and psychology which have not yet been sufficiently investigated. But it is often very difficult to say where the commentator on Aristotle stops and the philosopher begins. This much may safely be said that Ibn Rushd more than Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā regards the soul as the form of its body. With its spiritual substantiality and individual immortality would disappear.


(T. de Borch)

**Rūḥ.** [See Nāṣr.]

**Rūḥ b. Ḥātim b. Kādīya, governor of Iṣṭīḵya,** was appointed to this high office by the caliph ʿĀ'id al-Raḥīf in 171 (787). Under al-Mansūr he had been bāḥīlī, then governor of al-ʿĀṣīr; he was appointed by al-Mahdi successively governor of al-Kūfah, Sind, Ṭabaristān and Palestine. He must have been advanced in years when ʿĀ'id al-Raḥīf sent him to Iṣṭīḵya in the year after his accession to the throne. He belonged to the family of al-Mahallah, which had already sent two governors to the same province and was to supply two more after him. “It seems that at this period the caliph thought of entrusting the affairs of Iṣṭīḵya to a vasal family” (Vonderheyden). The government of the Muhallabids which preceded that of the Aghlabids, was very successful. The rebel Berbers appeared to be finally overcome and the Kādīya agitation was suppressed; so satisfactory was the position that Rūḥ b. Ḥātim when he reached al-Kātibah in Raʾīfah 171 (Dec. 787—Jan. 788) had no serious difficulties to face. Besides, he had brought with him new contingents of the qandāla, 500 horsemen, who were joined soon after by 1,500 others brought by his son Kādīya. For the three years of his governorship, the country was peaceful. Rūḥ even succeeded in concluding a peace with ʿAbd al-Wahhab [q. v.], the Rastamiş ṭāfir of Tāhir. The authors who are our authorities upon him, notably Abu ʾl-ʿArabī and Ibn ʿIthārī, make special mention of his generosity, his stoicism in face of adversity and of his skill in disarming his opponents. As he was showing signs of senility, the postmaster and a kāhid of the province requested the caliph to appoint a successor to him secretly, who would take his place if necessary. Following their advice, Ḥātim al-Raḥīf appointed Nāṣr b. Ḥālim. Rūḥ b. Ḥātim died on 10th Ramadān 174 (Feb. 3, 791), and his son Kādīya was formally recognised as his successor in the great mosque of al-Kātibah. But the postmaster and the kāhid informed Nāṣr, the governor designate, and Kādīya had to give way to him.


**G. Marçab**

**AL-RUḤĀʾ.** [See ORBA.]

**Rūḥi, the maṭhūr of the historian,** whose work was until 1925 known only from the references in *ʿAlī’s* [q. v.] *Kahf al-Ruḥīf* and in Mīnādī’s *Dirāṣāt* [q. v.]. J. H. Mordtmann (*M. O. G.*, ii. 129 sqq.) was the first to identify by conclusive arguments several manuscripts of the anonymous original work. They tell us practically nothing about the personality of the author and it is only a hypothesis (cf. F. Babinger, *Die frühromänischen Fahrburcher des Urudus*, Hanover 1925, p. xiii.) that connects the historian Rūḥī with a certain Rūḥī Fāḍi Efendi who, like Muḥyī al-Dīn Djamālī (cf. F. Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 72 sqq.), was a son of Zennībīl ʿAlī Efendi, distinguished himself as a poet and died young, in 927 (1528) it is said. As he is also called Rūḥī Efrendwī, i.e. Rūḥī of Adrianople, this hypothesis may be correct. But elsewhere (cf. Schöf, *Teğhirer*, p. 127), this Rūḥī Fāḍi Efendi is said to have been born and to have died in Stamboul.

The history of Rūḥī entitled *Tawārīḵ-e Alī* is written in a simple style and divided into two parts (bism). The author calls the first *maḥāl*, i.e. beginnings, the second *mazābīd*, i.e. elucidations. The first part falls into two sections of a general nature, the second contains eight chapters each of which describes the reign of one sultan. The chronicle was written in the reign of Bayezid II (1481—1512) and ends in 917 (beg. March 31, 1511). Rūḥī’s work has not been further investigated nor is there a critical edition of the text, which could easily be prepared from existing old and good manuscripts (Berlin, Oxford, Aligrest, cf. F. Babinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 43). It is clear however that Lutfī Fasāḥ’s [q. v.] Chronicle is dependent on that of Rūḥī.


**Rukan al-Dawla.** Abū ʾl-ʿArabī b. Ḥasan b. Byya, second in age of the three brothers that founded the Ḫūṣūd dynasty [q. v.]. His fortunes followed those of the elder brother Abū l-ʿImād al-Dawla [q. v.] up to the latter’s occupation of Ḳāṣf in 322 (934); Rukan was then given the governorship of Ḳāṣārta and other districts. But shortly afterwards he was forced by the ʿAbbadid general Yūkīt, at whose expense the Ḫūṣūd conquest of Ḳāṣf had been made, to seek refuge with his brother; and when Yūkīt was in turn defeated by the Ziyārid Mardawīdī [q. v.], the Ḫūṣūd’s former overlord against whom they had revolted, ʿImād, who then found it advisable to conciliate Mardawīdī, sent Rukan to
him as a hostage. On Mardâdji's assassination in the following year (323 = 935), Rukn escaped and rejoined 'Imâd, by whom he was supplied with troops to dispute the possession of the Diqân with Mardâdji's brother and successor, Washghir. Rukn succeeded at the outset in taking Isfahân; but the first round of his contest with Washghir ended in Rukn's ejection from that city in 327 (939), when he again fled to Fârs.

In the next year Rukn's help was sought by his younger brother al-Husnîn [later Mu’izz al-Dawla [q.v.], who had meanwhile set himself up in Khuzistân against the Barûdis [q.v.], whereupon Rukn, being already possessed of no territory attempted to take Wâsit but was obliged to retire when the caliph al-Râfiq [q.v.] and the amir Badjîm [q.v.] opposed him. Almost immediately afterwards, however, he succeeded in recovering Isfahân, owing to Washghir's championship of Mânîk b. Kâkîy in a quarrel with the Sâmânî Nâṣr b. Âhmad [q.v.]; and when the latter ruler died in 334 (943), Rukn, who had meanwhile supported the Sâmânî cause, was able to drive Washghir as well from al-Raiy, of which he had momentarily regained possession on the retirement of the Sâmânî general Ibn Muhûtîd.

With al-Raiy Washghir gained control of the whole Diqân; but for two short intervals (of about a year in each case) retained it for the rest of his days. Up to 344 (955–956), however, his position was highly precarious. For not only Washghir, but also the Sâmânîs continued to challenge it. It was only by playing them off against each other and sowing dissensions between the Sâmânî princes and the officers they sent against him that Rukn was able to maintain it. Even so (as indicated above) he was driven from al-Raiy, and his representatives were expelled from most parts of the province, once in 333 (944–945) and again in 339 (950–951), in each case by Sâmânî forces. Indeed he was obliged in the end to become the Sâmânî tribe's tributary (at least for two agreements for the payment of tribute being recorded); it was on this basis that he first made peace with them in 344 (955–956) as again in 361 (971–972). In the course of his long contest with Washghir, who, until he was killed in an accident in 357 (968) never ceased to intrigue with the Sâmânîs against him, Rukn on several occasions invaded Tabârânî and Gurghû, but was unable to incorporate these provinces permanently in his dominions. And though in 337 (948–949), after he had defeated an attempt on al-Raiy made by the Sâlûrî Marsûb b. Muhâymad, whom he took prisoner, he gained control of southern Ghurabîdân, his ejection two years later from al-Raiy itself [see above] naturally cost him as well.

Rukn received his lành simultaneously with his brothers in 334 (945–946), on Mu’izz’s entry into Baghdad; and on ‘Imâd’s death in 338 (949), succeeded him as head of the family and amir al-awliyâ’ (though this title was also held by Mu’izz). The last two years of his life were rendered unhappy — so much so that he was rescued from the shocks produced by the news — owing to the conduct of his son, ‘Adud al-Dawla [q.v.], in taking advantage of an appeal for help sent by Bâktîyâr [q.v.] (son of Mu’izz and his successor in the rule of al-‘Râfî), to imprison the latter, and, in conjunction with Rukn’s own wârîf

Abu ‘I-Fâth Ibn al-‘Amîd [q.v.], who had been sent likewise with a force to Bâktîyâr’s aid, to seize that province for himself. And though ‘Adud obeyed his command to release Bâktîyâr and return to his government in Fârs, Rukn was only with difficulty persuaded to visit ‘Adud in 365 (975–976) at Isfahân, in order that by receiving a confirmation of his appointment as amir, he should succeed without dispute. Rukn died at al-Raiy in Mahbûrân of the next year (September 976).

Rukn al-Dawla was fortunate in his employment of the remarkable naṣîh Abu ‘l-Fâdîl Ibn al-‘Amîd [q.v.] from 329 (941) for thirty years until his death in 359 (970), though, as that minister himself complained (see Miskawah), he was prevented by the prince’s lack of royal blood and of culture from governing properly. Rukn (so he said) was in fact no more than a predatory soldier, who could secure the allegiance of his supporters only by means of largesse, and was not able to forge revenue in the expectation of subsequently increasing its yield. On the other hand he is said to have been just and humane towards his troops and his subjects, and gave proof — especially in connection with the episode of ‘Adud al-Dawla mentioned above — of a tender sense of honour.


RUKN AL-DIN, SULAIYKIN II b. KILID ARSLAN II, a Saljuq ruler in Asia Minor. His father Kilid Arslan b. Mas‘ûd [q.v.] in his old age divided his kingdom among his many sons. The consequence of this was that the latter set up as independent rulers and began to fight with one another so that at his death in Şam bât 388 (Aug. 1102) complete anarchy reigned. In the course of time however, Rukn al-Din brought the whole kingdom under his sway. Kuth al-Din Malikshâh who had received Siwâs and Aqgersâr, began by attacking his brother Nûr al-Din Mahmûd, lord of Kaysarî. The latter was killed and Kaysarîa was lost to Kuth al-Din. On the latter’s death Rukn al-Din who ruled in Tokat (Dêkûa), attacked Siwâs and took possession of it. He next seized the two towns of Aqgersâr and Kayserîa. After some time, he turned against his other brother (Chîyâth al-Din Kâhlüsawr in Konya and laid siege to him. The latter had to give in and ceded his territory to his brother. In Ramaçân 397 (June–July 1201) Malatya which belonged to Mu‘izz al-Din Kâshgârî b. Kilid Arslan was captured. Erzerûs was the next to pass to Rukn al-Din. When the latter’s troops approached, the governor there, ‘Alî al-Dîn î b. Malikshâh, the last of the Saltukids dynasty, began negotiations by which he was surrendered to Rukn al-Din who gave it to his brother Tughlîshâh. Another brother, Muhyi al-Din, who had obtained Angora when the kingdom was divided, long resisted. Rukn al-Din’s last for conquest, and only after a three years’ siege found himself forced to capitulate when supplies were completely cut off, but was promised suitable compensation. Rukn al-Din promised him...
a fortress in a remote part, but laid an ambush for him in which he was attacked and killed as he left the town. Soon afterwards however, Rukn al-Din (fell ill and died before the news of his brother's murder reached him. He was succeeded by his son Khalid Arslân III (q.v.). Ibn al-Athir's (xii. 128) gives the date of his death as the 6th Dhu-l-Ka'da 600 (July 6, 1204); according to another statement (xii. 59) however, the surrender of Angora and the death of Rukn al-Din did not take place till 609 (1204–1205).

Ibn al-Athir describes Rukn al-Din as a strong and vigorous ruler; he is said to have held certain heretical views (madhhab al-jāfūf) on religious matters which, however, he concealed from fear of his subjects.


RUKN AL-DIN. [See BAI RAYS, BAKIYADU, ZUMAL-ROY, KUIJU-ARXN.]

RUKNABAD (or Rukn al-Din: the water of Rukn al-Dawla), a canal (bund) which runs from a mountain (called Kula; P. Schwerz, Iran in Mittelalter, ii. 48, No. 7) about six miles from Shiraz. Enlarged by a secondary canal, it follows for a part of the way the road from Isfahan to Shiraz. Its waters reach as far as the vicinity of the town towards the end of spring in which Haft is buried, when they are not entirely absorbed for irrigation purposes. According to Hassan Fashi's (Firuzabad Nastri, part ii., p. 20), "all the waters of the plain of Shiraz are conveyed by subterranean channels except the water from the spring of Djoghak... The best waters are those of the Zangh and Rukn canals... The Kāmil-i Rukn (i.e. Ruknabad) was made in 1318 (1299–1300), one and a half farshaks N. E. of Shiraz by Rukn al-Dawla Haasan the Dālamī, [cf. stāvar]; its water rise in the ravine of Tang-i Allah Akbar a mile north of Shiraz; it is the water of the Murshid (q.v.)."

In the fourteenth century, Ruknabad is mentioned by Ibn Bahtūz and by Hazīr Muntawī Kāzwīni (Nasbat al-Rukn, transl. The Strange, in G.M.S., p. 112; "the water comes from subterranean canals and the best of that of Ruknabad"). But it is to the poet who that this canal really owes its fame. In the eighteenth century, Sādi declares himself charmed by the land of Shiraz and the waters of Ruknabad (Kalilah, Calcutta 1874, fol. 299, l. 4). In the following century, Usā'īr Zākānī sings, "The serpentine which flows from al-Musallay and the wave of Ruknabad removes from the stranger the memory of his native land" (text quoted by K. G. Brown, who finds in it an echo of Sādi's, Persian Lit. under Tarkh-Dominion, p. 238). Haft: in particular immortalised Ruknabad in his verses: "Fare out, cup-bearer, the wine is left, for in Paradise thus shall find neither the stream of Ruknabad nor the promenade of al-Musallay (ed. Khalaj, Tashcan 1306, No. 3, v. 7)"; "Peace and the wave of Rukn and the sweet breeze of the serpentine, bewail them not, for they are the pride of the universe" (ibid., No. 35, v. 7); "The serpentine which flows from al-Musallay and the wave of Ruknabad will never allow me to depart" (ibid., No. 168, v. 9); "May God a hundred times preserve our Ruknabad, for its limpid waters give life along as that of Khišr" (ibid., No. 277, v. 3), and in a piece which may be apocryphal (ibid., part 2, No. 71): "The water of Rukn, like sugar, rises in al-Tang (i.e. Allah Akbar)". According to later writers, Ruknabad, which Ibn Baṭṭūṭa called a great water-course (al-madhhab al-kabīr), gradually dried up. Among the notable travellers of the xviith century, Chardin, almost alone in mentioning it, saw only a large stream and gives Ruknabad the fanciful meaning "Ruknabadat, vein of filet de sucre" (Voyages, ed. Langlès, viii. 341). At the end of the xviith century, W. Franklin praises the sweetness and clearness of the waters of little stream which to the natives attribute medicinal qualities. At the beginning of the xixth century, Scott Waring notes that its breadth was nowhere more than six feet. Kez Porter observes that the canal has become choked up through neglect. The Kalān manāch deplores the disappearance of the groves that surrounded it. At a later date we have the same observation by Gobineau ("Cet onde poétique me m'apparut sous l'aspect d'un trou bourbéux"), Curzon ("a tiny channel filled with running water") and Sykes ("a diminutive stream").

The Fīrūz-ābād Nāṣīrī mentions a second Ruknabad in Farṣ: "the source of the warm stream of Ruknabad is part of the district of Bilqeez-El (Lariān); it is over a farshak north of the village of Ruknabad; having a bad flavour and an unpleasant smell, it is of no use for agriculture; it cooks in a few minutes. Eggs put into it; one can only bathe in it at some distance from the spring." (ii. 318 middle and 268).


RUM, the name in Persian and Turkish for the Byzantine empire. Rum means the land of the Romans (Ῥωμαίοι) or Byzantines although in Central Asia Rūm is also used for the Roman empire. In course of time the conception
became narrower. While Rüm still is the old name for Konya [q.v.] and Rumelija, in the early Ottoman period Rüm comprises the district of Amasra [q.v.] and Siwâs [q.v.] while Anatolia included the so-called province with the capital Kütahya [q.v.] (cf. L. 12, x., 1920, p. 144, note 1). From the earlier name Rüm for old Hellas (cf. Jehovah=Rüm, i.e. Alexander the Great), Eastern Roman and Byzantine, it was applied in Turkey to designate the modern Greeks (also Urum) in contrast to the ancient Greeks who were called Yunanîyan or Ionians. Rüm also sometimes meant Turkey in general; cf. the expression Rüm Padişâhi for the sultan. Rüm later was used in a derogatory sense. Rüm Meşhureb was said of the Greek character, faithless, unreliable, flattering.

Cf. also Ezerem (i.e. Erzfil Rümu) and Rumelia.

FRANZ BARGENSE.

RÜM KAL'À, a fortress in Northern Syria. According to Arnold Nöldeke's description, it is situated "on a steeply sloping tongue of rock, lying along the right bank of the Euphrates, which bars the direct road to the Euphrates from the west for its tributary the Maristan as it breaks through the edge of the plateau, so that it is forced to turn a curve northwards around this tongue. The conical hill spread out this tongue of rock, some 1,300 feet long and about half as broad, and the plateau which rises above it is broken by a ditch made by man about 100 feet deep. The walls of the citadel with towers and salients follow the outlines of the rock along its edge at an average height of 150 feet above the level of the Euphrates, while the ridge extending along the middle of the longer axis rises 100 to 120 feet higher." (A. Nöldeke, in Petermanns Mitteil., 1920 p. 53 sq., where the main road up to the citadel, the buildings etc. are also described).

The unusual position of the fortress on a high cliff suggests that it corresponds to the tower of Sittmarat "hovering like a cloud in the sky" which Salamanasar III took in 855 B.C. (F. homann, art. Syria, in Pauli-Wissowa, K.E., iv, A., col. 1569, 1592).

While Th. Nöldeke (M. G. W. Gtin, 1876, p. 12, note 2) wished to distinguish Rüm Kal'a clearly from Osma and identify with the former place the modern Orum, Hürn on the Euphrates, above Balikes, Urma is now generally identified with Rüm Kal'a (Marnier, B. Moritz, Cuvonin, Dussaud etc.). The name of the old bishopric of Urma last appears in Matthias of Edessa (ed. Wahab, 1958, p. 323): in 561 Arm. (1112-1113 a.d.) the Armenian Kogh Wasil returned to Tankerd of Artioch the lands of Harm Mar, Thorsh and Urem, which he had taken from the Franks. The first two are Hiş Amur and Trab (Turkish) and Uremm is Urma (Hist. ar. des croisades, Docum. arm., i. 102; J. Markwart, Sürdârûnî and the Tigrişquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 182, note 1 of p. 177). The Syriac chronicles record (Mich. Syr., iii. 199; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Beijer, p. 279) that the Kogh Basil or after his death Kurthig, who acted in governor for his widow, held the towns of Kajûm, Ra'hân, Behbensî and Ka'a Rômâna. It is very likely that the latter, the Syriac for Rüm Kajûm, here corresponds to the Kajum of the Armenians, which is later in Armenian always called Hromak and by similar names.

Rüm Kal'a later belonged to the county of Edessa. The metropolitan Abu 'l-Farajihb. Sham-

mnem of Edessa, who after the second capture and destruction of this town by the Turks in 1146 escaped to Samosata, was imprisoned for three years in Rüm Kal'a by Joscelin; he then wrote several narîsî "with an account of the events" which caused his imprisonment (Mich. Syr., iii. 277; Bauml, Gesch. der syr. Literatur, Bonn 1922, p. 293).

At the request of an Armenian of Kal'a Rômâna named Michael in 1148 Beatris, widow of Joscelin II of Edessa, and her son demanded that the Armenian Catholics Grigor III Pahlavan shoued move his residence to the "fortress of the Romans" (Arm. Hromak) which belonged to their territory, the former county of Edessa (the capital of which since the fall of al-Rahah in 1145 had been Tall Bâshir). The Catholicoi had lived since 1145 in Cowk ("little lake"), i.e. the fortress of Kal'at Soûf in the Djabal Sa'if (Soûf) to which Bait al-Din Manqûlâd al-Ainî fled in 803 (1400-1401) from Timurlenek (Quatremeron, Histoire des Sultans Mamelouks de l’Egypte, ii., 1840, p. 227), and recently visited by Hausknacht, as is evident from Armenian sources which mention the "little castle of Cowk in the region of Tilkâ" (Daliak, Topikaç. (Papken G. W. Gûlseren, Couvent des Carmes Theணî, Arménie, une historique-topographie Studie [Armenien], Vienna 1913, p. 33-44; Markwart, Sürdârünî, p. 18 sq., still wrongly identified Cowk with Gollûk). The Catholicoi obeyed the demands and in 1145 purchased the fortress of Rüm Kal'a from the Franks but it is said to have shown ingratitude to Michael for he deprived him of all his possessions and drove him out of the country (Mich. Syr., iii. 297; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Beijer, p. 317). The Armenian Catholicoi after that lived in the fortress from 1147=1148 till 1295 (Chronique du royaume de la Petite Arménie, in Rec. hist. crit., Docum. arm., i. 618, under the year 390 Arm. = 1141-1142 a.d.).

Grigor's successor, the poet Nerses IV Shnorohl, "the graceful" (patrarch 1166-1173), was called Klayeç from his place of residence in May 1170 and March 1172 negotiations concerning a church union took place between him, Theorianos as ambassador of the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenos, and the bishop Iwanus (Elias) of Kashnak and the monk Theodoros Bar Wahûin as delegates of the Jacobite patriarch Michael the Great, who had remained in the monastery of Mar Bar Samwîn (To he kaptolin aştî le krâmûn 4 Peçes Khashvand), in Rüm Kajûm (Syr. Kajûm Rômâna or Hrnân dhé-Rômaky, Greek Ρομαϊκα Κακου) and in Kajûm (Syr. Kajûm, Greisch Kajûmîs) (Migne, Patr. græci, cxxiii, col. 114-298; Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., ed. Abellois, Lamy, i. 549-553 expanded in Mich. Syr., iii. 334-336). After the death of Nerses (Aug. 8, 1173) his younger nephew was proclaimed Catholicoi in Rüm Kal'a. His older nephew however induced his brother-in-law Mleh of Cilicia to obtain from Nûr al-Din a charter, on the authority on which he threw his cousin into prison and had himself installed as Catholicoi (Sept. 5, 1173 (Mich. Syr., iii. 355 sq.)). As Grigor IV (of Teghga, "the child") he was Catholicoi from 1175 till 1192 in the person of prince Wasil of Gerger, who was brother to Nerses Shnorohl. Under him in 1179 took place the audit of Hromak, at which Nerses of Lampron delivered a famous speech in which he recommended the adoption of the Chalcedonian creed (Mansi, xxii,
col. 197—206). But the proposed union of the churches fell through because Manuel Comnenos died on Sept. 24, 1180. In the same year Theodoros Ibar Wahboun, who had ascended from his teacher and godfather Michael the Great and was seeking assistance everywhere to oust him from the patriarchate, came to the Catholics in Rüm Ka’la, who welcomed him kindly and sent him to Cilicia to Leon II (Syr. Lebbuon; Armen. Lewon) of Little Armenia; the latter made him patriarch (1180—1193) of his whole kingdom (Mich. Syr., iii. 386 sqq.; Barhebræus, Chron. ecc., i., col. 585—585; J. Gerber, Zwei Breviare Barhebræi, Halle [diss.], 1911, p. 3—9).

When the emperor Frederick Barbarossa was on his way through Asia Minor, in 1185 (1189—1190) the Armenian patriarch of Ka’la al-Rum (i.e. Grigor IV) sent a letter to Saladin to ask for help; in the following year he (al-Kágithus) again sent a letter to him (Abî Shîma, Kitâb al-Râmaqdatin, in Rec. hist. or. sect., Hist. ar\.k., iv. 435 sqq., 453—455).

After the death of Grigor IV (July 1193), the Armenians made his young nephew Grigor V Manag ("the young") or as Michael Syrus calls him, Dirêka ("the clerics") Catholics (1193—1194; Mich. Syr., iii. 411 sqq.). Leon of Cilicia in 1195 had him carried off and thrown onto the fortress of Guhdara (Kupitar) where he perished in an attempt to escape. The Armenians thereupon made his predecessor’s cousin, Gregoros, son of Shahan, his successor as Catholicos Grigor VI known as Abirad ("the sounder") (1194—1203; Mich. Syr., iii. 413; Hist. or. sect., Dauon. arm., i. p. ccc.). His successors were: Hoshamêh VI of Sis (1203—1221),constantin I Baržberdê’s (1221—1267), Hakob I Khayce’s (1267—1286), Kostandin II (1286—1289) and Stephanos IV Horomkliche’s (1290—1303).

In Rüm Ka’la in the 14th century there were also many Jacobites, among whom the presbyter Isho’ (Barhebræus, Chron. ecc., i. 665) and his sons (Benêt Isho’; Barhebræus, i. 665; 673, 721, 751, 759; Yéshî’h, ibid., i. 683—685, 751, 779). The presbyter and physician Shem’son (ibid., i. 751, 757, 759, 759—760) and his two sons (ibid., i. 741) played an important part. The Jacobite patriarch Ignatius II (Rahban Dawid, 1222—1252), celebrated for his wealth, endowed Ka’la’s Rômaiya among other places with a splendid church (Barhebræus, i. 665). Later he chose this fortress as the seat of his patriarchate (Barhebræus, i. 685). He did not come out openly against the Armenian Catholics but he endeavoured as far as possible in secret to advance the Syrian church at the expense of the Armenian (Barhebræus, i. 687—689). On the other hand, we are told that at this time, when the doultu, very profitable part of the Jacobite saint Barwama was at its height in the monastery at Gargar, now Norsun Ka’la (between Malatya and Sivas), the Armenians put some "doughtiness built a monastery called after Barwama" in Rüm Ka’la and received many gifts from the people, to the occasion of the Jacobites. The patriarch Ignatius therefore resolved to build a Jacobite monastery there also and to buy a suitable site for it on the Nahêt-al-Pharamüz (Arab.: Nahêt Marsubûn, now Merzwan-Cal) from the Benêt Isho’ and also to get from them an agreement of sale by which they were to surrender any authority over the monks living there. When they stubbornly refused, the patriarch communicated them and established himself in a cave on the Euphrates but was brought back by the Armenian Catholics. Later on he fell ill and, after a reconciliation with the Benêt Isho’ through the offices of the Katholikos, died in Rüm Ka’la on July 11, 1252 (Barhebræus, Chron. ecc., i. 691 sqq.).

In 1250 Hüllâgû crossed the Euphrates by bridges of boats at Malatya, Ka’la al-Rum, Bira and Karşîyû (Barhebræus, Malikâneh Ta’îrbik al-Din, Bairit 1290, p. 486; Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 509). In the decades following, the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius III (1264—1282) had to defend his possession of the Barwama monastery at Gargar in a desperate struggle with the physician Shém’son of Ka’la’s Rômaiya; both had received or alleged they had received new charters of ownership from Hüllâgû and Abâlâ (Barhebræus, Chron. ecc., i. 753—756; ii. 439 sqq.). Later on they made up their quarrel (Barhebræus, i. 769). After the death of Ignatius III, the first patriarch Yâghê, son of Ka’la’s Rômaiya made his nephew Phrourones or Nestorius patriarch in 1283 (Ignatius IV). The latter died at the beginning of July 1292 in the monastery of Barwama (Barhebræus, Chron. ecc., i. 781); after his death the Jacobite patriarchate disintegrated and three rivals appeared in Malatya, Cilicia (Gaykût monastery) and Mûria and as a result of this permanent schism the Jacobite church sank to complete insignificance (Barwama [?], additions to Barhebræus, Chron. ecc., i. 781 sqq.).

It was perhaps not merely chance that the end of the united Jacobite patriarchate which in recent years had been closely associated with the town of Rüm Ka’la, happened almost the same day as the collapse of the Armenian Catholicate of Hrûmskyl.
RUM-KALÀ — RUMELI, RUMELIA

in Damascus (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 579). According to the inscription of ownership in a Syrian manuscript (Brit. Mus., MS. Syr., No. 295), it belonged to a certain Rabban Barzanî of Kalà Rûmâ, a high priest of Rabûn who in a note refers to the harsh imprisonment which he suffered from the Egyptians; Armenian verses on the fall of the fortress are preserved on a relic casket (Wright, Catal. syr. Miss. Brit. Mus., i. 257; Courière, Inscription d’un religieux arménien, in Mélanges orientaux, Paris 1883, p. 210, note 1; Promis, Mem. dell’ acade. di Torino, xxxv., 1884, p. 125-130). The inscription on the great gate of the citadel which was restored by al-Asgraf (cf. above, vol. ii., p. 2351) speaks of him as a victor who among other feats had put the Armenians to flight, an allusion to the capture of Rûm Kalà (van Berchem, in J. A., 1902, May-June, p. 456; the inscription published by Soherrnberg, in It., xv., 1906, p. 176). The sultan sent boastful bulletins of victory to the cities of Syria in which he proclaimed the capture of this improbable citadel as an unprecedented feat of arms and concluded with the words: *After the capture of this fortress, the road is open to us to conquer the whole of the East, Asia Minor and the Írâk so that with God’s will we shall become owners of all the lands from the rising of the sun to its setting" (al-Nuwairi, MS. Leyden, fol. 56, transl. by Well, Geoch. d. Chiffon, iv. 184, 189). The fortress of Kalà al-Rum was rebuilt by orders of the sultan by the wèlê of Syria, Sandrang Shuqai, and given the name of Kalà al-Muslimin; another part of the town was left in ruins however (Quadremire, Hist. des Sultans Mamelouks, t. iv., p. 139 sq.). The successor of the imprisoned Armenian patriarch Stephanos, Grigor VII of Anavars (1293-1307) took up his residence in Sis in Cilicia, which henceforth was the seat of the Catholics. Êm Kalà, in spite of its restoration as a frontier fortress (cf. also Abu l-Fida’s), ed. Reinsaud, p. 226; al-Dimashkî, ed. Mehren, p. 214), under the Mamlûks never seems to have recovered from the blow. In 775 (1373-1374) much damage was done by floods in Kalà al-Muslimin as well as in Halab, al-Ruhât al-Bita and Baghdîdî (al-Harîn b. Habîb, Durust al-Islâm fi Dawa’l at-Atâ’ah, in Walziers, Orientalia, ii, Amsterdam 1846, p. 435). In the spring of the year 1477 the Mamlûk sulûn Khalîfî made a tour of inspection as far as Kalà al-Muslimin (described by al-Dîmân Abu l-Bakr, ed. R. V. Lanzone, Viaggio in Palestina e Soria di Kalà Ba, Torino 1878; transl. R. I. Devonshire, in Bulletin I. F. A. O., xx, Cairo 1921, p. 1-43). After the battle of Marj Dâkhî, the fortress became in modern times under the papal brief of Halâj (Halâj Khalifî, Dîjam-namû, p. 508). The Armenian and European authors give the name Rûm Kalà or Kalà al-Rum in many forms. Among the Armenians we find the forms Hromskîy, Klav-Hofomazik, vulg. Arm. Outoum-gala (works of St. Nerséh, St. Petersburg, p. 80; his poems, Venice, p. 224, 277; Indjûdân, Alterne Arménien, iii. 378; Saint-Martin, Mémoires... de l’Arménie, ii, Paris 1818, p. 196). Gulemius Tyrius (Hist. xvi. 16) writes Ramulak; but it is no doubt identical with his Rongulath (xii. 11; French text, ed. Paulin Paris, ii, Paris 1880, p. 164), which however he takes to be a quarter of Edessa. Schlihtberger (Reise, p. 47) calls the fortress Uramula. Only a few remnants of the fortress now remain as well as of an Armenian monastery and a mosque (plans of the fortress in Müller and following him in Humann-Puchstein, Reisen..., p. 175, and in A. Nödeke, in Peterm. Mitt., 1920, p. 3, map; Plan von R. K. in x. 2000; photographs: F. Frech, in Geogr. Zeitschr., xxv., 1916, pl. 1; Cumont, Études syriennes, p. 170, fig. 54; from the north: Humann-Puchstein, op. cit., p. 176, fig. 25; from the east with the Euphrates: A. Nödeke, op. cit., pl. 13). Bibliography: Vâkitî, Muqâmî, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 164; Saat al-Din, Marzîd al-Itla, ed. Juynioll, ii. 442; Abu l-Fida’s, ed. Reinsaud, p. 226, 279; al-Dimashkî, ed. Mehren, p. 206, 214; Ibn al-Shihab, al-Durr al-munahhah fi ‘Tâhirî Mamlûkîl Hâlal, Bârîû 1909, S. 157, 235 sq.; R. Pococke, Description of the East, London 1754, ii. 155-157; Saint-Martin, Mémoires sur l’Arménie, i, Paris 1818, p. 196; H. Kretz, Erdkunde, x., 461 sqq., 931-942; Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans Mamelouks de l’Egypte, ii., Paris 1842, p. 209, note 2; Th. Nödeke, in N. G. W. Göt., 1876, p. 12, note 2; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, London 1890, p. 44, 473 sq.; Humann-Puchstein, Reisen in Kretien und Nordestia, Berlin 1890, p. 175-179; transl. by R. Mayer, La route du Soudan au Zeugma, in Société de Géographie de l’Est, Bulletin trimestriel, Nancy 1890, p. 531-534; van Berchem, in C. I. A., i. 503, note 1; p. 504, note 1; B. Moritz, in M. S. O. A. S., i, Berlin 1898, p. 131 sqq.; P. Rokrab, in Freuds. Jahrbücher, v., 1901, p. 471; Papken C. W. Gülesarian, Cookû, Cookû-Tâlîk and Hromskîy, eine historisch-topographische Studie, Vienna 1904, p. 61-88; Hist. orient. des erdân, Docum. armeni, i., p. cxx; K. J. Basmandjian, in R. O. C., xix., 1914, p. 361 (Catholikoi of Rûm Kalà’s); R. Hartmann, in Z. D. M. G., xix., 1916, p. 32, note 10 sq.; F. Frech, in Geogr. Zeitschr., xxvii., 1916, p. 5; F. Cumont, Études syriennes, Paris 1917, p. 167-171, 203, 247, 293, 329; A. Nödeke, in Petermanns Mitteilungen, 1920, p. 53 sq.; Gaudez-Frey-Demou- bynes, La Syrie à l’étude des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. 86; R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, Paris 1927, p. 450, note 2. (E. HONGMANN)

RUMELI, RUMELIA. The name Rum-ili, Rum-ili (i.e. land of the Romans) was given in the narrower sense to the province proper of this name, which comprised Thrace and Macedonia i.e. an area which was bounded on the north by the Balkans, in the east by the Black Sea and the Bosporus, in the south by the sea of Marmara and the Aegean, the so-called White Sea, then by the Olympus range and in the west by the Pindos, Barnos and Sher-Dagh (Shar planina), embracing the old territories of Thrace, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Servia and Albania as well as the ancient Hellas, with the exception however of the strip of coast near the islands of the Aegean or Archipelago, which were a separate government (Eptéi) under the Grand Admiral (kapudan pasha); q.v., after 1849 the Eptéi-I Skudi-I Sefid formed an eyalet, cf. René de l’Orbiet, xi. 117, and later a waliyet). The governorship of Rumelia (Rum-ili eyalet)
was bounded in the north by Austria and Wallachia, in the northeast by Moldavia and Russia, in the east by the Black Sea, in the southeast by the Ionian Sea and in the west by the Adriatic, in the northwest by Austria and Russia [q. v.]. It is to be noted that these frontiers included the small qâbâs [q. v.] belonging to the governorship of the Archipelago (aygârî cihâlî) Gallipoli [q. v.], Negropont (Egëripos, Këbëca) and Ainëskhât (Nau- 
phantos), the former of which comprised the coast from Stamboul to the exit of the Këra Sû into the Aegean Sea with a considerable stretch of land running into the interior, the second and third of which comprised the east and south coast of Greece proper with the exception of the Morea (Peloponnesus).

The area of the province at its greatest extent was estimated at about 5,100 square miles while the population was estimated at not more than 3,512 millions of different nationalities (millet), Turkish (Ottomans, who, although the ruling nation, formed the smallest part), Tatar, Greeks, Slavs, Arnauts, Armenians, Jews and G Kıpûs. The pre- 
dominant religion was Islam, while the Christian confessions of the so-called non-uniat Greeks was the largest.

The residence of the beylerbeg of Rumelia was at first Philippopolis (Filibe, now Plovdiv), which was conquered by the Ottomans in 1353. The first governor to reside there was Lâlû Shâhin Pasha, conqueror of that country, whose türbe is still to be seen not far from Stara Zagora. In 787 (1385) there appears Timurshâh-Beg [q. v.] as beylerbeg (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 191, following Ferîndân-Beg) with his residence in Sofia.

The governorship of Rumelia was divided into sandjaqs, the number of which varied in course of time and the boundaries of which were constantly changing. About 1830 there were 24 of them namely: Wixi, Kirk Kilibe [q. v.], Sillistra (Sîlêstar), Nikopolis [q. v.], Vidin, Sofia, Çırâm, Kostandil, Sozînik [q. v.], Turbâk, Triëkkâla, İzân [q. v.], Tîbî, Tîmîn, Delvína, Avelona, Ełbasan (cf. F. Bâbiner, Die Gründung van Elbasan, in M.S.O.S., iii., vol. xxxiv., 1931, p. 84—93), Ískendure (Scutari, Albania), Dükürgân (Dukâtzîn), Oktîr (Obrîk, Ochîdrâ), Perzîn (Prizren), Vîlî (Vohîn), Ușka (Skopje), Alâja Hâr (Krukerî), and Semendria (Semsîria, Smudero). By an imperial hattî-i şerifî of 6th Rabi' 1 (June 21, 1836) the area under the Rumîî cihâlî, governor of Rumelia, was redefined. As previously the position of Sofia as the centre of administration had favoured the rebellion of treacherous vassals and attempts to secure independence by the mountain tribes especially in Albania, Montenegro (Tollî Monastîr, now Bûtç) on the S. E. extremity of this area was chosen as the centre of government. The province of the Rumîî cihâlî was divided as follows: 1. the district of the town of Monastîr directly under the governor, 2. the personal estates of the sultan's mother (mâlîk) or the land of Oktîr, 3. the sandjaq of Elbasan, Kavaja, Tirana [q. v.] and Lezh (Alex- 
no), which were governed by Arman governors who could be dismissed, 4. the sandjaqs of Ishqodra (Ískendure, Scutari), Perzîn (Prizren) and Ėpik (Pëc) which were under military officers (generals of division, Ėfendi), 5. the dâmîlî's Podgorica, Bar (Antivari), Ulcinj (Doljogno), which were under native hereditary dâmîlî whose powers were very minutely regulated, 6. the districts of Zadrim, Mirrîf, Dibra (Debar) which were under chiefs self-elected, the only Turkish officials being those who collected the taxes. The paşâhîs of Prizren, Niş [q. v.] and Tetovo, originally part of the cihâlî of Rumelia, were transferred in 1859 to the mûçîrî of Sofia. The paşâhîs of Uskub (Skopje) and Kâlkanîden (Tetovo) were only under the political supervision and not the administration of the Rumîî cihâlî, while the northern Arnaut tribes and Montenegro (Kâradagî), although nominally under the governor of Rumelia and in particular the paşka of Scutari, in reality were in no organic connection with the Ottoman government (cf. J. v. Mûller, Albanië, Rumellien und die österreichisch-monarchische Griechen, Prague 1844, p. 2—3). The remainder of the former Rumelia was divided into paşâhîs of which Adria- 
nopole (formerly called "mûçîrî of Çîrâm", as Adriano Ble was the chief residence of the sultan; in 1840 there were still law-courts in Çîrâm) and the three Bulgarian paşâhîs of Rusîn [q. v.]. Vidin and Sillistra were the most important (cf. A. Mûn, La Turquie d'Europe, vol. iii., Paris 1840, p. 187—189 with further details of the division and of the officials in 1840). The division continued to change frequently so that J. Gg. v. Hahn in 1860 found the cihâlî of Rumelia divided into four "îlîcs", namely Ishqodra, Oktîr, Monastîr and Kastoria (Kastoria) of which Ochîdrâ comprised the whole of Central Albania i.e. down to the coast of the Adriatic (cf. J. Gg. v. Hahn, Reise van Belgrad nach Salonika, Vienna 1861, p. 116 = Denkschriften der Wiener Akad. der Wiss. phil.-hist. K., vol. xi.). Rumelia remained divided in this way until 1864, when the first milîyet law — i.e. the law the object of which was to create larger provinces and entrust them to able governors — was promulgated. The new governors were to carry through the progressive plans of the government with the help of expert officials and numerous subordinate governors (mûçîrîs); in addition to governor-generalships, formerly cihâlîs, now called milîyetîs at the head of which was a milîyet, remained divided into îlîcs, formerly sandjaqs, at the head of which was a mûçîrî. As a model province the Danube milîyet (Thâm milîyet) was first created in Radja 1281 (Dec. 1864) and entrusted to Mîçfat Pasha [q. v.] who had already made a name for himself as governor of Niş and Prizren. The milîyetîs of Salonica and Yiânâ (Ioannina) were formed in 1867. The name Rumîll was disappered completely until it was revived in 1878. In this year by the treaty of Berlin, the new principality of Bulgaria, which was declared an independent tributary principality recognising the sovereignty of the sultan, was created and limited to Bulgaria on the Danube, the former Danube milîyet (Thâm Milîyet). From the trans-Balkan district of southern Bulgaria, an autonomous pro- 
vince of Turkey was formed and called eastern Rumellia (cf. Cari v. Sêz, Geschichte des Macht- 
fallen der Türken, Berlin 1912, p. 373, 446). Alexo Pasha from 1875 to 1884 and Cârvîl Pasha from 1884 to 1885 acted as governors there. Western Rumellia formed part of the Ottoman empire and was divided into three milîyetîs: Adriano Ble, Salonica and Monastîr. While Eastern Rumellia was occupied by the Bulgars in 1885, by the peace of Bucharest (1913) Monastîr (Tirol) was ceded to Serbia and Salonica to Greece and
only the milâjet of Adrianople [q.v.] remained to the Ottoman empire.

The history of İslam in Rumelia, which is closely associated with the expansion of Ottoman power on European soil, is still very obscure, at least as regards the sixteenth-century. Political dissections and the mixture of peoples favoured in Rumelia are even more than elsewhere the formation of sects, so that even directly after the arrival of the Ottoman on European soil (cf. John Draseeke, Der Ubergang der Ortschaften nach Europa im XVT. Jahrh., in Neues Jahrbuch für das klassische Altertum, xxxiv. 7 sqq. and ii. A. Gibbons, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916), perhaps even earlier in the Byzantine period, as is clearly shown by the not sufficiently explained problem of the Shii sectarian Şarî Salîdê Dede [q.v.; i.e. “Father Yellow Pate”], as an English translation of 1653 explains the strange name), not to speak of the obscure history of the Turks in the Vardar valley (Wardarli), all kinds of Muslim sects developed in Rumelia, the study of which has not yet been begun. Islam was built upon all kinds of religious ideas and a kind of syncretism was created which raises difficult problems for the study of religions. In particular, we must recall the converts to Islam, formerly Bogomilics, who inhabited certain areas of Bulgaria, Bosnia and the Herzegovina, and the Muslim sects and dervish monasteries of the northern Balkans, where the şâiiznas have flourished down to the present day, being undoubtedly favouring in their rise by the remarkable sectarian Şaiîḫ Bârî-dûn Mahmûdî (d. 1416 in Serres; cf. Ien Xani Simawna and Fr. Babinger, Šaïïîx Bât-dûn, der Sufi des Richters von Simavn, Berlin and Leipzig 1921), who gained an astonishingly large following in Southern Bulgaria, particularly in Deli Orman [q.v.]. Closely connected with the advance of Ottoman power is the history of the Bektashis [q.v.] in Rumelia. They founded settlement everywhere (cf. F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, Oxford 1929, 3 vols.), and quickly propagated Shiî’s views as far as the coast of the Adriatic. At the same time in Bulgaria, in the inaccessible forelands of the vast Deli Orman, the Bektashis seem to have made considerable progress (cf. thereon also T. Kowalski, Les Turcs et la langue turque de la Bulgarie du Nord-Est, Cracow 1933). Their still unlicated history there seems to be closely connected with the holy man Denir Baba and his brothers and descendants who are still to be found there (cf. F. Babinger, Das Bektashikhostr von Denir Baba, in M. O. S. S., ii. vol. xxxiv., Berlin 1931, p. 84 sqq.; cf. thereon already Ewliyya Celbî, Seyyidatunam, vol. v., p. 379). After the prohibition of the dervish orders in Turkey, banished şâiîznas and monks to some extent have sought refuge here and found followers. As well as in Bulgaria the dervishes have flourished in the modern Southern Serbia; where monasteries of the different orders are still to be found (cf. D. G. Gajdzanow, in vol. i. of the Makedonski pregled, Sofia 1925, p. 59-66). A problem not yet fully explained is raised by the Pama (q.v.) in the Rhodope mountains and round Lozena (now Lovec; see also Pama, Bajiski, cf. A. Boug, loc. cit., vol. i., p. 24) and the Gagauz on the coast of the Black Sea. But even the history of official İslam in Rumelia still requires investigation. It is certain that in many places like Adrianople [q.v.], Philippopolis, Söna, Sumula (Sumen), Razgrad (Hesargrad), Dupnitsa, Kastendil, Lovec (Lovec), Pleven (Pleven) where there were the numerous and rich mosques and buildings of the Mikhail-oghlius; cf. Jordan Trifunov, Istorija na gradove Pleven do osvoboditelnata vojna, Sofia 1933, p. 35-41), Kuskub, Istanbul (Stip), Pirizan, Pristina, Kalkunjani (Tetovo), Prilep, Momastir (Tolj-Monastir, Bitolj), and particularly in Thessaly and Macedonia, there were formed centres of Muslim culture, as the schools, mosques etc. founded there show. In these centres were born men who made a name for themselves in the intellectual history of Turkey, Kuskub, Pirizan and Pristina in particular are rich in such names and it may be assumed that their bearers were mainly South Slavs converted to and Islam. Epirus Albania play a special part in the cultural history of Islam; from there the Ottoman empire, apart from Bosnia and the Herzegovina, drew its abest and greatest statesmen and generals, for the supply was in the main maintained by the tribute of youths (denizière; q.v.) levied in the Balkans. The number of men born in Rumelia who played an important part in the political and intellectual life of Turkey is legion. They were almost exclusively natives, not Ottoman immigrants, the number of whom must always have been small, as the Turks confined themselves to exploiting the land, divided into large and small fiefs (sâtme and timür; q.v.). Ami Boué put the number of Turkish fiefs at 614 sâtme and 8,360 timür (cf. A. Boué, La Turquie d’Europe, vol. iii., Paris 1840, p. 182, without however saying to what date his figures refer).

The rule of the Ottomans in Rumelia, which began with the crossing of the Turks to European soil (1355-1357) and soon found visible expression in the capture of Adrianople in the spring of 1361 (cf. F. Babinger, in M.O.C., ii. 311. and the article ORGAN), is only very superficially known, so far as the sixteenth and even the first part of the xvth century is concerned. It is to be supposed that certain bases such as Salonika frequently changed hands, which is the simplest way to explain the different dates given of the capture of this town for example. From the great political and administrative government of S.E. Europe, the advance of the Ottomans met with varying degrees of resistance, and it looks as if the great Ottoman generals of the sixteenth and xvth centuries, who distinguished themselves on Rumelian soil and soon won tremendous influence as magnates and great landowners — e.g. the Erenos-oglu, the Mikhail-oghlu, the Timariot-oglu, the Malkoç-oglu, the Kavanoz-oglu, a “feudal family of Asia Minor” (C. J. Jirecek), who ruled in and around Tatar Bazar since the xvith century, but perhaps already much earlier, till the year 1835 when the fall of Rumelia for the second time Kavanoz-oglu Hasun Pasha died (cf. Süfîziât 1205, ii. 523 sp. and ibid., ii. 265), families (see the articles on them) who were able to hold their hereditary estates in some cases down to the xviith century — were able to win over by an elastic policy the people who had lost their own princes and chiefs. In the course of centuries some tribal chiefs were here and there (especially in Albania and Epirus and in Thessaly) to make themselves more or less independent of the Porte so that they had to be granted a certain degree of autonomy. This is shown by the case of the Yürükheg, of whom there were 7 in Rumelia about 1840, and
particularly of the ala'm in Albania who were able to make themselves more or less independent. The case of 'Ali Pasha of Janina [q. v.] and his whole family is the most eloquent example of this. Although the decline of Turkish rule in Rumelia has now been going on for over a century, the influence of Turkish culture there is in many ways so distinct that even if there were no monuments of the Muslim period to recall the past, it will remain in manners, customs and traditions.

Bibliography: In addition to the numerous books of travel of all periods which form the most important source for the history of Turkish rule in Rumelia and of which the following are specially important: A. Griesbach, Reise durch Rumelien und nach Brussa im Jahre 1789, Göttingen 1843; Josef Müller, Albanien, Rumelien etc., Prague 1844; Aim Boné, La Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1840 (fundamental work also in German: Die europäische Türkei, Vienna 1858); also his Recueil d'itinéraires dans la Turquie d'Europe. Détails géographiques, topographiques et statistiques sur cet empire, Vienna 1854; the following may also be consulted: Maxmillian Friedrich Thilen, Die europäische Türkei, intended as a work of reference for the non-special reader, Vienna 1828; also A. M. Perrot, Itinéraire de la Turquie d'Europe et des provinces d'Asie mineure, Description géographique et militaire de toutes les routes, villes, forteresses et ports de mer de cet empire, Paris 1855; C. Moutas, Dictionnaire géographique de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris 1873; E. Isambert, Itinéraire descriptif de l'Orient, Paris 1874; very full statistics regarding administration, population, religion etc. of Rumelia are given in the following: A. Uicini and Patet de Contreille, État présent de l'Empire Ottoman d'après le Statisthe (annuaire impérial) pour l'année 1823 de l'hégire (1817-1818), Paris 1876 and T. X. Bianchi, Le premier annuaire de l'empire ottoman, publié à Constantinople pour l'année de l'hégire 1242 (1827), Paris 1848; A. Uicini, Lettres sur la Turquie, Paris 1854 (reprinted from the years 1850-1852 of the Montlouis Universel, also English Letters on Turkey, London 1856 and Italian Lettere sulla Turcìa, Milan 1853); F. Crouzel, La Périménie grecque, son passé, son présent et son avenir, Paris 1876; Hianomi, Ethnographie et statistique de la Turquie, Paris 1877; Justin Cuvillé, La Périménie baltique, Paris 1918; Paul de Regla, La Turquie officielle, Paris 1890; Guillaume Le Jean, Ethnographie de la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1861; an able survey of social conditions in Turkey in Europe about 1840 is given by Jérôme-Adolphe Blanqui (1789-1814, called Blanqui in his Considerations sur l'état social des populations de la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1841, Gavneux by H. Roth: Erwägungen über den gesellschaftlichen Zwischenraum zwischen Osten und Westen der ala'm, Sudenburger-Maegdeburg 1846, based on a journey made in Rumelia for the French Academy of which he gave a Rapport sur l'état social des populations de la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1842, and described in his Voyage en Bulgarie pendant l'année 1841, Paris 1843. — On the educational system in European Turkey cf. François-Adolphe Bellis, De l'instruction publique et du mouvement intellectuel en Orient, reprinted from Le Contemporain, vues d'économie chrétienne, Paris 1866. — The Slav peoples of Rumelia are dealt with by: Albert Dumont, Le Balkan et l'Adriatique, Les Bulgares et les Albanais. L'administration en Turquie. La vie des campagnes. Le Pélemviciel et l'Hellenisme, Paris 1873; Paris 1873; Cyprien Robert, Les Slaves de la Turquie, Sur le, Montenegrins, bosniens, Albanais et Bulgares, leurs sources, leurs traditions, et leur progrès politique, Paris 1844 (? vold. 1853, with an Introduction nouvelle sur leur situation pendant et depuis leurs insurrections de 1844 à 1871); Mackenzie and Iry, Travels in the Slavonic provinces of Turkey, London 1866 et seq. suggestive descriptions of travel in Rumelia are given by A. Vignaesel, Voyage dans la Turquie d'Europe. Description physique et géographique de la Thrace, Paris 1856, with atlas; H. F. Tuyard, Researches in the Highlands of Turkey, 2 vols., London 1869; Anton Tuna, Die östliche Balkan-Halbinsel, Vienna 1886; do., Griechenland, Mahedonien oder die südliche Balkan-Halbinsel, Vienna 1888; Léon Hagonot, La Turquie insoumise. Roumanie, Bulgarie, Macédoine, Albanie, Paris 1885; Dora d'Istria (i.e. Helene Prinzessin Ghica), Excursions in Roumellia et en Morée, Paris 1863-1865; Ed. Perinettier, Voyage dans la Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1859; James Baker, Turkey in Europe, London 1877 (German transl.; Die Türken in Europa, transl. by Karl Emil Franzen, 1st and 2nd [title] ed., Stuttgart 1878-1879; French: La Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1884); Sir Charles Elliot, Turkey in Europe, London 1908; Heinrich Barth, Reise durch das Innere der europäischen Türkei (in the Berlin Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde, 1863-1864, also separately). The principal Ottoman sources for our knowledge of Rumelia are: Huldjidh Shalifa [q. v.], Rumel und Bosnia, transl. by Jos. v. Hammer, Vienna 1801 (cf. above Fr. Tschachner, in M.O.G., vol. ii., Hanover 1826, p. 309 sqq.); and the travels of Ewolty Celehi [q. v.], parts of whose sections on Rumelia have been translated into various European languages: Albanian: cf. Fr. Babinger, Ewolty Celehi's Reise in Albanien, Berlin 1930; Greek: S. A. Hadavisorgi Theodotos, in Zhanners, vol. iv., Athens 1931, p. 429-438 (cf. also, in M. Unter Athen, No. 2960 of Dec. 21, 1931, 'Un voyageur en Grèce au XIXe siècle' and Ioannis Spatarias, in Zeinam, vol. iv., Athens 1933, p. 113-125, vol. v., Athens 1934, p. 170-217, also Jean Deny, 'Un voyageur en Turquie,' in Hubert Pernet, Introduction à l'étude du d'islam Turc, Paris 1934, p. 497-508; Bulgarian: D. G. Gadzhanov, in Periodikltski spisanie, no. 5, 1933; garašteo kalianmo kritstvo vo Srbija, vol. i, Novi Sad 1909; on South Slavia of the literature collected by F. Babinger, Ewolty Celehi's Reise in Albanien, p. 1, note 3, on the Dobrudja, Rumunia etc. of the extensive literature collected by F. Babinger, Robert Bargrave, un voyageur anglais dans les pays roumains du temps de Bizans. Lupa (1854) [= Academia Românil, Memoriale sectiunii istorice, seria III, Anulul XIII, no. 7, Bucarest 1936], p. 10, note 3. — On the Ottoman geographer Mehemet Ali (a.o.) 'Omer, who included Rumelia in his work, e.g. F. Babinger, in M. O. G., I. 167 sqq. and da., G. O. P., p. 128 sq.
RUMILI HIŞAR [See Anadolu Hişar.]

RUPIYA (v.), an Indian coin, a rupiya.
In the latter xvth and early xvi th centuries the silver tanka [q.v.], of the sultans of Delhi had become so debased that when Sher Shah (1539—1545) reformed the coinage, the name could no longer be given to a silver coin. To his new silver coin, corresponding to the original fine silver tanka, he therefore gave the name rupiya = rupye, i.e. the silver coin (Sanskrit, रुप्य, rūpaka), and tanka became a copper denomination. The weight of the rupiya was 175 grains (11.53 grms.); and it quickly established itself in popular favour. Under the Moghals it was struck all over India at over 200 mints and with the decline of Moghal power continued to be struck by their successors, notably the English East India Company. In the xvth century Akbars and Djihaŋgirs struck many square rupiyas; on one coin of Akbar the name rupiya occurs. Djihaŋgir for a short period struck a heavy rupiya of 220 grains (14.259 grms.), but on the whole the rupee has shown little variation in weight. In the xixth century the English rupee gradually drove the local issues out of circulation and with few exceptions the local mints have now been closed. Such native states as still issue their own rupees strike them on the same standard as the Indian government rupee.

Aḥmad Ẓahir Duranjī adopted the rupiya as his monetary unit on becoming independent and until quite recently it remained the standard coin of Afghanistan. The Hindu kings of Assam also struck the rupees.

The Indian rupee having become current in British East Africa, it was adopted in 1890 as the standard coin of German East Africa also.

RUPY (v.), an Indian coin, a rupiya.

RUŠ, the Russians; at first the Normans, then the founders of the dukedoms of Kiev.

The Rūs of the east. In his description of Spanish Yuftli, B.G.A., vii, 334, says that in 829 (843-844) "the Magyars called Rūs" invaded Seville and committed all kinds of depredations. The name Magyars [q.v.] is regularly applied to the Normans.

The name even passed into the Spanish Primera Cronica General (xvith century) according to which the Almamnetes were worshipers of fire (λ). The origin of this use of *magia* is obscure. Did the Arabs and Spaniards allude to such rites as the invocation of the dead [cf. Ibn Fašīḥa] Masūdi, Murādī, l. 364—365; speaking of events in Spain about 900 (912—913) he also uses the term Rūs although he gives it a special meaning.

The Rūs of the east. There is quite a literature on the origin of the name of the Russians. The "Norman" school claims that the name Rūs belongs to the Normans; the Finns call the Swedes Ruodi whence in Russian Rūs (Рус). The name of the Finns Sueni similarly becomes in Russian Suom [Cymr], the basis of Ruodi[Rūs] must be a Scandinavian word [cf. the name of the coast Ruodiog and of its inhabitants Rude-kharat "rowens"). The names of the earliest Russian princes are undoubtedly Scandinavian (Rūsik < Heathræ, Igar < Ingvar etc.); the testimony of Constantine Porphyrogenetus (cap. ix.) is equally positive; in his list of the cataracts on the Dnieper, he gives the names in Russian (comesuru) and in Slav (ῤεραντζουερε), e.g. Oktúbras < in Scandinavian "octum isle" + for "rapids." = ορταιόγονιαριές < in Slav *πρωνεία *of the isle" + πρω "the cataract." The "anti-Norman" school pronounces in favour of the native origin of the name, but its arguments are mainly useful to show certain contaminations of the term Rūs (in Greek Ρούς, Ρουζ) by names in Hebrew (Ῥαζ, Ῥουζ, Septuag., xxxviii. 2—3; xxxix. 1), Greek (ῥουζ ἱδρυαντα "the red boats") etc. [It is evident that the ajāhul al-Rūr mentioned in the Kārān with the 'Ad and Thambil (Sira xxv. 40 and l. 12) have nothing to do with the Normans or the Russians, in spite of the late texts, Dimygh, text; p. 92, transl. Mehren, p. 131 and the fancies of European commmentators like v. Hammer, Sur les origines de l'état russe, St. Petersburg 1825, p. 24—29].

According to the Russian Chronicles, the Varangians (Var'sag; see below) came from beyond the sea in 859 and levied tribute on certain Slav and Finnish peoples until in 862 they were driven away by the latter. The civil wars which broke out soon afterwards among them, however, forced these tribes to invite from beyond the sea "the Varangians called Rūs". The Rūs at first settled in the region of the great Russian lakes (Ilmen, Ladoga) but in 882 Oleg (< Heiðr) moved to Kiev. This was certainly not the first appearance of the "Russians" for previously under 839 the Annaler Bertinianæ mention the arrival at the court of Louis the Pious of a Byzantine embassy accompanied by envoys from the Khān whom their king Chacunus had sent to Constantinople and who now wished to return home. An enquiry as to their identity showed that they were Swedes (Lentus ex Duennom). The Normans in Kiev were not numerous and their marriages with Slav women accelerated their assimilation. Sirotoslov (born in 942) already has a Slav name and c. 1000 the process of slavization of the Normans was complete [cf. Thomsen, op. cit., p. 123—124].

The sources of the ixth and xth centuries. The Muslim sources are acquainted with the Rūs from their first appearance in eastern Europe, Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 154, mentions only Rūs merchants whom he regards as a kind of Slaves (djīnin min al-Saḥāibā); and describes their journeys (by sea: from the remotest parts of the Saḥāla to the Black Sea, to the Khasar capital and the Caspian Sea, and by land: from Tangier to Damascus, Bagdad, Basra and then into India and China; or again they travelled still farther beyond (= to the north of) Rome through the Slav countries to reach the Khasar capital, Balkh, the lands of the Toghdunt and China; cf. Ibn Fašīḥa, p. 271). Ibn Khurdādhbih does not assign any definite territory to the Rūs. It is true that the available text of his book is incomplete but another detail is significant. Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 154, speaks of *المختصر من al-Saḥāibā* which de Goeje identifies with the Tumais (Don) [Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 352, reads Tum for Don]. The term later disappears from geographical literature but Ibn Hawkal, p. 476, and the Hadīd al-Aṣīr,
speak of a "river of the Rūs" and although the meaning they give to the term is doubtful, it is possible that their nomenclature indicates the transformation of the Šāhīla into Rūs while Ibn Khurdādbeh reflects the situation before the consolidation of Norman power in Russia. [In Idris, ii. 385, the Naḥr al-Ḵūsh is certainly the Don].

On the other hand, the common source [Muslims b. Abī Muslim; cf. Marqāt, Tabākha, p. 190] used by Ibn Rusd, the Ḥudūd al-ʿAlam, Gardizi, ʿAwtī, etc. formally distinguishes between the Rūs and the Slavs. The latter (probably the western Slavs) lived under their own princes, while the Rūs occupied an island three days' march in length and breadth, situated in the middle of a lake. Their king bore the title of khālīf Rūs. This version seems to refer to the sojourn of the Norman chiefs in the region of the great Russian lakes (cf. Novgorod, in Scandinaviam Hólm garðr "the Town of the Lake"). The Ḥudūd al-ʿAlam adds that the Russians have many towns and Gardizi says that the population of the island is 100,000 men (mardaw); these additions may reflect the gradual expansion of the Rūs or rather their amalgamation with the Slavs.

The third tradition is represented by Iṣḥākṣī and Ibn Hawqāl (< Abū Zayd Bāḥṣī) who place the Rūs between Būlgār and the Slavs. The point from which the description starts must be the town of Būlgār on the Volga. Three groups of Rūs are described. The king of the group nearest the Būlgār lives in Kūshān (Kiev; Const. Porphyrio, ch. 9; Kostka, Koppa). The most remote are the Šādūlima (probably the original inhabitants of Novgorod, the Sverd). The third group are the Arđāwīna whose king lives in Arđā (many variants, reading doubtful). They are savages who kill strangers; they come down the rivers to export the skins of black sapihe and kid (ṣījayān). Since the time of Fudayn, Arđī has usually been explained as ʿardī, the name of the eastern branch of the Finnish people Mordeva (in the basin of the Sura, a tributary of the Volga to the west of Kazan). Another explanation (Keinath, Chwolson) which starts with the variant ʿārān and explains ʿArđān by Birmania (Perm) is very doubtful. In both cases, it is necessary to suppose the previous subjection of these regions by the Rūs. In a recent work, P. Smirnov seeks to prove the existence of a Russian "khakānāt" in Rūs (in the Volga and the Oka, cf. the incident quoted above from the Annals of Berlianî. Cf. also M. Vassmer, Wikingergreifen in Russland, in S. B. Pr. Ak. W., 1937, p. 639–674, on the traces of Scandinavians on the upper Volga).

The fourth independent source is Masʿūdī (cf. Marqāt, Sīrāj, p. 330–353). In the Masʿūdī, ii. 15, he calls the Black Sea "Sea of the Rūs" for they are the only people who sail upon it and they live on one of its shores. This last allusion may be to the Russian colony of Tatarumāna (Tuttarwy, the ancient Tawārīqa on the peninsula of Taman) (although Westberg and Marqāt, cf. cit., suppose the Baltic to be meant here). Among the many tribes that composed the Rūs, Masʿūdī, Masʿūdī, ii. 18, mentions ʿArđān = Šādūlima = Tabākha, p. 141, who trade with Spain, Rome, Constantinople and the Khazars. This name is probably identical with ʿārān.
After the tenth century, Idrit alone affords any independent information about the Rus, under клине византийского, sect. 5 (the river of the Russians, the town along the Dnieper) and клине византийского, sect. 4 (the sources of the Западничество, Dnieper, Russian, and Куманы, i.e. the land of the Commans); cf. Jabbeni's translation, ii. 395–398, 401, 404, 433–434, and the passage (clime византийского, sect. 5) transcribed in O. Tallgren-Tulin, Idrit. La Finlandia, Helsingforss 1930 (Sc. Orient. Fennica), p. 115–121. Idrit hence confuses traditional and contemporary data by putting them in juxtaposition, e.g. Кызбаба is mentioned alongside of Казан (Kiev).

Persian poetry. Ниагат in his Ибн-аль-мамлекет celebriates Alexander's campaign against the Russians who had devastated Барсам и and carried off queen Низами, an ally of Alexander's. The king of the Russians who rules over the Барсам, the Казан, the Alans, the Буюрк (in Russian Восток) etc., is called Ниагат, perhaps a corruption in transcribing or in bearing the title бизан (Russ. байз) already found in Ibn Khuradбабу, p. 17. Cf. F. Erdmann, De expeditions Russorum Herodami narratis, Kazan 1826, 1828, 1832, 3 vols., and the French translation by F. B. Charmoy, L'expédition d'Alexandre, St. Petersburg 1829, English by H. W. Clarke, 1881, The Ибн-аль-мамлекет, p. 665–664, German by G. J. Baekelandt, Narodescerfdeling, 1932, last and in complete version. In the Hijaz of Ниагат, ed. H. Ritter and Ryskova, 1924, p. 11, 178–196 (transl. C. E. Wilson, i. 171–188), it is found the daughter of the king of the fourth clime (ит), the fair Slavonic, rosy-red of cheek who tells a story that happened in a "Russian" town. There is more reality in the odes of Кифтант dedicated to the Ширванских Ахильуви (530–590 == 1125–1193) from which we learn a raid by the Russians which this ruler successfully repelled; cf. Khankov, in Bull. Ar. Spb., xiv, No. 25–24 (= Mit. Isl. hist., iii. 114–150).

From the Mongol period. The statements by the later writers regarding the Russians are very fragmentary; cf. for the Mongol period: Djawun, l. 224; Abu 'l-Fidā, p. 201, 207 (the Russians, a Turkish tribe), p. 222; Dimishkī, transl. Mehren, p. 311, 378 (the Russians live on the islands of the Mazois, probably confused with a northern lake); Mustawī, Нискат-ал-Кытб (сп), p. 264; and for the period of Timur: Западник, 739–762 (as well as the geographical introduction to the Западник, Br. Mus. MS. Or. 18406, fol. 13, on the Рус, descendants of Japheth).

Turkish libraries and archives must contain intact important information about Russia; cf. Babin, G.O.I.P., p. 310 and index as well as the journal of a Turkish officer at St. Petersburg in the time of Catherine II, quoted in V. D. Smirnov, Obraz. prosv. vnut. liter., St. Petersburg 1891, p. 223–242 (writing in the edition of 1903). In Persia the Saffar chronicles only mention briefly the Russian embassies; the chronicles of the Khorasan are such as the Ибн-аль-мамлекет of 'Abd al-Rasul, N. Nādirkuli (transl. Bryan), the Ибн-аль-мамлекет of 'Abd al-Rasul, Nādirkuli, the Ибн-аль-мамлекет of Ibn 'Abd al-Qadir, and the Ибн-аль-мамлекет of Sipīr (ق.س.), contains information about the Russian-Persian wars and the subsequent negotiations [cf. Теберан]; a curious paragraph no the Russians is to be found in the Жартанах of Zain al-Abidin Shirwānī, Teheran 1315, p. 299; of no value from the geographical point of view, it is curious as reflecting the ideas of the Persians about 1530: the Russians, like the other Fārs, are clever in worldly matters (дзиннризат), but devoid of spirituality (джинн мудран). Bibliography: See the article Библиотека. — A bibliography of the Muslim sources will be found in the commentary on the Ибн-аль-мамлекет by V. Minorsky (in G. M. S., in the press). The principal studies on the Mamlukian sources are: Fréach, Ibn Fostan and andere Araber Berichten über die Russen, St. Petersburg 1823; Chwolson, Ибн-аль-мамлекет Ibn Dost (read: Ibn Rusta) etc., St. Petersburg 1869; Garkavi (Harkavy), Shamsiyya musulmān, pisatidē, St. Petersburg 1870 and 1871 (translations from 26 + 6 Arab authors; on the necessity for a new edition of these texts and the preparation of a Corpus of Arabic sources on the Russians etc. see Kratkovskiy, in Zapt, Inst. Vost., 1932, i. 55–62); Dott, and Kunik, in Carpa, in Mem. Ar. Spb., series viii, vol. xxiii, No. 1, 1875 (Russian edition ibid., vol. xxvi, app. i, 1875); Kunik and Rosen, Ибн-аль-мамлекет, St. Petersburg, l. (1875) and ii. (1903); A. Seippel, Краткое введение в тюркское языкознание, in Cer. Mar. Mus. Prov., 1909, xii. 293–444; Wehberg, Zur Kürzung oriental, Quellen in Bull. Ar. Spb., 1889, vol. xi, No. 4 and 5, and Abramov vonштукке сочинений, in Jour. Mem. Mus. Prov., 1909, xiii. 293–444; Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 330–353 (Mas'udi on the Rus). A general survey of the literature on Russian origins has recently been given by V. Minorsky, Варяго-русскую виггрез, in Slavica, t. (1931), 1–3. A still valuable survey is that of Thomsen, The relations between Russia and Scandinavia and the origin of the Russian state, Oxford 1877 (new edition in Thomsen, Samlede Arbeidsninge, i, 1919, p. 231–444); many difficult questions are dealt with in the works of Kunik, Marquart, Streiffzüge, passim, and Westberg. Among recent works must be mentioned P. Smirnov, Восток, север ("The Volga route and the early Russians"), Kiev 1928 (in Ukrainian; an original work).

AL-RUSAF (РУСАФА, Русафат Рысма, Русафат Рысма), a town in the desert in the Syrian Palmyrene, 4 farashe or 25 miles south of the Euphrates.

The town already bore this name in the pre-Mamlukian period. The Assyrian lists of eponyme mention in the years 840, 838, 804, 775, 747, and 737 B.C., a town Рас-гап as the residence of the Assyrian governor (шаху). On a relief stela of Adad-nirari IV Русафата is mentioned among the lands governed by Urigalle-eresh and formed with Kastîn (now Tell Djedlî on the Кийтб) an administrative district (Унгар, Рельєфные Адад-нирарIV III. Aus Schaw, Publikationen der Kirl. Osmanischen Museen, ii, Stambul 1916, p. 10–12, p. 2, i. 23 sqq.). The identification of Русафата with Belid Sinjar б. Forrer (Provinzialteilung des assyr. Rücker, Leipzig 1921, p. 15) can hardly be maintained (Mussel, The Middle Euphrates, New York 1927, p. 210 sqq.). In the Bible (2 Kings xiii. 12; Isaiah xxxvi. 12) Reesof, for which we should not doubt read Rejasf, is mentioned along
with Gusan, Haraq and Benê 'Eden in Telestar. Ptolemy (Geogr., v. 14, 19) mentions our town in Palmyræa as Perasa; the Tabula Peutingeriana writes Risa, the geographer of Ravenna (Cosmogr., ii. 15, ed. Finder-Parthey, p. 95, s. v.) Risa, the Notitia dignitatum (er., xxvii. 5, 27) Rosafa, the Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis in a letter (Acta Concilii Ossanam., ed. E. Schwartz, tom. i. vol. iv., p. 171, n. 2) Rasa. The name (cf. ṭaṣṣāf) means "walled road" (Clérmont-Ganneau, in M. C. O., iv. 1901, p. 112 sqq.).

About 434 the town was raised to be a bishopric against the otherwise usual practice by the patriarchal loaves of Antioch, not by the Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis. It was than famous for its church of St. Sergius dedicated to the memory of the martyrdom of the two officers of the imperial palace Sergius and Bacchos ("in the reign of Maximiannus") (the Acta Martyr., ed. in Greek by Delahaye, in Ann. Bull., xiv. 373—395; in Syrian by Bedjan, Acta martyror. et sanct., ii. 283—322, do not bear historical criticism: Haranac, Chronologie der altchrist. Litteratur, ii. 481, note; Delahaye, in Ann. Bull., xxiii. 478). The first bishop of Perasa was Marainius, who is mentioned in 434, 444 and 451 (it is not mentioned in the list of bishops of Remapa—Sergipolis in Le Quien, in O. C. ii. 951, s. v.; cf. E. Hombigg, in Orient Christianorum, iii. 214—217). The emperor Anastasius (491—518) had the thumb of St. Sergius brought from Remapa to Constantinople and stories of the miracles associated with this relic spread even as far as Gaul (Gregor. Turunensis, Hist. Francorum, vii. 31). In honour of this event the town was given the name Sergipolis and the privileges of an ecclesiastical metropolis (Ioannes Diakronomenos in Cramer, Annot. Graecæ ad cod. Paris., ii. 109). Perhaps we have Ttrsēpax [τρασπαξ] as early as 512 in the trilingual inscription of Zebed (Newbauer in Sasan, Reif. in Syrién et Mesopotamie, p. 126, note 1; otherwise in Prentice, Bull of the Amer. Archæol. Exped., Greek and Latin Ins., p. 262). Georgios Kyprios (ed. Geiser, v. 953) known as a third name of the town. Tθρασπαξ, the name of which has wrongly been doubted, probably the great basilica in Al-Rusafa also dates from this emperor (Oudinod, Topographie de la Syrie, p. 254, who however wrongly takes Ἱεράπαξ to be a name of Al-Rasafa). The Syrian name also remained in use (γάρ Περασάς: Ioannes Moschos, Phratum spirituale, chap. 180, in Migne, Patr. Graec., lxvii/vi. iii., col. 3054). The Armenian Basileios who in the 17th century sought to transform the profane geography of Georgios Cyprios into an ecclesiastical handbook added to the town the epithet τὸ τιμωρῖνον Περασάς (M. Hartmann, in Z.A., xiv. 340 sq.; Chapot, La Frontière de l’Euphrate, p. 330, note 8).

Rahban Bar 'Ida (6. Jan., 511), the teacher of the Persian Vahanians who wrote his life (Baumstark, Orientalische Litt., p. 202, 321, s. v.), was buried in Rasafa (E. A. W. Budge, The History of Rahban Hormizd the Persian and Rahban Bar 'Ida, i., London 1902, p. 115).

The town, which was situated in the desert ḥavafa (τὸ ἥαβαφα) (Procop., Bell. Pers. ii. 5, 29; Theophyl., Simoc. de de Boor, v. 13, 2; Syrian, Barbariyya: Kugener, in Orient Christian., 1907, p. 408—412), was at first defended against the Saracens only by fortifications of no great strength. Justinian is said to have been the first to surround it with proper walls (probably before 542 A.D.) (Procop., De aedificiis, ii. 9, 37), a statement which however the results of modern archaeological research show to be exaggerated (Herzel in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archäol. Reise, i. 135; Guérin, ibid., i. 28, 37). Justinian also built barracks and other fine buildings and large cisterns to provide the town with water (Procop., De aed., ii. 9, 39-46).

Khusraw I., who on his campaign to Syria in 540 had been promised by Kandidos, bishop of Sergipolis, 200 pounds of gold for removing the captured inhabitants of Sibra to the Euphrates, on his third campaign in 542 took prisoner the bishop, who had come to meet him to make excuses for not carrying out his promises, and sent a force against the town, which had however soon to withdraw on account of the lack of water (Procop., Bell. Pers., ii. 20, 3—7). Half a century later, the story was already told of the miraculous rescue of the defenceless city by St. Sergius and his heavenly forces (Eugætios, Hist. ecle., iv. 28).

About 570 there were five bishoprics under the metropolitan of Sergipolis (Notitia Antiochena, in Byz. Zeitschr., xxv., 1924, p. 75; 83). Besides the already mentioned bishops Marainius and Kandidos we know of the following metropolitan bishops: in 524 Sargs (Sergios) of Beth Rūsiyya (Ghulī, in Atti della R. Accad. dei Lincei, 1851, p. 297); in 550 Joseph, bishop of the Sacred Monastery of Rasafa (Assenian, in B.O., i. 117, 553 Abramius (Masii, i. 390; Wright, Catal. syr. MSS. Brit. Mus., i. 797), between 793 and 986, Michael Syrus (Caram., transl. Chabiac, iii. 451, n. 974, 501 a.) mentions eleven further Jacobite bishops, and from inscriptions we know of a certain Sergios (between 910 and 922); cf. Mich. Syr., iii. 462, N° 18) and Simeon, who, in 1093, restored the great Basilica (Moull, Palmyræa, p. 160, 267 sq.).

The generation and pious awe which was generally felt with regard to the sanctity of the place is shown with particular clearness in the fact that the Ghasanid al-Mundhir b. Hārith only dared to meet the Byzantine envoys here (summer of 578), as he felt himself safe nowhere else from their treachery (Johann. Ephes., vi. 43; Nödlke, in Arch. Pr. Al., W., 1887, p. 24). At this time the town was apparently not in the possession of the Ghasanid; the inscription ascribed to him states Ἰαμπαξ Ἄμαραμάκ, which was found at the "Central Church extra muros" also indicates that the inner town was still Roman at this date.

In the sanctuary of Sergius at a later date among the gifts dedicated to the saint was shown a richly decorated cross given by Justinian and Theodora, then taken to Persia by Khusraw II after the plundering of Kallinikos and Barbalissios (Mich. Syr., iv. 295), but given back by his grandson Khusraw II with another cross and a gift, both of which bore long inscriptions (Eugætios, Hist. ecc., iv. 28; vi. 21; Niechep, Kallist., Hist. ecc., xviii. 21, 22; Theophyl., Hist. ecc., v. 13; Findawri 1946; in Nödlke, Tahari, p. 297, note 1; C. de Boor, in Zett. der Archäol. f. Kirchenarch., v. 315—323). On his flight to the Byzantines Khusraw II lived in 590 in Edessa in the house of the general Johannes Rūsafīyā, a member of the family of the bishops of the same name (Mich. Syr., iii. 380, 414; Barbehraeus, Chron. ecc., i. 271). The cistern built by Justinian and later enlarged by a lahdāt is said to have been restored by the Ghasanid Nūrān b. al-Harīth b. al-Abīm (Hamza al-Isfahānī, Tāvīd, ed. Gottwaldt, i. 120;
According to Ibn Battān (in Yāsūfī, ii. 784 sq.), Kirjat al-Ruṣāfā was smaller than the Dar al-Khilāfa of Baghdaḏ. He describes the church, the outside of which was adorned with gold mosaics, and says it was built by Constanṭine, son of Helen. Below this church and of the same dimensions was a subterranean cistern panelled with alabaster slabs. The inhabitants of the fortress were for the most part Christians who earned their living by guarding caravans and transporting merchandise, but they also made bargains with thieves and robbers. The desert around Kirjat al-Ruṣāfā is so flat that one can see to the horizon on all sides. According to al-Iṣṭaḥīrī (transl. Jalālābādī, iii. 137), the town in his day (1154) had a flourishing market; a much used road led from there through the desert to Salamiya and Ḫirma. Yāsūfī was still able to see in the centre of Kirjat al-Ruṣāfā the monastery of al-Ruṣāfā which, on account of its architectural beauty, he describes as one of the wonders of the world (Yāsūfī, ii. 660 sq., v. v. Dāʾir al-Ruṣāfā). Abu ʾl-Fidāʾ (ed. Reinaud, p. 271) gives the distance of the town from the Euphrates as less than a day's journey.

In 1340 the Khwārizmians on their return from Syria came via Salamiya to al-Ruṣāfā; troops from Halab followed them and fought them at Śifīn (Abu ʾl-Fidāʾ, Ammādīs Māṣūmī, ed. Resiké-Adler, iv. 458). In 668 (1269) the inhabitants of al-Ruṣāfā fled for fear of the Mongols to Salamiya; henceforth the town remained uninhabited (B. Moritz, in Z. G. Erdh. Berl., xxii. 174 sqq., M. S. Ö. A., i. 1898, p. 144).

In 1300 al-Dimīḥābī (ed. Mehren, p. 205) includes Śifīn and Ruṣāfā in his work, which, as he knew it occupied a site of a Greek city, in the district of Bālī, while Ḫudżdji Khīlāba (Stanībul 1445, p. 593) includes Bālī and al-Ruṣāfā in the Province of Ḫīnārsīn with Halab as capital.

The imposing ruins of the town date almost entirely from ancient times. They have in modern times been several times surveyed, thoroughly examined and fully described.

RUSČUK, capital of a district and port on the Danube in Bulgaria (often wrongly written and pronounced Rutšuk) in Bulgarian Rus (Rýtš; Ruske), is situated at the junction of the eastern Lom (Turk. Kara Lom) and the Danube, hence, 1,400 yards wide, opposite Giurgiu (Giurghiu, Trans. Yer Yel Ködehyde), in part high on the line of the plateau, on the state railway from Rusčuk to Varna (since 1866) and Rusčuk to Tirnovo and is Bulgaria’s nine ports on the Danube (with about 50,000 inhabitants).

After the decay of the medieval Češevonne some 15 miles inland, which survived as the name of a Bulgarian eparchy and the ruins of which could still be seen in the xviiith century (cf. Hadžidi Kutila, Rumel und Bithynien, trans. J. v. Hammer, Vienna 1812, p. 44), the new Rus arose on the Danube half a day’s journey away. The Turkish name Rusčuk, by which the town is still almost exclusively known outside of Bulgaria, is undoubtedly a diminutive from Rus (Rútsch; Rutš; Rútsčuk; cf. the name of the island of Rhodes, Turk. Rodos and Rodos-čuk for Rodosto; q.v.), but only seems to have come into being in the first third of the seventeenth century. In the two treaties concluded between the Porte and Hungary on Aug. 20, 1503 (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., ii. 331 sqq. and text on p. 347), then Rus (Rúts) and April 1, 1519 (cf. Their Monumenta Hungariæ, ii. 524; Nasti for Rusčuk) and in Mercator’s map of 1584 the Bulgarian form still appears. The town must have already attained considerable prosperity in the xvith century. It quickly developed under Turkish rule and became an important centre of traffic, trade, industry and strategy in Danubian Bulgaria and surpassed the two fortified towns of Nicopoli (q.v.) and Silistria which played the leading part there at the beginning of Ottoman rule (cf. A. Ilrikov, Bulgarien, Land und Leute, Leipzig 1917, ii. 102 sqq.). The French traveller Pierre Lescaupier, who reached Rusčuk on June 14, 1570, in his valuable journal, which has only been published in part, describes Rusčuk as a populous town: "cette ville est peuplé et y a quantité de marchandises de toutes sortes et des vivres en abondance et à bon prix." (cf. Revue de l’Histoire diplomatique, vol. xxxv., Paris 1921, p. 46). Shortly before, the famous Ottoman architect Sinan (q.v.) built a mosque there for the grand vizier Rustem Paša (q.v.) still admired in the xvith century, presumably in the north at the water’s edge. The figure given for the population as for mosques varies; of the latter Rusčuk had at one time a considerable number. The Franciscan Peter Bögian Bakkhtas, later archbishop of Sofia, in 1640 found in Rusčuk 3,000 Turkish houses with 15,000 inhabitants and 10 mosques of stone ("fakte die pietra bianca"); and 200 Armenian houses with over 1,000 inhabitants and a citadel with five towers (cf. Eug. Fermandin, Itinera Bulgariae ecclesiasticae vol. viii. of the Monumenta stagnatiana historia Slavorum meridianalium, Agam 1887, p. 74). In 1659 Filip Stanovulov counted 6,000 Turkish wooden houses with over 30 mosques (1862, p. 263; cf. also p. 7, 10, 26, 31, 88, 137, 299 (Rusič in Russian: 1685), 300 with further particulars). Ewlija Čelebi (Seyyidkemal, iii. 334 sq.; cf. the Bulgarian translation by D. G. Gardjanov, in Periodično izdanie na bugarskoto kitovno druzhestvo na Sjefia, vol. lxx., Plovdiv 1909, p. 654 sqq.) about the same time mentions 2,000 houses of wood, also three Christian quarters, the mosque of Rustem Paša, baths and three caravan-serais in "Rusčukan". The only Jews, he says, were those who visited the place on their trading journeys. The people, whom he praises for their hospitality, lived by commerce and spoke Bulgarian as well as the "language of Wallachia and Moldavia". Ewlija Čelebi says the pumpkin (żeran) there was particularly good, to be sold for 1 pennies (5 of which = 1 Vienna groschen or 3 kreuzer, 150 = 1 taler).

Rusčuk is regularly mentioned in the many records of travel on the Danube in the following centuries. References to the town in the xvith and first half of the sixteenth century are in general agreement. The inhabitants seem at all times to have conducted a busy trade in wool, cotton, silk, leather and tobacco, which at an earlier period was for a considerable part in the hands of Rumanian merchants, who had a settlement there from 1675 to 1755. The English clergyman R. Walsh (1827) estimated the population at 18—20,000 souls. The streets by walls on three sides after the manner of Turkish fortresses, as a rule sloped steeply to the Danube which part was partly undefended. Turks, Greeks, Bulgars and Armenians lived in some 7,000 houses and conducted a busy trade with Turkey (cf. R. Walsh, Narrative of a Journey from Constantinople to England, London 1828, p. 207). Helmuth v. Moltke, who visited Rusčuk in 1835 and described it (cf. Briefe über Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei, Berlin 1877, I. 11. eg., 132. eg., 424. eg.) was surprised that "this important Turkish fortress, with its long, dominated and enclosed lines without outer walls, half armed and defensively planned" could offer the enemy such resistance. As an important frontier fortress Rusčuk suffered a great deal in course of centuries. Sieges, conquests, and bombardments (the last by the Rumanians during the world war on Aug. 28, 1916) continually altered the appearance of the town which with its regular streets and large open spaces no longer has anything of an oriental appearance. In the Turkish period Rusčuk was the residence of a sandjak-bey, at one time of a paša (about 1840, when Bulgaria was divided into the three sub-branches of Rusčuk, Varna, Vidin and Silistria), until in 1864 it became the capital of the new Danube vilayet ("Vama vilayeti") with the so-called liman of Rusčuk, Varna, Vidin, Tulca, Tirnovo (Tirnovo), Sofia and Nik, created and administered by the reformer Midhat Paša (q.v.) and formed out of the eyalets of Silistria, Vidin and Nik (q.v.). A special printing press was instituted and in addition to a newspaper a saddened ("Vama Vilayeti Sâbâatâ") annually published, which gives a good survey of the administrative measures. After the devastation wrought in the Russo-Turkish wars of 1811 and 1828, Rusčuk attained new prosperity as the official residence of a governor (wali). In 1854 Boucher de Perthes estimated that Rusčuk had about 30,000 inhabitants in 4,000 houses (cf. Voyages à Constantinople, vol. iii., Paris 1855, p. 413 sqq.); the German physician
RUSTAMIDS, a dynasty of Ḩārādī Khudjīz of Tākht. The first of the Rustamid imāms, ʿAbbāb al-Rājmān b. Rustām, of Persian origin, had been made governor of Kairawān when the Ḩārādī Khudjīz Berbers of the Ǧībel Nefūsas, led by Abu ʿl-ʿKhaṭṭāb al-MuʿtāfīrīNI (q. v.) seized the town in 753. Three years later (756), Muḥammad b. al-ʿAṣṣāḥ al-Qādī at the head of a strong Arab army, recaptured Kairawān. Ibn Rustām fled to the west and founded Tāḥtar (q. v.) in a region where the Ḩārādī Khudjīz must already have been very numerous. Fifteen years later, the Ḩājātī conferred the imamate upon him. Six members of the same family in turn succeeded him. The chronology of their reigns is however rather uncertain. With certain gaps it may be arranged as follows:

1. ʿAbbāb al-Rājmān b. Rustām 760–768
2. ʿAbbāb al-Waḥḥāb b. ʿAbbāb al-Rājmān 769–788
4. Bakr b. al-ʿAlāʾ, dethroned 799
5. Abu ʿl-Vaḳṣānī Muḥammad b. al-ʿAlāʾ b. ʿAlāʾ (7)–894
6. ʿAbbāb ʿHādīm Yūsuf b. Muḥammad, dethroned 894
7. ʿAlāʾ b. al-ʿAlāʾ, dethroned
8. ʿAbbāb ʿHādīm Yūsuf, restored
9. ʿAlāʾ b. al-ʿAlāʾ, restored

The history of the foreign relations of the Rustamids, all that authors like Ibn Khaldūn, Ibn ʿIdāhī or al-Bakrī, knew of them, is limited to a few facts. Although the kingdom of Tāḥtar was surrounded by enemies (the territory of the Ǧībal- Ǧūhadīs included the Ǧabārī [q. v.] and the İdādīs of Tāḥtar), and the tributes of Tyre passed through Samarkand [q. v.] it existed was not directly threatened by the Mongols for 100 years. We find the second imām, ʿAbbāb al-Waḥḥāb, associated in the attack by the Ḩārādī Khudjīz Berbers (Huwārān and Nefūsas) on the town of Tripoli which was under the Ǧībal- Ǧūhādīs. At the same time the Rustamids, who could not recognise the ʿAbbābād caliphate and had to defend themselves against the Ǧībal- Ǧūhadīs who were vassals of Bagdad, seem to have sought the friendship of the Umayyads of Cordova. Ibn ʿIdāhī under 107 (822) mentions the magnificent reception given by the Umayyad ʿAbbāb al-Rājmān II to an embassy from Tāḥtar which included the son of the imām ʿAbbāb al-Waḥḥāb. We also know that this Umayyad had a Rustamid among his viziers (information supplied by E. Șevi-Provençal) and that in 95 (853) al-ʿAlāʾ received a present of 100,000 dirhems from the
Umairuddin Muhammad I. The reign of this imam al-Abd saw a conflict between the Rustamids and the Barbers of the region of Tiemen, partisans of the Idrijdids of Fās, in which Tāhert was victorious. Lastly we know how in 969 (902) the kingdom of Tāhert collapsed in a few days before the onslaught of the Kutama Berbers led by the Shīʾite missionary Abū ʿAbd Allāh [q.v.]. Several Rustamids were put to death and their heads sent to Rakkāda and carried through the streets of Kairu- nā. Others, among whom according to some authors were the imams Yaʿqūb and his son Abū Sulaimān, were able to escape and reach the oasis of Wargla.

What is of more importance than the relations with the other powers of Spain and Barbary, is the internal life of the Rustamid state which our usual sources ignore or of which we get a glimpse from Iḥbāʾi chroniclers like Abū Zakarīya [q.v.].

Although hereditary, the succession of imāms was not by the will of the elite of the Iḥbāʾ community. The imām, regarded as the most worthy, most honourable and best educated man, the legal and political and spiritual chief of the state, whose prestige extended to the communities in the east, was in reality under the control of the religious caste: alābī, waqāʾīn, ṣalāḥī, the guardians of the strict observance of the laws of the sect.

In a theocratic state of this kind, crises naturally took the form of schism. The most serious took place during the reign of the second imām, Abū al-Wahhāb. At the instigation of a rejected candidate for the imamate a group of malcontents demanded that the elected imām should rule with the control of a regular assembly. This innovation was put to the Iḥbāʾ doctors in the east, who rejected the principle completely. The advocates of the reform separated from the community and formed the sect of the Nūkāris [q.v.].

A second schism took place in the region of Tāhert on the death of a governor of the province and the successor of his successor designated by the imām of Tāhert.

Crisis no less serious which seem however to have been more of the character of dynastic rivalries disturbed the peace of Tāhert from the fourth imām. The claims to the throne gained the support of an opposition formed of diverse elements. No less than the religious prestige of the imām, the resources of the region and the activity of its commerce attracted to Tāhert foreigners from Persia, the ancestral home of the Rustamids, or from different parts of Barbary, Africa from Rīfiyya, Nafta from Tripolitania, and Christian Berbers. The Sāzānznads of Rīfiyya and the Central Maghribi frequented its markets and grew rich in them. Among these heterogeneous groups, some, like the Nefātī, Fātimid and Christian, showed themselves regularly the supporters of the established authority; while others, the Arabs in particular, and very often the nomads, were disposed to encourage the ambitions of pretenders.

Exposed to the troubles stirred up by its guests and its neighbours, this ideal state had then a somewhat agitated existence. The dynasty included able politicians, like Abū al-Wahhāb, who, using the maxim divide et impera, ensured peace and whose reign marks the apogee of Rustamid power. Several Rūsmanīs were learned imāms, rising less for their looks so reform for their theological speculations, and in various problems like astronomy. Their surprising tolerance of foreigners, even those hostile to the sect, encouraged the entrance of dissident elements into the administration and prepared the way for the collapse of Tāhert and the annexation of the kingdom by the victorious Shīʾīs.


RUSTEM PASHA, OTTOMAN GRAND VIZIER AND HISTORIAN, was born in 1505 in the vicinity of Sarajevo [q.v.; cf. the report of the Ballo B. Navagero in Albâri, Relationi degli ambasciatori veneti al senato, ser. III., vol. 5, p. 807; s dn case appears il serraggio di Roma, i.e. Boma-Serby], either in Bename or perhaps on the western border of Sarajevo polje (cf. C. Truhelka, in Bojnaica Listy, Sarajevo 1915, no. 80, who comes to this conclusion because Rustem Pasha built a bridge with 15 arches over the Željeznica (of which remains still exist), of parents probably originally Christian. In a c.sagitt. of the Serbian court in Sarajevo, "Nefīs Khamun, daughter of Muḥṣaf and sister of Rustem Pasha" in the middle of Shaban 947 (June 1557) sold through her agent [khanī] Abū al-Bag Ḥ &al-De:n, mikρvā of Rustem Pasha's āmīra in Sarajevo, her house there; this gives the name of the father Muḥṣaf. The family is said to have been originally called Opaša, while C. Truhelka, op. cit., says the name was also Čiguli. The local tradition of Sarajevo knows Nefīs Khamun as a sister of Rustem Pasha and daughter of a Muḥṣaf Beg or Paša. Rustem Pasha's brother was the kapānī paša (q.v.; grand admiral) Sinān Paša. As a boy Rustem entered the school for pages in Stambul and then the service of the court. He became stirrup-holder (rifībādīl; q.v.), gained the favour of the sultan and was appointed governor of Dıyūbāriq [q.v.], later of Anatolia. In 1553 he became third and in 1541 second vizier. On Dec. 31, 1544 he received the imperial seal for the first time. In 1553 at his own request Rustem Pasha was relieved of office and retired to Serettari where his wife Miḥrā bi-Mah [q.v.], a captive from Sulamīnī (Sinānī [q.v.], had built a palace. But by 1555 he was again grand vizier, and held this office until his death in July 1561 (28th Shawwāl 968; of the various dates given, this must be the right one). H. Mordtmann, in M. S. S., xxvii, 2, 1927, 30, however, gives the 26th Shawwāl 978 (July 8, 1561) as the day of his death. He was buried in his own splendid mausoleum in Stambul beside the Saha-ke mosque (cf. Hadīth al-Wasāwa, 28).
and Husain b. Ismail, Hadithat al-Dhimānī, i. 16; wrongly in Siddīq-i 'ayyāmān, i. 378). In addition to the many buildings, notably mosques, which he erected with his vast wealth in various parts of the empire and for which he employed the great architect Sinān, Rustom Pasha made a reputation for himself by a chronicle of the Ottoman empire, Taṣārīrāt-i 'Alî-ı' Ormān, which goes under his name. In the incomplete version that has survive, it comes down to 968 (1560-1561). The narrative, as regards the earlier period, closely follows the anonymous Taṣārīrāt-i 'Alî-ı' Ormān and the Annals of the Khans of the Chaghatay, Djinālī and Nešīrī (q. v.). It is a work of the reign of Mehemmed II the Conqueror, and it shows a certain independence, although perhaps here also an original source may be found. It only becomes important when it describes the events of his time. Although Rustom Pasha is known to have encouraged historical studies (cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 82, note), it is by no means certain whether he is himself the author of the Chronicle that bears his name or whether he only had it compiled. A German translation of part of it was published by Dr. Lindwurm Vetter under the title Die Osmanischen Chronik des Rustom Pascha in the Türkische Bibliothek, xx. (Leipzig 1923); cf. also - throner 0. L., xxviii. (1925), p. 246 sq. (ib., vii., 1925), p. 154 sqf., and Hister, Zeitsschrift, vol. xxxviii. (1928), p. 57 (ib.).


RUYAN, a district comprising the western half of Mərasmər [q. v.].

Iranian tradition. According to Daramoset, Aserda, ii. 416, Ruyan corresponds to the mountain called Raudūta ("redfish") in Vajkī, i. 19, and Ruyxîb-әsän in Sundājā𝑛, iii. 2, 37, W. of East, p. 34. Hufnī, Chronology, 1, ; and Suzak, p. 220, makes Ruyan the scene of the exploit of the archer Aragh (cf. Zahir al-Din, p. 18; Fig. 8, 6, in this connection mentions the hill At-Bala-chal). In the letter addressed to the mobed Tensar by king Qobosrānu (12th century A.D.), the latter claims to be lord of Taşbāristān, Pālāšār-gar, Gîlan, Dālānāb, Ruyan and Damāvand.

Geography. According to Ibn Rusta, p. 150, and Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 304 (the latter cites Bāhashī as authority, but the passage is lacking in the Fāṣil al-Nu’l, Ruyan was at first an independent әsra attached to Dālānāb. It was conquered by Ömer b. Ḥajj Abī (after 141 = 758) who built a town there with a minār and attached it to Taşbāristān. Ruyan comprised an extensive area the districts of which lay between two mountains [Ibn al-Fakhrī: "between the mountains of Ruyan and Dālānāb"]; each township could supply from 400 to 1,000 soldiers [Ibn al-Fakhrī: in all 50,000]. The Šāhīd trived on Ruyan by Harīn al-Qaṣībī was 400,050 dirhams. The town of Ruyan called Kazda was the headquarters of the ābād. Ruyan was near the mountains of Ruyan and was reached via Ruyan. The text of the two authors above quoted suggests that between Ruyan and unsolicited al-Qaṣībī was a region which formed the military zone from which operations were conducted against Dālānāb. To this zone belonged Shāhba ["Sahāb"]; a town called al-Kaṭah [situated opposite Kazda], another (?) town called al-Mujāhīdī and lastly Muzn. [On these frontiers see the Ḥadīthat al-Ālam and Zahir al-Din.]

Iṣṭakhri, p. 206, enumerates the mountains of "Dailam" [in the broad sense] as the following: Dījālū Kārīn, Dījālū Ṭāḥūlitūbān and Dījālū al-Rūhānī (according to Barthold: al-Rūhānī = Ruyan); in these last named highlands there were formerly kingdoms (manīlā); in the part adjoining Tabaristan the kings were of Tabaristan and in the part adjoining Ruyan they were of Ruyan. According to the Ḥadīthat al-Ālam (written in 372 = 682, ed. Barthold, fol. 150b, Nūṭīl (according to Iṣṭakhri, p. 217; one nāshqīa west of Amlān) Čūr, Rūsīn (Rūyān = Ruyan) and Kaṭār (west of Gīlan) formed a province of Tabaristan but the authority there belonged to a king named Ustāndūr. Ehlī produced red woollen materials for waterproofs and blue gilī (a kind of carpet material).

Rustāmdār. From the Mongol period we find the geographical term Rustāmdār. According to the Nusart al-Qānum, p. 161, the greater part of its territory was irrigated by the Shīlī-rūd (†) and the Ṭurčhī-l Kâln (ed. Dorān, p. 298), says that Taʃk̄un (on the upper Shīlī-rūd) adjoined Rustāmdār. On the other hand, Zahir al-Dīn gives the term a larger connotation and uses it sometimes as a synonym of Ruyan and sometimes with a special meaning. An examination of the passages lends R. Vazirn, et. al., p. 133-134 to the conclusion that Rustāmdār in the proper sense was situated towards Kudžar and Kaṭār while Ruyan primarily meant the country towards Ruyan. According to Zahir al-Dīn (p. 19-20), the eastern frontier of Rustāmdār was originally at Si-Sangān (near the mouth of the river of Kudžar), but in the time of the Ābād Sišānpar was brought back to Alats (near Amlān); the western frontier was at first at Ṣalūkī (near Lengerfūd in Gīlan), but in 550 (1153) was brought back to Cottagee (on the eastern frontier of Gīlan) and in 640 (1242) at Namak-ašā-rūd (west of Kudžar). It is curious that Zahir al-Dīn, p. 17 seems to place the "town of Ruyan" (Kazda) of Ibn Rusta) at Kudžar but the passage is not very explicit and the legend of the foundation of the town given by Zahir al-Dīn may belong to a period before the appearance of the term Rustāmdār.

The princes of Ruyan. The title attached for the dynasty is Ustāndūr (perhaps *Ustān-dīr < Ostan-dīr; cf. Tahārtā, i. 2638). It is not clear if the dynasty also took the title of Ṭūrḫān < Tūrkhān which in Sāfīanī terminology was at first borne by the viceroy of the four great divisions of the empire, the prerogatives of which were lessened in time by the increase in power of the military commanders (ṣifākūhā; cf. Christensen, L'Espace des Sāfīanis, p. 41, 43). The fact is that in the passage in Iṣṭakhri, p. 206, the mountain of *Fāṭūfīān is mentioned separately and, it seems, to the east of *Ruyan but it is possible that the
two names only mean the two parts of "Ruyan" which at this time were under Tabaristan and Raify respectively. In any case, in the genealogy of the Ustumbas (Zahir al-Dir, p. 146-154 and 320-321), Padaspán appears as the personal name of the eponymous founder and of certain princes only. The synonym Padaspán (towards the end of the 16th century?) was regarded as one of the three sons of Gil-Gambur, a descendant of the Safyanian Djamasp (who reigned 497-499). Towards the end of the 7th century (Isahakii, p. 326 [see above]), the dynasty seems to have passed through a crisis which it survived. After the death of Džafar al-Dawla Kayumurth b. Rustum b. Gustahun in 847 (1453) his possessions were divided between his two sons: the line of Kâla reigned in Nîr, in the valley of the left bank tributary of the river of Amul (Haraz-pêy), and that of Iskandar at Kudîdh, on the northern slopes of the mountains of Nîr.

On the feudal wars in Māzandarān see Zahir al-Dir, ed. Dorn, index. The princes of Rustam-dâr retained their autonomy down to the time of the Safawīs. In 947 (1540) the expedition of Šah Tahmāsp against Malik Džâhângîr b. Malik Kâla, who had abd himself up in the fortress of Ludāsân, was a failure (cf. Aḥsan al-Tawḥīd, ed. Sedilou, p. 209). In 997 (1586) the maliks Džâhângîr b. 'Adil al-Nîr and Džâhângîr b. Muḥammad of Kudîdh came to pay homage to Šah ʿAbbâs but finally in 1009 (1594) they were both dispossessed of their lands: the rulers of Nîr submitted voluntarily while he of Kudîdh was seized by force (cf. ʿАd-dawli, p. 265, 334, 354-357).


The names of the carpenters are Ahmad and Husain (b. Ḥasan), cf. the name of Ahmad b. Ḥasan who carved a gateway at Bâb-e Fārūq in 670, Rahino, op. cit., p. 115 and ibid., p. 15, Husain b. Ahmad who carved the gate of Buland-Imâm near Aṣhrâf, dated 873 (1468).

Bibliography: Cf. the ars. Māzandarân; Justi, Iranisches Namensbuch, s. v. Padaspân, Ustumbâd and p. 433-435; Marquart, Kermân, p. 141, 115 (Reut); Barthold, Irans geogr. obor irâna, St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 155 and 159; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 337-338; R. Vasmer, Die Entstehung Tabaristan durch die Araber, in Islamica, 11/1, 1927, p. 115-125 (a detailed analysis of the sources); Rahino, Māzandarân in G.M.S., 1928, see index. (V. Minorsky)

RUZZ ì b. ṬALĀṬ al-MALîK al-ʿADîD, Rustâm al-Dir b. Ṭalâṭ, Mâlîk al-Isâm, Fatehmîd waṣîr, of Armenian origin, succeeded his father Ṭalâṭ [q. v.] after the latter's assassination on 26th Ramadân 556 (Sept. 12, 1165) and remained in office for fifteen months. The only event of importance during this period was a Berber invasion in 557 (1165) under Ḥusain b. Nisâr [see Mîrâb b. AL-MUSTAṢÂRî], who was captured and put to death. Rustak inherited the literary tastes of his father and is said to have governed well, but when, in the same year, he attempted to remove his rival ʿAbîwar [q. v.] from the governorship of the Upper Sa'd, the latter, encouraged by the Caliph al-ʿAdîd [q. v.], rebelled and marched on Cairo. The waṣîr, deserted by his partisans [see harâm], fled from the city (18th Muḥarram 558 = Dec. 29, 1165) but was betrayed, and executed by Ṭalâṭ b. ʿAbîwar. The historian al-Malikī remarks (Khâṣṣāt, i. 207-208) that Rustak was the last holder of the office of waṣîr al-imaṣâmî in the Fâṭimid period.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIC OF ISLĀM
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 3, read: M. is now a pretty little Arab town with 9,423 inhabitants. To the east of it is the Biaz, which was formerly separated by a wall, now taken down, from the town which lay to the west of it. The whole area is surrounded by a wall which is pierced on the north by three, in the west by one, and in the south by three gates.

P. 41b, article LUL, l. 71, instead of: The clans (gurāk), read: The tribes (gurāk).

P. 42b, l. 28, instead of: mutu-ifarika, read: muta-ifarika; l. 51, instead of: southern, read: northern.

P. 43b, l. 48, instead of: village, read: valley.

P. 43b, l. 62, instead of: like, read: as well as.

P. 44b, l. 11, instead of: Būyid, read: Ziyārid.

P. 43b, l. 63, instead of: Mākān, read: Mākān.

P. 62b, l. 37, instead of: Siyāq, read: Siyāq.

P. 76a, l. 1 and p. 77a, l. 6 from below, read: Rāmiya, for Rūmiya.

P. 76b, add on l. 22 from below: From January to March 1928, L. Waterman conducted excavations in the region of Tell 'Umair for the American Schools of Oriental Research (cf. their Bulletin, No. 30, 1928). The mound seems to conceal a tāgūrat (tower built in successive stages) with a large temple adjoining it which continued to be used in the Graeco-Roman period; a Roman cemetery was laid bare in another part of the ruined area. From inscriptions found here the equation Akhshk-Upt (Opla-Seleucia is made quite certain. For Akhshk, cf. also the article by Unger in the Reisstatuen der Assyriologie, vol. i., Berlin 1928, p. 64—65.

P. 77b, read iv. 447; for v. 447.


Add to the Bibliography of the article AL-MADĀʾIN: Apart from the already mentioned poem of Patchachy, unimportant in matter, in the periodical Lugat al-ʿArab, Baghdad, iii., 1914, p. 392, cf. especially the articles by F. Djebra in the same periodical, iii. 136—141 (with corrections by Kāsim al-Ḏujailī, op. cit., p. 292—294) and Kāsim al-Džujailī, op. cit., p. 282—294. Djebra deals particularly with the present settlements of Arab tribes in the region of al-Madāʾin, al-Džujailī also gives an account of the latter and gives interesting information also of the pilgrimages to the tomb of Salmān al-ʿArabī, describes the interior of this "sanctuary" and gives notes on various mounds of ruins in the region of al-Madāʾin which form a welcome addition to Herrfeld's topography.


P. 22a, l. 29 and 33, instead of: Maʿmūnids, read: Maʿmūnids.

P. 22b, l. 3, instead of: Farighūnids, read: Farighūnids.

P. 42b, l. 11 al ṭafra, add: According to Ibn al-ʿAṯîr (ed. Tornberg, l. 314, 375, cf. Yalāʾī, iv. 294) Kawsūdī destituted al-Mundhar b. Māʿṣār ibn-Sāmār because of his refusal to accept Masdakum and appointed in his place the Kindite al-Ḥārith b. Amr, who had embraced the new faith. Whatever may be the truth, the relations between the king of Persia and the Arab have been influenced by Mandsakum.

P. 49b, l. 11, 12 al ṭafra, read: Timur who stayed in Balkat (Milet) on his return from Smyrna in the winter after the battle of Angora (1402) (Duca, p. 76, ed. Bonn, various reading).


P. 51b, l. 19, instead of: Nūzāt, read: Nūzāt.

P. 51b, art. MIRĀTH. To be added to the Bibliography: Pellet and Bouquet, Les successions agraires misipetées, Paris 1935.


P. 64b, art. AL-MUḤAṢİRĪN. Add: In modern times the name Muḥāṣerīn has been applied to the Muḥāṣirīn who, as a result of the transfer of Muslim territory to the non-Muslim rule left their native land and went to a Muslim country in order not to be impeded in the exercise of their religious duties. For example, towards the end of the xviith century and in the xixe century large bodies of such emigrants abandoned lands occupied by the Russians and sought a new home in Turkey. A similar phenomenon
accompanied the liberation of the Balkan peoples from Turkish rule and the rise of the independent Balkan states. The Mahomedans deported to Turkey from Greek territory after the Treaty of Lunantr (1923) as a result of an agreement with Greece were always called Muhadjir, even in official language. Their affairs were regulated by a General Office for Nomads and Emigrants (Adı: Aray mucadilce Mürdürüyec müdürüysisi).

In modern Turkey the Muhadjir constitute an important domestic and cultural problem. Their settlements which are distributed over the whole of Anatolia are as a rule centres for the advancement of Turkish culture. The word Muhadjir also plays an important part in place-names in Turkish territory as an element in names, mainly of recent origin.

P. 673b. l. 22, instead of: f. 101, read: f. 108.

l. 62, instead of: Guhar, read: Guhar.

P. 674a. l. 51, instead of: Sa'dn, read: Sari.


P. 688a. l. 43, 55, 63, instead of: Mere, read: Mere.

P. 691a. l. 80, instead of: in May 1264, read: in May 1262.


P. 692a. l. 29, to be added: He has been buried at the feet of the poet Niyaș Miâri at Kastan (Lammon), where his tomb was still shown in 1916 (cf. L. Massignon, Revue, p. 164).

P. 701a. l. 48, to be added: In an early period Turkish has also known the form mus'ar (from Semitic mawâr, mawâr, mawar, cf. W. Bang and A. von Gallus, Türk. Turfan-Texte, v. 53).

P. 701b. l. 60, to be added: Signature was something of a privilege. Of the surviving engravings of Istanbul two only possessed it: Yâmmi, the son of a famous father of that name, and 'Aṭîk. The personal seals in Latin characters, made up to this day (1933), are, with a few exceptions, barbarous.

The ethnographic museum at Ankarà possesses a curious collection of metal seals provenient from the suburb of the now dissolved qawâr of the Bektâşis.


P. 712a. art. Mâkâtî. B. Seleâm. Mâkâtî's commentary on the Kur'ân is evidently from manuscripts recently found by Rütt er and Schacht is called al-Tasarj fi mutahâsibîh al-Kur'ân and deals with the different meanings of single words like la zdîh, la zdûr etc. in different passages of the Kur'ân. There are manuscripts in Scambur, Hamûdîya, N. 58, Faîrûkî, N. 79, Serîkî, N. 74, Umbîlî, N. 541; cf. Rütt er, loc., xvii. 249, and Schacht, Aus dem Bibliothek..., l. 58; also al-Abbâr Mâkâtî, ed. Rütt er, index, p. 46. According to Massignon, Le Passage d'al-Makâtî, p. 520, note 2 the commentary is quoted by Abu l-Hasan al-Malâqî, Târikh wâ-sâ'îd (Pers.) on. p. 573. Massignon calls attention to Mâkâtî's importance as a source for hymnages in which al-Shâhî followed him, cf., also, p. 703. (M. Flesser).
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From the Preface:

"Die genaue Feststellung des rechtsgeschäftlichen Typus der Ernte-
arbeiterverträge und der Unterscheidungsmerkmale der beiden Ver-
tragsarten liess das Vorkommen bisher übersehener Mischformen
erkennen. Der günstige Stand der Quellen ermöglichte es, von den
direnden Arten rechtsgeschäftlicher Verwertung menschlicher
Arbeitskraft für einen wichtigen Zeitschnitt Babyloniens ein anschau-
lliches Bild zu entwerfen, dessen Lebensdasein durch Heranziehung
von Wirtschaftstexten erhoben werden konnte, die uns Aufschluss über
Arbeitsorganisation, Arbeitskontrolle und Lohnverrechnung gewähren".